



Eugene City Council

125 E. 8th Ave., 2nd Floor
Eugene, OR 97401-2793
541-682-5010 • 541-682-5414 Fax
www.eugene-or.gov

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

July 28, 2020

**5:30 p.m. JOINT WORK SESSION OF THE EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AND THE
LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

Due to Governor Kate Brown's Stay Home, Save Lives Executive Order to combat the spread of Covid-19, this meeting will be held remotely using virtual meeting technology. Information about online or other options for access and participation will be available at <https://www.eugene-or.gov/3360/Webcasts-and-Meeting-Materials>

**Meeting of July 28, 2020;
Her Honor Mayor Lucy Vinis Presiding**

Councilors

Emily Semple, President
Mike Clark
Chris Pryor
Betty Taylor

Jennifer Yeh, Vice President
Greg Evans
Claire Syrett
Alan Zelenka

**5:30 p.m. JOINT WORK SESSION OF THE EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AND THE
LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

1. JOINT WORK SESSION: Homeless Systems Transformation

For the hearing impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hours' notice. To arrange for these services, contact the receptionist at 541-682-5010. City Council meetings are telecast live on Metro Television, Comcast channel 21, and rebroadcast later in the week.

El consejo de la Ciudad de Eugene agradece su interés en estos asuntos de la agenda. El lugar de la reunión tiene acceso para sillas de ruedas. Se puede proveer a un intérprete para las personas con discapacidad auditiva si avisa con 48 horas de anticipación. También se puede proveer interpretación para español si avisa con 48 horas de anticipación. Para reservar estos servicios llame al 541-682-5010. Las reuniones del consejo de la ciudad se transmiten en vivo por Metro Television, Canal 21 de Comcast y son retransmitidas durante la semana.

For more information, contact the Council Coordinator at 541-682-5010,
or visit us online at www.eugene-or.gov.



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY FOR EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AND LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS



Work Session: Homeless Systems Transformation

Meeting Date: July 28, 2020
www.lanecountyor.org
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 1
Staff Contact: Sarai Johnson
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-6503

ISSUE STATEMENT

The purpose of this work session is to update City of Eugene and Lane County elected officials on the implementation of homelessness systems transformation, including cross-jurisdictional coordination and expansion of shelter and housing opportunities in a COVID-19 environment.

BACKGROUND

Homelessness in Eugene and across Lane County continues to increase, with large numbers of people experiencing the loss of housing and shelter. Lane County Point in Time (PIT) counts have been trending upward since 2017, and since 2019, efforts have been made to improve understanding of the scope and nature of the county's homelessness crisis by improving data collection and reporting. During this time, a Homeless By Name List (HBNL) was established in the Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS), showing a monthly inflow and outflow of the population accessing homelessness services, and important demographic and geographic information. The first full year of this detailed recordkeeping established a baseline of 9,679 unduplicated people who accessed homelessness services in Lane County in 2019. As of June 30, 2020, 6,023 unduplicated people have used homelessness services. These numbers reflect a more accurate depiction of who and how many people are affected by a lack of housing and permanent shelter in Lane County.

In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, traditional approaches to sheltering have been strained. Congregate sheltering tactics, including warming centers and group shelters, are contraindicated in a pandemic response. In Eugene, congregate shelter beds have been reduced by nearly half, with a loss of at least 250 beds due to COVID-19 shelter protocols based on CDC guidelines. City of Eugene has successfully partnered with a variety of local service providers to create alternative shelters such as microsites and rest stops that provide non-congregate shelter options. In the pandemic environment, continuing this expansion of non-congregate shelter access can help prevent an even greater public health crisis by creating places where people can shelter in place, practice hygiene and physical distancing, and get access to basic needs to stay healthy and keep their neighbors and community members safe.

July 28, 2020 Joint Work Session – Item1

In the spring of 2018, Lane County and the City of Eugene selected the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC) to conduct a shelter feasibility study for Lane County. The study included analysis of the homeless service system map, homelessness data, best practices, and local economic conditions, to produce a final report related to homeless services and public shelter options. This report set the stage for policy makers, community providers and the community at large to begin having policy discussions about how to address the recommendations provided by TAC.

On January 22, 2019, following a presentation to the joint elected officials, Eugene City Council approved the final Technical Assistance Collaborative Homelessness Systems Analysis Report (titled "Lane County Shelter Feasibility Study"). Council also passed a motion, directing the County Administrator and City Manager to work together to establish, by May 1, 2019, a framework for implementing the recommendations in the TAC report and supporting establishment of a joint steering committee. Lane County Commissioners verbally supported the direction and deferred formal action to a future board meeting. The City and County determined that the appropriate next step would be for each organization to assign a manager tasked with co-leading the process of developing the implementation framework. The framework was developed in consultation with a steering committee comprised of Mayor Vinis, Councilor Syrett, Lane County Commissioners, and representatives from the Poverty and Homelessness Board. The steering committee developed a framework for implementing the 10 recommendations delivered in the Lane County Shelter Feasibility Study.

On May 13, 2019, City and County staff charged with leading the development of the TAC implementation framework presented to elected officials at a joint work session the Homeless Service System Transformation Framework that was developed by the steering committee (the "Service Framework"). Within that Service Framework, the City and County identified several immediate actions that could be taken to respond to homelessness in the short term as both organizations collaborate to develop a more in-depth strategic approach. City Council took action to approve the framework for implementation of steering committee strategies and passed a motion directing the City Manager to move forward with year one implementation plans, and return with a work plan, budget, financial plan, and performance metrics for Council approval.

On July 17, 2019, staff returned to City Council with specific recommendations for allocating \$1.9 million to begin implementing the Service Framework. At that meeting, Council adopted a motion approving the proposed TAC Implementation \$1.9 million Recommendations funding allocation plan.

On June 8, 2020, staff reported to City Council regarding COVID-19 pandemic responses and progress on TAC implementation. At the June meeting, Council expressed interest in updating the forecasting metrics used in the TAC report, discussed creating more housing units, inquired as to the status of the former Veterans Affairs Clinic located at 100 River Avenue, and conveyed a willingness to expand microsites and rest stops to accommodate people in need of shelter.

For the past year Lane County and City of Eugene staff have been working to advance the year one implementation strategies set out in the Service Framework, including expanding temporary

sheltering, developing potential siting options for the shelter and navigation center, supporting the siting of permanent supportive housing, and hiring a Joint Housing and Shelter Strategist to advance these strategies and champion the system-level work. Work is also underway to implement Coordinated Outreach and Landlord Engagement as well as stand up low-barrier, non-congregate emergency shelter in light of the constraints the pandemic imposes.

PREVIOUS DIRECTION

January 22, 2019:

Joint Work Session – City Council moved to approve the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC) report. (Motion passed)

Eugene City Council moved to direct the City Manager to work with the County Administrator to establish, by May 1, 2019, a framework and plan for implementing the recommendations in the TAC report. (Motion passed)

Eugene City Council moved to establish a steering committee to provide feedback during the development of the implementation plan, with the steering committee comprised of two elected officials from each jurisdiction, the Lane County Administrator and the Eugene City Manager, and two representatives from the Poverty and Homeless Board. (Motion passed)

May 13, 2019:

Joint Work Session – City Council moved to support the homeless services system improvement plan framework, that the City Manager move forward on immediate actions over the next year and direct the City Manager to bring back for Council approval a work plan, budget, financial plan and performance measures to identify success as soon as practical. (Motion passed)

July 17, 2019:

Council Work Session – City Council moved to adopt the staff funding recommendations. (Motion passed)

ATTACHMENTS

- A. TAC Update July 2020
- B. City of Eugene Code 4.815 (Prohibited Camping) and 4.816 (Permitted Overnight Sleeping)

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Sarai Johnson
Telephone: 541-682-6503
Staff E-Mail: sarai.johnson@lanecountyor.gov

TAC UPDATE JULY 2020

VERSION 7.22.20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW.....	0
HOMELESS BY-NAME LIST.....	1
HOMELESSNESS SYSTEMS TRANSFORMATION TEAM MEMBERS.....	1
UPDATE ON RECOMMENDATIONS.....	1
TIMELINES FOR PRIORITY LEVELS.....	2
PRIORITY LEVEL ONE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	2
I. RECOMMENDATION: EXPAND AND BETTER COORDINATE OUTREACH.....	2
II. RECOMMENDATION: CREATE CENTRALIZED AND COORDINATED LANDLORD AND HOUSING PARTNER MANAGEMENT.....	5
III. RECOMMENDATION: ADD LOW-BARRIER EMERGENCY SHELTER.....	7
DEVELOP A NEW YEAR-ROUND EMERGENCY SHELTER/NAVIGATION CENTER TO SERVE 75 PEOPLE.....	7
PRIORITY LEVEL TWO RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
IV. EXPAND DIVERSION AND RAPID EXIT SERVICES.....	11
V. EXPAND AND BETTER COORDINATE RAPID REHOUSING RESOURCES.....	12
VI. INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS OF COORDINATED ENTRY.....	13
PRIORITY LEVEL THREE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
VII. CREATE ADDITIONAL PSH & INCREASE UTILIZATION.....	15
PRIORITY LEVEL FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
VIII. IMPLEMENT EFFECTIVE MOVE-ON STRATEGIES.....	17
IX. EXPAND AND INCREASE UTILIZATION OF TENANCY SUPPORTS.....	17
X. TRAINING TO ENSURE IMPLEMENTATION OF BEST PRACTICES.....	17
UPDATED NUMERICAL MODELING.....	18

OVERVIEW

Since Lane County and City of Eugene formally adopted the recommendations and goals of the Lane County Shelter Feasibility Study submitted by Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC) in 2018, several critical components of the area’s homelessness services continuum have shifted dramatically. In particular, the COVID-19 pandemic has created many gaps in services due to staff furloughs and telework arrangements across social service agencies, which has slowed individuals’ access to Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and other housing placements, as well as contributed to a major loss of shelter bed capacity (44%) due to physical distancing guidance from public health agencies. While the County and City efforts to create temporary congregate and non-congregate shelter options (with approximately 200 beds during the first phase of the emergency response from March to June 2020) provided support for those without shelter and slowed the realization of this loss, the ultimate closure of the temporary emergency shelters did not coincide with equivalent bed space reopening at existing congregate shelters, leaving a gap of about 250 beds. Since the first phase emergency shelters demobilized, City of Eugene has added more than a dozen spaces through two new microsites and additional Overnight Parking Program spaces, and the Eugene Mission opened a small low-barrier pilot program. While these efforts are needed and valuable, additional capacity will be needed to close the gap between the number of people who are unsheltered and the number of emergency shelter beds available.

Lane County’s Point in Time (PIT) counts, upon which the Shelter Feasibility Study were based, have increased year over year since 2017. Point in Time counts offer a snapshot of how many people experience homelessness on one night of the year. This snapshot is helpful, but not complete. Additional information included in the Point in Time counts, collected from service providers, offers further perspective regarding how many people experienced homelessness in Lane County for at least one night each year (see table below)¹.

Year	Reported Number of People Experiencing Homelessness for at Least One Night of the Year in Annual PIT Count
2013	9,856
2014	11,668
2015	12,167
2016	12,998
2017	15,454
2018	13,070

¹ Source: https://lanecounty.org/government/county_departments/health_and_human_services/human_services_division/point-in-time_pit_homeless_count

HOMELESS BY-NAME LIST

Beginning in 2019, strides have been made to improve understanding of the scope and nature of the homelessness crisis by improving data collection and reporting. During this time, a Homeless By-Name List (HBNL) was established in the Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS), showing a monthly inflow and outflow of homelessness systems users and providing important demographic and geographic information on the population accessing these services. The first full year of this detailed recordkeeping established a baseline of **9,679** unduplicated people who accessed homelessness services in Lane County in 2019. As of June 30, 2020, **6,023** unduplicated people have used homelessness services so far this year. Of this population, 80% are unsheltered, a much higher rate than the national average of 35% unsheltered.² The HBNL numbers provide a more comprehensive view of who and how many people are affected by a lack of housing and permanent shelter in our community.

Given these COVID-related developments and the current HBNL data, along with elected officials' requests for updated projections regarding the Feasibility Study's shelter bed and PSH recommendations, the Homelessness Systems Transformation Policy and Implementation Teams has prepared this update.

HOMELESSNESS SYSTEMS TRANSFORMATION TEAM MEMBERS

Policy Team: Steve Mokrohisky, Sarah Medary, Kristie Hammitt, Greg Rikhoff, Karen Gaffney

Implementation Team: Peter Chavannes, Lora Ashworth, Brooke Freed, Steve Manela, Laura Hammond, Devon Ashbridge, Sarai Johnson

UPDATE ON RECOMMENDATIONS

This report includes all the recommendations from the Shelter Feasibility Study reordered based on current priority focus areas. These priority areas were approved by the Policy Team in May 2020, adapted in June 2020 based on COVID-imposed needs. Work to implement these recommendations is underway with the Implementation Team. Recommendations are listed according to current priority as determined by the

² The HUD definition for "unsheltered" is people who sleep in places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, or abandoned buildings (on the street). This definition includes alternative shelters such as Rest Stops, Dusk to Dawn, Opportunity Village, and car camping programs, which provide temporary shelter to about 400 people. There may be ways the county and cities can partner to make upgrades to some facilities to meet HUD habitation standards, which would allow them to count toward CoC (Continuum of Care) outcomes for emergency shelter. See: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3766/esg-minimum-habitability-standards-for-emergency-shelters-and-permanent-housing/>

Policy Team and appear in a different order than they were presented in the original Shelter Feasibility Study. Updates include current status of the recommendation accompanied by additional guidance offered by TAC in the original report, when available. Some recommendations may require changes in approach based on the current environment, which is noted under each Priority Level One and Priority Level Two focus area.

TIMELINES FOR PRIORITY LEVELS

In order to manage the work and prioritize the most immediately impactful recommendations, the Implementation Team worked with the Policy Team’s agreed-upon priorities and phased them into 90-day, 180-day, 1-year, and 2-year/beyond timing as follows:

Priority Level One: To be deployed **within 90 days**

Priority Level One projects reflect a commitment to support and respond to the most vulnerable members of the community – those who live unsheltered in places not meant for human habitation, who have barriers to housing, and require support and resources to remove barriers and obtain housing. The current pandemic and housing crisis necessitate a new approach, including strategies for the coming winter.

Priority Level Two: To be deployed **by 12/31/20**

Priority Level Three: To be deployed in **FY 21**

Priority Level Four: To be deployed after **FY 21**

PRIORITY LEVEL ONE RECOMMENDATIONS

For implementation within 90 days/ by September 30, 2020

I. RECOMMENDATION: EXPAND AND BETTER COORDINATE OUTREACH

Street Outreach is designed to build rapport and relationships with people who live unsheltered to help them move toward supportive services, emergency shelter, and permanent housing as it becomes available. This work moves at the pace set by the participant, with Street Outreach Workers supporting them to make incremental improvements to their living situation and removing barriers to housing as they are ready and able to do so.

Expand and Better Coordinate Outreach

Recommendation	Status	Changes
<p>Expand Street Outreach to include a minimum of five (5) FTE outreach workers and one (1) FTE County Outreach Coordinator/Manager</p>	<p>Underway – the Lane County budget included funds to hire one (1) FTE Program Services Coordinator to oversee Coordinated Street Outreach and Coordinated Entry efforts. Funding from Dislocated Worker workforce resources will allow the Human Services Division of Lane County to hire four (4) FTE Street Outreach workers (two teams of four 1040 (0.5 FTE) who will work for six months) to work in coordination with city and nonprofit partners in multiple jurisdictions to stand up ongoing Outreach work. These positions are posting in early July 2020 for immediate hire. In addition, City of Eugene used one-time funding to hire one (1) FTE Street Outreach Coordinator in March 2020 to lead a city-based outreach pilot in collaboration with county-based efforts.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Expand and redesign Street Outreach to become a coordinated system-wide approach, connected to Coordinated Entry, emergency shelters, and other housing opportunities</p>	<p>Underway – City and County staff have been collaborating to develop a coordinated system that will be further informed by service provider and lived experience input. These basic parameters and requirements of the program will be shared with providers and people with lived experience to help inform and create implementation plans for Coordinated Street Outreach. Formal program design began on May 5th with an Outreach Framework and Initial Budget draft, continued with a July 6th Outreach Planning Process with City of Eugene and Lane County internal stakeholders, and will move forward with repeating that process with external stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Increase use of mobile technology (tablets) with HMIS embedded. This would allow for entries into an “Outreach” project in HMIS before a common assessment is complete, so that there is a real-time accounting of all individuals or families living in unsheltered situations.</p>	<p>Upcoming – City and County staff have agreed that use of HMIS is fundamentally important to the integrity of Street Outreach work and impact measurement. Defining which application and how to employ HMIS in real time for Street Outreach workers is a critical part of defining the program activities and parameters in partnership with the Lane County HMIS Administrator.</p>	<p>None</p>

Expand and Better Coordinate Outreach, Continued...

Recommendation	Status	Changes
Create a small annual “Barrier Buster” fund of \$50,000 in financial assistance for those engaged in outreach to be used to reconnect people to permanent housing.	Upcoming – This fund has not yet been created or funded. This may be an opportune time to pilot a fund with one-time dollars from COVID relief or other CARES Act-related funds, some of which can be used for the next two fiscal years (Emergency Services Grant/ESG). Building in funding and expenditure policies and procedures will be part of the Street Outreach collaborative planning work.	None

II. RECOMMENDATION: CREATE CENTRALIZED AND COORDINATED LANDLORD AND HOUSING PARTNER MANAGEMENT

In the immediate term, this strategy is intended to create ways to reach out to landlords whose tenants may have difficulties making rent when the federal unemployment match sunsets on July 31, 2020, and when the state eviction moratorium ends in October. Long-term, this recommendation will allow the county to create a pool of willing landlords, which will expedite the placement and support for people who hold PSH vouchers or other housing vouchers.

Create Centralized and Coordinated Landlord and Housing Partner Management		
Recommendation	Status	Changes
Add two (2) FTE Housing Partner Coordinators at the county level whose sole job is to recruit new housing partners, create and maintain landlord relationships, and track levels of risk tolerance across housing partners.	Not Yet Started – This was not originally slated for FY 21 but has risen to the priority list because of widespread unemployment and the increased risks to housing stability in an already unstable rental housing market in Lane County. Landlord Engagement in the long-term is meant to increase the number of landlords willing to participate in housing voucher programs including Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH).	None
Establish a By-Name Landlord Management Tool to allow tracking of open units and willing landlords with a place to note risk aversion; for instance, noting which landlords will take individuals with past evictions vs. those who will not.	Not Yet Started – This list will be established in partnership with Homes for Good and other organizations that have access to landlords and are willing to share and collaborate within and beyond those relationships.	None
Implement a Housing Partner Handbook that outlines expectations for housing service providers when engaging with and responding to landlords, with communication protocol and service expectations. Create Memoranda of Understanding between CoC and Service Providers based on agreements outlined in the handbook.	Underway – a contract employee spent some time with Human Services Division within the past couple of years to begin working on this resource. Staff will update and complete with current information.	None

Create Centralized and Coordinated Landlord and Housing Partner Management, Continued...

Recommendation	Status	Changes
<p>Institute a quarterly service provider landlord case conferencing system whereby housing providers can share information and lessons learned relative to their direct interaction with area housing partners and landlords.</p>	<p>Not Yet Started – This work may not commence within the initial 90 days but can be implemented this fiscal year if other priorities allow for capacity to do so. This work may take longer to develop than other activities in this area of work because relationship development takes concentrated time and effort.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Consider a more robust landlord engagement strategy that educates landlords on the housing services provided and validates landlord concerns in working with housing programs.</p>	<p>Not Yet Started – Staff will work with the Public Information Officers on the Implementation Team and other partners as needed to develop this in tandem with Landlord Engagement strategies.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Create a risk mitigation fund that can be used if excessive damage is done to units or rent loss. Create strategic partnerships that could conduct repairs, furnishing, and provision of other necessities.</p>	<p>Underway – an initial fund of \$50,000 was set up within the Human Services Division to support the Landlord Engagement partnership pilot that was developed with Homes for Good. This fund has had one claim, which was limited to no more than \$2,000. This fund and other resources (including financial incentives and other strategies) will be explored with landlord stakeholders when program development begins in earnest.</p>	<p>Consider expanding beyond the risk mitigation fund to include incentive payments and/or revolving loan funds that may support landlords’ willingness to take on the perceived risk of leasing to people who were previously unhoused and have other barriers to housing.</p>

III. RECOMMENDATION: ADD LOW-BARRIER EMERGENCY SHELTER

The concept of a Public Shelter that provides access to people without requiring pre-requisites such as sobriety for entry has long been discussed by City Council. The recommendation in the report is to model the shelter service provision on Navigation Centers, a trend in shelter practices that has emerged over the past several years in metro areas along the West Coast. Navigation Centers are low-barrier shelters that are intended to improve the flow within the shelter system to house people quickly and free up shelter beds for people who need them. This recommendation is one that requires some thought and adaptation during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially in light of the focus on non-congregate shelter options supported by HUD and CDC.

DEVELOP A NEW YEAR-ROUND EMERGENCY SHELTER/NAVIGATION CENTER TO SERVE 75 PEOPLE

Status: Underway with some important immediate-term caveats as follow:

COVID- 19 CONSTRAINTS

In April 2020, Lane County purchased the former VA Clinic at 100 River Avenue in Eugene. This facility is currently used to support and shelter people who contract COVID-19 but can't return home to isolate safely, and to quarantine people who are leaving Department of Corrections and other facilities where there have been known COVID-19 outbreaks. This location was one of the top two sites previously considered for the Low-Barrier Emergency Shelter and Navigation Center. Should this location meet City Council's criteria, it could be used as the future Low-Barrier Emergency Shelter and Navigation Center. However, the timing for use of the facility – including a full buildout and adding sleeping capacity from the current 30-40 beds to 75 beds – is uncertain, and dependent on the COVID-19 trajectory in the county.

Along with this uncertain timeline, the system faces a shortage of emergency shelter beds due to COVID-19. Additionally, winter strategies have historically relied on Egan Warming Centers, volunteer-run congregate shelters that stand up during cold nights in the winter. This volunteer force primarily consists of older adults who are especially at risk of complications from COVID-19. CDC and HUD guidelines have increasingly moved toward promoting non-congregate shelter strategies in light of COVID-19. These shifts have prompted urgency to create *non-congregate* places where people can sleep now and continuing into winter months.

Unsanctioned camping has visibly increased as a result of congregate shelter bed reductions and CDC encampment guidance, which has imposed a significant cost to the city including portable toilets, handwashing stations, clean-up of garbage and other biohazards, and the cost to repair environmental damage (as well as all associated staff required to support these functions).

Should this disease begin to spread among the unhoused community (which, so far, has not been hit by the pandemic locally), it could have devastating impacts on the unhoused population as well as the community as a whole.

CONCERNS WITH NAVIGATION CENTER MODEL OUTCOMES IN EARLY ADOPTER CITIES (PARTICULARLY SAN FRANCISCO)

Navigation Centers are shelters that are designed to rapidly place people in permanent housing. This approach appears, on the surface, to create more through-put in the shelter and housing system, assuming permanent housing units are available (which is not currently the case in Lane County).

A 2020 conference attended by several Human Services Division staff members included presentations on unpublished outcomes information related to Navigation Centers in San Francisco. The city and county can learn from the challenges, mistakes, and unintended consequences of San Francisco's early work. A presenter shared the following examples:

Early on, the San Francisco Navigation Center was made the central point where people could access Permanent Supportive Housing and other resources, and as a result, became the de facto Coordinated Entry point, which was not a good system of care, and did not expand access for most people who needed it.

San Francisco city and county used an Incident Command Structure – nobody was in charge, and the responses were reactionary. They didn't have the right people at the table, and only had government officials engaged at this level.

A mistake they made early on was focusing on complaints from residents to trigger encampment enforcement rather than maintaining a social service approach. They treated people who were unhoused as a call that needed to be resolved rather than a complex human being with sophisticated needs and barriers. They suggested that "responding to the needs of housed people does not help the unhoused."

The approach led Street Outreach workers to leave en masse, which led to a significant decline in remaining staff morale and significant decreases in engagement with unsheltered individuals.

Data showed that 650 people were placed in permanent housing (PSH and other) through Navigation Centers; however, of these, *619 people returned to the streets*, representing a **95% recidivism rate**. No data was presented as to why this was the case, but the presenter alluded to the idea that the pace with which people were ushered through the Navigation Center did not allow for enough stabilization and support before exiting to housing. This fast-paced approach did not work for the unsheltered and unhoused, chronically homeless population.

As a result of widespread recidivism, peoples' cases and the community situation worsened, increasing trauma in people who were placed in housing, only to return to the streets within 24 months or less; more tents and vehicle encampments sprung up, along with increased

neighborhood complaints (the Navigation Center selected residents from encampments, which caused them to get larger as unhoused people became aware of this opportunity to gain access to better shelter and housing).

San Francisco encountered major equity issues by focusing on particular neighborhoods or populations.

Program managers said that the cost to run Navigation Centers is “absurdly expensive,” at approximately \$110 per bed per night (whereas traditional shelters run about half that cost).

LEARNING FROM THESE CHALLENGES

There are tangible ways city and county leaders and staff might avoid making similar mistakes to early Navigation Center deployment:

Harness the momentum of the community energy on this topic: At this time in Eugene, neighborhood associations, advocates, providers, and other community members are concerned over the increasing number of large unsanctioned encampments, and are interested in being part of the solution to the current housing and homelessness challenges.

Educate and involve housed people in this work: Implement community trainings, education, communication, and partner with media outlets to help housed people understand and get involved in housing and homelessness.

Engage unhoused people as community members: The unhoused/unsheltered population is as diverse as the population of people who have housing. Approach people who are unhoused and unsheltered in the community *as* community members, and not a problem to be fixed, controlled, or solved.

Continue building solid and reliable data: Tools such as the Homeless By Name List provide powerful information that can drive decision-making and evaluation of outcomes. Gather data, broaden participation in HMIS, maintain the integrity of data and reporting, and make data-driven decisions.

Engage curiosity when people decline services: When people refuse services, find out why. Integrate these responses into the programmatic approach to widen the net to support as many people as possible (rather than assuming people want to remain unhoused).

Make strategic, intentional investments in homelessness response: Consider the value and impact of each dollar invested into the shelter and housing system. Assess whether a Navigation Center model is the best use of funds in the current environment, or whether other models or combinations of models may serve our community more meaningfully. Determine whether funds currently allocated elsewhere could support proactive engagement, sheltering, housing, and other capacity-building opportunities.

Make equity front and center: Build equity into every step of planning, implementation, and impact assessment.

Based on updated modeling (below), Navigation Centers are one of several shelter options needed to house the people who live unsheltered and in places not meant for human habitation in Lane County. The county currently needs more low-barrier shelter options where people can safely

sleep without meeting prerequisites of sobriety or other mental or behavioral health milestones. Given the constraints imposed by COVID, it may be most appropriate to look at implementing a *Navigation System* to serve people staying at many different shelters (in a similarly intensive way as was intended within the planned Navigation Center).

In addition, the current approach to alternative non-congregate sheltering may be adapted to meet HUD habitation guidelines so that more shelter beds could count toward Continuum of Care (CoC) outcomes, which in turn, could increase funding allocations to the CoC, leading to more capacity to build and manage units and beds in the system.

This system approach may lead to smarter investments and enable shorter term outcome measurements with which to make decisions about programming before investing larger amounts.

PRIORITY LEVEL TWO RECOMMENDATIONS

For implementation by December 31, 2020

IV. EXPAND DIVERSION AND RAPID EXIT SERVICES

- 1. Implement diversion system-wide and have six (6) FTE Diversion Specialists and \$50,000 in annual diversion financial resources.*
- 2. Diversion Specialists should be positioned at and rotate through various emergency shelter and crisis service centers at key times of the day/week when newly homeless households typically present for services.*
- 3. Financial assistance should be highly targeted through written policies and procedures for payment commitments and distribution (minimum host expectations, limits on amounts, assurance that assistance aids in longer-term housing opportunities).*
- 4. Provide a system-wide diversion training for direct care practitioners and work to orient diversion and rapid exit services within the front door or all emergency access points.*

Status: Started – Some parts of this recommendation will be implemented by calendar year end, including Rapid Resolution implementation and training. The Barrier Buster fund of \$50,000 could potentially be funded with COVID Community Relief Funds and/or ESG. Funds have been allocated in the Lane County budget for ongoing support for this Diversion and Rapid Exit efforts.

V. EXPAND AND BETTER COORDINATE RAPID REHOUSING RESOURCES

1. *Use Rapid Rehousing resources as a system-wide intervention not constrained to any one provider, even if funds are managed and delivered by a discreet set of organizations.*
2. *Create system-wide RRH written standards and expectations, including training expectations, focused on households with higher vulnerability, and flexible, progressively administered housing and financial assistance.*
3. *Coordinate with and participate in a system-wide landlord and housing partner outreach and relationship management strategy (see Landlord Engagement Strategy Recommendation).*
4. *Include training and expectations related to housing first, crisis response, client choice, and progressive assistance. Training should also include tenancy support models that focus on tenancy access and preservation rather than clinical or other long-term personal outcomes.*
5. *Incorporate four dimensional tenancy supports (Breadth, Depth, Frequency, and Duration) as a foundation for housing services.*
6. *Identify an additional \$500,000 in annual RRH funds, \$350,000 of which would focus on individual adults and the remainder targeting families to serve 125+ more households annually.*

Status: Not Yet Started – This recommendation will become critical in the early fall with the likely sunset of the eviction moratorium at the state level (to be finalized in the special session this week). This may be another place where ESG and other relief funds would be helpful in jumpstarting work on this recommendation.

VI. INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS OF COORDINATED ENTRY

1. *Ensure referrals for all units dedicated to people experiencing homelessness (including non-CoC funded projects) are made through the Centralize Waitlist.*
2. *In addition to assessors at provider agencies and through outreach staff, add two (2) FTE county-level assessors who have the capacity to conduct assessments through walk-ins and via phone. Outreach staff who conduct assessments should be provided mobile technology whenever possible to ensure assessments are placed into the system in real time.*
3. *Ensure Coordinated Entry is fully connected to and engaged with the system-wide Outreach team (see Outreach recommendations).*
4. *Create strong housing navigation systems, including two to three (2-3) FTE Housing Navigators throughout the system to connect people to diversion, outreach, emergency shelters, PSH, and RRH. Housing Navigators will participate in the case conferencing process as well.*
5. *Eliminate separation and use of “buckets” for referrals to Centralized Waitlist for PSH and RRH. The Coordinated Entry system should allow people to access any of the resources for which they qualify and not presume that certain households will not be successful in RRH.*
6. *Implement a progressive and phased assessment approach. This could include a tiered approach based on when assessments occur and the level of assessment provided in each phase.*

7. *Revise how assessments are updated to decrease the number of “expired” assessments. The Coordinated Entry system should not require that households go through a full assessment to remain active in the system.*

8. *Establish a case conferencing process among Outreach, Navigator, and Coordinated Entry staff to allow for a dynamic prioritization of households on the CWL.*

Status: Partially Underway – Some work on this has been started. Staff plan to convene service provider partners to help co-design this set of recommendations in order to find the best ways to implement in keeping with partner capacity, needs, and capability. Staff want to do more than get “buy-in” – and want to share ownership of this work. CE is a relatively complex system that not all providers understand, and many have not opted to participate in this (or HMIS). Staff would like to find a way to engage and include providers who have traditionally operated outside the system so staff can create an easier pathway through homelessness services in Lane County (rather than the current lack of easy access points that exist today).

PRIORITY LEVEL THREE RECOMMENDATIONS

For implementation by FY 21 year end

VII. CREATE ADDITIONAL PSH & INCREASE UTILIZATION

1. *Add 350 new PSH units (as well as repurpose and increase utilization of existing units) to be accessible to people experiencing homelessness who have Extremely Low Incomes.*
2. *Continue to apply for and/or support developers in applying for Housing First PSH and Mainstream Housing Vouchers.*
3. *Identify barriers in VASH resource deployment, project base some vouchers, and once barriers are resolved, consider expanding the program.*
4. *Ensure PSH is targeted to the most vulnerable single adults by making all referrals to PSH through Coordinated Entry.*
5. *Ensure PSH providers coordinate with and participate in system-wide landlord and housing partner outreach and relationship management strategies (see Landlord Engagement Strategy).*
6. *Ensure the crisis response system – especially case managers – understands how to leverage reasonable accommodations.*
7. *Consider increasing the PHA payment standard to allow greater competition of vouchers within the private market.*
8. *Ensure effective participation in system-wide landlord engagement strategies to increase access to units and quicker housing search (see Landlord Engagement Strategy).*

Status: Underway – many portions of this recommendation area have been started and continue to be developed. The Commons at MLK will open for move-in in Winter 2020, which will add 51 PSH units for people who have a high level of need. The City and County continue to work with

Homes for Good to plan more units, and anticipate an additional 60 units for single adults to come online by the end of 2022. Additional projects will need to be identified in order to meet the goal of 350 units within five years, so this FY will include work on alternative development strategies, housing model diversity (including Single Room Occupancy, co-housing, cooperative housing, and other possibilities), and the development of additional funding streams that can lower the cost of unit production.

PRIORITY LEVEL FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS

For implementation after FY 21

More detail will be added to these recommendations before FY 2021/2022 ends. Currently staff time is dedicated to the level 1-3 priorities.

VIII. IMPLEMENT EFFECTIVE MOVE-ON STRATEGIES

1. *Target households ready to move on from PSH after stabilizing by creating preferences within mainstream affordable housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program to maintain housing affordability while freeing up PSH intensive resources for another household exiting literal homelessness.*

IX. EXPAND AND INCREASE UTILIZATION OF TENANCY SUPPORTS

1. *Ensure providers are able to effectively provide and bill for tenancy supports.*
2. *Require capacity development on service delivery and billing, and training and supports on the delivery of best practices.*

X. TRAINING TO ENSURE IMPLEMENTATION OF BEST PRACTICES

1. *Establish a training and professional development protocol at the county level that addresses, at minimum, the following:*
 - a. *Housing First, Progressive Assistance, and Client Choice (annual)*
 - b. *Rapid Rehousing Practices (annual and when a new provider begins)*
 - c. *Coordinated Entry (annual and when significant changes are made)*
 - d. *Tenancy Supports and Case Management (annual in person, quarterly online)*
 - e. *CoC Start Up Trainings (whenever offered by HUD)*
 - f. *Project and Fiscal Management (annual for housing assistance administrators)*

- g. HUD Webinar Trainings (all – every provider must have at least one attendee)
- h. VA SSVF Monthly Webinar Series (all SSVF providers)
- i. New Staff Orientation (all new staff, online modules specific to program type)
- j. SOAR (one SOAR specialist mandatory for each provider or county-wide SOAR training)
- k. Ongoing webinars offered by national partners such as TAC, NAEH, and others

UPDATED NUMERICAL MODELING

Implications of Improved Data: A recent meaningful change is the development of the By Name List, which, as mentioned above, provides a clearer picture of who and how many people are unhoused in our community. This new information has necessitated an adaptation of the original recommendations from the Feasibility Study using these new numbers and assumptions. The original assumptions were based on moving toward enough shelter and housing for all single adults served within the homelessness response system. Policymakers may consider moving the scope beyond just single adults by including specialized populations such as unaccompanied youth, veterans, medically vulnerable people, and chronically homeless, among others.

Glossary of Terms: The following types of housing and shelter are included in the updated numerical projections. Definitions are from HUD, unless otherwise specified.

Emergency Shelter: Any facility, the primary purpose of which is to provide a temporary shelter for the homeless in general or for specific populations of the homeless and which does not require occupants to sign leases or occupancy agreements.

Alternative Shelter: HUD does not define alternative shelter. Locally, Lane County uses Alternative Shelter to refer to shelters that do not meet HUD habitation standards, including Conestoga huts, tiny homes that don't meet RV or Mobile Home HUD requirements, car camping, and any other non-conforming structures. Under HUD definitions, people staying in Alternative Shelters are considered unsheltered.

Transitional Housing: A project that is designed to provide housing and appropriate supportive services to homeless persons to facilitate movement to independent living. Transitional Housing is not favored under Continuum of Care scoring but serves an important role in Lane County's housing spectrum as a temporary landing place where individuals or families experiencing homelessness can stabilize.

Rapid Rehousing: A form of permanent housing that is short-term (up to 3 months) and/or medium-term (for 3 to 24 months) tenant-based rental assistance, as set forth in [24 CFR 578.51\(c\)](#), as necessary to help a homeless individual or family, with or without disabilities, move as quickly as possible into permanent housing and achieve stability in that housing.

Permanent Supportive Housing: Permanent housing with indefinite leasing or rental assistance paired with supportive services to assist homeless persons with a disability or families with an adult or child member with a disability achieve housing stability.

At the time the Shelter Feasibility Study was created in 2018, shelter and housing capacity looked like this:

	Emergency Shelter (ES)	Transitional Housing (TS)	Rapid Rehousing (RRH)	Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
Individual Beds	364	47	50	407
Utilization Rate	85%	92%	73%	87%
Turnover Rate	9%	10%	11%	2%

TAC calculations originally concluded, based on the Lane County Point-In-Time count and a monthly newly homelessness rate of 130 people per month, that adding 75 beds of Emergency Shelter and 350 units of Permanent Supportive Housing while increasing turnover rates and improving diversion efforts would lead to functional zero *unsheltered* people experiencing homelessness (where the number of available beds and units is adequate for all people who want and need shelter and housing). These assumptions did not include adding any Transitional Housing or Rapid Rehousing units. In this scenario, the “current system” (based on 2018 PIT assumptions) would shift from 1009 unsheltered to 0 at 36 months; total literally homeless would reduce from 1365 to 467; and the estimated unmet permanent housing need would reduce from 1393 to 283.

These numbers are drastically different in light of the recent shelter bed losses coupled with the new information from the By Name List (averaging 4,100 people who are unhoused, of which 3,300 are unsheltered in Lane County in a given month according to the By Name List; as compared with the 2018 Lane County PIT count of 1,395 people who were unhoused and 1,009 who were unsheltered). Below are updated projections on the number of shelter beds and affordable housing units based on By Name List counts.

As of June 2020 the current system looks like:

	Emergency Shelter (ES)	Alternative Shelter (AS)	Transitional Housing (TS)	Rapid Rehousing (RRH)	Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
Individual Beds	260	332	48	59	411
Utilization Rate			72%	66%	80%
Turnover Rate			70%	59%	12%

Based on this information, staff recommend increasing all types of housing over the coming five years to achieve goals similar to those presented in the Shelter Feasibility Study.

In order for that to occur, the following capacity would need to be added the system (*these numbers only apply to adults, typically singles or couples, not families with children, unaccompanied minors, or youth*):

Emergency Shelter Beds to Add Each Year:

Additional beds to add beyond original Shelter Feasibility Study recommendations are highlighted in yellow.

Current	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	FY 24/25	TOTAL
260	75	100	100	100	100	735

This aggressive strategy to add new Emergency Shelter (that meets HUD habitation standards) would create safe places for single adults to sleep and adequately stabilize to be ready for permanent housing and make self-determined choices about their lives. As more vouchers and housing units are added to the system, and utilization rates are increased, less emergency shelter should be needed.

Alternative Shelter Beds to Add Each Year (Dusk to Dawn, Car Camping, Conestoga huts, etc.):

Additional beds to add beyond original Shelter Feasibility Study recommendations are highlighted in yellow.

Current	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	FY 24/25	TOTAL
332	100	68	68	68	69	705

As non-congregate shelter has become an essential strategy in the COVID-19 environment, and as the City and County work on building more housing units and adding vouchers, alternative shelter models have become increasingly useful. Expansion of the variety of alternative shelter programs by expanding car camping, rest stops, microsites, and other strategies may be the fastest and most affordable option at hand. If development of microsites and rest stops could include development of units that meet HUD habitation standards, the shelters could apply to CoC outcomes.

Transitional Housing Beds to Add Each Year:

Additional beds to add beyond original Shelter Feasibility Study recommendations are highlighted in yellow.

Current	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	FY 24/25	TOTAL
57	30	20	20	20	20	167

Transitional Housing allows people to stay in one place long enough to stabilize and make plans to move into longer term housing. Expanding access to this intervention can allow people to receive services specific to their needs to allow them to stay housed in a safe place before moving into Permanent Supportive Housing as units or vouchers become available. Transitional Housing allows people to stay for 3 months to 3 years, and may be phased out or ramped down as PSH units and vouchers are freed up. Transitional Housing is not considered a “Housing First” approach, in that it assumes “readiness” is needed before permanent housing can be obtained. In Lane County and the City of Eugene’s case, this is more related to the lack of available units in a constrained rental market.

Rapid Rehousing Beds to Add Each Year:

Additional beds to add beyond original Shelter Feasibility Study recommendations are highlighted in yellow.

Current	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	FY 24/25	TOTAL
90	50	50	50	50	50	340

Rapid Rehousing helps people who are unhoused or unsheltered quickly move into housing with relatively limited ongoing support for a limited time (TAC suggested \$4000 per household). This is both a more affordable and Housing First approach to housing than Transitional Housing.

Permanent Supportive Housing Beds to Add Each Year:

Current	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	FY 24/25	TOTAL
513	56	75	75	75	75	869

This PSH projection adds only 6 additional units beyond the 350 called for in the Lane County Shelter Feasibility Study. Not all people who are currently unhoused or unsheltered require ongoing service supports, and many can move into mainstream or subsidized housing directly.

Number of New Move On Vouchers to Add Each Year:

Current	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24	FY 24/25	TOTAL
15	100	25	25	25	25	215

Move On Vouchers enable people to move into subsidized housing if and when they no longer require the supportive services package required for PSH. This allows people to move through the PSH system when they gain skills, confidence, and the ability to maintain housing without ongoing case management at the intensity level PSH offers.

4.815 Prohibited Camping. <https://eugene.municipal.codes/EC/4.815>

(1) As used in this section:

(a) "To camp" means to set up or to remain in or at a campsite.

(b) "Campsite" means any place where any bedding, sleeping bag, or other material used for bedding purposes, or any stove or fire is placed, established or maintained for the purpose of maintaining a temporary place to live, whether or not such place incorporates the use of any tent, lean-to, shack, or any other structure, or any vehicle or part thereof.

(2) It is found and declared that:

(a) From time to time persons establish campsites on sidewalks, public rights-of-way, under bridges, and so forth;

(b) Such persons, by such actions create unsafe and unsanitary living conditions which pose a threat to the peace, health and safety of themselves and the community; and,

(c) The enactment of this provision is necessary to protect the peace, health and safety of the city and its inhabitants.

(3) No person shall camp in or upon any sidewalk, street, alley, lane, public right-of-way, park or any other publicly-owned property or under any bridge or viaduct, unless otherwise specifically authorized by this code or by declaration of the Mayor in emergency circumstances.

(4) Upon finding it to be in the public interest and consistent with council goals and policies, the council may, by motion, exempt a special event from the prohibitions of this section. The motion shall specify the period of time and location covered by the exemption.

(Section 4.815 amended by Ordinance No. 19163, enacted July 11, 1983; and Ordinance 20062, enacted September 16, 1996, effective October 16, 1996.)

4.816 Permitted Overnight Sleeping. <https://eugene.municipal.codes/EC/4.816>

This section was recently amended by Ordinance No. 20621, codified in February 2020.

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this code:

(a) Persons may sleep overnight in a vehicle in a parking lot of a religious institution, place of worship, business or public entity that owns or leases property on which a parking lot and occupied structure are located, with permission of the property owner. The property owner may not grant permission for more than six vehicles used for sleeping at any one time. For purposes of this subsection (1), the term "vehicle" includes a car, tent, camper, trailer, and Conestoga hut.

(b) Persons may sleep overnight in the back yard of a single family residence in a residential zoning district, with permission of the owner and tenant of the residence. Not more than one family may sleep in any back yard, and not more than one tent or camping shelter may be used for sleeping in the back yard. As an alternative, but not in addition to sleeping overnight in the back yard, not more than one family may sleep in

a vehicle, camper or trailer parked in the driveway of a single family residence in a residential zoning district, with permission of the owner and tenant of the residence. For purposes of this subsection, "family" means persons related by blood or marriage, or no more than two unrelated adults.

(c) Persons may sleep overnight in a vehicle, on a paved or graveled surface located on a vacant or unoccupied parcel, with the permission of the property owner, if the owner registers the site with the city or its agent. The city may require the site to be part of a supervised program operated by the city or its agent. The property owner may not grant permission for more than six vehicles used for sleeping at any one time.

(2) A property owner who allows a person or persons to sleep overnight on a property pursuant to subsections (1)(a), (1)(b) or (1)(c) of this section shall:

(a) Provide or make available sanitary facilities;

(b) Provide garbage disposal services as required by sections 6.050 and 6.055 of this code;

(c) Provide a storage area for campers to store any personal items so the items are not visible from any public street;

(d) Require a tent or camping shelter in a backyard to be not less than five feet away from any property line; and

(e) Not require payment of any fee, rent or other monetary charge for overnight sleeping, as authorized by this section.

(3) A property owner who permits overnight sleeping pursuant to subsection (1) and (2) of this section, may revoke that permission at any time and for any reason. Any person who receives permission to sleep on that property as provided in this section shall leave the property immediately after permission has been revoked.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the city manager or the manager's designee may:

(a) Prohibit overnight sleeping on a property if the city finds that such an activity on that property is incompatible with the uses of adjacent properties or constitutes a nuisance or other threat to the public welfare; or

(b) Revoke permission for a person to sleep overnight on city-owned property if the city finds that the person has violated any applicable law, ordinance, rule, guideline or agreement, or that the activity is incompatible with the use of the property or adjacent properties.

(5) The city manager or the manager's designee may impose administrative civil penalties on property owners who fail to comply with the requirements of subsections (1) and (2) of this section, as provided in section 2.018 of this code.

(6) In addition to any other penalties that may be imposed, any campsite used for overnight sleeping in a manner not authorized by this section or other provisions of this code shall constitute a nuisance and may be abated as such. As used in this section, "campsite" has the meaning given in section 4.815 of this code.

(7) The city manager may adopt administrative rules in the manner provided in section 2.019 of this code to implement this section.

(8) With authorization from the city manager or designee in connection with a specific special event, persons may sleep overnight on public property which has a community center, swimming pool, or other city-operated athletic facility located thereon at which the special event is being held. The authorization shall be limited to no more than eight days in any two-week period.

(9) Nothing in section 4.815 or 4.816 of this code creates any duty on the part of the city or its agents to ensure the protection of persons or property with regard to permitted overnight sleeping.

(10) Permitted overnight sleeping rest stop program.

(a) Up to 15 persons may sleep overnight in vehicles, as that term is defined in subsection (1)(a) of this section, on property authorized pursuant to subsection (c) below. However, for rest stop sites that have been operating in good standing for at least six months, the operator of the rest stop may request, and the city manager may approve, that up to 20 persons may sleep overnight at a specified site under this program.

(b) No site may be used for overnight sleeping pursuant to subsection (a) above unless one or more entities enters into the agreement with the city referenced in subsection (c) below and one or more entities provides adequate garbage, toilets and supervision. The entity providing supervision shall work with surrounding and nearby neighbors (businesses or residences) to address any concerns.

(c) The city manager shall recommend to the city council one or more proposed sites authorized by subsections (a) and (b) above. Any such site may not be located in a residential area or close to a school unless the city council determines that any potential impacts to the surrounding residences or to the school can be effectively mitigated. Before a proposed site may be used, the site must be approved by the city council by motion and an agreement must be executed between the city and the entity referred to in subsection (b) above. Such an agreement may include but is not limited to provisions concerning:

1. Supervision;
2. Selection of the individuals who may camp at the site;
3. Number of continuous days that someone may camp at the site;
4. Hours that people may stay at the site in addition to 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.;
5. Structures and other items that may be placed on the site; and
6. Closure of the site for non-compliance with the terms of the agreement.

(Section 4.816 added by Ordinance No. 20130, enacted August 5, 1998; and amended by Ordinance No. 20255, enacted June 10, 2002, effective July 10, 2002; Ordinance No. 20517, enacted and effective September 25, 2013; and Ordinance No. 20621, enacted July 22, 2019, effective August 23, 2019.)