

Appendix A: Training & Funding Resources

In From the Cold – Safe Havens for Homeless People, U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Division of Community Planning and Development, no date. Available at: <http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/library/havens/index.cfm>

This HUD “Tool Kit” is a guide for creating effective Safe Havens. Written by people who have developed and/or operated Safe Havens, the Kit includes eight chapters covering the key issues surrounding the creation of Safe Havens.

The Building Better Communities Network available at:
<http://www.bettercommunities.org/index.cfm?method=aboutbbc>

The Building Better Communities Network website is an information clearinghouse and communication forum dedicated to building inclusive communities and to successfully siting affordable housing and community services. This website was created to help those who site community housing, by providing them with the tools they need to successfully complete their housing efforts. The web pages on “Siting Tools” and “Planning and Design” are most relevant to efforts to build Safe Havens and Community Model programs.

Bankability: A Practical Guide to Real Estate Financing for Nonprofit Developers, Community Development Research Center, New School University, 1996. CDRC, New School University, 66 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10011, (212) 229-5414

This guide provides technical assistance to nonprofit organizations seeking financing for housing and other development from private-sector lending institutions.

Beyond Housing: Profiles of Low-Income, Service-Enriched Housing for Special Needs Populations, The Enterprise Foundation, 1995. The Enterprise Foundation, Communications Department, 10227 Wincopin Circle, Suite 500, Columbia MD 21044, (410) 964-1230.

This report reviews the design elements of 29 service-enriched housing programs across the United States.

HIV, Homelessness, and Serious Mental Illness: Implications for Policy and Practice, by S.M. Goldfinger, E. Susser, B.A. Roche, and A. Berkman, Rockville, MD Center for Mental Health Services, 1998.

This paper provides an overview of available epidemiological data, reviews the literature on the interface between HIV/AIDS, homelessness, and mental illness, and explores what is known about sexuality and high-risk behaviors in this population. It examines risk reduction programs that have been developed and implemented with homeless people who have serious mental illnesses. Finally, it makes recommendations for appropriate public policy and future research directions.

Supportive Housing Financing Sources Guide with special emphasis on programs in Arizona, California and Nevada, Corporation for Supportive Housing, January, 2004.
www.csh.org

This guide identifies potential financing and funding sources for supportive housing projects and programs. It provides both general information on categories of funding sources and detailed information on more than 40 sources and initiatives with the greatest potential for providing significant project funding.

Breaking New Ground: Developing Innovative AIDS Care Residences, AIDS Housing of Washington, 1993. AHW, 2025 First Avenue, Suite 420, Seattle, WA 98121, (206) 448-5242.

Focused specifically on developing and operating housing for people with AIDS, this book shares lessons that can be applied to many social service facilities.

Effectiveness of Integrated Services for Homeless Adults with Serious Mental Illness, A Report to the Legislature as Required by Division 5, Section 5814, of the California Welfare and Institutions Code, Governor Gray Davis, Grantland Johnson, Secretary, California Health and Human Services Agency, Stephen W. Mayberg, Ph.D., Director, California Department of Mental Health, May 2003.

This report presents results of the Department of Mental Health's implementation of programs at County and City levels serving homeless adults with mental illness. The results document the personal success of clients as well as the ongoing cost effectiveness of the program.

Final Report on the Evaluation of the Closer to Home Initiative, Corporation for Supportive Housing, February 2004.

The report focuses on six programs that aim to engage and house people whose combination of disabilities, long histories of homelessness and repeated use of emergency services have marked them as "difficult to serve."

Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Mental Health Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, 1999.

The report in its entirety provides an up-to-date review of scientific advances in the study of mental health and of mental illnesses that affect at least one in five Americans. Several important conclusions may be drawn from the extensive scientific literature summarize in the report.

Housing First, Consumer Choice, and Harm Reduction for Homeless Individuals With a Dual Diagnosis, Sam Tsemberis, PhD, Leyla Gulcur, PhD and Maria Nakae, BA, American Journal of Public Health, April 2004, Vol 94, No. 4.

The Authors examined the longitudinal effects of a Housing First program for homeless, mentally ill individuals' on those individuals' consumer choice, housing stability, substance abuse, treatment utilization, and psychiatric symptoms. Two hundred twenty-five participants were randomly assigned to receive housing contingent on treatment and sobriety or to receive immediate housing without treatment prerequisites. Participants in the Housing First program were able to obtain and maintain independent housing without compromising psychiatric or substance abuse symptoms.

Blueprint for Change: Ending Chronic Homelessness for Persons with Serious Mental Illness and Co-Occurring Substance Use Disorders, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, DHHS Pub. No. SMA-04-3870, Rockville, MD: Center for Mental Health Services, 2003.

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration has developed this *Blueprint for Change* to disseminate state of the art information about ending homelessness for people who have serious mental illnesses, including those with co-occurring substance use disorders. The document offers practical advise for how to plan, organize, and sustain a comprehensive, integrated system of care designed to end homelessness for the population.

Appendix B: OPCC Safe Haven Siting Narrative

The following Case Study is based on observations and interviews conducted by the RAND Corporation Evaluation Team.

It is not possible to understand OPCC's experience siting a Safe Haven program in Santa Monica without first understanding a series of events and an ongoing drama that preceded even the conceptualization of the project. These events pertained to OPCC's longstanding need to relocate its Access Center and Day Break programs to new, nearby locations. How that search proceeded, and the way it exemplified the unique relationship between the City of Santa Monica and OPCC, all bear on how their experience siting a Safe Haven ultimately played out.

The adoption of the Santa Monica Transportation Facility Master Plan in 1997 made it necessary for OPCC to relocate the Access Center and Day Break programs. Santa Monica Big Blue Bus (BBB) owned the land on which the projects had been housed. Due to a steady increase in the number of its bus lines, BBB needed the space for purposes such as expanding the fleet, an alternative fueling center, and to enlarge maintenance facilities and customer service. All other tenants in the building were relocated immediately (i.e. in 1997) except for OPCC's Access Center and Day Break programs, which faced enhanced difficulties in identifying and securing another property. By the Spring of 2001, when The California Endowment awarded a grant to OPCC, Shelter Partnership, LAMP and RAND to establish a Safe Haven for mentally ill homeless adults in Santa Monica based on the Community Model, the problem of relocating the Access and Day Break programs had yet to be resolved. With this in mind, during the process OPCC decided to relocate the Access Center and Day Break to a place where they could also house the Safe Haven.

In some ways, it is difficult to know the extent to which the experience of OPCC in siting homeless services in Santa Monica can be generalized to other municipalities because Santa Monica is somewhat atypical in how it views its responsibility to serve needy and even undesirable populations. Historically, Santa Monica has been extremely progressive on issues of social responsibility, manifested in a longstanding commitment to assist disadvantaged residents. Santa Monica has always been generous in its provision of services to homeless individuals and has a well-deserved reputation as a city that tolerates the presence of homeless people. Over the last decade, strong tensions have emerged between those who want Santa Monica to continue its commitment to social activism and those who question whether the commitment to providing services is making Santa Monica a magnet for homeless people, to the detriment of daily quality of life. Recent restrictions on when, where and how services are provided reflect this tension, but Santa Monica still displays an extremely generous approach to homelessness relative to most cities.

It is also the case that OPCC has an unusually long-standing and highly respected reputation within the city that served it well as the siting process unfolded. This equally well-deserved reputation stemmed from OPCC's considerable history of providing excellent services that address a variety of local problems in a manner that engenders strong, consistent community support. OPCC's supporters include high-profile state-level politicians, like State Senator Sheila Kuehl, local politicians, and local community members, ranging from influential citizens to formerly homeless city residents. The unique social and political climate in Santa Monica and the solid reputation that OPCC enjoys has resulted in a partnership between the City and OPCC that is also somewhat unusual. This is reflected not only in the extent to which the City has funded OPCC programs but in the way it has literally partnered with OPCC to help the agency achieve its goals.

Consistent with this, the City played a pivotal role in aiding OPCC's siting process from the beginning of OPCC's scheduled displacement from the Big Blue Bus property in 1997. Numerous City offices were involved in facilitating OPCC's relocation, including the Department of Human Services, the Transportation Department, the City Manager, Resource Management, the Housing Department, and the Planning Department. The extent to which officials from each of these departments actively assisted this process was unusual – even in Santa Monica. City officials themselves acknowledged that this level of support would not have been provided to various other social service agencies in the City. They attributed this to the fact that OPCC is a “homegrown” organization and that it has generated an especially notable degree of community goodwill and credibility. As a result, the City has always worked to support OPCC. There is a 30-year funding history between the two parties, and OPCC performs myriad social services roles for the City with its homeless populations, almost as an extension of the City itself. This connection, combined with the fact that OPCC was being relocated from a City property and the additional fact that the City was concerned that it not exacerbate the homelessness problem in Santa Monica, propelled the City to assist in the siting effort.

The City does not own a lot of surplus property (as many other cities may), so it wasn't able to provide an actual location for the Access Center and Daybreak. However, it was prepared to purchase an appropriate site for OPCC with available housing funds. City staff determined that the City's Housing & Redevelopment Division could provide loans to OPCC in accordance with the Consolidated Housing Trust Fund Guidelines, which would allow for the acquisition and renovation of property for housing purposes.

In 1997, after months of meetings between the City and OPCC to explore and decide who would be responsible for specific tasks and duties in the move, it was decided that the City would provide financial support for purchasing a property that OPCC would own and operate. Initially, the City spearheaded the effort to secure a feasible site for OPCC. In 1999, it identified a property around Fifth and Broadway in the downtown section of Santa Monica. The City's effort to acquire this property for OPCC's programs, however, sparked a severe and aggressive backlash from local businesses, which mounted so much pressure against OPCC and the City that the City eventually had to pull away from the deal. The community outcry in response to the Broadway site exemplified the intensive

mobilization that constituencies in Santa Monica are effective at organizing, and prepared OPCC for the need for comprehensive community outreach in its future efforts. Ironically, the Fifth and Broadway location addressed concerns that were later to surface when OPCC identified an alternative site that was more distant from downtown Santa Monica. Opponents later cited the need to locate the project closer to where OPCC's clients congregate and closer to where other social services are provided in downtown Santa Monica, which is exactly what the Broadway location would have done.

After the failure of the Broadway site, OPCC took the lead in the site identification search, but maintained contact with the City's Resource Management Department so that the City could weigh in on – and approve – OPCC's selections. This was a conscious decision. The City and OPCC determined that it would be more beneficial for OPCC to take control of the siting process because OPCC had a clearer idea of the type of property it was looking for and the type of setting in which the project could most feasibly be located. OPCC continued independently with its siting efforts for the next two years until 2001, when The California Endowment grant was secured by the inter-organizational partnership. At this point, OPCC's resources for the siting process expanded in that it could now draw on the resources of the grant and the strengths and experiences of its collaborating partners, particularly Shelter Partnership. From here on, the search criteria expanded to include a site that could house not only the Access Center and Daybreak programs but a Safe Haven as well.

The first year of the California Endowment grant involved extensive discussion between collaboration partners about the Community Model and documentation of its key elements. By the second year of the grant, the site identification process began in earnest. From 2002 to 2003, inter-agency collaborators met on a bi-weekly basis to monitor siting efforts, financing arrangements, and budgeting. Because OPCC's client base is in Santa Monica, the goal was to locate the project within that City. Unfortunately, there is an extremely limited amount of property available in Santa Monica that can be used for a project serving homeless people due to factors such as zoning laws, land prices, strong neighborhood and business organizations capable of marshalling impenetrable opposition, and the City's small size – only 8.9 square miles.

As a result, OPCC extended its site search beyond the borders of Santa Monica into Los Angeles, evaluating properties east to La Cienega, south to Los Angeles International Airport, north to Mulholland Drive, and west to the ocean. Toward this end, OPCC staff began meeting with local Los Angeles City government field staff including: Councilwoman Cindy Miscikowski (District 11), Councilwoman Ruth Galanter (District 6), Councilman Jack Weiss (District 5), and Councilman Dennis Zine (District 3). This contact was made in order to advise the council members of the plan to establish the Safe Haven, to notify them of the search for a viable site, to gauge their level of responsiveness, and to assess whether there were any areas in each district that the staff should avoid in siting the Safe Haven because of active neighborhood organizations, homeowners groups or businesses that might serve as irremediable obstacles. OPCC also asked the council members whether there were surplus government sites or potential commercial sites available within their districts. (Often there are properties sitting vacant

in a district that officials want to see redeveloped, to which they could steer OPCC.) While OPCC was notified of areas in the districts where active opposition could be anticipated, none of these meetings produced any information on available properties within the districts.

During the first year of extensive location scouting (2002), OPCC identified and examined approximately 300 unique properties within Santa Monica, Venice, Culver City, Inglewood, Palms, Mar Vista, West L.A. and Rancho Park. The key screening criteria used to identify potential properties included suitable distance from residential neighborhoods, school and businesses; proximity to other social service agencies; space for parking; outdoor space accessible to the building; and easy access to public transportation. Ideally, 15,000-20,000 square feet were needed to house the Access Center, Day Break, and the Safe Haven. Lou Anne White, Safe Haven Project Coordinator, conducted the initial screening of properties, which were identified through real estate listings, referrals by board members and realtors, and by driving through the neighborhoods included in the catchment area. When Lou Anne identified a potential site, she conducted a thorough site review with John Maceri, Executive Director of OPCC, to assess the property's location and the building's features in relation to program needs.

Potential properties proved to be situated primarily around commercial and motel corridors; these groupings included some hotels. Motels were more desirable than other types of properties because of their architectural design – individual rooms and lounge areas situated around courtyards, which could create a compound area for the center of the site. The main clusters in Santa Monica were found around Cloverfield and along Santa Monica Blvd. and Colorado Ave. In West L.A., the clusters were found primarily around Santa Monica and the San Diego Freeway, around La Cienega north of the Santa Monica Freeway, along Pico near the Westside Pavilion, and east of the San Diego Freeway in the area of Cotner near Pico and Santa Monica. In Culver City, the clusters were west of the San Diego Freeway near Washington Blvd. And in Palms, the cluster was around Palms and Jefferson.

During 2002, Nancy Lewis, a Housing Development Specialist, joined the collaboration to coordinate the financial aspects of the relocation process. Nancy's position was funded by the interest earned from The California Endowment grant, and she is scheduled to continue with the project until construction on the future OPCC site is completed. Often, Housing Development Specialists such as Nancy possess a familiarity with realtors, politicians and zoning laws in the area where a property is located, which facilitates the efficiency of siting efforts. As part of the inter-agency collaboration, Nancy helped to focus members on an overall plan of action for the siting process that included determining core components for identifying a site (politicians, community education, funding, actual location), directing preparation for dealing with politicians, identifying key players in local politics, assisting in the acquisition of pre-development funds, formulating an overview of operating costs, clarifying who the core members of the siting process should be, outlining the physical boundaries and catchment area for the siting process, locating funding sources and assisting the completion of those applications

(like EHAP loans), as well as organizing a fact sheet about Safe Havens. In addition to her expertise in funding and development, Nancy lent credibility to the project because she was so well known and respected in the housing development field.

Various challenges arose at distinct phases of the siting process. One challenge early on involved attempts at collaborating with brokers. Over a three-year period, approximately eight to nine brokers were approached sequentially to assist with securing a site, but such efforts at collaboration ultimately yielded little in the way of tangible results. Brokers rely on commission and proved to have little patience for the need to find a location that addressed all of the key criteria and for the time it takes to work through the siting challenges inherent in the location process for a project servicing an undesirable population. The high cost of real estate on the Westside and the limited number of available properties also hindered the pace of the site search, as did the negative response the project received by property owners as sites were visited. The owners were averse to housing a project that services homeless people and thought the project could bring down values in the area. The potential pool of sites was further limited by the need to adhere to the set of key criteria about location parameters.

The type of building needed to support the Community Model, in which people would reside at the facility over a long period of time, also presented a challenge to siting efforts. At first glance, commercial and industrial spaces seemed ideal because of the obvious challenges associated with placing undesirable populations in residential neighborhoods. While such settings had good internal space, they were frequently geographically isolated from the services clients would need to access. Commercial settings, in addition, rarely had outdoor space and/or had no (or limited) parking. This, in turn, created corridor concerns –concerns that high concentrations of program residents would be moving through the neighborhoods surrounding the commercial areas as well as within the commercial area, upsetting residents in the process and thus galvanizing them to resist the project.

Getting all of these location parameters to work simultaneously was an even more formidable challenge. On occasion, for instance, the physical layout of a site was acceptable but the location was either too far from where the client base typically congregated, too isolated from other social services, or too distant from public transportation.

In addition to the hurdles involved with locating and securing a site for the project, OPCC faced significant challenges with securing acceptance from local residential and business neighbors. Recent history in Santa Monica with community resistance to the attempted purchase of the Broadway site made it clear that obtaining public buy-in would be a potentially explosive issue.

Ultimately, in 2002, OPCC set its sights on a commercial property located at 1751 Cloverfield Avenue, on the eastern edge of Santa Monica. This was one of the first properties OPCC had identified when the site search began. It was also a property the City of Santa Monica had been watching for some time. Both parties had reservations

about the site because (1) the owner was known to be difficult and relatively unmotivated to sell below his price, (2) the price of the building was inflated, and (3) the property was not based in the downtown area of Santa Monica where OPCC's client base tends to be situated. However, given that an exhaustive five-year search (if one counts back to the first efforts to relocate the Access Center and Day Break in 1997) had produced no viable locations, and given that the site met important zoning and program needs, this property was determined by OPCC and the City of Santa Monica to be their best chance at a location for the OPCC programs.

The Cloverfield property was located on a corner lot at a very active intersection of one of Santa Monica's busiest streets and freeway entrance/exits, and in very close proximity to the entrance to the City Yards on Michigan Ave and to Bergomot Station, a collection of art galleries. The building, a minimalist, boxy and gray two-story structure in the shape of a warehouse, sat on a stark asphalt lot with virtually no landscaping. At that time, it had stood vacant and on the market for approximately five years, the most telling sign that its listing price (\$5.7 million) was too high. The building had begun to take on a dilapidated appearance and the property looked neglected, witnessed most prominently in the scraggly weeds that lodged themselves in the tall fence that surrounded it. It would not be an overstatement to call it an eyesore.

Many of the features that made this property so undesirable to other investors and commercial developers made it particularly useful for OPCC's purposes. The distance of this building from residential neighborhoods and its location in an industrial corridor meant that OPCC could service an undesirable population with minimal impact on the neighboring community. This site exceeded the City's required 300-foot distance that homeless service projects must maintain from residential areas (the closest residence being approximately 800 feet away). The location was already appropriately zoned for use as a social service program and homeless center, so OPCC would not have to seek a conditional use permit or zoning variance. Moreover, the ample outdoor area that surrounded the building could be integrated into a new design as both a communal gathering area and an outdoor activity area for clients, and could simultaneously meet the parking needs of staff, volunteers and clients – further mitigating the project's impact on the surrounding community. The large and open internal spaces that characterized the actual building also met OPCC's program and space needs, as did the square footage. Finally, the property gave OPCC the opportunity to improve the neighborhood, in that OPCC's plans to rehabilitate the building and introduce landscaping would increase the property's visual appeal. While the selling price was a considerable impediment, these other factors outweighed this barrier and led OPCC and the City to actively pursue the Cloverfield location.

Santa Monica city staff played a key role in devising a financial plan and accessing funding resources that would allow the purchase of this building. In November 2002, the City gave approval to OPCC to enter into discussions independently with the seller, though it was clear that no decisions would be made about the price of the property without input and consent from the City. The seller's asking price for the location, at \$5.7 million, was high relative to current market value. Moreover, as expected, he was difficult to negotiate with and often very slow in responding to offers. After numerous

counter-offers back and forth, the two parties were eventually able to settle on the mutually agreeable price of \$5 million – seven months after negotiations had begun.

Once this price was agreed upon, the City provided OPCC a \$400,000 “loan” from housing trust fund money. This money primarily was provided to allow OPCC to open escrow and obtain site control, which occurred on June 20, 2003. The City accepted that they were overpaying for the property – an independent appraisal had come in at 3% less than the agreed upon price – but believed that the building was worth obtaining at this price because of the lack of suitable locations and the architectural advantages of the building – its size, its wide open floors, a location that set it apart from residential areas, the presence of outdoor space, the fact that it was empty, and so forth.

Part of this early \$400,000 loan from the City to OPCC was used to pay for architect Wade Killefer, of the Santa Monica firm Killefer, Flammang, and Purtill Architects to develop design plans for the new facility. Wade provided OPCC with paper plans and a three-dimensional model that reflected the renovations that would be made to the Cloverfield site in order to house OPCC’s projects. The design included a renovated two-story 22,000 square foot building on a 33,000 square foot lot with an enclosed outdoor area. The two-story indoor area included small and large multi-purpose meeting rooms, kitchen areas, laundry and bathroom facilities, offices for staff, twenty-five beds for residents of the Safe Haven, and thirty beds for residents of OPCC’s Daybreak Program. This design plan and model ultimately played an important part in the community outreach OPCC carried out.

Community education, a key component of OPCC’s siting process, took place over the course of the 60-day escrow period between the time site control was obtained in June and the City Council Open Hearing in August. A longer escrow might have been more advantageous for OPCC, but the seller insisted on a short escrow, though he provided the option of a 30-day extension if it was needed to complete environmental review. While OPCC had gained authority to negotiate for the property seven months earlier, it chose not to begin the community outreach process until firm site control was achieved. This was in part because they were aware that the seller was neither eager nor predictable-- they were reluctant to open potentially contentious community discussion on a possibility that might not even materialize. It was also in part to limit the available time for intense opposition to mobilize in the community. Sixty days seemed like a reasonable compromise between giving the community ample advance notice and constraining the momentum that community opposition can build. Within that 60-day time-frame, however, OPCC was clear that it would mount an aggressive community outreach effort that would go beyond what was required by law in terms of the radius covered in door-to-door outreach and mailings about the project and organization.

Once escrow was opened and site control achieved, the collaborators on the project hired a community relations firm, The Consensus Planning Group (CPG), to develop and carry out a community education program in collaboration with OPCC. In July, OPCC and the CPG delivered an informational pamphlet in English and Spanish to 1,950 residents within a 500-foot radius of the site, and conducted door-to-door outreach to

approximately 300 business and residential neighbors. Members of the collaboration believed that the CPG played a pivotal role in the effectiveness of the information provided to the community. However, many residents found the information incomplete or misleading, especially the considerable number of people who were monolingual Spanish-speakers. Residents complained that the information given to them was vague. They were told, for instance, that the project would help homeless people in the area and were urged to sign the return card in support of these services. Residents believed this approach oversimplified the issue and didn't give them room to express a more complex reaction. They did not want to say that homeless people aren't in need of services, but they did want to voice the belief that it might be better to place such a facility elsewhere, given its potential affect on their community, or to open a debate on which services were a priority from their community's point of view. Contributing to this sense of vagueness, perhaps, was a tendency on the part of CPG door-to-door workers to direct concerns expressed by business owners and residents to an Open House that OPCC would be hosting, rather than answering any specific grievances directly.

As part of OPCC's community education plan and because of the nature of the City's approval process for projects such as these, OPCC's Executive Director, John Maceri, attended numerous public meetings with a 3-D model of the potential site in-hand in order to speak about the project and answer questions. These meetings included the Housing Commission on July 17, the Social Services Commission on July 25, and the Disabilities Commission on August 4. OPCC also met with various staff from the City Yards, the project's closest neighbor, on July 22 in order to discuss plans for the project, hear concerns from the employees, and describe precautionary measures that OPCC would be taking to meet these concerns. Santa Monica City staff were present at many of these meetings in order to clarify the City's role in the siting process and to explain the steps that would be taken by the City to address community concerns. The Human Resources Manager, Julie Rusk, attended meetings at the City Yards as well as the Commission meetings.

These public meetings invariably attracted community residents, whose reactions to the Commissions varied. Opponents were present on each occasion, generally speaking in support of OPCC but against the Cloverfield location, but in some instances attacking OPCC outright. Their primary complaint was that the Pico neighborhood was already saturated with social service agencies and that there were numerous alternative properties that would better serve the project. They voiced a longstanding concern that the Pico area – which included some of the poorer neighborhoods in Santa Monica – was being made a dumping ground for services for undesirable populations, that the project would lessen the quality of life in the neighborhood, and that the wealthier sections of the city were not carrying their fair share of the service load. In making these claims, they were tapping into a source of tension between the Pico Neighborhood and City government that had existed for decades over whether the needs of this neighborhood were being equitably addressed.

The Housing Commission met in mid-July at which point community opposition had not become as intense as it would later be. Commission members asked questions about

OPCC's public notification plan, the design features, and the plan for regular updates on the building and project implementation, and ultimately voted to support the location of the project.

The Social Services Commission met next. After much contentious debate at their July meeting, the Commissioners decided that they would hold an emergency meeting on August 5 to further discuss the matter and decide what recommendation it would provide to the City Council. At this July meeting, the Commission was clear that it would not take either a positive or negative stand on the Cloverfield site. It recognized that numerous other locations had been examined by OPCC, 23 within Santa Monica alone, and that these properties were either unavailable to the project, had inadequate space for program needs, or had no parking. The Commission also recognized that many landlords were unwilling to lease to the project, and that the Cloverfield property was the only site that had met all requirements. However, the Commission also acknowledged the legitimacy of the issue of concentrating programs in a geographical area, noting that it was as important as the individual merit of these agencies and services. The Commission observed that the pattern of locating social service programs in the Pico area was the result of Pico residents not having the political voice needed to keep these programs from being placed in their neighborhood. The position of the Social Services Commission with regard to whether or not it would take a stand changed after the August 5th meeting, however. At this meeting, members of the Pico and Sunset Park neighborhood associations loudly voiced their concerns that the relocation would negatively impact their community in terms of property values and safety. While supporting OPCC and the need for continued homeless services in Santa Monica, this Commission ultimately passed a motion to oppose the approval of a loan by the City Council to OPCC for acquisition and rehabilitation of the Cloverfield property. They also passed an amendment to the motion asking the City Council to direct city staff to work with OPCC to locate an alternate site for the project.

By the July meeting of the Social Services Commission, community opposition had begun intensifying, primarily as a result of the efforts of the Pico Neighborhood Association (PNA), which at the time was led by a pair of local homeowners who were vitriolic in their opposition to the project. PNA produced and distributed a video to the surrounding community about the risks that OPCC's clients posed to the neighborhood, the City's general neglect of the Pico area, OPCC's disregard in not siting the project elsewhere, and the deterioration that would occur in the area as a result of the project. The video was intentionally inflammatory. It implied that the OPCC Executive Director stood to financially gain from the project and generally tried to characterize the intentions of OPCC and the City in as negative and nefarious a light as possible. The PNA also printed large signs for residents to post in their yards reading, "No Skid Row Here". Again, the main grievance of the PNA was the claim that the City of Santa Monica was using the area as a "dumping ground" for social service agencies. PNA argued that the fact that land in its neighborhood was cheaper didn't mean the neighborhood should be further depressed. The PNA rejected the notion that the Cloverfield location was situated in an industrial area, noting that it was situated within 750-800 feet of a residential community. The PNA leadership also expressed dissatisfaction with how little time the

community was being given to voice its opposition and to mobilize for a change in location.

While community opposition to the Cloverfield site in 2003 was aggressive, important lessons had been learned about community outreach from the experience of trying to push through the Broadway site in 1999. These lessons left OPCC more savvy about how to proceed. For instance, rather than having an open and unstructured town hall meeting, which in the case of the Broadway siting process had deteriorated into a bitter free-for-all, OPCC arranged and advertised an Open House for community members on July 28th. This gathering created a more personalized and structured way for people to learn about the organization, project and facilities, as well as to ask questions and meet OPCC staff. OPCC staff and clients were present, as were City staff and community residents. There were some opponents outside with “No Skid Row Here” signs, but they did not enter the building. Some City staff tried to engage the protestors in discussion, but there was no real dialogue. While this Open House did not quell community opposition, it didn’t enflame it either. All in all, it was a more effective and controlled way of introducing the project to the community.

Even so, by the time the Disabilities Commission met in early August, community opposition had become so intense that the meeting room was filled nearly to capacity. The meeting was extremely lengthy and involved numerous highly contentious presentations by various community members stating concerns that had been expressed previously at the other Commissions, as well as a presentation by John Maceri on the history of OPCC and its siting efforts, the parameters and logistics surrounding the siting process, a summary of the building plan and services to be provided, and a general overview of community response thus far. The matter of OPCC was only item #6 out of 15 on the Commission’s agenda for that evening, but the passion surrounding the issue swallowed up the vast majority of the time. Ultimately, the Commission had to postpone its last 4 items to the next meeting. In the end, the Commission stressed the importance of housing as a concern and voted to support OPCC and the services it provides. However, the Commission chose not to take a position on the location of the project.

During the community outreach period, OPCC also met individually with representatives from numerous neighborhood, religious and community organizations as well as local schools and businesses around the Cloverfield site, including Bergamot Station galleries, the Water Garden (a large office complex), Ralph’s Supermarket, Saint Anne’s Catholic Church, the Government Affairs Committee of the Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce, Mothers for Justice, the PNA, and Edison Elementary School PTA. They also contacted staff at Crossroads and New Roads Schools but weren’t able to meet with them because of the headmaster’s vacation schedule. Later, some neighborhood organizations complained that the outreach effort had not reached them. Even so, OPCC did go beyond the physical radius required by law in contacting its future neighbors.

Outreach to businesses, schools and neighborhood residents allowed many specific quality-of-life concerns to surface. While businesses were concerned about OPCC clients lingering in outdoor courtyard areas or trying to use their bathroom facilities, schools

were more concerned about the potential safety risks to their students by mentally ill clients, as well as how their students would react to homeless people using OPCC services as they passed through the area to get to the Safe Haven. Residents were concerned about the impact of homeless people on their property and safety. By learning about these specific apprehensions, OPCC, with the help of the City, was able to take specific steps to address these problems. One important modification to the site plans that resulted from OPCC's outreach was to plan for extensive and bright street lighting around the site. Corridor concerns were addressed by adjusting the public Big Blue Bus line so that clients will be able to travel to OPCC without passing through residential neighborhoods.

Outreach also enabled OPCC and City staff to identify a series of more general concerns expressed by the community and to explore how these concerns might be addressed before public debate in front of the City Council took place. The two most salient concerns that surfaced, beyond the broader and more general concerns of neighbors that the homeless programs be located anywhere other than near them, focused on (1) the fact that the City was essentially giving OPCC millions of dollars to purchase a building that OPCC, rather than the City, would own; and (2) the fact that locating a day program like the Access Center at Cloverfield would virtually ensure substantial movement of homeless individuals through residential areas as they moved from the downtown area of Santa Monica to the City's eastern boundary and back. As a result, by the time the proposed site purchase went before the City Council at the Open Hearing in August 12, OPCC and the city staffers supporting them were able to offer a compromise that addressed these community concerns. This compromise, which was unveiled at the Council meeting, involved a decision not to house the Access Center at the Cloverfield site and to have the city retain ownership of the building but grant OPCC a long-term lease at a pittance.

The City Council meeting began at 5:30 p.m., though the OPCC agenda item was scheduled for much later. Even by that time, the Council room's 90-100 seats were completely full. Many of the PNA supporters arrived somewhat later, having been part of a march to City Hall that started at 5:00. Protestors were very vocal in front of City Hall, chanting and holding picket signs with the "No Skid Row Here" slogan. Supporters of OPCC were equally visible and identifiable by their "Be Part of the Solution" and "Support OPCC's Relocation" tags. Once the room was filled to capacity, people were redirected downstairs, where a monitor was set up, but this space quickly reached capacity as well, leaving many people outside and milling around the hallways. People filed toward the front of the Council room, placing chits in a basket indicating their wish to be heard by the Council. By the time the Council members entered and took their seats, 80 people had signed up to speak, prompting a rule that each speaker would be limited to two minutes. By 7:50, when the OPCC agenda item was reached, that number had reached 150. By 8:40, it was up to 176, signaling that it was going to be a very long evening.

As stated in the formal agenda, the issue being considered was a recommendation that the City Council and the Redevelopment Agency (1) approve a housing trust fund loan and

grant to Ocean Park Community Center (OPCC), in the amount of \$7,397,112, for the acquisition and rehabilitation of the real property located at 1751 Cloverfield Boulevard for temporary housing for low income persons, (2) adopt resolutions finding that the housing project is of benefit to the Ocean Park Redevelopment Project Areas; (3) that the City Council authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a relocation agreement between the Big Blue Bus and the OPCC, in the amount of \$1,800,000; and (4) that discussion take place of alternatives, including Redevelopment Agency and City ownership of the Cloverfield property and other potential OPCC locations.

The OPCC siting issue was laid out for Council members by Robert Moncrief, the Housing & Redevelopment Manager for the City of Santa Monica. Moncrief began by citing an original report, a supplemental report, and a second supplemental report that had been delivered to Council members, and then went on to explicate the history of the project and the background and substance of each of these reports. In the first report, City staff recommended the relocation of OPCC to the Cloverfield site, noting the increased services that they would be able to provide by virtue of obtaining it and that it would solve the problem of having to relocate OPCC from its current Access Center site. The report noted that the facility was well-built, that architectural features could be added that would mitigate community problems, and that City staff viewed this as a last chance to build a comprehensive homeless facility.

The first report went on to explain that about 75% of the services provided by the new facility would focus on housing, allowing the city to provide a housing loan/grant for that portion of the project. Staff were proposing that the City provide \$7,397,112 in loans and grants from several different sources. The loan portion would be funded with Tenant Ownership Rights Charter Amendment (TORCA) funds (\$1,893,707) and HOME (\$800,000) housing trust funds; the grant portion would be funded from the Redevelopment Housing Trust Fund (\$4,703,405). Because the Cloverfield site was outside of Ocean Park where the redevelopment funds were targeted, a determination would have to be made that Ocean Park would benefit from this expenditure, but it was clear that Ocean Park would benefit from the provision at this site of low income housing. The remaining 25% of the services provided at the new facility, attached primarily to the Access Center, were not housing loan eligible. Additional funds needed to make the project happen would come from the Big Blue Bus, which would provide \$1.8 million in relocation fees, and a \$400,000 grant from the County. These funds would cover the housing deal completely but left a gap of \$800,000 in operation costs that OPCC felt it could readily raise once there was a permanent site where services would be located.

Moncrief made it clear that the deal was constructed so that the \$7.4 million being provided by the city would not be paid back unless there was revenue generated by the services, which clearly wouldn't be the case given that this project was serving "the poorest of the poor." He noted that the last major city initiative and financial commitment for the homeless population had been for the Upward Bound facility, which had occurred several years earlier. Given that the City was sitting on \$120 million

allocated for housing, with a set aside for the homeless, this project seemed like a good idea and one that City staff could enthusiastically recommend.

Moncrief acknowledged, however, that the community had pushed back when this plan was vetted with them and had raised a number of issues and proposed solutions that seemed very feasible. The first of these had to do with alternative locations, which generated the first supplemental report before the Council. Community members had not been convinced that all viable alternative locations had been considered. They pointed, for instance, to the old police headquarters. This was not a feasible alternative, however, because the space on which the headquarters sat had already been designated as open space in the Civic Center plan and because the renovation of the space, even if a determination was made to use the building for OPCC, would be prohibitively expensive. They also pointed to the RAND building, once RAND had completed its new headquarters project, but City staffers rejected this for similar reasons – it was also designated for open space, was too big for the purpose, and would be prohibitively expensive to renovate. Moreover, to use either of these sites temporarily would hamper OPCC in terms of fund raising. To raise funds, Moncrief pointed out, OPCC needed to be able to guarantee donors that it would have access to a permanent site. The Santa Monica Airport had also been raised as a possibility, but all the buildings there were already leased. Moreover, these leases were all temporary by definition. Robbins Auto Top, located between Colorado and Olympic on 7th, had also been mentioned by community members. This building, however, was twice the size of what OPCC needed and was owned by the U.S. Postal Service, which wasn't interested in selling.

Community members had also proposed the Big Blue Bus site as a potential venue for the OPCC project. The City noted that given the current and eventual expansion needs of the Big Blue Bus, any siting of OPCC facilities on the property would have to be considered temporary in nature, which would impede OPCC's ability to raise funds. However, the City believed that it would be possible to relocate a smaller portion of the entire project—the Access Center—to the SWASHLOCK¹ location as part of a new integrated facility that would incorporate SWASHLOCK and the Access Center programs on the existing SWASHLOCK footprint. Moncrief noted that if the facility at Cloverfield was only going to be used for housing, new preliminary architectural plans would have to be drawn up and the estimated construction costs would have to be revised. Moreover, because Big Blue Bus funds would be used for the Access Center, the \$1.8 million coming from the Big Blue Bus would no longer be available and the loan/grant amount from the City would have to increase. Moncrief acknowledged that OPCC was not thrilled with this compromise but would accept it. He noted that from the City staff's point of view, this compromise had merit.

Moncrief next addressed the second source of community concern: the fact that the loan/grant provided by the City to OPCC was allowing OPCC to acquire and retain ownership of the Cloverfield property—that the City was essentially giving this money

¹ SWASHLOCK is a free shower and locker program where individuals can store their belongings during the day while they are working, looking for employment, or going to school. The showers and restrooms are available to provide a place for people to clean up and maintain their hygiene.

away, rather than retaining ownership of the property that had been bought with its money. Moncrief explained that standard operating procedure in situations like this one was to provide a loan for 55 years. If the non-profit was a charitable organization and operated the facility for another 25 years, they received ownership of the property. As such, the deal was set up to be consistent with this approach. When community members expressed confusion as to why the City would give the property away with no right to retain ownership, City staffers re-examined the issue and decided that, with the Council's approval, they could do the following instead. They would lend the money to OPCC to buy the property. OPCC would then convey the property back to the Redevelopment Agency. The redevelopment agency would then lease the property back to OPCC for 55 years for as little as \$0. (The City would not have the latitude to do this but the Redevelopment Agency does.) At the end of the 55 years, the Redevelopment Agency would be obligated to offer the title back to the City. If the City wanted it, it would then be unencumbered by redevelopment restrictions. (Currently, if the purchase involves redevelopment funds, the property needs to be used as housing for 55 years. This contingency would have been met so the City would be free to use the building in any way it saw fit.) A 55 year commitment was sufficient for OPCC to raise funds—from their point of view, it was almost equivalent to owning it. Moncrief emphasized that the idea for retaining ownership came completely from the community and acknowledged that City staffers felt stupid that they hadn't come up with this alternative themselves. (He seemed genuinely sincere in offering this comment, though he may have also been making the politically astute move of stroking the community and clearly communicating that their input had been heard and acted on.)

After discussing some other slight modifications to funding, the timeline for closing escrow, the availability of additional funds for more traditional affordable housing, and the Commission recommendations, Moncrief entertained questions from the Council members. For the most part, Council members asked questions that were designed to allay community concerns. For instance, Councilmember Feinstein noted the community's concern that these funds would be better spent on education, allowing Moncrief to restate that all of the sources that were being drawn upon were restricted to housing, with the exception of the Big Blue Bus money, which had to be spent on transportation-related issues. Only one Council member (Holbrook) seemed concerned about the recommendation. He had questions about who had authorized City staff to provide OPCC with the loan to open escrow, why the Big Blue Bus was paying relocation money, why OPCC was increasing its capacity, whether the issue had been raised earlier that TORCA funds might be used for a purpose like the one at hand, etc. Moncrief answered each of these in a measured way.

At 8:40 p.m., the open public hearing began. It continued until after 2:00 a.m. During that time, 118 individuals spoke, though many scheduled to speak left before their names were called once the hour grew late. Many of the speakers were ardent supporters of OPCC, including clients who offered testimonials regarding the impact OPCC had had on their lives. The strong presence of these people was the result of a concerted effort by OPCC's to mobilize support and to have their supporters put in their chits earlier. In all, 67 people spoke in favor of the acquisition of the Cloverfield property. A smaller, but

still considerable, number of people expressed concern over the Cloverfield location. What was interesting about the vast majority of these people was the fact that they began by stating their support for OPCC and its work, and their pride in living in a city that took its responsibility to the needy seriously. To hear them introduce their comments, one would have thought they were OPCC supporters. But invariably, their testimonies would change course and end with a number of objections to the project. Most commonly, these community members thought the location was a poor choice and wanted the facility placed elsewhere, or felt that more time should be granted so that the community could be more actively involved in the decision-making process. In all, 51 people spoke against the Council approving the recommendations before them that evening.

Halfway through the testimony, a break was called. During that time, there was an outburst as the two leaders of the PNA obstreperously demanded to know why Mayor Bloom would not allow them to show the anti-Cloverfield site video that PNA had produced. They were loud, arrogant, out of order, and impatient with the explanation that the process allowed people to express their opinions by signing up to speak. Rebuffed, they grew even more strident, crying for a recall, yelling that “King” Bloom would be taken down, and storming out in protest (though they actually remained on site). Their aggressive approach appeared to have little support among the community members in the audience.

Ultimately, all of the Council members with the exception of Holbrook applauded the process and indicated their support for the amended proposal. Both Mayor Bloom and Councilmember Genser took swipes at the PNA leadership, noting that they had abnegated the traditional responsibility of community groups to foster dialogue and had instead espoused strong points of view that quashed community discussion and bent the truth in an attempt to mislead. Each pointed out that the community had been able to see through these smear tactics. Overall, Council members indicated their understanding that OPCC had done all it could under the circumstances but also applauded community members for their active voice in shaping the ultimate solution and indicated their support for the proposed compromise. Only Councilmember Holbrook demurred, noting that he felt betrayed by the process—surprised that there was such a short escrow even though the City was paying top dollar, surprised that the location was being endorsed, surprised that his colleagues were ignoring the strong voices of opposition, surprised that anyone would question that the Pico Neighborhood is a service dumping ground, surprised that PNA was being faulted for their position when so many of the City Commissions had voiced the same opinion. In the end, however, his was the only negative vote. The revised plan (i.e. keeping the Access Center at the Big Blue Bus site and reorganizing the financing) passed 5-1. The compromise allowed the purchase of the property to occur while still leaving the community feeling that at least to some extent its voice had been heard.

In retrospect, it was clear that the City Council Open Hearing marked a turning point in public sentiment. Yes, complaints lingered about the City’s and OPCC’s handling of the event and the siting process in general. People felt that it had been a mistake not to move the hearing to a larger venue and not to hold it over multiple evenings in order to permit a

higher level of community input—many community members who planned on speaking left without doing so when they realized they would have to be there until the wee hours of the morning to speak their piece. Some community members felt deceived by not having been notified of the earlier than usual start time of the Hearing, which affected their ability to obtain seats, and by the fact that this change had not been posted on the city’s website. Lingering frustration remained over what felt like a very brief window for community outreach and discussion of the issue – a window that opened only after money was already committed to the purchase of the property. While acknowledging that a lengthier public notification process could have added more fuel to the opposition and might have derailed a successful conclusion, community members viewed OPCC as sending a decidedly mixed message: “We want to listen to you but not for very long and only after the train has already left the station (i.e. after escrow has opened).” Being asked their opinion after a decision was effectively made did not leave them feeling that their input was really valued or desired. In addition, many of the other, more general concerns that were expressed during the Council meeting remained.

Even so, looking back on the experience, virtually all the key stakeholders—council members, city staff, business representatives, representatives of the relevant community organizations, OPCC – expressed acceptance of the conclusion that had been reached by the close of the evening. Indeed, many, though certainly not all, of those who opposed the project and argued that it should be housed elsewhere were ultimately satisfied with the compromise that was reached.

An unexpected message that emerged as people looked back on the siting experience was that the hostile nature of the PNA campaign ended up alienating many of the community residents it was supposed to galvanize. Other neighborhood organizations contiguous to the Pico area indicated that the initial concern and resistance they felt towards the OPCC project when the PNA first condemned it gave way to a strong distaste for PNA’s tactics and a desire to see a compromise reached.

This dissatisfaction with how the PNA leadership handled the opposition campaign was expressed *inside* the Pico neighborhood as well. Many Pico area residents—most notably, the working class Latino segment of the community – offered that the PNA leadership neither understood nor represented their concerns. These individuals viewed the siting dilemma as an unfortunate confrontation between the needs and concerns of working class community members and the legitimate needs of homeless people. Working class Pico residents felt strongly that services for youth, employment services, and affordable housing were not being adequately provided in their community. The dissatisfaction with the siting process that these individuals expressed stemmed less from any antipathy for the homeless and more from their frustration over the lack of a safety net for the working class poor in their neighborhood – and over what they saw as the continued practice of siting programs in their midst that were not specifically addressing their primary needs. They felt further frustrated by PNA’s middle-class domination of the opposition platform, which elevated NIMBYism as the primary rallying point and left

less room for their needs and concerns to be voiced. In an ironic twist, the PNA board ultimately alienated enough of its constituency through its handling of the opposition campaign that at the group's next meeting, many Board members were voted out and replaced by those representing the Latino and working class base.

For their part, City staff felt comfortable with the siting process. They held fast to the belief that services like those provided by OPCC are critical for bringing people off the street and benefit the community at large. They made it clear that they valued OPCC as a partner and viewed OPCC as a sophisticated and efficient organization that actively involves its community-based Board and that understands the importance of being a good neighbor. Their longstanding relationship with OPCC left them comfortable with the idea of negotiating a funding plan and supporting OPCC's outreach efforts to enlist community support. They knew that local community members would voice complaints but felt committed to supporting the siting process by focusing attention on the facts and delivering information in a transparent and direct way. They saw their role as educating the community on the particulars, such as the critical nature of zoning laws and the limitations of different kind of funding mechanisms, but also saw themselves as fulfilling the higher purpose of focusing attention on the humanistic reasons why a project like this was so important. They pointed out that being able to offer so many successful examples of OPCC's work at the Open Hearing was very helpful in building public understanding and support and made their job easier. They felt that they had listened to community concerns and had made planning and financing adjustments wherever possible. Staff also underscored the importance of sorting out specific community concerns that can be addressed with practical solutions from the more inflammatory concerns that are trumpeted by players with a political interest in derailing projects like these – people who complain but offer no viable alternatives. Ultimately, City staff suggested that facilities that provide social services to the homeless will inevitably generate highly charged, gut-wrenching reactions in their surrounding communities, and that public education campaigns are a crucial method for addressing these sentiments. It is virtually impossible to overestimate the impact that the unwavering support of City staff and elected officials had on the eventual outcome of the siting process.

In the end, the compromise that was achieved by not locating the Access Center at the Cloverfield location provided a new opportunity for many community residents to develop a greater degree of trust in OPCC with regard to the Cloverfield facility. People who felt slighted by the outreach program, either because it occurred over too brief a period or because it was initiated so late in the siting process, acknowledged that if OPCC lives up to the promises it has made to its neighbors, the project may not end up hurting the Pico community. Moreover, they offered that by keeping its promises, OPCC will enable them to leave behind the bitter taste in their mouths left by how the siting process unfolded. As such, the decisions and events that transpire from this point on will be as crucial to community relations and public support as the outreach efforts that have occurred to date.