

Communication from Public

Name: Katherine C. King

Date Submitted: 10/14/2024 07:49 PM

Council File No: 22-1545-S23

Comments for Public Posting: The status report [C.F 22-1545] you are considering requests a transfer of \$150,000 from the Inside Safe Reserve Account to the HEA for an RV Storage Lot lease with Metro . Because the City has not yet created available housing for the folks who now live in the RVs that you intend to store in this lot, I ask that you NOT recommend this transfer. As the report explains on p.5, “people who are voluntarily brought indoors through both operations and response efforts to address repopulation can only be done [sic] when there is available housing that is either brought online or backfilling Inside Safe slots that are open as a result of participants moving through the continuum into permanent housing or exiting the program for other reasons.” Although this ungrammatical sentence is astoundingly confusing, it signals what the rest of the report makes clear: Inside Safe cannot work unless permanent housing is available for folks in interim housing to move into, which, according to this report, it definitely isn’t. On the next page, the report states that “as of September 30, 2024, the number of Inside Safe participants is 3,254 and the number of Inside Safe participants who transitioned from interim to permanent housing solutions since the beginning of the program is 741” (p.6). That means that only 23% of the people who voluntarily surrendered their vehicles, tents, sleeping bags in exchange for housing, have actually achieved permanent housing.(The chart on p. 31 says 34% but the numbers are still 3245/741). I note that the vast majority of those in permanent housing are on two-year rent-subsidies, and unless a large amount of affordable housing is built immediately, they will soon be houseless again. Compare the number of Inside Safe people in permanent housing (741) to those who have returned to homelessness: 956, or 29%. 1421 (43%) remain, precariously, in interim housing. As long as they stay in interim housing, there will be no room for new residents, since 1491 is the exact number of hotel rooms available (p.7). The projected number of new hotel rooms (Project Homekey) seems to number around 330 (p.12-13), a drop in the bucket for the 45,252 unhoused residents in the City (as of January 2024). One more statistic: there are 3691 RVs functioning as homes in the City (6854 in the County). In light of these statistics why should anyone willingly give up the protection of an RV, no matter its condition, in exchange for

temporary shelter? Since the City cannot offer shelter to the RV dwellers they sweep off the streets, they must not confiscate their RV s, and there is no need for a storage lot. A better use for the \$150,000 – plus the \$250,000 already earmarked for the LAPD “to support the initial phase of the new Vehicle Recycling Program (VRP)” (p.15) – would be to put it toward approving projects for permanent supportive housing. Use it to forward the approval process for projects like the Venice Dell Community rather than giving funds to the City Attorney to block such projects. Finally, although I approve of the rent subsidies that are currently making it possible for people to enjoy longer-term housing, it would be cheaper for the city and better for the people to use an amount equal to the \$2,206,041.75 allotted for 330 Time-Limited Subsidy slots (p.19, Att. 1 p. 3) for subsidies to build supportive permanent housing. Katherine Callen King
Venice, CA

The status report [C.F 22-1545] you are considering requests a transfer of \$150,000 from the Inside Safe Reserve Account to the HEA for an RV Storage Lot lease with Metro . Because the City has not yet created available housing for the folks who now live in the RVs that you intend to store in this lot, I ask that you NOT recommend this transfer.

As the report explains on p.5, “people who are voluntarily brought indoors through both operations and response efforts to address repopulation can only be done [sic] when there is available housing that is either brought online or backfilling Inside Safe slots that are open as a result of participants moving through the continuum into permanent housing or exiting the program for other reasons.” Although this ungrammatical sentence is astoundingly confusing, it signals what the rest of the report makes clear: Inside Safe cannot work unless permanent housing is available for folks in interim housing to move into, which, according to this report, it definitely isn’t.

On the next page, the report states that “as of September 30, 2024, the number of Inside Safe participants is 3,254 and the number of Inside Safe participants who transitioned from interim to permanent housing solutions since the beginning of the program is 741” (p.6).

That means that only 23% of the people who voluntarily surrendered their vehicles, tents, sleeping bags in exchange for housing, have actually achieved permanent housing. (The chart on p. 31 says 34% but the numbers are still 3245/741). I note that the vast majority of those in permanent housing are on two-year rent-subsidies, and unless a large amount of affordable housing is built immediately, they will soon be houseless again.

Compare the number of Inside Safe people in permanent housing (741) to those who have returned to homelessness: 956, or 29%. 1421 (43%) remain, precariously, in interim housing. As long as they stay in interim housing, there will be no room for new residents, since 1491 is the exact number of hotel rooms available (p.7). The projected number of new hotel rooms (Project Homekey) seems to number around 330 (p.12-13), a drop in the bucket for the 45,252 unhoused residents in the City (as of January 2024).

One more statistic: there are 3691 RVs functioning as homes in the City (6854 in the County).

In light of these statistics why should anyone willingly give up the protection of an RV, no matter its condition, in exchange for temporary shelter? Since the City cannot offer shelter to the RV dwellers they sweep off the streets, they must not confiscate their RV s, and there is no need for a storage lot.

A better use for the \$150,000 – plus the \$250,000 already earmarked for the LAPD “to support the initial phase of the new Vehicle Recycling Program (VRP)” (p.15) – would be to put it toward approving projects for permanent supportive housing. Use it to forward the approval process for projects like the Venice Dell Community rather than giving funds to the City Attorney to block such projects.

Finally, although I approve of the rent subsidies that are currently making it possible for people to enjoy longer-term housing, it would be cheaper for the city and better for the people to use an amount equal to the \$2,206,041.75 allotted for 330 Time-Limited Subsidy slots (p.19, Att. 1 p. 3) for subsidies to build supportive permanent housing.

Katherine Callen King
Venice, CA