

Minutes of the Ventura Social Service Task Force for June 6, 2021

6/6/21 3:18 pm via Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88503050348>

Attendees: Judy Alexandre, Emily Bridges, Brian Brennan, Jerry Breiner, Sue Brinkmeyer, Christina Cabral, Kyler Carlson, Tara Carruth, Kevin Clerici, Jim Duran, Sonja Flores, Peter Gilli, Meredith Hart, John Sanders Jones, Pam Kelley, Kelly Kivlahan, Jacob Lesner-Buxton, Staci Mallett, Pam Marshall, Ella Moore, Carl Morehouse, Kappy Paulson, Elizabeth R. Stone, Susan White Wood

- I. Meeting was called to order at 3:17; welcome and introductions took place
- II. Agenda approved with one change (Kappy Paulson/Pam Kelley) - We will do item 6 before item 5.
- III. Minutes of 5/5/21 approved without changes (Kappy Paulson, Pam Kelley)
- IV. Financial update - No changes - \$2,316.46
- V. "Town Hall" input to General Plan and Housing Element (Peter Gilli)
 - a. Nine points were approved last month, and two additional points will be added today:
 - i. #10 to have staff conduct an annual workshop to review the steps taken to act on the Housing Element (HE). Item #10 approved on voice vote.
 - ii. Item #11 is being added to ask that a study be done whether Airbnbs have an impact on the availability of affordable housing. Carl Moorhouse endorsed the idea. Judy replied to a question that the City does not currently have this information. Item #10 was approved on voice vote.
 - iii. Judy reviewed that clarification on what was meant in referring to inclusionary housing was added to the documents being approved today as follows: "Projects would be required to prove 15 percent affordable units as follows: 15% low for for-sale projects and 15% very low for rental projects."
 - b. Peter Gilli, Community Development Director, shared what is being done by the City with regard to GP and HE:
 - i. The City is updating the General Plan (GP) and the HE. GP needs to be updated every 15 years. Our last GP was adopted in 1005. HE must be submitted to State in October. Go to planventura.com to see all information about General Plan and the process it is going through. HE includes goals and policies to address issues as

well as identifying sites to address growth. Peter said he would focus primarily on HE in his discussion today, both because it is more time sensitive and because the list of recommendations Ventura Social Services Task Force is voting on relates mostly to the HE. City will be using map from 2005 GP because the GP update is not far enough along to have new map ready. We have a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) of 5,312 units. Based on 2005 plan, we have theoretically enough sites to accommodate 20,000 units, though not all might not qualify under the State's rules. We anticipate the bulk of RHNA units will be able to be accommodated with existing GP map.

- ii. On June 15 and June 29 there will be afternoon sessions at which VSSTF can have input. Of course, VSSTF can turn list in to planventura.com prior to that, so that it can get into the hands of the consulting team. Veronica Tan & Assoc. is our consultant and will put together draft HE we need to send to state in August. State will review and comment. August 2 council meeting will review. Between now and August 2 is time when input is most valuable. The Council is also going to allocate resources as part of the budget so that a new inclusionary housing ordinance can be put in place as quickly after HE as possible.
- iii. In reply to a question, Peter Gilli replied that if necessary to meet RHNA, sites in 2005 map could change low density sites to higher density. Also, as part of GP update, if there are areas that are low and it would make sense to designate as moderate or high density, that can be done.
- iv. Sonja Flores mentioned that a housing overlay is one of the main proposals being made by Homes for All and VSSTF. The proposal is that the City have an Affordable Housing Overlay within the HE. The City is required to have enough parcels that are suitable for Affordable Housing. This year the state is asking that those parcels be at least 2 acres and at density of at least 30 dwelling units per acre. Several funding sources require this density level as well. The last HE only identified 6 parcels that fit those parameters. Homes for All has identified over 100 parcels that could meet those requirements and asked that they be designated for affordable housing. They are spread all over the city and most are vacant, though some are underutilized. Sonja also indicated that Homes for All and VSSTF are requesting that, if a developer is willing to dedicate 25% of their project in a commercial zone to low, very low, or extremely low units, then 100% of the project could be 100%

residential by right, with no requirement for commercial. We are asking that R-3 standards be applied to all parcels in the Affordable Housing Overlay. We sent letter to staff and council already and will send another letter delving further into these recommendations in the next two weeks.

- v. Tara stated that Thousand Oaks has clarified that projects on land identified as mixed use can be 100% residential or 100% commercial, but she does not know if that is city specific.
- vi. Sonja added that with changes to online shopping, etc., that there does not appear to be as much need for commercial property.
- vii. Peter Gilli responded that there is a group that opposes by right development and is louder than VSSTF and Homes for All. On the topic of mixed use, the bigger issue is that most higher density areas are subject to form based codes that call for store fronts along major streets. Past general plans estimated that projects might be specific percentages, but there is nothing requiring that, as far as Peter knows. Our form-based codes apply in the areas where they have been assigned and have objective design guidelines. Questions we need to address: Do we keep our form-based codes in which we have invested a lot, and how do we make them easier to apply when there is an affordable project? How can we make them more flexible when it is a housing project, especially a project with affordable units? Form based codes can be a tool, if flexibility is added in for when it is tied to housing.
- viii. Carl Morehouse asked about density bonus under state law. Peter Gilli replied that Ventura has a 15% density bonus but only on for sale projects. If someone proposes a 15% bonus, the two numbers are not additive. With the density bonus, the developer gets concessions. We do not need a justification for a 15% density bonus, but we do for over 15%. Peter said that he appreciated that VSSTF proposals had a different threshold for for sale and for rental. Peter Gilli suggested that the City has concern with for sale requirements for anything less than moderate, because of re-sale. If they try to re-sell and can't get a buyer, the City have to let them re-sell at market rate. Peter Gilli said the state law has made starting at 15% much easier.
- ix. In reply to a question, Peter discussed AirBnB implications, saying he can see a policy being in the HE that says what #11 says, but not in the HE, as we don't have the funding now. We could adopt the HE as a policy and, if there are any policies that will affect the

coastal zone, we would have to amend the coastal plan, which is not easy. We do not know the answer to #11, so it would have to be a study and would require a budget allocation.

- x. Question: How do we make sure that #10 happens? Peter replied that the General Plan was adopted in 2005, but probably only 20% of policies were implemented because the recession hit. We want to let Council know that action is not over when the GP and HE are adopted. The plan is easy, but we have to do it. Barring things like a great recession, it should be as easy as reminding staff and Council and getting an annual update. We also want to make sure than we don't overpromise in the GP. Our implementation plan will prioritize what is to be done first. When Council sets goals, we need to ask that they be in line with the GP.
- xi. Minutes will include the 11 general points so that those who will to write an individual or a group letter to Council can do so.
- xii. In other jurisdictions, a draft has been released for public comment. Peter commented that the goal is to release the document early enough to have a Q & A meeting with the public before the August 2 meeting and present comments and recommendations regarding them to Council with the draft. Staff and consultants are brainstorming a way to get something out soon enough so that people can respond to it.
- xiii. Judy mentioned that VSSTF and other advocacy groups want the inclusionary housing to be a priority and for it to be developed by the end of the year, if possible. Judy offered to have advocates meet with Peter Gilli.

VI. Current advocacy housing discussion, approvals of needed letters, updates on meetings with Council members, questions and concerns

- a. The following 11 items have been approved by VSSTF and all are encouraged to advocate for them:

1. AFFORDABLE HOUSING ZONING OVERLAY

On November 12, 2020 Homes for All and the Ventura Social Services Task Force (VSSTF) submitted a letter to the City Community Development Department recommending that a program be added to the 2021-2029 City of Ventura Housing Element to implement an Affordable Housing Zoning Overlay (AHZO), see attachment A.

We propose that the AHZO parcels included within the letter, be added to the City's new housing element vacant and underutilized land inventory.

The main component of this program is an additive zoning overlay which designates parcels or groups of parcels as suitable for affordable housing development. The overlay program would apply to the sites listed within the letter and would address the lower income RHNA numbers listed in the Housing Element. This zoning designation then permits by-right the use of affordable multifamily in addition to the permitted uses of its underlying zone. By allowing more by-right uses on the parcel, an Overlay can create a clear opportunity for more affordable housing at the scale that is needed to meet this growing obligation to Ventura's extremely low-income, very low income, and low-income residents.

There is consensus among Ventura County affordable housing developers that in order for most multifamily affordable housing projects to be financially feasible that vacant/underutilized parcels 2 acres in size or greater *and* that have a density of 30 dwelling units per acre or more are needed. Therefore, the majority of the parcels in the AHZO list meet those thresholds. The parcels included on the list that are smaller than 2 acres in size were recommended specifically for the development of smaller, permanent supportive housing projects for special needs households, i.e., tiny homes for homeless individuals, etc.

Government Code 65583.2(c) currently requires that a nonvacant site identified in a prior housing element and a vacant site that has been included in two or more consecutive planning periods that was not approved to develop a portion of the locality's housing need will not be adequate to accommodate a portion of the housing need for lower income households that must be accommodated in the current housing element planning period unless the site is zoned at residential densities consistent with paragraph (3) of this subdivision (30 dwelling units per acre for the City of Ventura) and the site is subject to a program in the housing element requiring rezoning within three years of the beginning of the planning period to allow residential use by right for housing developments in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower income households.

What differentiates our proposed AHZO program from Government Code 65583.2(c), is that the AHZO zoning process would be simpler than the rezoning process that is required as a part of Government Code 65583.2(c). All that would be required for the AHZO program rezoning would just be to attach an AH code to the properties that are included in the program. This is essentially an additive zoning. The owner could develop the property under the existing zoning or under the AH zoning. This is essentially an added benefit to the property owner. In addition, restrictive development standards impede the ability of developers to produce affordable housing at higher densities. Therefore, just rezoning the sites to 30 dwelling units per acre is not enough. We would like to

specifically request that the R-3-1 development standards are applied to all parcels within the AHZO program. For example, 800 square feet minimum lot areas for each unit, etc. We are also asking the City to commit to allow the following on parcels included within the AHZO overlay: all affordable housing projects with at least 25 percent designated for extremely low income and/or very low-income and/or low-income units, be 100% residential.

Per Government Code 65583.2(i), the term By Right is defined as, “(i) For purposes of this section and Section 65583, the phrase ‘use by right’ shall mean that the local government’s review of the owner-occupied or multifamily residential use may not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary local government review or approval that would constitute a ‘project’ for purposes of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.”

In other words, the term By Right, should be a procedure where upon application, plans are submitted and should be approved at the counter as long as the plans comply with the building code and fire and safety issues. The development should not be considered a "project" within the meaning of CEQA. Specifically, a By Right project is not subject to the usual public input process, and instead the development is to be approved through an administrative process, known as "by-right." This process, also known as ministerial review, would allow eligible projects with at least 25% lower income units located on the identified sites to avoid a discretionary process that includes Planning Commission and City Council approval.

2. INCLUSIONARY HOUSING ORDINANCE UPDATE

We ask that the City continue with its original goal of completing the inclusionary housing ordinance update by December 2021. We are requesting that the City Council expand the City of Ventura’s current inclusionary housing policy to be citywide and include new for sale and new rental projects. The inclusionary requirement should only target production of very low income and low-income units. Projects would be required to provide 15 percent affordable units as follows: 15% low for for-sale projects and 15% very low for rental projects. We would also like the City to incorporate an in-lieu option for all projects subject to inclusionary housing policies. For each required affordable unit, the fee to be paid by the developer to the City would be comparable to or close to the cost of developing a housing unit. Inclusionary housing is the most concrete and efficient vehicle to affirmatively further fair housing.

2) IDENTIFY SITES LOCATED IN VENTURA’S HIGH OR HIGHEST RESOURCES AREAS AND INCLUDE THESE SITES WITHIN THE AHZO PROGRAM

Many affordable housing funding applications award scoring points tied specifically to whether a project is located in a census tract(s), or census block group, designated as high or highest resource areas on the most current Opportunity Area map. The most current Tax Credit Allocation Committee Opportunity Map can be found at <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/2021-tcac-opportunity-map>. The purpose of opportunity mapping is to affirmatively further fair housing. This is achieved through measuring and visualizing place-based characteristics linked to critical life outcomes, such as educational attainment, earnings from employment, and economic mobility. We request that the City identify sufficient sites within its current housing element vacant and underutilized land inventories that are located in high or highest resources areas and include these sites within the AHZO program as well.

3) FEE DEFERRAL

Reduce, defer or waive development fees including impact fees for 100% affordable housing projects that include units designated for extremely low-income and very low-income households.

This measure could help to reduce and/or defer project costs, thereby incentivizing the development of a variety of types of housing for vulnerable populations. Impact fee loans that could be repaid from residual receipts would also be helpful. The production of affordable housing for extremely low, very low and low-income housing reduces public expenditures in other areas including public health and public safety. This is a financial tool the City can offer to incentivize affordability without obligating general fund or entitlement program dollars.

4) FARMWORKER HOUSING

Work with the County of Ventura, advocacy groups, and agricultural organizations to plan, fund, and implement a countywide survey of farmworkers, employers, and housing providers to further define housing conditions, needs and barriers for farmworker households. Utilize the survey results to develop targeted programs and strategies to address the verified needs of farmworkers and to support agricultural businesses with a stable and healthy workforce. *Note: On February 9, 2021, the Ventura County Board of Supervisors approved inclusion of the Farmworker Housing Study in the programs of their Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element*

5) DIRECT ASSET SUPPORT FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Study opportunities for the City of Ventura to directly support the production of Affordable Housing through City owned land donations and providing more funding for affordable housing.

There are two parts to this recommendation—land donations and one-time revenues.

- a) One of the clearest signals of support for Affordable Housing the City can do is make its own underutilized parcels available for affordable housing development. To date, most studies have focused on whether the Redevelopment Successor Agency parcels are suitable for this purpose. These reports found that most of the land is either not suitable for affordable housing or is already under development agreements. The City should explore opportunities on land it owns outside of the Redevelopment Successor Agency's boundaries and consider entering into development agreements with affordable housing developers directly, or consider putting the land into a land trust, which will keep the housing affordable in perpetuity.
- b)
 - c) In future budget goal sessions, the City should adopt budget guidelines that prioritize the direct support of Affordable Housing production, e.g., prioritizing Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for affordable housing and also allocating one-time revenue funds towards affordable housing.

6) TENANT PROTECTIONS

Include a Housing Element Goal which promotes the preservation and maintenance of affordable rental properties and affordable housing. This goal could be achieved by implementing stronger tenant protection programs such as a rent stabilization program and a Just Cause Eviction protection ordinance.

- a) Rent stabilization is the strongest type of tenant protection. State legislation (AB 1482), limits rent increases to 5% per year plus the annual rate of inflation (CPI), which is typically around 2-3%. This prevents the most severe cases of rent gouging, but is a relatively loose cap which can still result in displacement and cost burdens for many families. For example, a household paying \$2,000 in rent could find themselves facing a sudden rent increase of \$150/month, and could see their rent double over a ten year period. AB 1482 excludes many renters, such as those living in single-family homes, newer apartment buildings (built in the last 15 years), and duplexes where the landlord lives in the other unit. Cities only have the power to tighten the cap of allowed annual rent increases to a lower annual amount. Most existing rent control policies have a rent cap equal to the CPI of the area. Finally, rent stabilization is financed through annual fees which are levied to rent controlled units.
- b) A Just Cause Ordinance restricts evictions to a list of fair reasons or "just causes," such as: not paying rent, damaging property, disturbing other tenants, or using the building for illegal activity. AB

1482 put in place basic Just Cause protections statewide. However, these protections are only temporary and will expire in 2030. Municipalities can adopt a permanent Just Cause Eviction Protection Ordinance. State law also allows for “no-fault” evictions when a landlord wants to convert a rental apartment building into for-sale condominiums, demolish a building, or move themselves or a family member into a unit. Cities can put into place protections to reduce the impact of these no-fault evictions. Notice requirements can set a minimum 120-day notice for no-fault evictions to give families time to find another place to live. Cities can also require landlords to provide displacement assistance for a no-fault eviction, to ensure families do not become homeless during their search for new housing and can afford security deposits and other move-in costs. This can be a set amount, such as three months’ median rent in the area, or it can vary with higher amounts for seniors, low-income families, or people with disabilities.

9) BY-RIGHT AFFORDABLE MULTIFAMILY ORDINANCE

Adopt a By-Right Affordable Housing Ordinance for large multifamily housing affordable to low-income households (80% AMI and below), modeled after a similar ordinance passed by the County of Los Angeles for unincorporated areas. Given the state of the affordable housing crisis, this would permit affordable multifamily housing developments by-right by using a ministerial review process in certain zones.

In order to accomplish this, it is recommended that the City add a new Housing Element Program that would create a Zoning Code Amendment to adopt a By-Right Housing Ordinance. The By-Right Affordable Housing ordinance will permit affordable residential uses by-right in zones that permit large multifamily housing that would apply to very low or low-income housing development. Per Government Code 65583.2(i), the term By Right is defined as, “(i) For purposes of this section and Section 65583, the phrase ‘use by right’ shall mean that the local government’s review of the owner-occupied or multifamily residential use may not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary local government review or approval that would constitute a ‘project’ for purposes of Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.” The benefits of this By-Right Affordable Housing Ordinance is described in the Affordable Housing Zoning Overlay (AHZO program in item #1.)

The Ventura By-Right Affordable Housing Ordinance will amend Division 24-Zoning Regulations of the San Buenaventura City Charter and Municipal Code to:

- Allow the large multifamily residential uses by right in Zones R-2 (Two-Family Residence), C-1 (Restricted Commercial), C-1-A (Intermediate Commercial), C-2 (General Commercial), and C-P-D (Commercial Planned Development); M-X-D (Mixed-Use Zone) and M-1 (Limited Industrial Zone) subject to the approval of a Ministerial Site Plan Review (SPR).
- Expand eligibility for by-right review of density bonus projects beyond those provided by the State Density Bonus Law and reflect the by-right enhanced density bonus effected by Assembly Bill (AB) 1763 (Chiu).
- Clarify how to calculate the allowable residential density and floor area ratio on a parcel. The R-3 allowable density and floor area ratio parameters will be used to calculate the maximum number of dwelling units permitted on a lot, not including dwelling units permitted by a density bonus.
- Establish development standards for residential and mixed-use developments in commercial zones. Assumption is that R-3 development standards will be adopted for residential development in commercial zones.

10) STREAMLINING AND MATRIX REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Use the Permanent Streamlining Ordinance and the Matrix Report Implementation to add measures that help Affordable Multifamily Projects navigate the entitlement process quickly, efficiently and without subjective discretionary approval.

Programs 24 and 25 of the 2014-2021 Housing Element focus on streamlining the development process for Affordable Housing Projects. Those programs have proven to be monumental tasks, and should be carried over into this housing element update in order to continue being implemented effectively. City Staff has already devoted considerable time and resources to analyzing the Development process in the City and is actively working on implementing streamlining changes. The initial results from the Emergency Streamlining Ordinance are very promising.

The focus on streamlining has broadened from the initial Housing Element Program to include all projects across the Community Development Division, so we ask that the City still pay attention to the particular way that affordable housing projects must navigate the development process as they implement these changes.

For example, implementing Recommendation 18 of the Matrix Report to offer expedited plan check services would be a useful option to affordable multifamily projects. Projects typically receive scoring bonuses in their financing applications when they are permit ready. The ability to expedite the plan check process in order to maximize a project's competitiveness for financing is an excellent option to have available.

Additionally, directing affordable housing projects to the Administrative Hearing Officer can help reduce significant delays experienced when a project must jump between the Planning Commission and Design Review Committee. If the City could establish its own ministerial approval process for affordable housing projects, that would be even better.

It is important that the City focus on developing its own streamlining and ministerial approval process, rather than relying on State-level legislation like SB35, because the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is soon going to evaluate a city's housing policies and processes as a part of competitive financing programs. This program will allow HCD to designate jurisdictions as "Pro-housing," when they demonstrate policies and strategies to accelerate housing production. In turn, Pro-housing jurisdictions will be awarded additional points or preference in programs such as the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC), Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) and Infill Incentive Grant (IIG) programs.

a) ANNUAL HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Add City of Ventura Annual Housing Element Workshop as a new program. Staff shall conduct an annual workshop with affordable housing advocates, affordable housing builders, and market-rate builders to discuss the City's annual progress in implementing the adopted Housing Element. The purpose of the workshop will be to review progress toward Housing Element goals and objectives, to evaluate the effectiveness of individual Housing Element programs, and to consider actions that will improve outcomes. The results of this workshop will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council, including any recommendations for improvement.

11) STUDY REGARDING THE IMPACT OF SHORT-TERM VACATION RENTALS ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Study the impact of short-term vacation rentals, e.g., Airbnb's on affordable housing or on housing availability and what can be done to address this issue.

- b. We have met with 5 of 7 council members. They cannot tell us where they stand on any point or how they plan to vote, or they would have to recuse themselves at the vote. We have had good interaction and questions that have been helpful.
- c. The City received some one-time funds from COVID relief and/or Thomas Fire. City allocated that \$16 million, with none allocated toward housing. A letter was put together requested that \$1 million of it be dedicated to

housing. The best way to maximize might be to allow a developer to use those funds toward fee offset, or toward Housing Trust Fund, or some other use to bring development to reality. Homes for All especially identified funding for a golf banquet hall as the \$1million that could go toward affordable housing. Peter Gilli responded that the banquet funds were allocated in order to be a way to bring in more funds. He also responded that Council can waive fees for any project, it does not necessarily have to be set aside. We did a NOFA (notice of funding availability), and \$4.6 million went toward a housing project. Folks were encouraged to send letters to council if they were concerned about the \$16 milion allocation.

- d. There is a meeting tomorrow night on economic development. There is a housing working at 6 pm on June 15 and again on June 29. These are open to the public and participation is encouraged. Find details at Planventura.com

VII. Tara Carruth gave an update on Point in Time count and current status of homelessness in the county and specifically in the City of Ventura. She shared slides, which are available on the Continuum of Care website

- a. We and most communities in California decided not to do our annual unsheltered count due to COVID.
- b. Sheltered count was done on Jan 28 of people in emergency shelters, in motels paid for by a program, in transitional housing, or in safe haven programs.
- c. Homeless numbers increased from 1271 in 2016 to 1743 by 2020. The count is a snapshot of one day of homelessness in the community. We cannot anticipate what will happen once eviction moratoriums are lifted.
- d. There was a 50% increase in people sheltered in emergency shelter programs, including Project Room Key, from 2020 to 2021, with biggest increase in Ventura. The ARCH was not included in 2020.
- e. Transitional housing increased from 162 to 204 from 2020 to 2021. Transitional housing is still recommended for people fleeing domestic violence and for youth.
- f. Sheltered demographics, 184 under 18, 34 18-24, 726 25+. 414 female, 530 male. COC.org has full data.
- g. Ethnicity 533 Hispanic/Latino; 411 non Hispanic/Latino.
- h. 87 veterans, 16 parenting youth, 22 unaccompanied youth, 36 DV survivor, 8 HIV/AIDS; substance use disorder 106, serious mental illness, 174; chronically homeless 168 — all self reported

- i. Largest increases in sheltered population, largely due to Project Room Key in Thousand Oaks, Ventura, and Oxnard
- j. 265 still being served by Project Room Key; Of those that exited: 142 permanently housed, 137 temporary placement, 45 death or exited from program. Funding is approved through September and in state budget to continue and that gives us time to implement Project Home Key with motel conversions, etc.
- k. We are having conversations about growing numbers of people living in vehicles and encampments in river bottoms, beaches, and open spaces
- l. 6,763 persons enrolled in County of Venturas' Healthcare for the Homeless. Approximately 20% met HUD definition of homeless
- m. Office of Ed, 5715 students were listed as homeless under those guidelines
- n. 6,184 instances of services by partner agencies in 2019 - pre-pandemic; in 2020 nearly the same number: 6,044.
- o. Pathways to Home - Coordinated entry — 30 partner agencies, 21,689 referrals to programs/services; 1,215 persons assisted with housing; 44% of referrals to Rapid Rehousing and Homeless Prevention
- p. Housing Placements - Total 2019 - 931; 2020 1215; 2021 449; Over 100 housing units served through Moving In, thanks to Kathy Powell and the faith community
- q. Housing Placements 63% of those touched October 2019-September 2020 - placed in housing (below target of 85%. Housing Retention 97% (above target of 85%). Average Length of Time Homeless - 126 days - Emergency Shelter; 147 days Transitional Housing (longer and longer each year because there are not housing resources available and affordable).
- r. Return to Homelessness within 2 years - 5% (target under 5%); First time homeless: 115 thanks to homeless prevention and eviction moratorium (target reduction from prior year). Income and employment growth 32% (target 55%) - during COVID and many are over 65 or ailing.
- s. Housing inventory chart - all emergency shelter resources utilized on night of count. Rapid Re-Housing - 595 (60 under development); Supportive Housing 716 (105 available; 49 under development)
- t. Affordable and Supportive Housing in pipeline: 17 projects, 1,115 affordable units; 12 projects include PSH, 280 PSH projected Estimated occupancy 2021-2015

- u. Funding opportunities HUD unsheltered NOFA; youth homelessness demonstration project; HUD CoC NOFA
 - v. Housing Challenges - Fair Market Rent Average 1 BR \$1,836 / month July 2020
 - w. Income needed to rent in Ventura county - one bedroom \$28.90/hour; 2 BR \$37.37
 - x. The three county Housing Authorities have about 150 emergency vouchers for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness; people are notified via wait list. Some vouchers should be available for homelessness prevention. They cannot be tied to a project because the funding is temporary.
- VIII. Pam Kelley gave an update on the Faith Sub Committee workshop (Sept. 30, 2021, O'Brian Hall, Mission Basilica Catholic Church, title "Everyone Needs Housing," 5:30pm-8pm)
- a. We have the facility at the Mission Basilica O'Brian Hall but are looking for a sponsor for certificate of insurance; John Jones will be making invites and program.
 - b. Program topics are projected to include:
 - i. Overview of GP and HE by Peter Gilli
 - ii. Voucher programs and housing eligibility
 - iii. Update on ARCH and Mercy House and supportive services
 - iv. Panel describing low income housing developers; Housing Authority, Mercy House, Cabrillo Economic Development; People Self Help housing; what are barriers, what needs to be allowed, changed or developed
 - v. Call to Action - with 11 points approved by VSSTF and Homes for All and what people in the faith community and general public can do to help housing projects be happen
- IX. Legislative Updates (Pam Marshall)
- a. These were sent via email. No oral review.
- X. Updates and Information
- a. HOPES City of Ventura Subcommittee (Meredith Hart)
 - 1. Name change is going to council at meeting after next

2. Met regional director of Catholic Charities and will partner on neighborhood issues
3. Work and work training program is in infancy stages
4. Interviewing for outreach worker
5. July 6, 2:30 next meeting

XI. Agency Updates:

- a. Emily Briggs - the Independent Living Resource Center has started a Rapid Response Committee, which is consumer-led and meets on the 2nd and 4th Mondays of the month. Committee will work on issues of accessible and affordable housing. Anybody who wants to find out more can contact Jacob Lesner-Buxton at jelsner@ilrc-trico.org.
- b. City Center - 2 rooms will opened at end of June
- c. Tenderlife - 2 rooms available. Walk fundraiser July 10.

XII. Upcoming Meetings:

- a. HOPES meeting, July 6, at 2:30pm
- b. Faith Subcommittee, June 23 at 3pm contact Pam Kelley pamjk3@msn.com
- c. General Plan Advisory Committee, with focus on housing, June 15 at 6:30pm. Check city website for specific information.

XIII. Resuming in-person meetings for VSSTF ? (Judy Alexandre) - Heard only from 2 people and one wanted August, the other September. Email Judy or perhaps there will be a survey

XIV. All are encouraged to write letters to Council regarding the approved 11 points. Updates on youth issues next month.

XV. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm

Respectfully submitted, Sue Brinkmeyer