

Background for PPCC – Two Motions re Homelessness

1) Request a letter from CW Yaroslavsky (CD 5), similar to CW Park’s letter to the Governor addressing encampments on state land.

The PPCC Board passed a mirror image motion on 9/12/24, supporting the letter from CD Park to the Governor to address encampments on state land in CD 11; see:

<https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Motions-re-Homelessness-passed-9-12-24.pdf>.

Now, we are asked to consider supporting our colleagues in the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC), *i.e.*, member councils located in CD 5, in requesting a similar letter from CW Yaroslavsky, asking the Governor and Caltrans to address encampments on state land in CD 5, per the Governor’s recent Executive Order.

WRAC is a cooperative coalition of Westside councils which takes positions on common regional issues that are supported by its member councils. In the spirit of collegiality with our fellow WRAC councils, PPCC has often supported motions or positions with little or no impact on the Palisades, but which impact other areas or districts such as CD 5. The reverse has also occurred (with councils in CD 5 or other areas of CD 11 supporting motions that have greater or more direct impact on Pacific Palisades (*e.g.*, WRAC councils’ opposition to the motion by former Councilmember Bonin in 2021 to place homeless housing on Will Rogers State Beach). Recently, Westwood NC (in CD 5) voted to support CD Park’s letter regarding state lands in CD 11; Brentwood CC and NC Westchester-Playa also support. More WRAC councils in CD 5 as well as other areas of CD 11 are also expected to support.

Pros / arguments in favor:

- In the spirit of collegiality, PPCC should support our fellow WRAC member councils in CD 5 with respect to this motion, as has been our practice with other motions over the years.
- Supporting this motion will not harm PPCC or our community.
- Supporting this motion is consistent not only with the PPCC motion passed on 9/12/24 re CW Park’s letter, but also with our own and WRAC’s numerous positions on homelessness.
- Supporting this motion will signal to WRAC member councils that we support them – as we hope and expect that they will continue to support us on matters important to the Palisades.

Cons / arguments against the motion:

- PPCC should not take positions on matters that do not directly involve our community, regardless of participation in WRAC or expectations regarding WRAC members’ support.
- *The author is not aware of other possible arguments against the motion.*

2) Support the Brentwood CC (BCC) Resolution and requests regarding policies and practices of the County Board of Supervisors.

The BCC Resolution: <https://westsidecouncils.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/BCC-County-resolution.pdf>.

The West LA VA is located in Brentwood, which has experienced and continues to experience homeless camping in the public right of way (County sidewalk area / not subject to LAMC 41.18) adjacent to the VA property. Many individuals in the encampments suffer from mental illness and addiction, which in turn negatively impacts veterans, including formerly homeless vets, now living on the VA campus, as well as nearby residential streets.

The specific requests in the Resolution speak for themselves and for the most part are supported by positions taken by PPCC. For example, in the interest of public health and safety, we fully support enforcement of 41.18 (which is not supported by the County Board of Supervisors/BOS); we support

removal of encampments in park areas and areas of high fire risk; we have supported enforcement against criminal behavior, the sale of illegal drugs and abatement of hazardous, unsafe and unhealthy conditions in encampments; and we support laws prohibiting blockage of the public right of way. We also support removal of encampments from state land (such as the RVs along PCH in the Palisades).

Author's opinion: the positions are entirely consistent with BCC's request for a protective zone around the perimeter of the WLA VA campus and for the clearing of encampments on County-owned property.

Moreover, as to BCC's request that the County act immediately to implement SB 43 and for a feasibility study for mental health facilities in the County: PPCC is well-aware, from PPTFH's work, of the many unhoused individuals who suffer from severe mental illness and/or substance abuse disorder – and of the critical need for treatment of these conditions. WRAC itself has called upon the County BOS to provide answers as to why implementation of SB 43 (changed definition of “gravely disabled” under the Lanterman-Petris-Short / LPS Act, for “51.50” holds)¹ has been delayed for two years, until 2026 (see <https://westsidecouncils.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/WRAC-Supervisors-SB-43.pdf>). The response received was only that the County needs more time to implement changes in its procedures.

Two additional WRAC member councils to date have passed the motion supporting the BCC Resolution: NC Westchester-Playa and Westwood NC; more are also expected to support.

Pros / arguments in favor:

- BCC's requests, if implemented by BOS, will benefit homeless veterans and nearby residents, will promote public health and safety and reduce the risk of hazardous encampments.
- In the spirit of collegiality, PPCC should support BCC and our fellow WRAC member councils, as has been our practice over the years.
- Supporting the BCC Resolution will not harm PPCC or our community.
- Supporting the Resolution is consistent not only with our own but also WRAC's numerous positions on homelessness.
- Supporting the Resolution will signal to WRAC member councils that we support them – as we hope and expect that they will continue to support us on matters important to the Palisades.

Cons / arguments against the motion:

- PPCC should not take positions on matters that do not directly involve our community, regardless of participation in WRAC or expectations regarding WRAC members' support.
- Sup. Horvath (who has differing policies and positions) is unlikely to act on the BCC Resolution and may not appreciate our support; this may weaken our relationship with the Supervisor.²
- *The author is not aware of other possible arguments against the motion.*

By Chris Spitz,

PPCC At-large rep and rep to WRAC; WRAC Vice-Chair and WRAC HOC Vice-Chair

Prepared in connection with the 9/26/24 PPCC Board meeting

¹ For definitions related to the LPS Act and other homelessness-related terms, see the PPCC Glossary of Homelessness Terms: <https://pacpalicc.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Glossary-HomelessnessR3.pdf>.

² Author's opinion: the fact that our supervisor has policies that conflict with positions and requests in the BCC Resolution – and may not act on or appreciate our support for the Resolution -- is not a reason to avoid supporting the Resolution. PPCC's positions are public and well-known, and we have never hesitated to take positions and express opinions that we believe are best for PPCC and the community, even if contrary or in opposition to the positions of our elected officials. There is no evidence that Sup. Horvath holds our well-known, differing positions on homelessness against PPCC or the Palisades community, or that our working relationship with the Supervisor would somehow be weakened if we support the BCC Resolution.