

Communication from Public

Name: David Matthews

Date Submitted: 10/18/2026 06:27 PM

Council File No: 26-1485

Comments for Public Posting: Council File 26-1485 — Public Comment (Part 2 of 3) To the Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council: This is the second of three public comments regarding the potential restructuring of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care. My concerns come from more than six years of firsthand experience coordinating homeless outreach and assisting individuals and families throughout Harbor Gateway and surrounding City and County communities. 4. A Coordinated, Real-Time Shelter Bed Availability System One of the most frustrating challenges in street outreach is identifying an available shelter bed when an individual is ready to accept assistance. I respectfully ask whether the City and County will establish a coordinated system requiring participating shelter operators to report available beds multiple times throughout the day, including evenings, weekends, and holidays. Will outreach providers have real-time access to accurate information regarding vacancies, eligibility requirements, accessibility accommodations, and intake procedures? Will this system include County-operated and County-funded shelters, City-funded programs, and other participating providers? Will outreach teams be able to reserve or secure an appropriate placement while physically with an individual willing to accept assistance? Will providers have access to a single coordinated referral process rather than having to contact multiple agencies and facilities individually? I recognize that not every vacant bed is appropriate for every individual. Placement must account for medical needs, disabilities, household composition, safety, and program eligibility. However, every available and appropriate bed should be visible to the providers responsible for helping people access shelter. An empty shelter bed serves no one when the outreach provider standing beside someone who needs it has no way of knowing it exists or securing the placement. I respectfully request that any restructuring include a shared City–County bed availability and referral system, with clear procedures to minimize unused beds and prevent individuals from being turned away unnecessarily. 5. Communication Between City and County Leadership For years, I have heard concerns regarding the lack of cooperation between City and County government in addressing homelessness. Yet, based on my observations, representatives from the two

governments rarely appear to participate in each other's public meetings in a meaningful, consistent manner. If we expect outreach providers to coordinate across jurisdictions, should we not expect the same level of coordination from the elected officials and departments responsible for directing these systems? Has the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors been formally engaged regarding Council File 26-1485 and the possibility of a City-only Continuum of Care? Will there be joint public discussions between the Los Angeles City Council and County Board of Supervisors before decisions are made that could significantly affect homelessness services throughout the region? Will the City and County establish regularly scheduled joint meetings to address operational challenges, funding responsibilities, shelter capacity, and service delivery? Will service providers and individuals with firsthand field experience be invited to participate in those discussions? The public deserves to understand not only where disagreements exist, but how both governments intend to resolve them. If City and County leadership cannot consistently communicate and coordinate at the policy-making level, how can we expect their outreach providers to coordinate effectively on the streets? This comment is Part 2 of a three-part submission addressing operational concerns regarding the proposed restructuring of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care.

Communication from Public

Name: David Matthews

Date Submitted: 10/18/2026 06:28 PM

Council File No: 26-1485

Comments for Public Posting: Council File 26-1485 — Public Comment (Part 3 of 3) To the Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council: This is the final portion of my three-part public comment regarding the proposed restructuring of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care. For more than six years, I have worked directly with individuals experiencing homelessness, outreach providers, public agencies, and community partners. My experience has demonstrated that successful interventions depend on coordination, consistency, access to resources, and follow-through.

6. Preventing Two Separate Systems From Creating Additional Barriers If the City and County have struggled to coordinate services within the existing regional structure, what assurances do we have that establishing separate systems will improve cooperation rather than create additional barriers? Will an individual receiving services in an unincorporated County area remain eligible for coordinated assistance upon entering the City of Los Angeles? Will outreach providers be able to access shared referral information, subject to appropriate privacy protections? Will both governments establish written agreements addressing funding, service delivery, emergency placements, and responsibility for individuals who move between jurisdictions? How will individuals living on Caltrans properties, railroad rights-of-way, LADWP parcels, flood-control channels, and other overlapping jurisdictions be served without duplication or gaps? What happens when a City outreach team encounters someone whose available shelter placement is funded or operated by the County? Will that individual have access to the placement, or will administrative boundaries prevent assistance? I respectfully request that the City establish enforceable interagency agreements before implementing any separate Continuum of Care. The administrative structure should never become more important than the people it is intended to serve.

7. Accountability Must Be Measured by Outcomes I encourage the City Council to establish meaningful performance standards that measure actual results rather than simply counting outreach contacts and completed cleanups. These standards should include:

- * Successful shelter, treatment, and housing placements.
- * Access to services during evenings, weekends, and holidays.
- * Continued outreach across jurisdictional boundaries.
- * Time between accepting assistance

and receiving an actual placement. * Accurate reporting and utilization of available shelter beds. * Follow-up with individuals who decline services or relocate during encampment cleanups. * Coordination between City, County, State, and other property-owning agencies. Will these performance measures be reported publicly? Will the City and County share responsibility for addressing failures in coordination? Will there be an independent process for identifying gaps in service delivery and requiring corrective action? Outreach contacts, cleanup statistics, and administrative reports alone do not tell us whether individuals are receiving the assistance they need. Closing Comments I recognize that restructuring the regional homelessness response system involves complex legal, financial, and administrative considerations. However, my years working directly on the streets have taught me that the greatest challenges often occur where government responsibilities overlap and communication breaks down. I have witnessed the dedication of outreach workers, service providers, and public employees who genuinely want to help. Too often, their efforts are limited by systems that do not communicate effectively. I am not opposed to examining a City-only Continuum of Care. I am asking that the practical consequences of such a decision be fully evaluated before implementation. I respectfully request that Councilmembers Harris-Dawson and McOsker, along with the appropriate City departments, address these operational concerns as part of the reports contemplated by Council File 26-1485. If City and County governments cannot consistently coordinate outreach and cleanup operations across a single street, how will two separate Continuums of Care improve the delivery of services? The individuals living on our streets deserve a system that works regardless of jurisdiction, time of day, or which government administers the funding. Our goal must remain simple: Clean Safe Healthy Streets, with meaningful assistance and opportunities for those experiencing homelessness. Thank you for your consideration. This concludes my three-part public comment on Council File 26-1485. David Matthews Harbor Gateway Stakeholder

Communication from Public

Name: David Matthews

Date Submitted: 10/18/2026 07:26 PM

Council File No: 26-1485

Comments for Public Posting: Council File 26-1485 — Public Comment (Part 1 of 3) To the Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council: I am submitting this public comment regarding the proposed restructuring of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care and the possibility of establishing a City-only Continuum of Care. For more than six years, I have worked directly on the streets of Harbor Gateway and surrounding communities, coordinating with homeless outreach providers, law enforcement, public agencies, private property owners, and community organizations. What began as picking up trash evolved into years of working alongside individuals experiencing homelessness, identifying resources, visiting shelters, coordinating outreach, assisting families, and navigating the complicated jurisdictional boundaries dividing our communities. My concern is not simply which government controls the funding or administers the homelessness response system. My concern is what happens to the individuals living in the spaces between these jurisdictions. 1. Individuals Living in the “In-Between” Harbor Gateway is a prime example of what I refer to as operating in the “in-between.” Within relatively small geographic areas, responsibility may fall under the City of Los Angeles, unincorporated Los Angeles County, Caltrans, Union Pacific Railroad, LADWP, flood-control agencies, or other public and private property owners. I have encountered individuals living along railroad rights-of-way, Caltrans properties, utility parcels, the Los Angeles River, flood-control channels, and other locations where jurisdictional responsibility becomes complicated. When assistance is requested, the response can become a discussion of who owns the property, which agency has authority, and who is responsible for providing services. Meanwhile, the individual needing assistance remains on the street. If Los Angeles establishes its own Continuum of Care, how will individuals living in these overlapping jurisdictions be included? Will formal agreements establish responsibility for outreach, referrals, emergency placements, and continued engagement? No individual should be overlooked simply because they happen to live on the wrong side of an imaginary jurisdictional line. 2. City and County Cleanups Must Be Coordinated Throughout my years working directly on the streets, I have rarely witnessed coordinated cleanup and outreach

operations involving both City and County agencies along shared jurisdictional boundaries. Consider a street where one side is within the City of Los Angeles and the opposite side is within unincorporated Los Angeles County. When a cleanup takes place on the City side, individuals who decline services may simply cross the street and wait until the operation is completed. In many instances, there are few, if any, outreach resources on the County side to continue engagement. The City may consider the cleanup completed, but the individuals have simply relocated across the street. What has actually been accomplished? We have moved individuals from one jurisdiction to another without necessarily connecting them to treatment, shelter, or housing. Will the proposed system require joint City–County outreach operations before, during, and after encampment cleanups along shared boundaries? Who will be responsible for continued engagement when individuals cross jurisdictional lines? A completed cleanup should not be confused with a completed homelessness intervention.

3. Outreach Must Operate Beyond Traditional Business Hours Homelessness does not operate Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Through my involvement in evening outreach operations, I have encountered individuals who were not accessible during traditional daytime outreach. Some work during the day. Others are more receptive to engagement in the evening. Still others need assistance during weekends or holidays when services may be limited. Will the proposed Continuum of Care provide meaningful outreach services during evenings, overnight hours, weekends, and holidays? Will providers have access to transportation, emergency shelter placements, medical services, mental health resources, and other necessary assistance during those hours? There is little value in convincing someone to accept help at 9 p.m. if the system cannot provide a placement until the following business day. This comment is Part 1 of a three-part submission addressing operational concerns regarding the proposed restructuring of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care.