

1 Yellowstone is in compliance, then what happens is
2 Yellowstone gets due process on the issue. That's how
3 this works.

4 So going back to our initial discussion, had
5 Yellowstone violated something, some rule, some zoning
6 rule of the County of Orange, what would have happened is
7 there would have been a notice that we were in violation,
8 and we would have been given an opportunity to be heard,
9 and there could have been Appellate rights, and there
10 could have been another appeal, and we could have
11 attacked the ordinance, and it goes on and on and on.

12 MR. ALLEN: I don't get that entirely. You're
13 saying, I think, that because they didn't catch you, that
14 is, they didn't come out and find that you hadn't gotten
15 a use permit, you were somehow vested?

16 MR. ZFATY: No.

17 MR. ALLEN: You need to get that clarified.
18 Because it seems to me quite clear from what I read here
19 that there were permit requirements for you, and that you
20 didn't get them.

21 MR. ZFATY: What I'm saying is -- yeah, no. I
22 understand. And I think we were very clear. I actually
23 reread the transcript from the February 20th hearing. I
24 made it clear that we did not have a use permit.

25 The question was asked, I think, by Mr. Kiff.

1 We're not claiming that we had any use permit. What I'm
2 saying is, we're not even sure that we needed to have a
3 use permit.

4 And the problem is -- and I understand, with
5 all due respect, Mr. Allen, that you're looking at the
6 City's analysis and saying, "Well, that kind of make
7 sense to me. I can read. It's pretty clear. Based upon
8 my review of this, yes, Yellowstone should have had a use
9 permit with the County as of December 31 of 2007."

10 The problem with that analysis is that had that
11 been true, then somebody from the County would have had
12 to go through that analysis and provided Yellowstone with
13 some notice that it was in violation of some County
14 zoning regulation. And then we get into the due process
15 part of it.

16 MR. ALLEN: But you have to make the
17 application first, and you didn't. That belies the whole
18 analysis you're doing here, it seems to me.

19 MR. ZFATY: I would respectfully disagree.
20 Perhaps we would have had to make the application,
21 perhaps not. Perhaps we would have been given some sort
22 of, you know, reasonable accommodation. Who knows what
23 he would have happened. But that's the problem. We
24 don't know. There's no way to know.

25 And so for us to sit here now, as a part of the

1 City of Newport Beach, and look back and say, "We think
2 this could have been a violation, and we're going to
3 assume that Yellowstone operated unlawfully as a result
4 of this speculation that there was a violation, or that
5 they would have remained in violation of the Code had
6 they gone through all these processes that I just
7 described for you, we're going to go ahead now and revoke
8 the CUP," that's not proper. That's my point.

9 The City of Newport Beach has an affirmative
10 requirement that it find that Yellowstone operated in
11 violation of some Federal, state or local law.

12 MR. ALLEN: You just said the City would
13 revoke. The City's not revoking anything, right? I
14 mean, you just used the word "revoking."

15 MR. ZFATY: Yeah, and I misspoke. I think the
16 better way to put it is the City is going to deny
17 Yellowstone use permits based upon its inability to make
18 a critical finding.

19 And that inability to make a critical finding
20 is subject to the City's inability to say that
21 Yellowstone was somebody who was acting within the laws,
22 generally speaking. I mean, it's a pretty broad statute.
23 But that's the analysis.

24 And the problem is, again, tying this back in,
25 the problem is that we haven't had that hearing, and we

1 can't have that hearing. It's impossible. It's legally
2 impossible.

3 So I understand your point. What you're saying
4 is, well, you're just saying that you didn't get caught.
5 But the fact of the matter is, we're not saying that.
6 We're not saying that we didn't get caught. We're saying
7 that we weren't in violation, period. That's the end of
8 it. And there's no way that we can make that finding
9 now.

10 MR. ALLEN: All right. I'm sensitive to your
11 argument regarding denial of due process. And, you know,
12 the City should not be engaged in denying you the
13 opportunity to be heard. I recognize that we can't go
14 back and hold a County hearing to determine whether or
15 not you might get a County hearing. That's not going to
16 happen here.

17 But we can delay this matter for a week or two,
18 or whatever time is agreed upon, if you wish to conduct a
19 further hearing and make a presentation on -- further on
20 what you've already presented today, and I would be
21 receptive to that, if you wish to do that.

22 MR. ZFATY: I don't think that there's anything
23 I need to add, because -- and I think it's a good
24 question, though. And it goes to one of the main points
25 that I'm trying to make here, which is that between now

1 and a week from now and two weeks from now, there's
2 nothing that we can do to go back and get a judicial
3 declaration or a County approval of something. It won't
4 happen. It can't happen, right? We don't have standing.

5 If I went into court tomorrow and said, "We
6 need a judicial declaration immediately that we didn't
7 violate some zoning code for the County that happened,
8 you know, two years ago," I'm going to get laughed at in
9 the courtroom. It's not going to happen.

10 They are going to say, "You don't have
11 standing. Are you part of the County still?"

12 "No."

13 "Well, did you get cited for some violation?"

14 "No."

15 "Well, what are we here to talk about?"

16 "Well, there's some speculation that perhaps,
17 had we gone in to try to get a use permit" -- actually
18 that skips a step.

19 "That perhaps we were required to get a use
20 permit, and had we done in to the use permit, we would
21 have been found -- we would have been denied the use
22 permit with the County." We'll never get there. That
23 will never happen. It can't happen.

24 MR. ALLEN: I understand that. But what I'm
25 suggesting or asking is whether you need any more

1 opportunity to look at your position, given the fact that
2 you can't go back and get something that's no longer
3 obtainable?

4 But, nevertheless, if there's further analysis
5 of County law you'd like to do to make presentation on
6 why you didn't need -- I don't want to start speculating
7 on what you might find.

8 I'm just saying that at the outset of this
9 discussion, you made pretty serious allegations about
10 being denied due process of law. And I don't believe
11 it's appropriate for us to make a quick decision today
12 unless you're saying, "I've had all the due process I
13 need from the City for you to make a decision."

14 MR. ZFATY: Yeah. And there's actually two
15 responses to that. The first is that, as I mentioned,
16 there is nothing that will happen between now and two
17 weeks from now that will give me that due process.

18 And the second is that I am absolutely saying
19 that we're not being afforded due process to the extent
20 that the City's going to make a finding that we violated
21 some County rule, right?

22 In other words, I'm saying that we are not
23 being afforded due process on that issue, and we cannot
24 be afforded due process on that issue. It's mutually
25 exclusive at this point, right?

1 The problem is that whatever the County was
2 doing up until December 31 of 2007 in connection with the
3 Yellowstone, or any other facility in the Santa Ana
4 Heights area, if the County thought -- and we've
5 presented some particular comments that was in the staff
6 report that said that the County knew who we were, they
7 knew what we were doing, and there was no citation, if
8 the County believed that we would doing something wrong,
9 the County would have had to act on that. And had the
10 County acted on it, then we would have had an opportunity
11 to respond, right?

12 I mean, that's how due process works. We
13 notice somebody that, "You know what? We think you're
14 doing something wrong." And the person is given an
15 opportunity to be heard.

16 And perhaps what happens there is go in and we
17 convince the County, "No, we are not required to have to
18 use permit." Or what happens there is we go in and we
19 convince the County that, "You know, we shouldn't be
20 subject to this, but maybe we'll agree to some
21 conditions, or maybe we'll figure something out," and we
22 reach an agreement.

23 Or perhaps what happens is we go into the
24 County. County says, "No, you're required to have a use
25 permit." We disagree. We appeal. We lose. We appeal

1 again. We win or we appeal again, and we lose or win. I
2 mean, we don't know. That's the problem, but that's why
3 we have due process is because we don't -- it sounds
4 cliché, but you're innocent until proven guilty.

5 And I'm not trying to say that we snuck under
6 the radar here. I think there's evidence before us
7 today, without doing any further investigation, that the
8 County knew exactly who we were, and exactly what we were
9 doing, and we were not cited. But we cannot be afforded
10 due process, not today, not a week from today, not two
11 weeks from today. It won't happen.

12 MR. ALLEN: Okay. Anything further?

13 Does the City wish to respond any further to
14 the comments that were just made?

15 MR. ZFATY: Oh, one other comment -- I'm sorry.
16 We have County Fire Clearances. We brought copies with
17 us here today if the City wants to see them.

18 MR. ALLEN: Sure, yeah. Those should be
19 submitted.

20 MR. BOBKO: I'm actually going to look for an
21 assist here from staff, but I don't think that the idea
22 that -- and I think you hit it right on the head,
23 Mr. Allen -- that if you establish a use that's illegal
24 and simply don't get caught, and then you're annexed,
25 well, now you're beyond the reach of the law, because

1 you've existed for all that time, and clearly they took
2 no action against us, the former jurisdiction, so we must
3 be legal.

4 I don't think that that's the way things
5 typically work. And, in fact, I would ask staff for a
6 little clarification on that. But in a beach community
7 like this, I'm sure there are many homes that were built
8 probably before there were much of a Building Code, and
9 they remain non-conforming.

10 And the Codes have been upgraded, upgraded,
11 upgraded through the years. And today, you have houses
12 that are probably legally non-conforming. And the reason
13 that they are legally non-conforming is because at the
14 time that they were built, they conformed with the Codes
15 at that time.

16 This is really no different. You have a County
17 rule. We are shining a bright light now on whether or
18 not the Applicant complied with the requirements of the
19 rules at the time they were established.

20 The rules have now changed on them, admittedly,
21 when the City annexed the property. And now we're
22 asking, I think, a very reasonable question is, "Given
23 that you no longer -- you clearly don't comply with our
24 rules, did you comply with the rules when you initiated
25 your business?"

1 And if you did, you're non-conforming, and
2 we'll give you all of the protections that you're
3 afforded under the law. If you didn't, well, now you're
4 illegally non-conforming, and that's a whole different
5 matter entirely.

6 This is no different than the situation -- and,
7 again, I'll ask the planners to amplify this. But this
8 is no different than the situation that occurs whenever
9 you have little beach bungalows out here that try to
10 expand or put on an upper level.

11 And you say -- I'm sure the City tells them,
12 "You can't do that. You're an illegal non-conforming
13 use." And you go back and do all that research. Exact
14 same thing, a little bigger scale.

15 And again, if you would require more briefing,
16 then we would -- the City would be happy to provide more
17 briefing on the matter. So again, we want to make sure
18 that the Applicant has had all the due process they can
19 stand. So any extra time or anything like that, of
20 course, the City will stipulate to whatever the Applicant
21 thinks is necessary.

22 MR. ZFATY: The problem is -- and we keep
23 coming back to it is we are looking now at Yellowstone,
24 as Mr. Bobko said, as you aptly put it, Mr. Allen, we're
25 shining a bright light, and we're taking a look at what

1 Yellowstone did, and we're looking at the County
2 requirements now.

3 And we are -- what's inclusive in here is we
4 are deciding -- we are deciding that Yellowstone violated
5 some County zoning requirement. That is a critical,
6 critical decision here. Okay?

7 Because I think, as we will all admit, and I
8 still haven't heard it, the City has had a number of
9 opportunities to make this claim. And according to the
10 City, you know, the new information came out on February
11 20th. I got this information yesterday, all right? Or
12 maybe it was a day before yesterday. But it was -- it
13 was no sooner than two days ago, okay?

14 The City's had plenty of time to analyze this.
15 And I'm not asking for a continuance. What I'm telling
16 you is we're not going to get there. There wouldn't be
17 any due process, because we cannot be heard on that
18 critical issue upon which the entire house of cards falls
19 down, and that is whether Yellowstone was in violation of
20 a County requirement. We cannot make that finding here.
21 It's not possible.

22 MR. ALLEN: I understand.

23 Well, given those circumstances, I'm persuaded
24 that the Yellowstone facilities were not lawfully
25 established uses when they were annexed into the City.

1 They simply didn't have the County approvals that were
2 required of them.

3 And so, therefore, I think the staff's position
4 is well taken and correct. So therefore, we don't have
5 adequate language. In fact, I believe there are a few
6 more determinations that need to be made in this respect.

7 And before we adopt a Resolution that
8 establishes a denial of all four of the use permits, I
9 would just like to see that Resolution include a
10 determination that the likelihood is that -- at least the
11 likelihood, if not the certainty, that these uses were
12 impliedly approved or could have been approved by the
13 language -- and maybe I'm going out too far here and may
14 have to drop back.

15 But I'm only concerned about the concept that
16 other -- that the County could approve permits for other
17 similar uses. And that may be very, very difficult to
18 analyze.

19 In fact, if you have any observations on that
20 right now, I mean, I'd like to hear that. Here's the
21 situation, it seems to me. They defined the congregate
22 care facilities, and then they talked about six beds or
23 less. And then there was another section, as I recall,
24 that allowed 12 beds or less, yeah, 7 to 12.

25 So the implication would be that in that "other

1 uses" category, the County might have authorized, you
2 know, a use with 17 beds. And I think that's kind of
3 what Mr. Zfaty is saying is that we don't know whether
4 they might have done that. But we'll never know, because
5 they can't go back and get that.

6 All right. Going around in circles here. But
7 if there's analysis of that that should be done in that
8 Resolution, it should be done, in my estimation.

9 MR. KIFF: Mr. Allen, I think that's a good
10 point, and we're -- we can go through that analysis in
11 more detail in part because most -- obviously government
12 staff changes, but the folks who have been in County
13 Planning have not changed. And it's fairly straight
14 forward to work with them on an analysis of what they
15 interpreted their laws to have been and what it would
16 have been applicable at the time, and continuing on. So
17 we'll do that within the proposed Resolution of Denial.

18 I would offer, though, before you close the
19 public hearing, public testimony would -- is probably
20 still an opportunity at this time.

21 MR. ALLEN: True.

22 MR. KIFF: Okay.

23 MR. ALLEN: By the way, Mr. Zfaty, you did an
24 excellent job of analysis also in a very short period of
25 time. I'm surprised you didn't know about this before.

1 We do have public hearing provisions here for
2 these uses. And so, despite the fact the Hearing Officer
3 has pretty much announced the decision, if someone feels
4 the need to come forward and give us their wisdom, we'd
5 be happy to hear it.

6 Okay. Seeing none, hearing none, we'll close
7 the public hearing.

8 Thank you, Mr. Kiff.

9 MR. ZFATY: Can I make one more comment on the
10 record?

11 MR. ALLEN: Sure.

12 MR. ZFATY: My last comment would be that based
13 on what Mr. Kiff just said, I think it's interesting that
14 even the City even now is saying to us that, "Well, we
15 want to go and talk to the people at the County and get
16 their analysis, because they are the same people who have
17 been there for a long time, and they will be able to tell
18 us whether Yellowstone would have been in violation of
19 the zoning requirements."

20 I mean, to me, what that means is even now,
21 even now, at the end of this hearing, which Mr. Bobko
22 said, "The time is here and now," even now at the end of
23 the hearing, we still don't know if Yellowstone is in
24 violation of some zoning requirement from the County,
25 which we will never have standing to go and challenge.

1 And the second part of that is that if the City
2 is having some behind closed doors discussion with the
3 County folks in zoning, how are we afforded an
4 opportunity to be heard on that? How does that happen?

5 MR. KIFF: I have a couple of comments.

6 Mr. Zfaty, I was just being kind. I have no
7 doubt that Yellowstone Recovery, from my analysis of the
8 law, needed use permits for these four facilities.

9 You are also welcome to contact the County and
10 go through the same discussions that we would have in
11 preparing the Resolution of Denial. That's your
12 opportunity to work with them, too.

13 MR. MC DONOUGH: Can I make -- Mr. Allen, can I
14 make a public comment, just one?

15 MR. ALLEN: Sure.

16 MR. MC DONOUGH: Mike McDonough, 1562 Pegasus
17 Street, Santa Ana Heights.

18 Mr. Zfaty keeps saying that or has said that
19 they're not sure they actually needed a permit. I would
20 think Yellowstone's Counsel would have checked to see if
21 they needed it. The fact that they did not check to see
22 if they were required does not exempt them.

23 And to reply on the fact that the County did
24 not enforce the law does not mean the law didn't exist or
25 that there was a violation. Had they checked, they would

1 have been able to tell if they were required and if they
2 could get the permit.

3 To just say, "We didn't have an opportunity to
4 be heard," had they requested the use permit, the
5 residents would have had an opportunity to be heard and
6 could have objected to it. Thank you.

7 MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

8 MR. ZFATY: Can I respond?

9 MR. ALLEN: Well, we have until 6 o'clock, I
10 guess?

11 MR. ZFATY: I think Mr. Mc Donough's comment is
12 a wonderful one. Because had we checked -- he said, "Had
13 he checked, we would have found out. And had we found
14 out, the citizens would have had an opportunity to be
15 heard, and we would have been at a use permit hearing."

16 Exactly. Exactly. That's exactly my point.
17 Had all of these things happened, we would have been in
18 front of the County and asking for a use permit. But
19 none of those things happened. So we don't get our due
20 process. We never do. We never will. And here we are.

21 MR. MC DONOUGH: We didn't get due process
22 either.

23 MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thanks.

24 All right. Is there anything else that we
25 have?

1 MR. KIFF: No, sir.

2 I'm sorry. The reasonable accommodation
3 discussion could be next. We move right into that
4 section of the hearing, I apologize.

5 MR. ALLEN: That's right, we do. So let's --

6 MR. KIFF: So -- sorry.

7 MR. ALLEN: Does the reasonable accommodation
8 application apply if there's no permit? But doesn't that
9 have to be amended somehow to then find a reasonable
10 accommodation to grant the permit? Or am I -- I'm sorry.
11 I'm not following you as well.

12 MR. BOBKO: I suggest that we perhaps take a
13 five-minute break here, if, for nothing else, the Court
14 Reporter. And maybe we can all regroup and come up with
15 a plan of attack.

16 MR. ALLEN: So ordered.

17 (Pause in proceeding.)

18 MR. ALLEN: All right. We're ready to
19 reconvene, and we have the reasonable accommodation
20 hearings in front of us.

21 Staff? Can you start out by explaining why we
22 would be having these, given that the permits were being
23 denied?

24 MS. WOLCOTT: Yes. Two of the -- Applicant's
25 made three requests for reasonable accommodation.

1 First, I'll state my name for the record, Cathy
2 Wolcott, Deputy City Attorney.

3 There were three requests that the Applicant
4 made for each of their facilities, 12 requests in all.

5 Request number one was request to be treated as
6 a single housekeeping unit.

7 Request number two was a request for exemption
8 from the occupancy limitations of the operating standards
9 for use permit.

10 And request number three was a request for a
11 hardship waiver, a waiver of having to pay the usual use
12 permit fee.

13 Of those requests, one of the requests, number
14 two, is directly tied to the issuance of the use permit;
15 therefore, we will not address that particular request
16 today. We will, however, address request number one and
17 three.

18 MR. ALLEN: Okay.

19 MS. WOLCOTT: All right.

20 To give you little bit of background on
21 reasonable accommodation, the Unfair Housing Act
22 Amendment require government entities to make exceptions
23 from the usual rules, policies and practices when the
24 request is reasonable and the request is necessary to
25 afford the disabled person an equal opportunity to reside

1 in a dwelling.

2 This is a Federal requirement, and it poses an
3 affirmative duty on government entities to grant the
4 request if the request is reasonable and the request is
5 necessary. And it has to have both of those two
6 elements.

7 When you look at the reasonable prong of the
8 analysis, the request would be considered unreasonable if
9 granting the request would either impose an undue
10 financial administrative burden on the City, or result in
11 a fundamental change in the nature of the City zoning
12 program.

13 And fundamental alteration in the -- excuse
14 me -- not zoning program. It can -- zoning can be one of
15 the factors, but any City program.

16 Fundamental alteration would be defined as
17 undermining the basic purpose which the requirement seeks
18 to achieve.

19 When you get -- if you establish that the
20 request is not unreasonable, then you move to whether or
21 not the request is necessary. Will the accommodation
22 allow a disabled individual to live in the dwelling?
23 Would the disabled individual be unable to live in the
24 dwelling out the accommodation?

25 If the answer to the question would be "yes" to

1 question one but there might be something else that would
2 be more narrowly tailored and more reasonable for the
3 government entity, alternative accommodations can be
4 suggested and considered.

5 And in every situation, when you're doing your
6 reasonable accommodation analysis, it's going to be on a
7 case-by-case basis. So you may have a similar request
8 from a different entity and come up with a different
9 result, because there are different facts applicable in
10 that case.

11 Yellowstone has requested to be treated as a
12 single housekeeping unit and for a waiver of the usual
13 use permit fee.

14 To address the single housekeeping issue first,
15 Newport Beach -- the Newport Beach Zoning Code has a
16 definition of a single housekeeping unit, which is,

17 "The functional equivalent of a traditional
18 family, whose members are an interactive group
19 of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling
20 unit, including the joint use of and
21 responsibility for common areas, sharing
22 household activities and responsibilities, such
23 as meals, chores, household maintenance and
24 expenses, and where, if the unit is rented, all
25 adult residents have chosen to jointly occupy

1 the entire premises of the dwelling unit under
2 a single written lease, with joint use and
3 responsibilities for the premises, and the
4 makeup of the household occupying the unit is
5 determined by the residents of the unit, rather
6 than the landlord or property manager."

7 Every aspect of the definition is important in
8 the analysis of whether or not a group living in the
9 dwelling unit is considered a single housekeeping unit.

10 The restrictions on single housekeeping units
11 are different from other residential uses within the
12 City. Single housekeeping units live in any residential
13 district. There are no occupancy restrictions under
14 zoning code. However, there are California Building Code
15 restrictions on the number of people who can reside in
16 the dwelling.

17 So to return to our analysis, first, is the
18 request reasonable?

19 The request to be treated as a single
20 housekeeping unit is essentially a request to be exempt
21 from all the restrictions and conditions that the City
22 might impose to reduce adverse secondary impacts from
23 larger facilities.

24 The basic purpose of Ordinance 2008-05 was to
25 mitigate those adverse secondary impact. Therefore, it's

1 our opinion that exempting them from any kind of controls
2 the City could put to reduce those negative impacts
3 undermines the purpose.

4 All other groups not living in the single
5 housekeeping unit currently are prohibited in all
6 residential districts in the City of Newport Beach.
7 Boarding houses, fraternities, sororities, lodging
8 houses, no group that follows that operational pattern
9 can reside in any residential zone.

10 Essentially, the City has already made a
11 reasonable accommodation for residential care facilities.
12 They are the only non-single housekeeping group that can
13 reside in residential districts in the City of Newport.

14 The next step in the analysis is whether or not
15 the request is necessary.

16 Would the requested accommodation allow
17 disabled persons to live in a dwelling?

18 Yes.

19 Would disabled individuals be unable to live in
20 a dwelling without this specific accommodation?

21 No. This is an unnecessarily broad exemption,
22 and we can find other ways to accommodate that don't so
23 severely undermine our Zoning Code. Alternative request
24 for more reasonable could be formulated that could get to
25 that result.

1 We're going to skip request two.

2 Okay. Moving to request three, the fee waiver.

3 Because it's a nonprofit and raises money for
4 the community to support its program, Yellowstone's
5 requested a waiver of the standard \$2200 use permit fee
6 deposit.

7 The Ninth Circuit does allow or does require
8 that some financial constraints directly arising from the
9 disability of individuals may require reasonable
10 accommodation. However, Newport Beach also requires 100
11 percent cost recovery for use permits.

12 To make a recommendation on financial
13 accommodation, financial information must be reviewed by
14 the staff. We made many attempts to get specific
15 financial information from this Applicant, and we got a
16 very general statement of average expenses for each
17 house. They are saying approximately \$6200 expense per
18 house.

19 And they gave us an estimate of what fees they
20 would normally charge their clients, the residents. The
21 number that they gave us was \$50 to \$160, I believe, a
22 week. That was the fee that they said that they would
23 charge their facility residents.

24 When you go on the Yellowstone's Web site,
25 which I checked again this morning before we came up,

1 there Web site creates a different picture. The Web
2 sites says that the fees are \$160 to \$180 a week, which
3 is about \$170 average. So we used that to do what
4 analysis we could in the finances.

5 We estimate that the average cost per house,
6 based on the Applicant's assertions, is \$6200 a month.
7 Estimated monthly profit per house -- you can see on the
8 screen.

9 If every one of the houses is fully occupied at
10 the average rate which their Web site states that they
11 are charging their facility residents, and if the
12 expenses that they submitted to us without verification
13 or without supporting documentation are accurate, they
14 are making approximately \$400 month profit on 1561 Indus,
15 \$4,680 a month profit on 1621 Indus, \$4,680 at Pegasus,
16 and \$4,000 a month at the Redlands facility, which, by
17 our analysis, should make them able to afford to pay the
18 use permit fees.

19 And for that reason, we believe it does not
20 reach the necessity prong of the reasonable accommodation
21 analysis.

22 If you have any questions, I'll be happy to
23 answer them.

24 MR. ALLEN: So seeking a complete exemption
25 or -- from the -- or having them found to be a single

1 housekeeping unit completely would then allow a sober
2 living facility to occupy a residence in any of the
3 residential zones with no conditions imposed on them
4 insofar as their operation is concerned?

5 MS. WOLCOTT: Any residential district, any
6 amount of residents, up to the amount that the California
7 Building Code determines is not permitted for a
8 particular size of a structure, which is a fairly
9 permissive standard.

10 No restrictions, other than those imposed by,
11 say, our Nuisance Code, Penal Code on any other residence
12 in a single housekeeping unit within the City. That is
13 correct.

14 MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thanks. Any more, staff?

15 MR. KIFF: No, sir.

16 MR. ALLEN: Would the Applicant like to address
17 this?

18 MR. ZFATY: Sure. Thank you.

19 As Ms. Wolcott -- Isaac Zfaty again, Mr. Allen.

20 As Ms. Wolcott mentioned, we're asking for, I
21 think, our first and third request for reasonable
22 accommodation in light of the finding that I think you
23 will sign soon. Request number two becomes moot.

24 The first request is that we be treated as a
25 single housekeeping unit. The third is that we have our

1 application fees waived.

2 The "Single Housekeeping Unit" is defined in
3 section 20.03.030, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.
4 And that's defined as,

5 "A functional equivalent of a traditional
6 family, whose members are an interactive group
7 of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling
8 unit, including the joint use of and
9 responsibility for common areas, sharing
10 household activities and responsibilities, such
11 as meals, chores, household maintenance and
12 expenses, and where, if the unit is rented, all
13 adult residents have chosen to jointly occupy
14 the entire premises of the dwelling unit under
15 a single written lease, with joint use and
16 responsibilities for the premises, and the
17 makeup of the household occupying the unit is
18 determined by the residents of the unit, rather
19 than the landlord or property manager."

20 And we would submit that we would accurately be
21 described as a single housekeeping unit.

22 First off, the residents are the functional
23 equivalent of a traditional family. They are supportive
24 of one another in the -- in their community in terms of
25 recovery from addiction. They are in an interactive

1 group.

2 They are in -- with respect to each of our four
3 homes that we're talking about here today, our single
4 dwelling units, each house stands alone. As we mentioned
5 in the February 20th hearing and in our submissions to
6 the City, there's no interaction between the homes.

7 And as to common areas, chores and activities,
8 the property provides the residents with a network of
9 support to encourage recovery from the systems -- from
10 the symptoms of alcoholism.

11 The residents reside separately at the
12 property. There is common area, however, where each
13 resident is responsible for their own meals, expenses,
14 chores, et cetera.

15 There is no individual treatment. There's no
16 group treatment or group therapy sessions that occur on
17 the property -- on any of the properties. And the sole
18 purpose for each resident living on the property is to
19 live in the house with other sober individuals with
20 similar disabilities and in a community.

21 There are no delivery vehicles going to and
22 from the property, and I guess this applies to request
23 number two, so we can skip that.

24 As to request number one, that we'd be deemed a
25 single housekeeping unit, again, I would submit that we

1 have provided the City with all of the information that
2 it needs to make that finding that we are a single
3 housekeeping unit, and to grant reasonable accommodations
4 as to each of the four properties.

5 The required findings are each of the following
6 five:

7 "First, that the requested accommodation is
8 requested on the behalf of one or more
9 individuals of a disability, protected under
10 the Fair Housing Laws."

11 This, by the way, is section 20.98.025B.

12 "The requested accommodation is necessary to
13 provide one or more individuals with a
14 disability an equal opportunity to use and
15 enjoy a dwelling.

16 "The requested accommodation will not impose
17 an undue financial or administrative burden on
18 the City, as 'undue financial or administrative
19 burden' is defined in the Fair Housing Laws and
20 also interpretative case law.

21 "And the requested accommodation will not
22 result in a fundamental alteration in the
23 nature of the City's Zoning Program, as
24 'fundamental alteration' is defined in Fair
25 Housing Laws and interpretative case law.

1 "And the requested accommodation will not,
2 under the specific facts of the case, result in
3 a direct threat to the health or safety of
4 other individuals or substantial physical
5 damage to the property of others."

6 As to findings one, three and five, Mr. Allen,
7 the City staff report notes that those findings can be
8 made.

9 "The requested accommodation is requested by or
10 on behalf of one or more individuals with a disability
11 protected under the Fair Housing Laws." We've
12 established that. Federal regulations and case law
13 define alcoholism as a disability.

14 As to the third prong, "the requested
15 accommodation will not impose an undue financial or
16 administrative burden on the City," the bed count that
17 we've proposed does not impose any financial or
18 administrative burden on the City. I think we're all in
19 agreement on that.

20 As to the fifth prong, "That the
21 reasonable -- the requested accommodation," excuse me,
22 "will not, under the specific facts of the case, result
23 in a direct threat to health or safety," I think we are
24 all in agreement that there's no threat there.

25 As to finding number two, which was one that

1 the staff felt that it could not make, "that the
2 requested accommodation is necessary to provide one or
3 more individuals with a disability an equal opportunity
4 to use and enjoy a dwelling," there are a number of
5 factors that are considered in connection with this
6 particular prong.

7 First is "whether the requested accommodation
8 will affirmatively enhance the quality of life of one or
9 more individuals with a disability."

10 Staff report says that "the facilities enhance
11 the quality of life of recovering addicts." And the
12 staff also agrees that rental rates for the Yellowstone
13 offer low cost sober living environment, and some of them
14 are actually free. This is a point that we will come
15 back to later when we talk about our request for number
16 three.

17 But one of the comments that Ms. Wolcott made
18 was that the Yellowstone Web site has a cost range that
19 differs from the submission. There's two pieces to that.

20 First off, Yellowstone has facilities
21 throughout the County and, in fact, outside of the County
22 as well. And so the rates that are quoted on there are
23 not necessarily the rates that we charge at these
24 facilities that we're talking about here today.

25 And as you can imagine, sometimes the rates

1 that are quoted on the Web site are not, in fact, the
2 rates that are actually charged to customers, so -- in
3 any kind of setting.

4 So you can only imagine that in a situation
5 like this, where Yellowstone, in some instances -- and
6 this is noted on the Web site -- provides absolutely free
7 accommodations for people, that there would be some
8 exceptions made when somebody wants to become a member of
9 one of these single housekeeping units.

10 The second factor is "whether the individual or
11 individuals with a disability will be denied an equal
12 opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice
13 absent the accommodation."

14 The staff report notes that "current future
15 residents will be denied affordable sober living." This
16 is, again, one of the key factors that we're talking
17 about here. We're analyzing this in terms of the City of
18 Newport Beach.

19 And as I think it is essentially undisputed,
20 Yellowstone provides some of the lower cost types of
21 sober living within this City. As compared to some of
22 the other facilities, it is far less expensive to reside
23 at one of these homes.

24 The only negative thing that's mentioned in the
25 staff report as to this piece is that there's

1 overcrowding of the facility or institutionalization of
2 the neighborhoods. Again, in the original application,
3 we provided information that evidenced the benefits and,
4 which I would comment, is undisputed.

5 The third prong is, in the case of a
6 residential care facility, "whether or not the requested
7 accommodation is necessary to make facilities of a
8 similar nature operation economically viable in light of
9 the particularities of the relevant market and the market
10 participants."

11 And the staff report notes that "maintaining
12 the current number of beds is not necessary for
13 Yellowstone to remain economically viable." Again, I
14 think this goes back to what I mentioned earlier, which
15 is that the staff is operating under some assumptions
16 that are not necessarily accurate as to what is charged
17 per resident per bed to stay in one of these homes.

18 The Yellowstone submission provided that it
19 needs to keep each house at its current occupancy to
20 remain open. The City's own calculations, based on the
21 information that we provided them, concludes the
22 opposite. And the City, I think, takes issue with the
23 fact that the Yellowstone's application was not supported
24 by bills, things of that nature.

25 I would say that we provided the information

1 that we felt was appropriate in light of privacy
2 concerns. We supported that with information. I
3 actually disagree. My recollection is that we provided
4 signed under penalty of perjury statements related to
5 what we submitted. That might not be right. I'll go
6 back to look at that. But if that's an issue, that's one
7 that can very easily be remedied.

8 Another issue that was raised in the staff
9 report was in the May 12, the one that pertains to this
10 hearing today, is that I think the City is under a
11 misconception that the CEO is eventually going to fully
12 own these properties, and that's not accurate.

13 As to at least two other properties that are
14 owned, they are now actually owned by Yellowstone. They
15 were donated to Yellowstone. And that is the plan as to
16 these properties as well, that they are not going to
17 be -- we're not talking about somebody who's one step
18 removed from the process who's going to be a profiteer,
19 just because they are able to rent out these properties
20 to Yellowstone, and then Yellowstone is able to, in turn,
21 collect rents from the tenants.

22 As to the issue of the whether Yellowstone, the
23 entity, operates at a profit, Yellowstone is a 501(c)(3).
24 So it is a nonprofit entity. That's an adjudication that
25 I don't think anyone here is looking to overturn.

1 Point four, Mr. Allen, is "in the case of a
2 residential care facility, whether the existing supply of
3 facilities of a similar nature and operation in the
4 community is sufficient to provide individuals with a
5 disability an equal opportunity to live in a residential
6 setting."

7 And we would submit that if these four homes
8 are removed, there absolutely would be a dirth of
9 availability for these people. These are individuals who
10 are at our homes, because these are the places they can
11 afford to go. These are oftentimes -- without getting
12 too far into details, they are oftentimes individuals who
13 have been subject to abuse themselves, who have -- who
14 are living with dependencies, and who, with the closure
15 of these four homes, will not be in a sober living home.

16 We don't know where they going to be, but I can
17 tell you right now that they are not going to be in a
18 sober living home. So the closure of these properties
19 will directly effect that result. There is no -- there
20 is no middle step in between that. If we close these
21 facilities, these people are out on their own.

22 In the staff report, there's mention of a
23 couple of other homes on Pegasus that -- I think they are
24 called the Lynn houses. These are houses that are
25 closing. So I don't think that that should have any part

1 of the calculation as to whether there's availability of
2 a similar nature and operation in the community of these
3 types of facilities.

4 On the issue of whether we are a single
5 housekeeping unit, the other factors that affect the
6 staff's suggested denial, City argues that Yellowstone's
7 request is too broad, that Yellowstone's requesting an
8 exception from all of the provisions of the Ordinance,
9 and that's not the case. We're asking that we be treated
10 as a single family -- a single dwelling -- single
11 housekeeping facility.

12 We are not asking for no regulation. We're not
13 asking for -- that we be -- that the sky's the limit as
14 to how we operate. We're simply asking that we be
15 treated as a single housekeeping unit, as any other
16 single housekeeping unit would be treated, subject to all
17 of the other rules and regulations of the City.

18 The City says that -- that the accommodation
19 requesting -- that's being requested is "broader than
20 necessary to afford the disabled individuals an
21 opportunity to reside in housing of their choice."

22 Yellowstone actually takes issue with that
23 statement in that we're not -- again, we're not asking
24 for any kind of reasonable regulation. We're simply
25 asking that we be given this one type of exemption.

1 As to -- specifically as to finding number
2 four, the staff said it "couldn't make the finding that
3 the requested accommodation will not result in the
4 fundamental alteration of the nature of the City's Zoning
5 Program."

6 The entire presentation that we provided on
7 February 20th of 2009 speaks to this issue. And it
8 actually parlays a little bit into what we were talking
9 about earlier in that we've established use at this
10 property -- at these four properties continuously. And
11 when we became part of the City of Newport Beach, for at
12 least 52 days we can say that we were operating lawfully.

13 Even if you're inclined to make a finding that
14 we operated unlawfully, okay -- we'll let that ship
15 sale -- if the City's inclined to make that finding,
16 which I strongly object to, it certainly can't make the
17 finding that for a minimum of those 52 days -- and I
18 think even broader. I think from January 1, 2008, even
19 until the present -- we've been operating lawfully.

20 There's nothing -- there's nothing that has
21 required to us do anything different than what we're
22 doing as we stand here today since we've been a part of
23 the City of Newport Beach.

24 So as to this specific issue, whether there
25 would be a fundamental alteration, there is no alteration

1 in the City's Zoning Program, inasmuch as the Zoning
2 Program allows for reasonable accommodation of uses such
3 as ours that are there, that have been there, that
4 continue to be there lawfully.

5 On the factors that the City's considering of
6 whether the requested accommodation would fundamentally
7 alter the character of neighborhood or whether the
8 accommodation would result in a substantial increase in
9 traffic or insufficient parking, the staff report notes
10 that "the requested accommodation will fundamentally
11 alter the neighborhood because of litter, meetings,
12 visitors and parking."

13 Dealing with those in order, as to the issue of
14 litter, we talked last time we met, on February 20th,
15 about the idea that -- that there is no evidence before
16 us, either then or now -- I've looked at the City's
17 attachments to the staff record, and I haven't seen any
18 evidence that there's been litter that has come from any
19 of our properties.

20 Since February 20th -- I made the statement at
21 the February 20th hearing that we don't have that
22 evidence. Since that time, it still hasn't appeared. So
23 I think that -- at least that piece is questionable at
24 best.

25 As to the issue of meetings, we talked last

1 time about how we have one meeting. And it is a meeting
2 that is restrictive to just the residents of the homes.
3 There are no other on-site meetings, and this is a
4 once-a-week thing.

5 As to the issue of visitors, the City, again,
6 mentioned in the staff report, as to the reasonable
7 accommodation request, that there was some commentary
8 provided by someone who e-mailed the City in support of
9 our either getting a continued use permit, excuse me, a
10 conditional use permit or a reasonable accommodation.

11 As I mentioned in the last hearing, that
12 pertained to a visitation, an alumni visitation, at one
13 of our Costa Mesa facilities. So that is not an issue
14 here.

15 And then as to the parking, we provided
16 photographs of parking the last time we came on February
17 20th. We talked about our parking practices. And again,
18 I don't see that those are issues here.

19 Other factors affecting, I think, the staff's
20 suggested denial were that the purpose of the bed count
21 limit would be undermined and overconcentration. The
22 City says "the basic purpose is to draw a line at a
23 reasonable density for business providing residential
24 recovery services within a residential neighborhood."

25 Given the size of these homes, the available

1 parking, the proposed densities, we think that we've
2 provided the City with ample information that this
3 request is reasonable and this continued use is
4 reasonable.

5 As I mention had earlier, two of the homes at
6 Pegasus are going to be closed or have closed already,
7 1501 and 1502. These are these Lynn houses. This
8 reduces the bed count by 24 collectively.

9 So that actually concludes our request
10 on -- for reasonable accommodation as to number one.

11 As to number three, on the fee waiver, I'll
12 just go through this quickly.

13 The applications for discretionary approvals,
14 including use permits, has to be accompanied by a fee as
15 established by the Resolution of the City Council, and
16 we're asking for a waiver of that fee.

17 The City cites to -- that it's had insufficient
18 data and talks about the Oxford House, Evergreen versus
19 City of Plainfield case, and says that that case stands
20 for the proposition that actual hard, solid information,
21 specific information, supported information, must be
22 provided.

23 As to that piece, we have attempted to provide
24 the City with a type of information that we think
25 is -- strikes a fair balance and an equitable balance

1 between our privacy concerns, excuse me, and the City's
2 need for information. I would note, again, that to the
3 extent that we haven't provided sufficient information
4 for this fee waiver, that we would be willing to discuss
5 that further.

6 And then lastly, Ms. Wolcott made the comment
7 that "we can find more reasonable ways to accommodate our
8 residents."

9 And I heard that, and I've still not seen how
10 that's supposed to happen. In light of what the City's
11 doing with this Ordinance in reducing the number of beds
12 in the City of Newport Beach, it strains the imagination
13 to think that there's going to be some other
14 accommodation that's going to satisfy the needs of these
15 disabled individuals.

16 There is a -- there's already a bed reduction
17 that's happened in the City of Newport Beach. Sounds as
18 if there's going to be a further reduction as time goes
19 by. And to blanketly say that there are other
20 accommodations, there's other possibilities, without any
21 further discussion on how that might occur and within the
22 confines of the City of Newport Beach, I think it's
23 difficult to analyze that.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. ALLEN: Staff wish to make response to any

1 of the comments?

2 MS. WOLCOTT: Yes, please.

3 I'll start with saying that Mr. Zfaty presented
4 his analysis of request number two, as well as request
5 number one and three.

6 I did not -- in the interest of due process and
7 fairness, we did not stop him and allowed him to present
8 that information. I will not give you all of my analysis
9 on number two. It is in the staff report in detail.

10 What I'm trying to give orally is kind of a
11 shorthand version of the analysis for purposes of
12 brevity. But if anybody wants more details on our
13 analysis and how we reached them, they can find it in the
14 staff reports from February 20th and today.

15 Okay. To be begin with, the last assertions
16 made first. As far as the fee waiver, the Hearing
17 Officer has seen other applications for financial
18 reasonable accommodation. Reasonable accommodation based
19 on financial limitations which arose directly from the
20 applicant's disability. And the Hearing Officer has seen
21 the rigor with which staff has had to pursue making sure
22 that it really is an accommodation that's necessary.

23 And to that end we have required individual
24 applications in the past to submit financial information
25 which they found somewhat intrusive. They were not at

1 all excited about producing it. But they produced their
2 financial information when requested, because they
3 recognize that if they were raising the financial issue,
4 their duty was to backup their financial request by
5 showing what the hardship was.

6 Individual applicants have submitted W-2's,
7 Social Security statements. They have given confidential
8 medical information. Where the information was
9 confidential, we have -- staff has reviewed it and has
10 made a recommendation, based on the review of that
11 information, but has not made the information public to
12 protect the privacy concerns. We are very sensitive to
13 privacy concerns of individuals.

14 Where a business is concerned, I'm not sure
15 they have the same privacy concerns to protect. As a
16 501(c)(3), that's not, you know, an open -- doesn't mean
17 that the analysis stops there.

18 The Hearing Officer also would have the
19 opportunity to review any information that was submitted
20 to the staff in camera, which would mean he could view it
21 himself, make his own determination without making the
22 information public if it was considered to be
23 confidential.

24 So while I would respectfully disagree with
25 Mr. Zfaty's characterization of our request as overly

1 intrusive and designed to violate any kind of privacy
2 concerns, we need to verify whether the hardship is there
3 or not.

4 As far as the single housekeeping unit, we are
5 not -- we are not refuting that it's an interactive
6 group. We are not refuting that there's no treatment
7 done on-site. We don't know it's done on-site, but we
8 have no evidence that treatment is performed there.
9 However, many of the other essential elements of our
10 single housekeeping unit definition are not present in
11 this instance.

12 Mr. Zfaty's office's characterization of what
13 the use looks like, what the characterization of the
14 residential occupancy pattern is, has changed over time.
15 On May 20th of '08, the original characterization on the
16 reasonable accommodation application was,

17 "The residents reside separate at the
18 property and interact within the property.
19 There's individual use common areas. The
20 residents are responsible for their own meals,
21 expenses and chores. And most significantly,
22 each individual resides at the property subject
23 to a separate contractual arrangement with the
24 applicant."

25 In January of '09, after being informed by the

1 City staff that their request for single housekeeping
2 unit was overbroad and that the reported pattern didn't
3 fit, they said,

4 "The residents are" -- in the letter from
5 Mr. Zfaty's office, they stated,

6 "The residents are functionally equivalent
7 to a traditional family, whose members are an
8 interactive group of persons jointly occupying
9 a single dwelling unit. Like a single
10 housekeeping unit, there's a common area, and
11 each resident is responsible for their own
12 meals, expenses and chores. Also, the makeup
13 of the property is determined by the residents
14 of the unit, rather than the property manager."

15 This directly mirrors the language of our Code,
16 and it majorly conflicts with their early assertions. It
17 began to appear that the Applicant was characterizing
18 their use according to the result they wanted, not the
19 actual character- -- not the actual operating pattern.

20 But again, staff gave the Applicant a chance to
21 correct the inconsistencies. We did not want to do
22 unfair surprise. We did not want to do an ambush. Staff
23 informed them that there were inconsistencies between
24 their letter and May 20, 2008, application.

25 After being informed, the Counsel sent a letter

1 on February 13th of '09 saying,

2 "Material submitted to the City May 2008
3 reflects some inaccurate information.
4 Yellowstone does not have a contractual
5 relationship with the residents at its
6 properties. With respect to the residents of
7 the four Yellowstone homes in Santa Ana
8 Heights, Yellowstone's position is correctly
9 stated in a letter to the City dated January
10 29, 2009.

11 "The makeup of the property is determined by
12 the residents of the unit rather than the
13 property manager. More specifically,
14 Yellowstone's Board of Directors does not
15 determine who resides at each of the four
16 homes. New residents are introduced and
17 approved by the current residents during house
18 meetings, or they are not accepted."

19 That was the first time that characterization
20 was ever presented. And I believe if we had not
21 presented them with an opportunity, this would never have
22 been raised. The Hearing Officer can determine which
23 characterization he believes to be the true one.

24 The cost of the Web site differing from the
25 submission from the Applicant. It's the first time I've

1 ever heard the argument that the facilities are cheaper
2 in Newport Beach than elsewhere in the County. "The
3 rates quoted are not always the rates charged."

4 Sir, we used what we had to go with. We made
5 every attempt to get more financial information from the
6 Applicant. What we were able to get, we used.

7 My final comment is when Mr. Zfaty said that
8 when they are asking for an exemption from the single
9 housekeeping unit, they are not asking for a broad
10 exemption, they are asking for a very simple exemption,
11 what they are asking for is no conditional use permit
12 required, no conditions required, no reasonable
13 conditions the City could impose, such as reasonable bed
14 count, quiet hours, smoking areas, reasonable parking
15 controls, for extensive density. None of those would be
16 required, and, therefore, we do feel this is an overly
17 broad request.

18 Janet Brown was also going to address the issue
19 of whether or not the facility was ever legally occupied
20 for the 52 days between when Santa Ana Heights was
21 annexed and when our Zoning Code -- the changes to the
22 Zoning Code took effect in February of 2008.

23 MR. ALLEN: Let's just ask a question, here.

24 It's 10 minutes to 6. We're getting close to
25 probably being done, but we still have a public hearing

1 to conduct on the reasonable accommodations. Can we keep
2 going?

3 MR. KIFF: We don't have a conflict tonight
4 with this room. Sometimes we do on Thursdays. This time
5 we don't.

6 MR. ALLEN: Okay.

7 MS. BROWN: Thank you.

8 Yes. Starting in January 1, 2008, when the
9 properties were annexed to the City of Newport Beach, the
10 requirement at that time for sober living use would have
11 been the approval of a Federal Exemption Permit, which
12 the applicant did not have or did not make an application
13 for at any time.

14 So to say that they were conforming use or in
15 compliance with the City regulations at that time would
16 not be a correct statement.

17 MR. ALLEN: Would they have had to have that
18 permit as a County facility?

19 MS. BROWN: No. That was not a County
20 requirement. It's a City of Newport Beach requirement.

21 MR. ALLEN: So -- but they should have had one
22 as a City -- as soon as the annexation occurred?

23 MS. BROWN: Correct.

24 MR. ALLEN: All right. So anything else from
25 staff?

1 MR. KIFF: I'll make one comment.

2 Near the end of Mr. Zfaty's presentation, he
3 was noting that -- I apologize. I'm going to be
4 paraphrasing about how the City's enactment of this
5 Ordinance limits of the amount of -- what will
6 significantly decrease the amount of beds in the
7 community.

8 And as you're aware, Mr. Allen, you've approved
9 the use permit for 11 beds and 14 beds. The City
10 has -- City Council has approved a development for 204
11 beds with the largest operator of facilities in the City,
12 Sober Living by the Sea.

13 Your denial actions have only been, up until
14 this point, one, Newport Coast Recovery at 29 beds. And
15 then the facility at Narconon, Southern California,
16 voluntarily offered -- asked to be allowed to stay up
17 until February 2010, when its ADP license expires, and
18 then they had entered into an abatement agreement from
19 that date forward. That reflects 22 nighttime beds.

20 MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

21 So before -- Mr. Zfaty, do you need to make
22 some more comments before we see if any public needs to
23 talk?

24 MR. ZFATY: Yeah, I would like to have an
25 opportunity to respond to some of that, thank you.

1 First off, maybe I'll just go backwards. As to
2 the last comment about number of beds, though there may
3 have been some approved beds, and though there may have
4 been some beds that were -- there that was agreements
5 reached, the net effect, I think we can all agree, is
6 that the number of beds available have been decreased.
7 That much I think there's no dispute over.

8 We can talk about what we've approved and what
9 we've denied, but the bottom line is, there are less beds
10 available today of the nature that we're discussing here
11 than there were before February 22nd of 2008.

12 As to the issue of the Federal Exemption
13 Permit, I'm actually a little bit surprised by
14 Ms. Brown's comment. Because if you look at our initial
15 submission in May of 2008, we asked specifically -- we
16 noted that there was a provision in the Code for Federal
17 Exemption Permit.

18 And we asked, "We'd like to apply for a Federal
19 Exemption Permit." And the Code talked about how that
20 was supposed to -- how that process happened. We never
21 heard anything back from that or from the City on that
22 issue.

23 One of our representatives actually went down
24 to the City, and said, "I'd like to have the Federal
25 Exemption Permit document," and was denied, was told to

1 go anyway. "We don't have those." So unless I'm missing
2 something, and I may be, we have asked the City
3 specifically that we be available to a Federal Exemption
4 Permit.

5 MR. KIFF: While you're looking there,
6 Mr. Zfaty, you are missing something. The Federal
7 Exemption Permit went away on February 22nd, when the
8 Ordinance took effect. So it was a requirement for those
9 days up until the effective date of the Ordinance. We
10 could not issue any more from that date forward, because
11 the change stripped away the FEP process.

12 MR. ZFATY: Give me one second.

13 As to the issue of whether we were heard on our
14 request number two, notwithstanding that there may have
15 been some slides that talked about request number two, I
16 actually redacted my entire presentation on number two.

17 So we haven't argued our request for number
18 two. And I think it makes sense that we don't, because
19 request number two is that we be provided additional
20 beds. If at some point in time the City wants to hear
21 our argument on that, I'm more than happy to make it, but
22 it has not been made.

23 As to the production of financials, it kind of
24 gave me a little pause to hear that some of the
25 facilities may have provided medical information, because

1 it sounds like a HIPPA problem to me. But that
2 notwithstanding, we've never been asked to provide
3 anything in way of medical anything relating to our
4 residents.

5 And again, I don't think that's an issue here.
6 From my read of the staff report, there's no question
7 that we have a disabled class that we're talking about in
8 connection with these properties.

9 As to the information on the Web site, again, I
10 want to be real clear here, because I didn't say that the
11 bed -- the cost for staying in a bed in Newport Beach is
12 less than anything we do anywhere else. That's
13 interesting advocacy and argument, but that's not what I
14 said.

15 What I said was, as with anybody, you have
16 something on your Web site, that doesn't necessarily mean
17 that that's actually what is charged. So, we've provided
18 the City with information as to what we actually charge
19 or what we actually collect, is probably a better way to
20 put it, from the individuals who stay at these
21 properties.

22 If there's an issue regarding whether we have
23 properly signed them under penalty of perjury, because I
24 think that might have been the City's bigger problem or
25 larger concern, that can be provided.

1 Certainly if there's an issue as to whether
2 we're entitled to an exemption on that issue, whether the
3 City's inclined to grant us an exemption on that issue,
4 or whether that casts any aspersions on veracity of any
5 comments or statements we've made, that can be very
6 easily remedied.

7 Again, nobody has said at any point in time
8 that there's treatments at our facilities. It was
9 discussed that -- well, I'll leave that one alone. And I
10 think that's all I have.

11 MR. ALLEN: Okay. Thanks. Shall we -- let's
12 open the public hearing now.

13 Would anyone like to make comments on the
14 elements of the reasonable accommodation, either the
15 single housekeeping unit aspect or the fee waiver?

16 Mr. Mathena?

17 MR. MATHENA: Good to see you.

18 A couple of brief comments. I'm Larry Mathena,
19 M-a-t-h-e-n-a.

20 I just wanted to second Mr. Kiff's observations
21 in respect to making the observation that, yes, hopefully
22 actually bed counts are declining, considering that
23 there's still excessively disproportionate, even after
24 the decline, compared to anywhere else in the state. And
25 I just think that's worth having in the record.

1 And the second point I'd like to make, there's
2 an implied lack of cooperation relative to financial data
3 on the hardship point. I would observe that, as a
4 nonprofit entity, all you need to do is ask them for copy
5 of their 990, and they have to give it to.

6 And you will instantly be given the global
7 economic status, as least reported for tax purposes.
8 And, in fact, I would find it very disappointing that
9 they didn't choose to volunteer that for you. It's the
10 law that that is available.

11 Secondly, I believe, although I don't have the
12 expertise, that there's similar State filings that are
13 also absolutely publicly available.

14 And I have two observation there. One, I would
15 view that as a sign of a lack of cooperation in terms of
16 saying, "Here's the things we have to give to anybody."
17 It also troubles me that actually the City, in a
18 nonprofit examination, isn't aware enough to understand
19 that and go get that as additional evidence of what
20 charges are, frankly, what expenses are, and a variety of
21 other things that are useful.

22 And just an aside to that, the whole process, I
23 have to say of this, is as long as you tell us what
24 you're going to tell us, and if -- assuming you do it
25 subject to a penalty of perjury, it's like I don't see

1 the City independently verifying. I don't see the City
2 doing even a small amount of confirmation that it really
3 ought it.

4 And otherwise, you're kind of stuck with us
5 poor citizens, who really don't have the tools to do it
6 either. And you end up with this evolving mishmash, and
7 you also sort of end up -- because the City isn't, I
8 think, doing a great job of investigating, it sort of
9 says, "Well, but we can kind of see there's this
10 potential violation here, but for us to answer that, we
11 have to ask the question." And once of question is
12 asked, you have this evolution of what the answer is.

13 And the easy answer is, the way these things
14 are unfolded, from my perspective, if you're smart and
15 paying attention and you're the operator, you probably
16 ought to be able to get yourself into the box that you
17 qualify. And it's unfortunate that it isn't really
18 necessarily what the operations are and what the reality
19 is.

20 And one final brief point. A whole bunch of
21 testimony was presented at the February 20th hearing
22 about a whole bunch of different issues that do get to
23 parking, do get to, frankly, unlawful assembly, do get to
24 safety and health issues. And I -- I know you're aware
25 of that, but I just wanted to reiterate it in this

1 hearing. Thank you.

2 MS. WALKER: Good evening. Judy Walker, 1571
3 Indus.

4 We have heard repeatedly that there are no
5 parking problems, and that no evidence has been
6 presented. I bring with me this evening photographs. I
7 will leave the disk with -- I have the thumbprints as
8 well. It's hard for me to be able to say, "Here, plug in
9 a thumb drive."

10 These are documentation of parking issues that
11 we did explain in February. And we now are
12 substantiating those with visuals in addition, because
13 that was brought up, that there were no parking issues.
14 Also, that there are no safety issues.

15 Also, there are photographs of behavior with,
16 particular case, trash receptacles being placed and left
17 in front of the fire hydrants that, I believe, is a
18 safety issue to the neighborhood.

19 And hearing that the residents decide who's
20 going to be the next set of residents is most
21 disconcerting when you understand that these are the
22 people who are parking and are taking care of things like
23 trash and not paying attention to safety issues.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. ALLEN: Anyone else from the public?

1 Okay. Thank you. We'll close the public
2 hearing.

3 Anything else from staff?

4 MR. KIFF: No, sir.

5 MS. WOLCOTT: No, sir.

6 MR. ALLEN: I'm persuaded by staff's argument
7 with respect to the single housekeeping. I just don't
8 think that the reasonable accommodation requirements
9 extend that far, and the analysis that's been done is
10 solid. So I would rule to deny that portion.

11 Frankly, with the reasonable accommodation for
12 the fee, I can't get my head clearly around all of the
13 information and numbers here to be able to do it. And
14 I'm not sure how I can -- I don't see the need to
15 continue the hearing necessarily, but I'd like to be able
16 to take further time to analyze what's been presented and
17 what's been said to make a decision.

18 Does anybody have any suggestions?

19 MR. KIFF: Just a moment.

20 (Pause in proceeding.)

21 MR. ALLEN: I'm sorry. Can I intervene one
22 moment?

23 MR. KIFF: Sure.

24 MR. ALLEN: Mr. Mathena made the suggestion
25 about the 990, which I assume is some Federal tax return

1 or some such document that hasn't been provided. And
2 whether that would help at all, that should be considered
3 in my mind, if it's available and helpful.

4 MS. WOLCOTT: I would ask whether the Applicant
5 is willing to submit more, because we have always been
6 willing to review more up to the minute the staff report
7 was published, yes.

8 MR. ALLEN: Would the Applicant like to respond
9 to that at this point?

10 MR. ZFATY: As I mentioned in my presentation,
11 Mr. Allen, we're more than happy to continue our dialog
12 with the City on that issue.

13 MR. ALLEN: All right. Well then, again, the
14 procedure -- I hate to have to take up and spend City
15 money and time to conduct hearings here just on that
16 issue, because -- but if that's inappropriate, tell me,
17 you know. I wish we could do it without having to go
18 that far.

19 MR. ZFATY: I would actually defer to the staff
20 on that issue, but we are certainly willing to submit
21 that you can take the matter under submission, Mr. Allen,
22 subject to additional provision of information by us.

23 MS. WOLCOTT and I are in frequent
24 communication, so I'm more than happy to speak with her
25 next week about the provision of additional information.

1 She can forward it on to you whatever she needs.

2 I don't need about the public -- the
3 transparency issues. I will leave that to the staff,
4 but --

5 MR. ALLEN: Right.

6 MR. ZFATY: -- in terms of our requirements, we
7 will waive any kind of additional hearing on that
8 particular issue.

9 MR. ALLEN: All right. Thank you.

10 MR. BOBKO: Mr. Allen, what we suggest
11 is -- Kit Bobko -- is that the Applicant will submit to
12 staff whatever additional documentation that they'd like
13 to provide, and staff will submit it to you, and, you
14 know, two weeks from now or whatever, whatever is
15 convenient for you, you can issue your ruling.

16 But the City would be acceptable to letting you
17 take this under submission with that proviso.

18 MR. ALLEN: That's just fine with me.

19 MR. BOBKO: Okay.

20 MR. ALLEN: Let's proceed in that fashion,
21 then. Applicant will present whatever they wish to
22 present within, what, a week?

23 MR. ZFATY: That's fine. Actually, before you
24 do this, let me say one additional thing, because I
25 wanted to make sure we're clear.

1 Any such documentation that we provide that
2 relates to the broad Yellowstone, Yellowstone as a
3 facility, may not be specific enough. I think we're
4 talking about individual homes here. But with that
5 proviso, just so we're all clear --

6 MS. WOLCOTT: The kind of documentation we
7 requested before was mortgage statements, utility bills,
8 that kind of information, nothing confidential.

9 MR. ALLEN: Okay.

10 MR. BOBKO: The other thing is that to the
11 extent that any of this is sensitive information, we
12 would be more than happy, the City would, to submit it to
13 you under seal, or for review confidentially, of course,
14 and, of course, we return it back to them.

15 MR. ALLEN: If you'll identify that when you
16 submit it to me, then I would hold it confidentially.

17 MR. BOBKO: I'm sorry. I wasn't paying
18 attention. Could you say it again?

19 MR. ALLEN: I said that if you submitted it to
20 me under confidential -- in a confidential manner, then I
21 would hold it in that right and nevertheless consider.

22 MR. BOBKO: Okay. And the other thing is, of
23 course, just for clarity's sake, when staff provides this
24 information to you, there is no further communication
25 between the Hearing Officer and staff. I just want

1 everybody to be clear on that.

2 MR. ALLEN: Yes.

3 MR. BOBKO: Staff is providing you with
4 information in response, of course, to any additional
5 questions that you have. But staff does not work with
6 you in any regard. You are making these determinations
7 completely.

8 MR. ALLEN: Independently. So then also I
9 would prepare whatever finding needed to be made to
10 incorporate into a Resolution.

11 MR. BOBKO: Very well.

12 MR. ALLEN: Correct?

13 MR. BOBKO: Yes. I just want to make sure that
14 everyone who is listening or perhaps watching will know
15 that even though that this is going to occur under
16 submission, that, in fact, you will still be making this
17 independently.

18 MR. ALLEN: Correct.

19 MR. BOBKO: Okay.

20 MR. KIFF: I just had announcements, if you're
21 going to end the hearing, as to when the next hearings
22 are for the public's input, I'm sorry, for the public's
23 participation and information. I'm sorry. It's a long
24 day.

25 Notwithstanding the Yellowstone case, I was

1 going to -- for the folks in the audience who usually
2 attend these, just so they know when the next ones are,
3 if you're ready for that.

4 MR. ALLEN: I just wanted to clarify for us the
5 procedure we'll follow. Is it necessary to hold up the
6 entire Resolution on just -- for this fee, or can we do
7 that separately?

8 That is, we can adopt a Resolution with the
9 determinations that have been made today with respect to
10 all except the fee waiver request, and do that separately
11 or --

12 MR. KIFF: That would be my understanding.
13 After conferring with Counsel, we would -- we could maybe
14 do them in three different steps. The Resolution of
15 Denial for the use permit could be one. The Resolution
16 of the Denial on the single housekeeping unit reasonable
17 application. And then a third one could be the use
18 permit -- sorry -- the fee waiver, and that would be held
19 under your submission until you review additional
20 financial data.

21 MR. ALLEN: I think that's the way to do it.

22 MR. KIFF: Okay.

23 MR. ALLEN: All right. Then, there's nothing
24 further from me, except -- now, you wanted to make an
25 announcement about upcoming hearings?

1 MS. WOLCOTT: Mr. Zfaty also asked me to
2 interject. He'd like you to put on the record the
3 procedure of how the Resolution will be adopted so that
4 they don't lose any due process rights.

5 MR. ALLEN: The procedure of how the Resolution
6 will be adopted?

7 MS. WOLCOTT: Maybe you could ask Mr. Zfaty to
8 clarify.

9 MR. ZFATY: I'm not talking about due process
10 now. I'm just talking about notice. I just want to know
11 what the procedure is going to be.

12 In other words, will the staff provide you with
13 a proposed Resolution? Will you sign the Resolution?
14 Will we subsequently be -- will there be an announcement?
15 After the Resolution has been adopted, will we be
16 provided with some notice that that's occurred? Those
17 are my questions, just so we don't lose any appellate
18 rights.

19 MR. ALLEN: What we've been doing heretofore on
20 these is bringing the Resolutions back at a
21 subsequent -- like we did this afternoon with
22 that -- with the one that I signed. It was made public
23 by the staff several days ago.

24 MR. ZFATY: Perfect.

25 MR. ALLEN: So I would expect that we would do

1 the same procedure with this one, so that you get an
2 adequate opportunity to at least look at that before it's
3 signed.

4 MR. KIFF: And for, again, the Applicant's
5 information, the appeal timeline, which is deemed 14
6 days, takes effect -- begins, the clock starts, when
7 Mr. Allen signs the Resolution.

8 Let me go into, then, the next hearings. We
9 have a reasonable accommodation hearing for 900 West
10 Balboa. That's scheduled for March 19 at 4 o'clock.

11 We have another reasonable accommodation for
12 Pacific Shores Recovery. These are facilities at 3309
13 Clay, and 492 and 492 1/2 Orange. And that's scheduled
14 for March 25th, at 2 o'clock.

15 The Council has also hearing two appeal issues.
16 One is the Newport Coast Recovery denial. So the Council
17 will hear -- decide whether or not to uphold or overturn
18 that denial. That's March 24 at 7 p.m. here, starting at
19 7 p.m. That's a regular City Council meeting.

20 At the same night, the Council is expected to
21 weigh in on an Ocean Recovery application relating to
22 1115 West Balboa. And the action by the Hearing Officer
23 to continue that hearing to -- for six months. So the
24 Council has been asked to offer an opinion about that,
25 and potentially either declare it to be a decision or not

1 a decision, and then uphold it or return it to the
2 Hearing Officer for future action or further action.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. ALLEN: So that concludes our proceedings
5 for today, and we'll convene our hearings again on the
6 19th; is that correct?

7 MR. KIFF: Yep.

8 MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

9 (Ending time: 6:16 p.m.)


1
2
3 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
4 Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify:

5 That prior foregoing proceedings were taken
6 before me at the time and place herein set forth; that
7 any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to
8 testifying, were placed under oath; that a verbatim
9 record of the proceedings was made by me using machine
10 shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my
11 direction; further, that the foregoing is an accurate
12 transcription thereof.

13 I further certify that I am neither financially
14 interested in the action nor a relative or employee of
15 any attorney of any of the parties.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed
17 my name.

18
19 Dated: MAR 25 2009

20
21 
22 Laura A. Millsap, RPR
23 CSR No. 9266
24
25

A	72:14	addicts	advocacy	38:9
abatement	73:18,18	62:11	83:13	Allen 1:11
15:18	73:22	addition	affect 67:5	4:4,5 5:4
26:13	75:16	87:12	affiliation	5:6,13,20
80:18	84:14 88:8	additional	22:15	5:22 12:17
able 20:20	88:11 95:9	6:4 82:19	affirmative	12:20,22
21:7,9	95:11	85:19	24:21	13:5,9
46:17 48:1	accommod...	89:22,25	32:14,18	14:3,5,6
56:17	24:22 52:3	90:7,12,24	35:9 51:3	15:21
65:19,20	60:3 63:7	92:4 93:19	affirmat...	16:24 18:8
78:6 86:16	72:20 79:1	address	62:8	19:25
87:8 88:13	accompanied	29:14	afford 50:25	20:19 24:2
88:15	71:14	50:15,16	56:17	26:18,20
absent 63:13	accurate	52:14	66:11	26:22 29:4
absolutely	56:13	57:16	67:20	29:7,11
38:18 63:6	64:16	78:18	affordable	30:1 31:17
66:8 85:13	65:12	addresses	63:15	31:18
abuse 66:13	97:12	4:10 9:18	afforded	33:12,17
accept 27:7	accurately	adequate	15:8 38:19	34:5,16
acceptable	12:4 58:20	44:5 95:2	38:23,24	35:12
27:2 90:16	achieve	adjudicated	40:9 42:3	36:10
accepted	51:18	25:11	47:3	37:24
77:18	act 39:9	adjudica...	afternoon	40:12,18
accommodate	50:21	25:24	6:6 94:21	40:23
54:22 72:7	acted 4:19	65:24	agency 11:20	42:24
accommod...	39:10	administ...	agenda 4:24	43:22 45:9
24:18	acting 35:21	5:2 51:10	ago 37:8	45:21,23
29:17	action 5:2	60:17,18	43:13	46:11
34:22 49:2	7:7 10:6	61:16,18	94:23	47:13,15
49:7,10,19	20:17,20	admit 43:7	agree 5:19	48:7,9,23
49:25	23:14 41:2	admits 23:11	14:23	49:5,7,16
50:21	95:22 96:2	admittedly	15:15	49:18
51:21,24	96:2 97:15	41:20	39:20 81:5	50:18
52:6 54:11	actions	adopt 5:6	agreed 36:18	56:24
54:16,20	80:13	12:11 44:7	agreement	57:14,16
55:10,13	activities	93:8	39:22	57:19 61:6
56:20	52:22	adopted 94:3	61:19,24	66:1 72:25
57:22 60:7	58:10 59:7	94:6,15	80:18	78:23 79:6
60:12,16	Activity	adoption	agreements	79:17,21
60:21 61:1	10:11	4:25 11:23	81:4	79:24 80:8
61:9,15,21	actual 10:12	adopts 5:3	agrees 12:9	80:20
62:2,7	16:12	ADP 80:17	62:12	84:11
63:13 64:7	71:20	adult 52:25	ahead 29:11	87:25 88:6
67:18 68:3	76:19,19	58:13	35:7	88:21,24
69:2,6,8	add 12:18	adults 8:9	alcoholism	89:8,11,13
69:10 70:7	36:23	adverse	59:10	89:21 90:5
70:10	addiction	13:13	61:13	90:9,10,18
71:10	58:25	53:22,25	allegations	90:20 91:9

91:15,19	32:8	25:1 51:25	applicants	77:17 80:8
92:2,8,12	analysis	56:23	74:6	80:10 81:3
92:18 93:4	15:4,7,20	86:10,12	applicant's	81:8
93:21,23	19:20,20	86:13	7:9,13,18	approxim...
94:5,19,25	24:16 34:6	anybody	27:7,14,24	20:4 55:17
95:7 96:4	34:10,12	73:12	29:21	56:14
96:8	34:18	83:15	49:24 56:6	aptly 42:24
allow 6:12	35:23 38:4	85:16	73:20 95:4	arbiter
51:22	45:7,10,14	88:18	application	23:23
54:16 55:7	45:24	anyway 82:1	14:19 22:1	area 4:9
57:1	46:16 47:7	apologize	31:9 34:17	9:12,16
allowed 8:20	51:8 52:6	49:4 80:3	34:20 49:8	39:4 59:12
9:24 13:24	53:8,17	App 18:2	58:1 64:2	76:10
44:24 73:7	54:14 56:4	appeal 20:18	64:23	areas 9:9
80:16	56:17,21	33:10	75:16	52:21 58:9
allowing	73:4,8,11	39:25,25	76:24	59:7 75:19
9:25	73:13	40:1 95:5	79:12	78:14
allows 20:25	74:17 88:9	95:15	93:17	argue 22:23
69:2	analyze	appear 76:17	95:21	argued 82:17
alter 69:7	16:11	APPEARANCES	applicat...	arguendo
69:11	43:14	3:1	7:16 29:17	15:2
alteration	44:18	appeared	71:13	argues 67:6
51:13,16	72:23	69:22	73:17,24	argument
60:22,24	88:16	appears	applied	7:13,23
68:4,25,25	analyzed	10:14	21:22,23	13:6,23
alternative	24:19	appellate	31:1	23:1 28:3
52:3 54:23	analyzing	33:9 94:17	applies	31:3 36:11
alumni 70:12	14:25 32:6	applicable	59:22	78:1 82:21
ambush 76:22	63:17	7:25 16:16	apply 11:2	83:13 88:6
amended 49:9	Angeles 3:5	45:16 52:9	21:7,9,16	arising 55:8
Amendment	annexation	applicant	23:2 31:3	arose 73:19
15:12	9:16 11:11	4:12 5:17	31:5 49:8	arrangement
50:22	30:21	6:17 10:2	81:18	75:23
Amendments	79:22	10:18 12:8	approach	Article
17:16	annexed 4:20	12:21	5:18 29:6	17:23
amount 30:9	40:24	27:10 28:3	appropriate	aside 85:22
57:6,6	41:21	28:19 30:4	7:6 38:11	asked 15:18
80:5,6	43:25	30:8 31:7	65:1	27:7 29:18
86:2	78:21 79:9	41:18	approval	33:25
ample 71:2	announced	42:18,20	4:25 5:7	80:16
amplify 42:7	46:3	50:3 55:15	20:15 37:3	81:15,18
Ana 5:25	announce...	57:16	79:11	82:2 83:2
8:16 15:3	93:25	75:24	approvals	86:12 94:1
20:1 21:13	94:14	76:17,20	44:1 71:13	95:24
25:7 26:8	announce...	77:25 78:6	approve 6:10	asking 37:25
39:3 47:17	92:20	79:12 89:4	44:16	41:22
77:7 78:20	answer 24:6	89:8 90:11	approved	43:15
analyses	24:7,25	90:21	44:12,12	48:18

57:20 67:9	55:14	44:14 45:5	72:12,17	40:25
67:12,13	attend 93:2	62:15	72:22 78:2	big 15:19
67:14,23	attention	64:14 65:6	79:9,20	16:8
67:25	14:15	81:21	83:11	bigger 14:24
71:16 78:8	86:15	91:14	bed 61:16	42:14
78:9,10,11	87:23	94:20	64:17	83:24
aspect 53:7	91:18	background	70:20 71:8	bills 64:24
84:15	attorney 3:7	50:20	72:16	91:7
aspersions	50:2 97:16	backup 74:4	78:13	bit 50:20
84:4	audience	backwards	83:11,11	68:8 81:13
assembly	93:1	81:1	84:22	blanketly
86:23	augment 29:9	balance	beds 6:13	72:19
asserted	authority	71:25,25	10:13	Board 77:14
29:22 30:4	27:12	Balboa 5:8	44:22,24	Boarding
31:7	31:12,20	95:10,22	45:2 64:12	54:7
asserting	31:23	based 6:16	72:11 80:6	Boards 31:22
28:4	authorized	7:2 10:14	80:9,9,11	Bobko 3:4
assertions	45:1	14:1,21	80:14,19	26:22,23
30:14 56:6	availabi...	16:15,21	81:2,3,4,6	29:5 40:20
73:15	66:9 67:1	16:25 17:7	81:9 82:20	42:24
76:16	available	18:10,12	began 76:17	46:21
assessment	6:2,18	21:18 25:2	beginning	49:12
18:13	12:16 14:9	32:14 34:7	2:9 14:18	90:10,11
assigned 5:5	70:25 81:6	35:17	begins 95:6	90:19
assist 40:21	81:10 82:3	46:12 56:6	behalf 2:7	91:10,17
Assistant	85:10,13	64:20	12:23 60:8	91:22 92:3
3:8,9	89:3	73:18	61:10	92:11,13
Associate	Avenue 3:5	74:10	behavior	92:19
3:8	average	basic 15:7	87:15	boilerplate
assume 35:3	55:16 56:3	51:17	belies 34:17	25:17
88:25	56:5,10	53:24	believe	bottom 26:11
assuming	aware 19:16	70:22	10:16,21	32:10 81:9
15:1 85:24	23:12 80:8	basically	28:2 38:10	Boulevard
assumptions	85:18	4:18 9:7	44:5 55:21	2:8 3:9
64:15	86:24	21:4 28:16	56:19	5:8
attached		basis 4:16	77:20	box 16:3
8:21	B	52:7	85:11	86:16
attachments	b 11:5 17:7	beach 1:12	87:17	break 49:13
69:17	17:9	2:8,9 3:3	believed	brevity
attack 49:15	back 4:24	3:7,10,14	39:8	73:12
attacked	5:9 14:18	4:1 26:6	believes	brief 84:18
33:11	16:5 23:21	32:17 35:1	12:3 77:23	86:20
attempt	24:20 25:1	35:9 41:6	benefits	briefing
20:20 78:5	25:19,23	42:9 52:15	64:3	42:15,17
attempted	28:5 33:4	52:15 54:6	best 69:24	bright 41:17
10:9 19:10	35:1,24	55:10 58:3	better 35:16	42:25
71:23	36:14 37:2	63:18	83:19	bring 7:16
attempts	38:2 42:13	68:11,23	beyond 15:7	87:6
	42:23			

bringing 94:20	calculat... 64:20	CEO 65:11	charge 55:20	3:7,7,8,9
broad 21:12	California	certain 8:20	55:23	4:6,14,21
35:22	1:12 2:9	certainly	62:23	9:15,16
54:21 67:7	4:1 7:20	68:16 84:1	83:18	11:11 15:5
78:9,17	17:23,25	89:20	charged 63:2	15:15,23
91:2	18:5 53:14	certainty	64:16 78:3	15:24 16:4
broader	57:6 80:15	44:11	83:17	16:5,9,22
17:24 18:6	97:5	certific...	charges	18:21 19:8
67:19	called 20:5	10:4,10	85:20	23:22,23
68:18	66:24	19:11 22:2	charging	24:6 26:6
Broadway	camera 74:20	22:4,7	56:11	26:19,20
3:13	cards 43:18	29:19	cheaper 78:1	27:3,6,13
broken 21:14	care 8:4,5,7	certified	check 27:19	27:18,25
brought	8:9,9,11	2:11 22:6	47:21	28:4,7,9
14:14	8:12,12,22	97:4	checked	28:15,22
40:16	8:23 9:6	certify 97:5	47:20,25	29:7,16
87:13	10:18	97:14	48:12,13	30:7,12
Brown 3:8	18:23,23	cetera 59:14	55:25	32:5,7,13
6:4,6 14:7	22:21,22	chagrin	checking	32:17 35:1
14:13	44:22	19:25	31:24	35:9,12,16
78:18 79:7	54:11 64:6	challenge	children 8:9	36:12
79:19,23	66:2 87:22	25:21 26:1	choice 63:12	38:13
Brown's	case 28:1	28:17	67:21	40:13,17
81:14	30:9,14	46:25	choose 85:9	41:21
Building	52:10	chance 76:20	chores 52:23	42:11,16
41:8 53:14	60:20,25	change 51:11	58:11 59:7	42:20 43:8
57:7	61:2,12,22	82:11	59:14	43:10,25
built 41:7	64:5 66:1	changed 7:22	75:21	46:14 47:1
41:14	67:9 71:19	41:20	76:12	50:2 51:10
bunch 18:15	71:19	45:13	chosen 52:25	51:11,15
86:20,22	87:16	75:14	58:13	53:12,21
bungalows	92:25	changes	circles 45:6	54:2,6,10
42:9	cases 7:21	13:16	Circuit 55:7	54:13
burden 51:10	30:10	45:12	circumst...	57:12 59:6
60:17,19	case-by-...	78:21	7:24 43:23	60:1,18
61:16,18	52:7	character	citation	61:7,16,18
business	cast 22:19	69:7 76:19	23:10	63:17,21
41:25	casts 84:4	characte...	24:10 39:7	64:22
70:23	catch 33:13	29:15	cited 7:20	65:10 67:6
74:14	catchall	74:25	15:18 16:6	67:17,18
buying 27:16	21:4	75:12,13	30:15	68:11,23
C	category	75:15	37:13 40:9	70:5,8,22
C 25:7	22:24 45:1	77:19,23	cites 18:8	71:2,15,17
CA 3:5,10,14	Cathy 3:7	characte...	21:11	71:19,24
Cal 18:2	29:13 50:1	7:19 12:4	71:17	72:12,17
calculation	caught 36:4	characte...	citizens	72:22 76:1
67:1	36:6 40:24	30:10	48:14 86:5	77:2,9
		76:17	City 2:8 3:3	78:13 79:9

79:15,20	29:1 33:18	53:14,14	76:10	74:15 75:2
79:22 80:9	33:22,24	54:23 57:7	communic...	concludes
80:10,11	34:7 83:10	57:11,11	89:24	12:15
81:21,24	90:25 91:5	58:3 76:15	91:24	18:25
82:2,20	92:1	78:21,22	community	20:13 24:1
83:18	clearance	81:16,19	8:4,7,22	64:21 71:9
85:17 86:1	31:10,11	Codes 41:10	9:6,8,11	96:4
86:1,7	31:13	41:14	18:23	conclusion
89:12,14	Clearances	collect	22:21 41:6	6:25 18:11
90:16	23:6 40:16	65:21	55:4 58:24	24:7,9
91:12	clearly 41:1	83:19	59:20 66:4	concurred
95:19	41:23	collecti...	67:2 80:7	7:1
City's 14:15	88:12	71:8	compared	conditional
16:14	Clerk 3:9	come 23:8,9	63:21	70:10
18:12	cliche 40:4	25:22 27:3	84:24	78:11
27:21 34:6	client 13:12	27:10,15	competent	conditions
35:13,20	clients 7:16	27:25	23:17,19	6:10 11:9
38:20	55:20	33:14 46:4	25:14	30:18,22
43:14	clock 95:6	49:14 52:8	complete	39:21
60:23	close 25:22	62:14	31:9 56:24	53:21 57:3
64:20 68:4	45:18 46:6	69:18	completed	78:12,13
68:15 69:1	66:20	comes 31:17	13:2	conduct
69:5,16	78:24 88:1	coming 42:23	completely	20:12 26:4
72:1,10	closed 7:3	comment 14:7	22:12 57:1	36:18 79:1
80:4 83:24	47:2 71:6	31:16 32:3	92:7	89:15
84:3	71:6	32:19	complete...	conducted
claim 25:3	closely 8:13	40:15 46:9	7:17	7:23 9:21
26:18 32:4	closing	46:12	compliance	16:14
43:9	66:25	47:14	22:18	conferring
claiming	closure	48:11 64:4	32:20,21	93:13
14:15 34:1	66:14,18	72:6 78:7	33:1 79:15	confiden...
clarific...	Coalition	80:1 81:2	complied	74:7,9,23
31:19 41:6	22:14	81:14	41:18	91:8,20,20
clarific...	Coast 80:14	commentary	complies	confiden...
16:23	95:16	70:7	31:24	91:13,16
clarified	code 8:3,6	comments	comply 17:10	confines
33:17	9:2,6 10:6	39:5 40:14	20:14	72:22
clarify 93:4	11:3 18:21	47:5 62:17	41:23,24	confirma...
94:8	19:16,19	73:1 80:22	concept	86:2
clarity's	19:20 20:3	84:5,13,18	44:15	conflict
91:23	20:11,23	Commission	concern	79:3
class 83:7	21:10,10	9:1,3,13	83:25	conflicts
classifi...	22:20	20:16,23	concerned	16:22
8:13	23:12	21:1	44:15 57:4	76:16
classified	25:10	common 52:21	74:14	conformance
8:4 18:22	32:24 35:5	58:9 59:7	concerns	15:10
Clay 95:13	37:7 41:8	59:12	65:2 72:1	conformed
clear 19:3	52:15	75:19	74:12,13	41:14

conforming 79:14	continue 6:12 7:5	77:24	34:9,11,13	11:25
conforms 11:8	11:25 69:4	83:11	36:14,15	63:14
confused 32:10	88:15	Costa 70:13	37:3,7,11	64:12,19
confusion 22:3	89:11	Council	37:22 38:5	77:17
congregate 8:5 18:23	95:23	71:15	38:21 39:1	currently
44:21	continued 4:8 7:7	80:10	39:4,6,8,9	23:5 26:15
connection 39:2 62:5	11:14 70:9	95:15,16	39:10,17	54:5
83:8	71:3	95:19,20	39:19,24	cursor
consider 91:21	continues 11:13	95:24	39:24 40:8	21:18
consider... 5:15	continuing 45:16	Counsel 7:10	40:16	customers
considered 51:8 52:4	continuo... 68:10	7:13,18	41:16 43:1	63:2
53:9 62:5	contractual 75:23 77:4	28:12	43:5,20	D
74:22 89:2	contrast 17:1 30:25	29:21	44:1,16	damage 61:5
considering 13:20 69:5	controls 54:1 78:15	47:20	45:1,12	data 71:18
84:22	convene 96:5	76:25	46:15,24	85:2 93:20
consistent 9:3 21:1	convenient 90:15	93:13	47:3,9,23	date 80:19
constitute 13:17	conviction 27:23	count 61:16	48:18	82:9,10
Constitu... 15:13	convince 39:17,19	70:20 71:8	62:21,21	97:17
17:17,23	cooperation 85:2,15	78:14	78:2 79:18	dated 10:11
18:5,7	copies 9:17	counts 84:22	79:19	77:9 97:20
Constitu... 15:7 25:20	40:16	County 8:2,6	County's	DAVE 3:8
constraints 55:8	copy 85:4	8:19 9:5	15:4 26:1	DAVIS 3:12
contact 47:9	correct 6:24	9:16,17,21	couple 6:7	day 8:9,11
contacted 9:17	44:4 57:13	10:3,9,11	20:1 32:3	8:12,12,23
contempl... 25:8,18	76:21	15:9,11,25	47:5 66:23	43:12
26:8	79:16,23	16:11,18	84:18	92:24
contention 4:18	92:12,18	17:22	course 13:4	days 9:24
continuance 28:24	96:6	18:12,16	14:20 26:7	43:13
43:15	correctly 77:8	18:20,25	42:20	68:12,17
	correspo... 29:15	19:3,4,11	91:13,14	78:20 82:9
	cost 55:11	19:16,20	91:23 92:4	94:23 95:6
	56:5 62:13	19:22	court 23:17	Dealing
	62:18	20:11,16	23:18,24	69:13
	63:20	20:21 21:5	25:14 37:5	December
		21:7,19	49:13	32:15 34:9
		22:10,20	courtroom	39:2
		23:2,3,5,7	37:9	decide 87:19
		23:12,16	creates 56:1	95:17
		23:20 24:3	critical	decided
		24:10,12	35:18,19	15:10 23:3
		24:19 25:8	43:5,6,18	deciding
		25:18,21	CSR 1:24	43:4,4
		26:3,9	97:23	decision
		30:17,23	CUP 12:25	22:13
		31:12,20	13:25 16:9	23:25
		31:21,23	17:7 35:8	25:15 27:1
		31:25,25	cure 21:17	27:2 38:11
		32:18 33:6	current	38:13 43:6

46:3 88:17	38:10	53:5 58:18	disabili...	dispute 81:7
95:25 96:1	49:23	76:13	59:20	district
declaration	63:11,15	77:11	disability	8:20 9:4,8
37:3,6	81:9,25	determines	55:9 60:9	9:11 11:10
declare	densities	57:7	60:14	11:22 21:2
95:25	71:1	detrimental	61:10,13	53:13 57:5
declared	density	13:13	62:3,9	districts
25:13	70:23	detrimen...	63:11 66:5	54:6,13
decline	78:15	13:23	73:20	Doctrine
84:24	deny 32:13	development	disabled	23:25
declining	35:16	10:23	50:25	document
84:22	88:10	80:10	51:22,23	20:24
decrease	denying	dialog 89:11	54:17,19	81:25 89:1
80:6	36:12	Diego 18:1	67:20	document...
decreased	Department	difference	72:15 83:7	6:17 56:13
81:6	18:20	26:10	disagree	87:10
deemed 11:11	dependen...	different	34:19	90:12 91:1
59:24 95:5	66:14	27:9 28:8	39:25 65:3	91:6
defend 20:20	deposit 55:6	41:16 42:4	74:24	doing 19:23
defer 89:19	deprived	42:6,8	disagrees	26:16
define 61:13	17:18	52:8,8,9	5:18	27:21
defined	Deputy 3:7	53:11 56:1	disappoi...	34:18 39:2
44:21	50:2	68:21	85:8	39:7,8,14
51:16 58:2	described	86:22	disconce...	40:7,9
58:4 60:19	35:7 58:21	93:14	87:21	52:5 68:22
60:24	designated	differing	discovered	72:11 86:2
defines 8:6	4:6	77:24	4:16	86:8 94:19
definition	designed	differs	discredit	donated
52:16 53:7	75:1	62:19	28:18	65:15
75:10	despite 46:2	difficult	discrepa...	DONOUGH
delay 36:17	detail 4:17	44:17	16:25	47:13,16
delivery	12:6 45:11	72:23	discreti...	48:21
59:21	73:9	diligence	71:13	Donough's
demonstr...	details	27:22 28:7	discuss 72:4	48:11
10:24	66:12	direct 12:13	discussed	doors 47:2
17:14	73:12	61:3,23	84:9	doubt 47:7
demonstr...	determin...	directed 7:6	discussing	Draft 12:11
10:17	11:4 44:10	direction	81:10	draw 70:22
denial 6:14	74:21	97:12	discussion	drive 87:9
12:7,11,14	determin...	directly	22:1 33:4	drop 44:14
36:11 44:8	44:6 92:6	20:9 50:14	38:9 47:2	dropped 22:6
45:17	93:9	55:8 66:19	49:3 72:21	due 7:9 15:8
47:11 67:6	determine	73:19	discussions	17:18,19
70:20	6:23 28:5	76:15	7:14 25:6	18:4,16
80:13	36:14	Directors	47:10	20:6 23:21
93:15,16	77:15,22	31:22	disk 87:7	27:21 28:7
95:16,18	determined	77:14	dispropo...	28:12 29:2
denied 37:21	7:2 30:15	dirth 66:8	84:23	33:2 34:5

34:14	effectively	62:13	evaluation	38:25
36:11	28:3	equal 50:25	6:22 19:4	excuse 11:7
38:10,12	either 8:4	60:14 62:3	evening 87:2	25:10
38:17,19	18:22	63:11 66:5	87:6	29:24 30:6
38:23,24	48:22 51:9	equaled 31:4	eventually	51:13
39:12 40:3	69:16 70:9	equals 31:5	65:11	61:21 70:9
40:10	84:14 86:6	equitable	Evergreen	72:1
42:18	95:25	71:25	71:18	exempt 47:22
43:17	elements	equivalent	everybody	53:20
48:19,21	51:6 75:9	52:17 58:5	92:1	exempting
73:6 94:4	84:14	58:23 76:6	evidence	54:1
94:9	employee	ESQ 1:11 3:4	19:7,8,14	exemption
duty 51:3	97:15	3:13	19:15	50:7 54:21
74:4	enactment	essential	23:12	56:24
dwelling	80:4	75:9	27:25	67:25 78:8
51:1,22,24	encourage	essentially	28:14,18	78:10,10
52:19 53:1	59:9	53:20	28:20 40:6	79:11
53:9,16	enforce	54:10	69:15,18	81:12,17
54:17,20	47:24	63:19	69:22 75:8	81:19,25
58:7,14	enforcement	establish	85:19 87:5	82:3,7
59:4 60:15	8:3 10:6	40:23	evidenced	84:2,3
62:4 67:10	18:21	51:19	64:3	exist 47:24
76:9	19:16	established	evolution	existed 41:1
dwelling	20:11,17	4:20 7:19	86:12	existing
8:21	23:12,14	7:21 8:1	evolving	66:2
	engaged	8:15 10:20	86:6	expand 42:10
E	36:12	11:6,14,16	ex 15:5	expansion
e 21:22	enhance 62:8	14:16,20	Exact 42:13	27:17
earlier	62:10	16:17	exactly 40:8	expect 13:11
17:20	enjoy 60:15	30:19	40:8 48:16	94:25
29:15	62:4 63:12	32:23	48:16,16	expected
64:14 68:9	entered	41:19	examination	95:20
71:5	80:18	43:25	85:18	expense
early 76:16	entire 43:18	61:12 68:9	examine	55:17
easily 65:7	53:1 58:14	71:15	28:16	expenses
84:6	68:6 82:16	establishes	Examiner 4:6	52:24
easy 86:13	93:6	44:8	example 17:2	55:16
economic	entirely	estimate	18:19	56:12
85:7	33:12 42:5	55:19 56:5	excellent	58:12
economic...	entities	Estimated	45:24	59:13
64:8,13	50:22 51:3	56:7	exception	75:21
effect 10:19	entitled	estimation	67:8	76:12
13:13	30:21 84:2	45:8	exceptions	85:20
25:16	entity 31:4	estopped	50:22 63:8	expensive
66:19	32:25 52:3	28:4	excessively	63:22
78:22 81:5	52:8 65:23	et 59:14	84:23	expertise
82:8 95:6	65:24 85:4	evaluated	excited 74:1	85:12
effective	environment	6:5	exclusive	expires
82:9				

80:17	55:23	25:22	93:10,18	16:12
explain 4:17	56:11,16	44:13	feel 78:16	32:14,18
6:4 87:11	57:2 64:1	63:22	feels 46:3	35:18,19
explaining	64:6 66:2	66:12	fees 55:19	36:8 38:20
49:21	67:11	73:16 75:4	56:2,18	43:20
explanat...	78:19	88:9 89:18	58:1	57:22 60:2
17:2	79:18	farther	fell 22:24	61:25 68:1
extend 88:9	80:15 91:3	29:20	felt 62:1	68:2,13,15
extensive	fact 15:16	fashion 5:20	65:1	68:17 92:9
78:15	19:3 27:10	90:20	FEP 82:11	findings
extent 38:19	27:15	favor 13:7	fewer 8:22	60:5 61:6
72:3 91:11	31:10 36:5	February 6:8	fifth 61:20	61:7
extra 42:19	38:1 41:5	7:12 10:3	figure 39:21	finds 9:3
e-mailed	44:5,19	13:3 14:10	filings	21:1
70:8	46:2 47:21	15:17	85:12	fine 32:9
	47:23	16:19,20	final 27:1,2	90:18,23
F	62:21 63:1	17:5 24:20	31:13 78:7	fire 10:12
f 21:24	64:23 85:8	29:21 30:3	86:20	23:6 31:10
facilities	92:16	30:8 33:23	finally	31:11,12
5:24 6:12	facto 15:5	43:10 59:5	28:10 31:7	31:13,20
7:19 8:11	factor 63:10	68:7 69:14	finances	31:23
8:14,22	factors	69:20,21	56:4	40:16
9:6,20	51:15 62:5	70:16	financial	87:17
10:18,20	63:16 67:5	73:14 77:1	51:10 55:8	first 1:10
10:25 11:2	69:5 70:19	78:22	55:12,13	3:11 14:14
12:4 15:3	facts 32:9	80:17	55:15	19:10 22:4
17:15 22:6	52:9 61:2	81:11 82:7	60:17,18	24:12,14
31:10,14	61:22	86:21	61:15,17	26:24 29:8
43:24	factual	87:11	73:17,19	29:16,25
44:22 47:8	16:21	Federal	73:24 74:2	30:7 32:4
50:4 53:23	failed 31:5	11:19 18:7	74:3,4	34:17
54:11	failure 31:3	35:11 51:2	78:5 85:2	38:15 50:1
62:10,20	fair 60:10	61:12	93:20	52:14
62:24	60:19,24	79:11	financially	53:17
63:22 64:7	61:11	81:12,16	97:14	57:21,24
66:3,21	71:25	81:18,24	financials	58:22 60:7
67:3 70:13	fairly 45:13	82:3,6	82:23	62:7,20
78:1 80:11	57:8	88:25	find 9:22	73:16
82:25 84:8	fairness	Federation	21:18	77:19,25
95:12	30:24 73:7	18:1	30:17,24	81:1
facility 7:5	falls 13:8	fee 50:12	33:14	fit 76:3
8:3,4,5,7	43:18	52:13 55:2	35:10 38:7	five 60:6
8:7 9:7,10	family 8:12	55:5,22	49:9 54:22	61:6
16:17 17:9	8:17,21,23	71:11,14	72:7 73:13	five-minute
18:23,23	52:18 58:6	71:16 72:4	85:8	49:13
19:17	58:23	73:16	finding	Floor 3:5
22:21	67:10 76:7	84:15	10:21	folks 45:12
23:13	far 15:5,7	88:12 93:6	15:24,25	47:3 93:1
30:18 39:3				

follow 93:5	frequent	46:4 50:20	32:13 33:4	groups 54:4
following	89:23	73:8,10	35:2,7,16	guess 48:10
8:25 9:16	front 6:2	82:12 85:5	36:15 37:8	59:22
49:11 60:5	21:4 32:7	85:16	37:9,10	guidelines
follows 54:8	48:18	given 16:7	38:20	24:15
foreclosed	49:20	19:5 22:22	40:20	guilty 40:4
28:4 32:6	87:17	33:8 34:21	43:16	
foregoing	fully 56:9	38:1 39:14	44:13 45:6	H
97:6,8,12	65:11	41:22	52:6 55:1	h 17:8,13
form 31:9	functional	43:23	59:21	handicapped
formed 31:22	52:17 58:5	49:22	65:11,16	8:10
former 41:2	58:22	67:25	65:18	happen 15:21
formulated	function...	70:25 74:7	66:16,17	20:12,21
54:24	76:6	85:6	71:6 72:13	36:16 37:4
forth 21:12	fundamental	global 85:6	72:14,18	37:4,9,23
21:20,20	51:11,13	go 24:4 25:1	78:18 79:2	37:23
97:7	51:16	25:25	80:3 85:24	38:16
forward 27:3	60:22,24	27:19	87:20	40:11 47:4
27:11	68:4,25	29:11	92:15,21	72:10
45:14 46:4	fundamen...	34:12 35:7	93:1 94:11	happened
80:19	69:6,10	36:13 37:2	good 6:6	33:6 34:23
82:10 90:1	further 4:23	38:2 39:16	36:23 45:9	37:7 48:17
found 10:2,8	6:21 16:15	39:18,23	84:17 87:2	48:19
19:2 30:25	28:25	42:13 45:5	gotten 33:14	72:17
37:21	36:19,19	45:10	government	81:20
48:13,13	38:4 40:7	46:15,25	31:4 45:11	happening
56:25	40:12,13	47:10	50:22 51:3	27:23
73:25	72:5,18,21	55:24 65:5	52:3	happens 33:1
four 4:8,18	88:16	66:11	governme...	39:16,18
5:16,24	91:24	71:12 78:4	11:19	39:23
9:18,20,24	93:24 96:2	81:1 82:1	governments	happy 13:5
12:7 13:1	97:12,14	85:19	31:22	42:16 46:5
13:25 23:5	future 63:14	89:17 95:8	Grand 3:5	56:22
32:16 44:8	96:2	goes 14:20	grant 49:10	82:21
47:8 59:2		23:21	51:3 60:3	89:11,24
60:4 66:1	G	24:19,23	84:3	91:12
66:7,15	general 25:8	33:11	granted 24:3	hard 19:9
68:2,10	55:16	36:24	31:1	71:20 87:8
77:7,15	generally	64:14	granting	hardship
frame 14:6	6:3 7:21	72:18	51:9	50:11 74:5
frankly	18:2 35:22	going 4:23	great 86:8	75:2 85:3
85:20	GERSHON 3:4	6:7 12:25	greater 12:6	hate 89:14
86:23	getting	13:22 14:8	group 5:23	head 24:25
88:11	19:19	14:18 16:5	52:18 53:8	40:22
fraterni...	25:22	25:23 26:9	54:8,12	88:12
54:7	66:11 70:9	27:6,17,22	58:6 59:1	health 61:3
free 62:14	78:24	28:5 29:9	59:16,16	61:23
63:6	give 13:24	31:24	75:6 76:8	86:24
	38:17 42:2			

hear 44:20	70:11	66:15,18	54:8 56:9	Importantly
46:5 82:20	73:16,20	homes 8:12	66:24,24	18:8
82:24	74:18	8:23 10:16	71:7	impose 51:9
95:17	77:22	22:8,15	housing	53:22
heard 15:14	78:25	24:13 41:7	19:17	60:16
16:2,7	84:12	59:3,6	23:13	61:15,17
18:17 19:6	86:21 87:1	63:23	50:21	78:13
20:18 21:5	87:19 88:2	64:17 66:7	60:10,19	imposed 57:3
21:16	88:15 90:7	66:10,15	60:25	57:10
22:23	91:25	66:23 70:2	61:11	impossible
24:11	92:21 95:9	70:25 71:5	63:12	36:1,2
28:18 31:2	95:15,22	77:7,16	67:21	inability
31:5 33:8	95:23 96:2	91:4	hydrants	35:17,19
36:13	hearings 4:8	hopefully	87:17	35:20
39:15 43:8	4:15,16	84:21		inaccurate
43:17 47:4	13:1,8,11	hours 20:1	I	77:3
48:4,5,15	13:14,18	78:14	idea 28:10	inapprop...
72:9 78:1	13:19	house 1:10	40:21	89:16
81:21	49:20	3:11 10:12	69:15	inasmuch
82:13 87:4	89:15	43:18	identical	69:1
hearing 1:7	92:21	55:17,18	5:17	inches 20:4
1:11 2:7	93:25 95:8	56:5,7	identify	20:5
4:4,6 5:1	96:5	59:4,19	91:15	inclined
5:2,23 6:8	Height 8:16	64:19	illegal	68:13,15
6:9,9,20	Heights 4:9	71:18	11:15 12:2	84:3
6:22,25,25	5:25 15:3	77:17	12:5 27:9	include 23:6
7:7,11,13	21:13 25:7	household	28:6 40:23	44:9
7:18 12:9	26:8 39:4	52:22,23	42:12	included
12:10 13:3	47:17 77:8	53:4 58:10	illegally	8:19,24
14:10,10	78:20	58:11,17	42:4	19:8 21:21
14:13	held 7:21	housekee...	imagination	21:21 25:6
16:10,19	15:18 19:5	50:6 52:12	72:12	includes
16:20 17:5	93:18	52:14,16	imagine 15:9	8:11
17:22 19:5	help 6:22	53:9,10,12	62:25 63:4	including
21:21 25:2	89:2	53:20 54:5	immediately	8:10,21
26:25 27:1	helpful 89:3	54:12 57:1	27:19 37:6	11:17
27:5 28:20	heretofore	57:12,25	impact 53:25	17:11
28:22 30:4	94:19	58:2,21	impacts	26:12
30:8 33:23	HIPPA 83:1	59:25 60:3	53:22 54:2	52:20 58:8
35:25 36:1	hit 40:22	63:9 67:5	implemen...	71:14
36:14,15	hold 36:14	67:11,15	14:21	inclusive
36:19	91:16,21	67:16 75:4	implication	18:6 43:3
45:19 46:1	93:5	75:10 76:1	44:25	incompetent
46:2,6,7	home 10:4,7	76:10 78:9	implied 85:2	8:11
46:21,23	22:24	84:15 88:7	impliedly	inconsis...
48:15 49:4	27:16,16	93:16	44:12	76:21,23
59:5 65:10	27:17,18	houses 23:5	important	incorporate
69:21	31:24	41:11 54:7	21:3 53:7	92:10

increase 69:8	14:9 15:1 15:2 16:19	31:23 instance	25:11,14 investig...	items 17:7
incurred 13:12	16:21 18:15 27:3	75:11 instances	86:8 investig...	J
independ... 86:1 92:8	28:15 43:10,11	4:13 63:5 instantly	7:24 16:15 20:11 40:7	Janet 3:8
92:17	55:13,15	85:6 institut...	involving 4:9 5:24	6:4 78:18
indicated 4:11 16:14	60:1 64:3 64:21,25	64:1 insuffic...	Isaac 3:13	January 26:6
30:11	65:2 71:2	69:9 71:17 intent 9:4	12:23 57:19	68:18
31:13	71:20,21	21:2 interact	issuance 9:12 50:14	75:25 77:9
individual 51:22,23	72:2,3 73:8,24	75:18 interaction	issue 14:6	79:8
59:15	74:2,8,8	59:6 interactive	14:11,25 15:8 17:19	job 1:24
63:10	74:11,11	52:18 58:6 58:25 75:5	23:3,21 26:18 27:4	45:24 86:8
73:23 74:6	74:19,22	76:8 interest	32:12,13 33:2 38:23	JOHNSON 3:8
75:19,22	77:3 78:5	18:6 73:6 interested	38:24 43:18	joint 52:20
91:4	82:25 83:9	97:15 interesting	52:14 64:22 65:6	53:2 58:8
individuals 54:19 55:9	83:18 88:13	46:13 83:13	65:8,22 67:4,22	58:15
59:19 60:9	89:22,25	94:2 interject	68:7,24 69:13,25	jointly
60:13 61:4	91:8,11,24	32:24 interpre...	70:5,13 74:3 78:18	52:19,25
61:10 62:3	92:4,23	60:20,25 interpreted	81:12,22 82:10,13	58:7,13
62:9 63:11	95:5 informed 8:2	45:15 interrupt	83:5,22 84:1,2,3	76:8
66:4,9,12	18:21 75:25	5:12 Intersch...	87:18 89:12,16	judgment
67:20	76:23,25	18:1,1 intervene	89:20 90:8 90:15	22:20
72:15	initial 5:13	88:21 introduced	issued 9:20	judicial
74:13	17:4 33:4	6:21 77:16 intrusive	9:23 10:1 21:15	16:12 37:2
83:20	81:14 initially	73:25 75:1 invalid	issues 16:21	37:6
Indus 4:10	22:11 initiated		32:6 70:18	Judy 87:2
5:9 6:12	20:21 41:24		86:22,24	jurisdic...
6:16 7:3,4	injunctive 23:17		87:10,13	16:17
9:23 12:13	innocent 40:4		87:14,23	23:18,19
56:14,15	input 92:22		90:3 95:15	25:14 41:2
87:3	insofar 57:4		item 5:23	jurisdic...
ineffective 25:15	inspection 10:12			23:23
infer 23:7	inspections 23:6			justice
inference 19:2,12	Inspector			28:11,21
inferences 23:7				K
infers 18:9				K3 4
information 4:16 6:4				keep 42:22
6:18,21				64:19 79:1
7:2,10				keeps 47:18
9:14 14:1				key 63:16
				Kiff 3:8 5:4
				5:11,19,21
				12:19
				31:16,19
				33:25 45:9
				45:22 46:8
				46:13 47:5
				49:1,6
				57:15 79:3

80:1 82:5	landlord	61:11	line 26:11	location
88:4,19,23	53:6 58:19	lease 53:2	32:10	12:1
92:20	language	58:15	70:22 81:9	lodging 54:7
93:12,22	17:25 18:4	leave 84:9	list 24:23	long 46:17
95:4 96:7	44:5,13	87:7 90:3	listed 24:4	85:23
Kiff's 84:20	76:15	left 87:16	24:5	92:23
kind 25:17	large 8:23	legal 26:4	listen 13:12	longer 11:8
34:6 45:2	larger 53:23	27:8,11,24	23:19	23:20 26:2
47:6 54:1	83:25	28:6 30:5	listening	38:2 41:23
63:3 67:24	largest	41:3	92:14	look 20:6
73:10 75:1	80:11	legally	litter 69:11	35:1 38:1
82:23 86:4	Larry 84:18	30:20 36:1	69:14,18	40:20
86:9 90:7	lastly 72:6	41:12,13	little 9:14	42:25 51:7
91:6,8	Latches 28:2	78:19	41:6 42:9	65:6 81:14
Kit 90:11	32:4	length 17:2	42:14	95:2
knew 19:22	latest 7:11	lengthy	50:20 68:8	looked 29:20
19:23 39:6	laughed 37:8	28:13	81:13	69:16
39:7 40:8	Laura 1:23	letter 10:2	82:24	looking 16:5
know 18:24	2:11 97:22	76:4,24,25	live 51:22	34:5 42:23
21:14 23:8	law 7:22	77:9	51:23	43:1 65:25
23:15	10:25	letting	53:12	82:5
24:18	16:13	90:16	54:17,19	looks 75:13
25:20 26:5	17:10,15	let's 4:5	59:19 66:5	loose 22:14
28:12	18:9 19:1	5:20 29:1	living 6:12	Los 3:5
29:18	20:14	49:5 78:23	7:5 8:3	lose 39:25
34:22,24	24:10 30:9	84:11	10:4,4,6,9	40:1 94:4
34:24	30:10,14	90:20	10:16	94:17
36:11 37:8	32:1,18	level 42:10	18:22	low 62:13
39:13,19	35:11 38:5	liberty	19:11 22:8	lower 63:20
40:2 43:10	38:10	17:18	22:14,15	Lynn 66:24
45:2,3,4	40:25 42:3	license 8:8	53:8 54:4	71:7
45:25	47:8,24,24	80:17	57:2 59:18	
46:23	60:20,25	licenses	62:13	M
66:16	61:12	11:17,18	63:15,21	machine
74:16 75:7	85:10	life 62:8,11	66:14,15	97:10
86:24	lawfully	light 41:17	66:18	main 36:24
89:17	4:20 11:6	42:25	79:10	maintained
90:14	11:14 26:5	57:22 64:8	80:12	11:15
92:14 93:2	43:24	65:1 72:10	load 30:20	maintaining
94:10	68:12,19	likelihood	local 10:19	64:11
knows 34:22	69:4	44:10,11	11:19	maintenance
	laws 7:24	limit 67:13	17:10	52:23
L	10:19 11:7	70:21	20:14	58:11
lack 31:4,5	16:16	limitations	35:11	majorly
85:2,15	35:21	50:8 73:19	located 6:11	76:16
Laguna 3:14	45:15	limited	6:15 8:16	makeup 53:4
land 8:19	60:10,19	11:18	11:10	58:17
31:25,25	60:25	limits 80:5	12:12	76:12
				77:11

making 23:7	35:14, 22	2:11 97:22	Municipal	31:6 34:2
24:16 32:4	39:12 40:2	mind 89:3	11:3 58:3	47:8, 19, 21
56:14	44:20	minimum 26:4	mutually	92:9
73:21	46:20	68:17	38:24	needs 32:8
74:21	47:24	minute 89:6	M-a-t-h-...	60:2 64:19
84:21 92:6	74:16, 20	minutes	84:19	72:14
92:16	83:16	78:24	N	80:22 90:1
management	meaning	mirrors	name 4:5	negative
17:11	20:13	76:15	50:1 97:18	54:2 63:24
manager 3:8	means 17:20	miscarriage	Narconon	neighbor...
10:24	46:20	28:11, 21	80:15	69:7, 11
17:13 53:6	medical 74:8	29:2	narrowly	70:24
58:19	82:25 83:3	misconce...	52:2	87:18
76:14	meeting 4:9	65:11	nature 51:11	neighbor...
77:13	4:19 5:15	mishmash	60:23 64:8	64:2
manner 91:20	6:3, 5, 5	86:6	64:24 66:3	neither
March 1:13	70:1, 1	missing 82:1	67:2 68:4	15:14
2:10 4:1	95:19	82:6	81:10	97:14
7:8 10:1	meetings	misspoke	Near 80:2	net 81:5
95:10, 14	9:24, 25	35:15	necessarily	network 59:8
95:18	69:11, 25	mitigate	17:1 62:23	never 7:14
market 64:9	70:3 77:18	53:25	64:16	16:6, 6, 7
64:9	member 63:8	modifica...	83:16	20:21 30:4
matches 8:13	members	17:11	86:18	31:2 37:22
Material	52:18 58:6	moment 29:4	88:15	37:23 45:4
77:2	76:7	88:19, 22	necessary	46:25
Mathena	mentally	moments 6:7	15:24 29:1	48:20, 20
84:16, 17	8:10	money 19:20	42:21	77:21
84:18	mention	55:3 89:15	50:24 51:5	81:20 83:2
88:24	19:24	month 56:6	51:21	neverthe...
matter 12:24	29:18	56:14, 15	54:15	38:4 91:21
19:1, 4	66:22 71:5	56:16	60:12 62:2	new 6:21
26:25 28:7	mentioned	monthly 56:7	64:7, 12	7:10 14:1
36:5, 17	17:19	months 7:15	67:20	14:8, 12, 23
42:5, 17	38:15	31:8 95:23	73:22 93:5	14:25 15:1
89:21	57:20 59:4	moot 23:18	necessity	43:10
matters 4:7	63:24	57:23	56:20	77:16
5:9, 14	64:14 70:6	mootness	need 4:24	Newport 1:12
Mc 47:13, 16	70:11	15:6 23:25	33:17	2:8, 8, 9
48:11, 21	89:10	morning	36:23 37:6	3:3, 7, 9, 10
McDonough	merely 27:7	55:25	37:25 38:6	4:1 26:6
47:16	Mesa 70:13	mortgage	38:13 44:6	32:17 35:1
meals 52:23	met 69:14	91:7	46:4 72:2	35:9 52:15
58:11	MIDDENWAY	move 49:3	75:2 80:21	52:15 54:6
59:13	3:9	51:20	85:4 88:14	54:13
75:20	middle 66:20	Moving 55:2	90:2	55:10 58:3
76:12	Mike 47:16	multiple...	needed 30:15	63:18
mean 5:12	Millsap 1:23	18:10	30:17, 24	68:11, 23

72:12,17	18:12 19:5	observat...	73:17,20	6:13 10:7
72:22 78:2	21:6,15	44:19	74:18	10:18,24
79:9,20	24:11,17	84:20	77:22	15:3 17:14
80:14	26:13,13	observe 85:3	91:25	26:5 50:8
83:11	31:4 33:7	obtain 10:3	95:22 96:2	64:15
95:16	34:13	10:9 19:11	office's	68:12,19
night 19:25	39:13	19:13	75:12	76:19
95:20	94:10,16	obtainable	oftentimes	operation
nighttime	noticed 16:1	38:3	66:11,12	57:4 64:8
80:19	16:6	obtained	Oh 40:15	66:3 67:2
nine 7:15	noting 80:3	16:19	okay 5:21	operational
31:8	notwiths...	20:15	14:4 20:7	6:10 10:23
Ninth 55:7	82:14 83:2	obviously	29:5 40:12	54:8
NOELANI 3:9	92:25	45:11	43:6,13	operations
nonprofit	Nuisance	occupancy	45:22 46:6	30:19
55:3 65:24	57:11	6:13 30:20	48:23	86:18
85:4,18	number 4:25	50:8 53:13	50:18 55:2	operator
non-conf...	5:5,7 7:20	64:19	57:14	20:15
7:20 11:12	12:12 43:8	75:14	68:14	80:11
11:23 12:5	50:5,7,10	occupied	73:15 79:6	86:15
14:16,22	50:13,16	56:9 78:19	84:11 88:1	opinion 54:1
27:8,9,18	53:15	occupy 52:25	90:19 91:9	95:24
27:24 28:6	55:21	57:2 58:13	91:22	opportun...
28:9 29:18	57:23	occupying	92:19	43:9
29:19,23	59:23,24	52:19 53:4	93:22	opportunity
30:5 41:9	61:25 62:4	58:7,17	once 86:11	15:13 16:1
41:12,13	62:15	76:8	once-a-week	16:1,7
42:1,4,12	64:12 68:1	occur 59:16	70:4	17:21
Non-Conf...	71:10,11	72:21	ones 24:24	18:17 19:6
11:4	72:11 73:4	92:15	26:22 93:2	20:17,18
non-medical	73:5,9	occurred 6:8	on-site 70:3	21:5,15,16
8:8	81:2,6	19:4 79:22	75:7,7	21:17
non-single	82:14,15	94:16	open 4:4	22:23
54:12	82:16,17	occurs 42:8	5:15 16:4	24:11
normally	82:19	Ocean 1:8	16:9 25:1	28:16,19
55:20	numbers	5:1,8	64:20	33:8 36:13
note 22:22	88:13	95:21	74:16	38:1 39:10
72:2	nurseries	offer 45:18	84:12	39:15
noted 5:22	8:12	62:13	opening 5:10	45:20 47:4
6:20 8:14		95:24	operate 7:5	47:12 48:3
14:13 63:6	O	offered 13:6	67:14	48:5,14
81:16	oath 97:9	80:16	operated	50:25
notes 10:10	object 68:16	office 76:5	11:16 35:3	60:14 62:3
20:10 22:5	objected	Officer 1:11	35:10	63:12 66:5
61:7 63:14	48:6	5:3 6:9,22	68:14	67:21
64:11 69:9	observation	7:1 12:9	operates	74:19
notice 15:13	84:21	12:10	65:23	77:21
17:20	85:14	28:22 46:2	operating	80:25 95:2

opposite 64:22	17:13 Oxford 71:18	pattern 10:17, 24	7:12 9:1 9:12, 19, 23	8:25 9:8 9:11 57:7
optional 22:7	o'clock 48:9 95:10, 14	17:14 54:8 75:14 76:2	9:25 10:7 11:25	person 32:25 39:14
orally 73:10		76:19	12:12	50:25
Orange 8:6	P	pause 49:17	17:12	personnel 20:11
9:5 16:18	Pacific	82:24	19:18	persons 8:11
18:20	95:12	88:20	20:16 21:9	8:22 9:8
20:16	pages 20:2	pay 50:11	21:16, 19	9:10 10:16
31:11, 20	Pandora's	56:17	22:25 23:2	11:21
31:21, 25	16:3	paying 86:15	23:14 24:3	52:19
31:25 33:6	paper 20:5	87:23	24:13	54:17 58:7
95:13	paraphra...	91:17	29:17, 24	76:8
order 15:22	80:4	Pegasus 4:11	30:6, 12	perspective 86:14
24:7, 8	parking 69:9	6:15 7:3	31:4, 6	persuaded 43:23 88:6
25:1 69:13	69:12	10:5, 5, 15	32:14	pertained 70:12
ordered	70:15, 16	19:11	33:15, 19	pertains 65:9
49:16	70:17 71:1	31:11	33:24 34:1	pertinent 18:4
ordinance	78:14	47:16	34:3, 9	photographs 70:16 87:6
5:23 11:24	86:23 87:5	56:15	37:17, 20	87:15
14:22	87:10, 13	66:23 71:6	37:20, 22	physical 61:4
15:19 21:7	87:22	Penal 57:11	39:18, 25	physically 8:10
26:9 33:11	parlays 68:8	penalty 65:4	47:19 48:2	picture 14:24
53:24 67:8	part 22:9, 11	83:23	48:4, 15, 18	15:20 16:8
72:11 80:5	22:13	85:25	49:8, 10	56:1
82:8, 9	23:20	people 10:7	50:9, 12, 14	piece 63:25
original	25:15 26:2	46:15, 16	52:13 55:5	69:23
14:19 25:2	26:2, 8	53:15 63:7	56:18 70:9	71:23
64:2 75:15	32:16, 16	66:9, 21	70:10	pieces 19:7
ought 86:3	34:15, 25	87:22	78:11	62:19
86:16	37:11	perceived	79:11, 18	place 11:7
outset 38:8	45:11 47:1	16:22	80:9 81:13	13:16
outside	66:25	percent	81:17, 19	15:22
62:21	68:11, 22	55:11	81:25 82:4	24:14 26:9
overbroad	particip...	Perfect	82:7 93:15	29:25 30:7
76:2	64:10	94:24	93:18	97:7
overconc...	particip...	perfectly	permits 4:22	placed 30:18
70:21	92:23	27:2	6:10, 15	87:16 97:9
overcrow...	particular	performed	9:15 11:3	
64:1	32:6 39:5	10:12 75:8	11:17, 18	
overly 74:25	50:15 57:8	period 13:16	12:8, 14	
78:16	62:6 87:16	36:7 45:24	21:23	
overturn	90:8	perjury 65:4	35:17 44:8	
65:25	particul...	83:23	44:16 47:8	
95:17	64:9	85:25	49:22	
owned 65:14	parties	permissive	55:11	
65:14	97:16	57:9	71:14	
owner 10:23	Patrick 3:4	permit 4:15	permitted	
	26:23			

places 66:10	88:10	26:17	problematic	74:1
Plainfield	portions	27:24	20:8	production
71:19	25:9,16	28:13	problems	82:23
plan 8:17,18	poses 51:2	29:21	87:5	profit 56:7
8:24 9:9	position	36:19 38:5	Procedural	56:14,15
9:12 17:11	13:20 38:1	68:6 80:2	18:4	65:23
20:2 21:13	44:3 77:8	82:16	procedure	profiteer
25:7,10	possibil...	89:10	21:19	65:18
26:1 49:15	72:20	presented	26:25	program 22:4
65:15	possible	14:12	89:14 93:5	22:7,8,8
planned 9:8	25:9 43:21	28:14,19	94:3,5,11	51:12,14
9:11	post 15:5	30:9 31:12	95:1	51:15 55:4
Planner 3:8	post-hoc	32:9 36:20	proceed 5:13	60:23 68:5
planners	27:5	39:5 73:3	5:20 14:5	69:1,2
42:7	potential	77:20,21	90:20	prohibited
Planning 8:2	16:5 22:1	86:21 87:6	proceeding	54:5
9:1,3,13	86:10	88:16	49:17	prong 51:7
9:21 18:20	potentially	presume	88:20	56:20
20:16,22	95:25	12:21	proceedings	61:14,20
21:1 45:13	practice	pretty 19:3	96:4 97:6	62:6 64:5
please 30:2	10:17	34:7 35:22	97:8,10	proper 35:8
73:2	practices	38:9 46:3	process 15:8	properly
plenty 43:14	50:23	previous	17:18,19	83:23
plug 87:8	70:17	4:19 5:15	18:5,10,16	properties
point 7:16	Prejudice	previously	20:6 21:20	6:15 7:25
13:7,23	12:11	4:9	22:2 23:21	8:16 10:15
19:22,24	preliminary	principal	28:12 29:2	13:1,25
20:9,19	12:24	8:20,25	30:12 33:2	23:9 26:15
21:25	premises	prior 7:14	34:14	32:16
25:23	53:1,3	32:15 97:6	36:11	59:17 60:4
28:17,17	58:14,16	97:8	38:10,12	65:12,13
29:22	preparation	privacy 65:1	38:17,19	65:16,19
30:17 35:8	28:25	72:1 74:12	38:23,24	66:18
36:3 38:25	prepare 7:6	74:13,15	39:12 40:3	68:10
45:10	92:9	75:1	40:10	69:19 77:6
48:16	prepared	probably	42:18	79:9 83:8
62:14 66:1	12:13	41:8,12	43:17	83:21
80:14	preparing	45:19	48:20,21	property
82:20 84:7	47:11	78:25	65:18 73:6	6:11,11
85:1,3	present	83:19	81:20	7:3,3,4,5
86:20 89:9	28:19	86:15	82:11	10:5,5,10
points 26:21	68:19 73:7	problem 15:6	85:22 94:4	11:22
36:24	75:10	25:19 34:4	94:9	12:12
policies	90:21,22	34:10,23	processes	17:18 23:8
50:23	presenta...	35:24,25	35:6	41:21 53:6
poor 86:5	6:1,3	39:1 40:2	produced	58:19 59:8
portion	12:15 13:4	42:22 83:1	74:1	59:12,17
25:13	13:25	83:24	producing	59:18,22

61:5 68:10	provides	pursue 19:4	62:22 63:1	reasonable
75:18,18	17:9,13,24	73:21	78:3	24:18,21
75:22	20:22 59:8	pursued 19:1		28:23
76:13,14	63:6,20	put 21:6	R	29:17
77:11,13	91:23	28:10,13	R3:13	34:22
proposed	providing	35:16	radar 40:6	41:22 49:2
45:17	70:23 92:3	42:10,24	raise 20:9	49:7,9,19
61:17 71:1	provision	54:2 83:20	raised 7:14	49:25
94:13	12:2 25:8	94:2	16:22	50:21,24
proposing	81:16	p.m 2:9,10	26:21 65:8	51:4,7
24:8	89:22,25	4:2,2	77:22	52:2,6
proposition	provisions	95:18,19	raises 55:3	53:18
71:20	8:24 24:19	96:9	raising 74:3	54:11,24
protect	46:1 67:8		range 18:6	55:9 56:20
74:12,15	proviso	Q	62:18	57:21 60:3
protected	90:17 91:5	qualified	rate 56:10	61:21
60:9 61:11	public 1:7	11:2,24	rates 62:12	67:24 69:2
protections	2:7 5:1,23	qualify 4:21	62:22,23	70:6,10,23
42:2	21:21	86:17	62:25 63:2	71:3,4,10
protects	45:19,19	quality 62:8	78:3,3	72:7 73:18
18:6	46:1,7	62:11	reach 24:7	73:18
proven 40:4	47:14	question	39:22	75:16
provide 8:8	74:11,22	23:15	40:25	78:12,13
13:5 17:17	78:25	33:25	56:20	78:14 79:1
22:22	80:22	36:24	reached	84:14 88:8
42:16	84:12	41:22	73:13 81:5	88:11
60:13 62:2	87:25 88:1	51:25 52:1	read 33:18	93:16 95:9
66:4 71:23	90:2 94:22	78:23 83:6	34:7 83:6	95:11
83:2 90:13	publicly	86:11,11	reading	reasons 12:6
91:1 94:12	85:13	question...	19:21	22:12
provided	public's	69:23	ready 49:18	recall 44:23
6:17 7:2,9	92:22,22	questions	93:3	recap 6:8
7:10 9:6	published	11:1 12:16	real 83:10	receive 11:2
15:12,14	89:7	12:17 24:6	reality	received
16:18,21	pure 23:3	24:24 29:3	32:21	26:13
16:23	purely 22:7	56:22 92:5	86:18	receptacles
17:20,21	purported	94:17	really 15:6	87:16
18:16 19:7	17:22 19:8	quick 26:22	27:21	receptive
24:17,22	purpose 4:24	38:11	32:11	36:21
34:12 60:1	9:3 13:20	quickly	41:16	recognize
64:3,18,21	21:1 51:17	71:12	73:22 86:2	36:13 74:3
64:25 65:3	53:24 54:3	quiet 78:14	86:5,17	recollec...
68:6 70:8	59:18	quite 33:18	reason 10:21	65:3
70:15 71:2	70:20,22	quote 14:8	16:18	recommen...
71:22 72:3	purposes	19:21	25:13	7:1 17:6
82:19,25	73:11 85:7	20:25 21:3	29:20	55:12
83:17,25	Pursuant	25:12	41:12	74:10
89:1 94:16	11:21	quoted 17:24	56:19	recommen...
		18:19		

6:16,23	referring	13:13	64:11 65:9	68:3 69:6
12:10	14:10	relied 13:23	66:22 69:9	69:10 74:2
recommended	20:24	relief 23:17	70:6 73:9	91:7
6:9,14	refers 21:25	relies 18:14	83:6 89:6	requesting
recommen...	reflects	remain 41:9	reported	10:3 67:7
15:23	77:3 80:19	64:13,20	1:23 18:11	67:19
recommends	refute 28:17	remained	76:2 85:7	requests
7:11 12:7	refuting	35:5	Reporter	16:9 49:25
12:10	75:5,6	remaining	2:11 49:14	50:3,4,13
reconvene	regard 26:24	25:16	97:5	50:13
49:19	27:4 28:12	remedied	reports 6:19	require 6:21
record 10:8	92:6	65:7 84:6	18:9 73:14	8:8 42:15
14:7 21:14	regarding	reminder	represen...	50:22 55:7
24:5 46:10	36:11	5:22	81:23	55:9
50:1 69:17	83:22	removed	request 9:17	required
84:25 94:2	regards	65:18 66:8	9:22 13:11	11:9,16,18
97:10	10:22	rendered	50:5,5,7,7	17:11
records 9:15	regroup	11:23	50:10,10	22:10
9:17,19,22	49:14	rent 65:19	50:15,16	24:13
9:23 10:14	regular	rental 62:12	50:24,24	27:13 31:3
27:19 28:5	95:19	rented 52:24	51:4,4,4,8	37:19
30:23	regulation	58:12	51:9,20,21	39:17,24
recovering	15:11	rents 65:21	52:7 53:18	44:2 47:22
62:11	34:14	reopen 4:14	53:19,20	48:1 60:5
recovery 1:8	67:12,24	12:25	54:15,23	68:21
4:12 5:1,8	regulations	13:11	55:1,2	73:23
19:10 47:7	8:19 11:9	reopened	57:21,23	78:12,12
55:11	25:13	7:12 13:18	57:24	78:16
58:25 59:9	61:12	13:20	59:22,24	requirement
70:24	67:17	reopening	62:15 67:7	26:14
80:14	79:15	13:7,14	70:7 71:3	35:10 43:5
95:12,16	reiterate	26:24	71:9 73:4	43:20
95:21	86:25	repeatedly	73:4 74:4	46:24 51:2
redacted	rejected	87:4	74:25 76:1	51:17
82:16	19:13	reply 47:23	78:17	79:10,20
Redlands	rejection	report 5:14	82:14,15	79:20 82:8
4:11 6:11	17:6	6:2 7:11	82:17,19	requirem...
7:4 10:10	related 65:4	8:15 10:11	93:10	9:6 15:5
10:15	relates 91:2	12:7 16:16	requested	16:11
56:16	relating	18:8,14,20	4:14 12:8	24:21
reduce 53:22	83:3 95:21	18:25	48:4 52:11	25:21
54:2	relation...	19:21	54:16 55:5	33:19
reduced 6:13	77:5	20:10,13	60:7,8,12	41:18 43:2
reduces 71:8	relative	20:22 22:5	60:16,21	46:19 88:8
reducing	85:2 97:15	23:11 24:1	61:1,9,9	90:6
72:11	relevant	39:6 61:7	61:14,21	requires
reduction	64:9	62:10	62:2,7	15:4 55:10
72:16,18	reliance	63:14,25	64:6 67:19	requiring

reread 33:23	Resolution	restrictive	18:18	36:6 38:8
research	4:25, 25	70:2	29:23 30:5	38:12, 18
28:8 42:13	5:3, 7, 7	result 13:13	30:12, 16	38:22 45:3
reside 50:25	12:11, 14	35:3 51:10	33:9 94:4	46:14
53:15 54:9	44:7, 9	52:9 54:25	94:18	47:18
54:13	45:8, 17	60:22 61:2	rigor 73:21	55:17 73:3
59:11	47:11	61:22	room 79:4	77:1 85:16
63:22	71:15	66:19 68:3	RPR 1:23	says 21:4, 11
67:21	92:10 93:6	69:8 76:18	2:11 97:22	39:24 56:2
75:17	93:8, 14, 15	retain 7:21	RSF 8:17, 20	62:10
residence	94:3, 5, 13	return 53:17	rule 15:25	67:18
57:2, 11	94:13, 15	88:25	23:1 33:5	70:22
resident	95:7	91:14 96:1	33:6 38:21	71:19 86:9
59:13, 18	Resolutions	reverse 25:2	41:17	scale 42:14
64:17	7:7 94:20	review 21:18	88:10	scheduled
76:11	respect 34:5	30:15 34:8	rules 23:23	95:10, 13
residential	44:6 59:2	74:10, 19	41:19, 20	scope 17:24
5:24 8:9	77:6 84:21	89:6 91:13	41:24, 24	screen 56:8
8:17 9:9	88:7 93:9	93:19	50:23	Sea 80:12
10:18	respectf...	reviewed	67:17	seal 91:13
11:22	34:19	55:13 74:9	ruling 12:25	search 9:22
53:11, 12	74:24	reviewing	13:19 25:2	15:17
54:6, 9, 11	respond	20:1	90:15	second 19:15
54:13 57:3	12:21 29:6	revised 8:18	Ryan 17:25	24:15 27:4
57:5 64:6	29:12 32:3	revoke 35:7		38:18 47:1
66:2, 5	39:11	35:13	S	63:10
70:23, 24	40:13 48:8	revoking	S 3:5	82:12
75:14	80:25 89:8	35:13, 14	safety 61:3	84:20 85:1
residents	response	RICHARDS 3:4	61:23	secondary
19:17	7:23 26:7	right 12:20	86:24	53:22, 25
23:13 48:5	26:21	27:6 28:20	87:14, 18	Secondly
52:25 53:5	72:25 92:4	29:13 31:5	87:23	85:11
55:20, 23	responses	32:2 35:13	sailed 16:10	section 9:2
56:11 57:6	38:15	36:10 37:4	sake 91:23	9:5 10:22
58:13, 18	responsi...	38:21, 25	sale 68:15	11:3, 5, 5
58:22 59:8	52:22 53:3	39:11	San 18:1	11:21 17:7
59:11	58:10, 16	40:22	Santa 5:24	18:2 20:24
63:15 70:2	responsi...	43:11	8:16 15:3	21:10, 11
72:8 75:17	52:21 58:9	44:20 45:6	20:1 21:13	25:7 44:23
75:20 76:4	responsible	48:24 49:3	25:7 26:8	49:4 58:3
76:6, 13	59:13	49:5, 18	39:3 47:17	60:11
77:5, 6, 12	75:20	50:19 65:5	77:7 78:20	Security
77:16, 17	76:11	66:17	satisfy	74:7
83:4 87:19	rest 28:10	79:24	72:14	see 4:5
87:20	restrict...	89:13 90:5	saying 14:21	13:15 20:4
resides	53:10, 13	90:9 91:21	32:5, 5	27:19
75:22	53:15, 21	93:23	33:13, 21	31:24
77:15	57:10	rights 7:22	34:2, 6	40:17 44:9
			36:3, 4, 5, 6	

47:20,21	sharing	53:9,10,12	snapshot	speak 89:24
56:7 70:18	52:21 58:9	53:19 54:4	20:6	speaking
80:22	Sheriff's	56:25	snuck 40:5	35:22
84:17	22:2,4	57:12,25	sober 6:12	speaks 68:7
85:25 86:1	shining	58:2,7,15	7:5 8:3	special
86:9 88:14	41:17	58:21 59:3	10:3,4,6,9	21:23
Seeing 46:6	42:25	59:25 60:2	10:15	specific
seek 11:24	ship 16:10	63:9 67:4	18:21	8:16,18,24
23:17	68:14	67:10,10	19:11 22:8	9:9,11
seeking	Shores 95:12	67:10,15	22:14,15	20:1 21:13
56:24	short 13:8	67:16 75:4	57:1 59:19	25:7,10
seeks 51:17	13:16	75:10 76:1	62:13	26:1 30:9
seen 30:23	45:24	76:9,9	63:15,21	30:18,19
69:17 72:9	shorthand	78:8 84:15	66:15,18	54:20
73:17,20	2:11 73:11	88:7 93:16	79:10	55:14 61:2
sense 34:7	97:4,11	singly	80:12	61:22
82:18	showed 15:16	8:21	Social 74:7	68:24
sensitive	showing 74:5	sir 49:1	sole 59:17	71:21 91:3
36:10	shows 25:8	57:15 78:4	solid 71:20	specific...
74:12	25:17	88:4,5	88:10	16:9 21:11
91:11	SI 20:12	sit 34:25	somebody	68:1 77:13
sent 10:2	sign 5:11	site 55:24	19:22	81:15 82:3
76:25	57:23	56:1,10	34:11	speculating
separate	85:15	62:18 63:1	35:21	38:6
31:22	94:13	63:6 77:24	39:13 63:8	speculation
75:17,23	signed 31:11	83:9,16	65:17	23:4 35:4
separately	65:4 83:23	sites 56:2	somewhat	37:16
31:21	94:22 95:3	situation	13:9 73:25	speculative
59:11 93:7	signific...	42:6,8	soon 57:23	18:15
93:10	75:21 80:6	44:21 52:5	79:22	spend 89:14
September	signs 95:7	63:4	sooner 43:13	spent 20:1
10:11	similar	six 8:22 9:7	sororities	staff 4:14
serious 38:9	10:25 12:2	10:7 19:17	54:7	4:17 5:14
services	17:14 21:8	23:13	sorry 5:12	5:17 6:1,9
70:24	44:17 52:7	44:22	30:1 40:15	6:14,22
serving 8:22	59:20 64:8	95:23	49:2,6,10	7:1,6,11
9:7,10	66:3 67:2	size 57:8	88:21	7:11,15,23
sessions	85:12	70:25	91:17	8:3,15
59:16	simple 78:10	skip 55:1	92:22,23	9:16,21
set 10:13	simply 5:2	59:23	93:18	11:1 12:3
21:12,19	5:16 27:23	skips 37:18	sort 13:17	12:7,7,9
21:20	28:7 40:24	sky's 67:13	19:9 34:21	12:10,13
87:20 97:7	44:1 67:14	slide 25:5	86:7,8	12:18 13:7
setting 63:3	67:24	slides 82:15	sound 21:14	13:10,21
66:6	single 8:17	small 86:2	sounds 40:3	15:22
seven 9:10	50:6 52:12	smart 86:14	72:17 83:1	16:15,23
severely	52:14,16	smoking	Southern	17:6 18:8
54:23	52:19 53:2	78:14	80:15	18:9,14,21

18:25	start 16:5	42:20	73:24 89:5	64:23 65:2
19:21	38:6 49:21	stop 73:7	89:20	71:21
20:10,10	73:3	stops 74:17	90:11,13	supporting
20:13,22	starting	straight	91:12,16	56:13
21:11 22:5	79:8 95:18	45:13	submitted	supportive
22:19	starts 95:6	strains	16:24	58:23
23:11 24:1	state 8:8	72:12	17:10	supposed
24:8 30:15	11:19	Street 3:13	29:16	72:10
39:5 40:21	17:10	6:15 19:12	40:19	81:20
41:5 45:12	35:11 50:1	47:17	56:12 65:5	sure 29:7
49:21	84:24	stretches	74:6,19	30:3 31:18
55:14	85:12 97:5	15:7	77:2 91:19	34:2 40:18
57:14 61:7	stated 8:25	strikes	subscribed	41:7 42:11
62:1,10,12	12:6 76:5	71:25	97:17	42:17
63:14,25	77:9	stripped	subsection	46:11
64:11,15	statement	82:11	17:9 21:22	47:15,19
65:8 66:22	29:10	strongly	21:23	57:18
68:2 69:9	55:16	68:16	subsequent	73:21
69:17 70:6	67:23	structure	15:17	74:14
72:25 73:9	69:20	57:8	94:21	88:14,23
73:14,21	79:16	stuck 86:4	subseque...	90:25
74:9,20	statements	stuff 19:9	94:14	92:13
76:1,20,22	65:4 74:7	25:17	substantial	surprise
79:25 83:6	84:5 91:7	subject 9:1	17:19 30:9	76:22
88:3 89:6	states 11:5	9:12 29:24	61:4 69:8	surprised
89:19 90:3	15:13	30:6,11	substant...	45:25
90:12,13	17:17	35:20	87:12	81:13
91:23,25	56:10	39:20	sufficient	symptoms
92:3,5	stating 9:7	66:13	5:10 66:4	59:10
94:12,23	10:6	67:16	72:3	systems 59:9
staff's	status 85:7	75:22	suggest	T
22:20 44:3	statute	85:25	27:25	table 6:2
67:6 70:19	35:22	89:22	49:12	tailored
88:6	stay 17:3	submission	90:10	52:2
stand 42:19	64:17	17:4 62:19	suggested	take 6:7
68:22	80:16	64:18	52:4 67:6	27:13
standard	83:20	77:25	70:20	32:22
10:23 18:3	staying	81:15	suggesting	49:12
55:5 57:9	83:11	89:21	37:25	88:16
standards	step 1:10	90:17	suggestion	89:14,21
50:8	3:11 4:24	92:16	88:24	90:17
standing	37:18	93:19	suggestions	taken 2:7
23:16	54:14	submissions	88:18	13:21
25:25,25	65:17	59:5	Suite 3:13	32:19 44:4
37:4,11	66:20	submit 14:17	supply 66:2	97:6
46:25	steps 93:14	18:14	support 55:4	takes 64:22
stands 59:4	stipulate	58:20	59:9 70:8	67:22 95:6
71:19	28:24	59:25 66:7	supported	

talk 37:15	45:19	36:22, 23	thumb 87:9	40:11, 17
46:15	86:21	39:13 40:6	thumbprints	41:11
62:15	thank 5:6, 21	40:21, 22	87:7	50:16 59:3
80:23 81:8	6:6 12:22	41:4, 22	Thursday	62:24
talked 17:3	29:4 31:15	43:7 44:3	1:13 2:10	65:10
24:20	46:8 48:6	45:2, 9	4:1	68:22
44:22	48:7 57:18	46:13	Thursdays	73:14
69:14, 25	72:24 79:7	47:20	79:4	81:10 93:9
70:17	80:20, 25	48:11	tied 50:14	96:5
81:19	87:1, 24	57:21, 22	time 4:20	told 81:25
82:15	88:1 90:9	61:18, 23	6:18 7:25	tomorrow
talking 14:2	96:3, 8	63:19	8:15 10:19	37:5
32:11 59:3	Thanks 48:23	64:14, 22	11:7 12:18	tonight 79:3
62:24	57:14	65:10, 25	13:16 14:9	tools 86:5
63:16	84:11	66:23, 25	14:14 15:6	top 24:25
65:17 68:8	therapy	68:18, 18	16:16 17:4	total 9:25
83:7 91:4	59:16	69:23	20:15 22:5	town 27:15
94:9, 10	thereof	70:19 71:1	28:23	traditional
talks 18:2	25:16	71:24	36:18 41:1	52:17 58:5
71:18	97:13	72:13, 22	41:14, 15	58:23 76:7
tax 85:7	they'd 90:12	81:5, 7	41:19	traffic 69:9
88:25	thick 20:5	82:18 83:5	42:19	transcribed
tell 46:17	20:24	83:24	43:14	97:11
48:1 66:17	thing 26:24	84:10, 25	45:16, 20	transcript
85:23, 24	42:14	86:8 88:8	45:25	33:23
89:16	63:24 70:4	91:3 93:21	46:17, 22	transcri...
telling 24:2	90:24	thinks 28:23	69:14, 22	97:13
43:15	91:10, 22	32:8 42:21	70:1, 16	transpar...
tells 19:21	things 17:3	third 57:21	72:18	90:3
42:11	32:3 41:4	57:25	75:14	trash 87:16
temporary	48:17, 19	61:14 64:5	77:19, 25	87:23
9:23	64:24	93:17	79:4, 10, 13	treated 50:5
ten 9:24	85:16, 21	Thomas 1:11	79:15	52:11
tenants	86:13	4:5	82:20 84:7	53:19
65:21	87:22	thoroughly	88:16	57:24 67:9
terms 13:5	think 5:9	9:21	89:15 96:9	67:15, 16
14:25	12:24 13:6	thought 13:9	97:7	treatment
16:22	14:1, 14, 20	13:10	timeline	59:15, 16
58:24	15:15 16:4	30:23 39:4	95:5	75:6, 8
63:17	16:4, 10	threat 61:3	timely 13:10	treatments
85:15 90:6	19:2 22:2	61:23, 24	times 9:24	84:8
terrible	24:1 27:2	three 12:14	31:8	trial 27:5
28:11	27:12	19:7 49:25	today 4:7	27:22
test 19:9	28:25	50:3, 10, 17	18:13, 24	tries 22:19
testifying	32:19	55:2 61:6	21:8 23:1	troubles
97:9	33:13, 22	62:16	36:20	85:17
testimony	33:25 35:1	71:11 73:5	38:11 40:7	true 27:25
7:9 14:13	35:15	93:14	40:10, 10	34:11

45:21	undermining	unlawful	32:13	varied 17:4
77:23	51:17	25:3 86:23	33:15, 24	variety
try 37:17	undersigned	unlawfully	34:1, 3, 8	85:20
42:9	97:4	15:3 35:3	35:17	vehicles
trying 36:25	understand	68:14	37:17, 19	59:21
40:5 73:10	33:22 34:4	unnecess...	37:20, 21	veracity
turn 65:20	36:3 37:24	54:21	39:18, 24	84:4
turned 9:15	43:22	unreason...	40:23	verbatim
15:16	85:18	51:8, 20	42:13 44:8	97:9
twelve 9:10	87:21	unrelated	45:2 47:8	verifica...
two 36:17	understa...	22:12	48:4, 15, 18	56:12
37:1, 8	13:2 93:12	untested	50:9, 11, 14	verify 75:2
38:14, 16	undisputed	18:15	52:13, 20	verifying
40:10	63:19 64:4	upcoming	53:2 55:5	27:23 86:1
43:13	undue 51:9	93:25	55:11	version
49:24 50:7	60:17, 18	upgraded	56:18 58:8	73:11
50:14 51:5	61:15	41:10, 10	58:15	versus 17:25
55:1 57:23	unfair 50:21	41:11	60:14 62:4	71:18
59:23	76:22	uphold 95:17	68:9 70:9	vested 29:23
61:25	unfolded	96:1	70:10 71:3	30:5, 13, 16
62:19	86:14	upper 42:10	71:14	33:15
65:13 71:5	unfortunate	use 4:15, 21	75:13, 19	vesting
73:4, 9	86:17	6:10, 14	76:18	13:17
82:14, 15	unincorp...	7:12 8:13	78:11	viable 64:8
82:16, 18	26:2	8:19 9:1, 2	79:10, 14	64:13
82:19	unit 50:6	9:12, 19, 23	80:9 93:15	view 74:20
85:14	52:12, 16	11:3, 6, 8	93:17	85:15
90:14	52:20, 24	11:12, 13	useful 85:21	violate 37:7
95:15	53:1, 4, 5, 9	11:15, 21	uses 5:24	75:1
tying 35:24	53:9, 20	11:24, 25	7:20, 21, 25	violated
type 24:17	54:5 57:1	12:5, 5, 7	8:14, 15, 20	15:25
63:12	57:12, 25	12:12, 14	8:25 9:9	16:12 20:7
67:25	58:2, 8, 12	14:16, 20	12:3 43:25	32:17 33:5
71:24	58:14, 17	17:12	44:11, 17	38:20 43:4
types 63:20	58:18, 21	18:22	45:1 46:2	violating
67:3	59:25 60:3	19:18	53:11 69:2	21:6
typically	67:5, 15, 16	20:16, 25	usual 50:11	violation
41:5	75:4, 10	21:9, 12, 19	50:23	10:19, 25
U	76:2, 9, 10	21:23	52:12	15:19
unable 51:23	76:14	22:24 23:2	usually 93:1	17:15, 22
54:19	77:12 78:9	23:14 24:3	utility 91:7	18:9, 10
undated 10:6	84:15	24:13 27:8	utilized	19:1 21:15
undermine	93:16	27:9, 24	24:16	24:9 26:18
54:23	United 15:13	28:6, 9	V	33:7 34:13
undermined	17:16	29:17, 19	validity	35:2, 4, 5
70:21	units 4:19	29:23, 24	25:16	35:11 36:7
undermines	53:10, 12	30:5, 6, 11	variances	37:13
54:3	59:4 63:9	31:25	21:21	43:19

46:18,24	wants 16:4,5	42:2 45:4	win 40:1,1	yeah 33:21
47:25	32:25	45:17 46:6	wisdom 46:4	35:15
86:10	40:17 63:8	68:14 88:1	wish 26:20	38:14
violations	73:12	93:5 96:5	29:7 36:18	40:18
16:6 22:17	82:20	we're 13:22	36:21	44:24
virtually	wasn't 27:18	14:1,24	40:13	80:24
5:17	91:17	20:5 23:7	72:25	year 9:24
visitation	watching	23:20 32:4	89:17	years 37:8
70:12,12	92:14	32:5,5,11	90:21	41:11
visitors	WATSON 3:4	34:1,2	WITNESS	Yellowstone
69:12 70:5	way 9:14	35:2,7	97:17	1:10 3:11
visuals	14:18 21:8	36:5,6,6	witnesses	4:10,12
87:12	34:24	38:19	97:8	5:14 7:19
voiced 18:18	35:16 36:8	41:21	Wolcott 3:7	8:14 9:20
voluntarily	41:4 45:23	42:24,25	29:9,13,13	10:9,20
80:16	60:11 83:3	43:1,16	30:3 49:24	11:1 12:3
volunteer	83:19	45:10	50:2,19	12:23 15:2
85:9	86:13	49:18 55:1	57:5,19,20	16:12
	93:21	57:20 59:3	62:17 72:6	17:17
W	ways 54:22	61:18	73:2 88:5	19:10 20:7
W1:11 4:5	72:7	62:24	89:4,23	20:14
waive 90:7	Web 55:24	63:16,17	91:6 94:1	22:19,23
waived 58:1	56:1,1,10	65:17 67:9	94:7	22:24 23:2
waiver 50:11	62:18 63:1	67:12,14	Women's 1:10	24:9,13
50:11	63:6 77:24	67:23,23	3:11	25:3 26:5
52:12 55:2	83:9,16	67:24	wonderful	26:12,14
55:5 71:11	week 36:17	68:21	48:12	30:20
71:16 72:4	37:1 40:10	71:16	word 27:7,14	32:14,15
73:16	55:22 56:2	78:24	32:20,22	32:17 33:1
84:15	89:25	81:10 83:7	35:14	33:2,5
93:10,18	90:22	84:2 89:11	words 13:15	34:8,12
Walker 87:2	weeks 37:1	90:25 91:3	38:22	35:3,10,17
87:2	38:17	91:5	94:12	35:21 39:3
want 28:10	40:11	we've 15:8	work 41:5	42:23 43:1
32:2,3,10	90:14	32:19 39:4	45:14	43:4,19,24
38:6 42:17	week's 28:24	61:11,17	47:12 92:5	46:18,23
46:15	weigh 95:21	68:9,19,22	worked 7:15	47:7 52:11
76:21,22	welcome 14:5	71:1 81:8	works 33:3	62:12,18
83:10	47:9	81:9 83:2	39:12	62:20 63:5
91:25	went 37:5	83:17 84:5	worth 84:25	63:20
92:13	81:23 82:7	94:19	wouldn't	64:13,18
94:10	weren't 36:7	WHEREOF	43:16	65:14,15
wanted 22:11	West 5:24	97:17	written 6:19	65:20,20
29:14	95:9,22	wife's 19:25	53:2 58:15	65:22,23
76:18	we'll 4:4	willing	wrong 39:8	67:22 77:4
84:20	5:11,15	13:12	39:14	77:7 91:2
86:25	37:22	28:24 72:4	W-2's 74:6	91:2 92:25
90:25 93:4	39:20,21	89:5,6,20		Yellowst...
93:24			Y	

20:19 22:6	15:11,19	4:1 10:16	75:15	301 3:13
32:20	20:3,23	44:24,24	86:21	31 32:15
47:20 55:4	21:10	50:4 65:9	20.03.030	34:9 39:2
55:24	22:12,16	12th 7:8	58:3	3300 2:8 3:9
64:23 67:6	22:17,18	13th 77:1	20.62.030	3309 95:12
67:7 77:8	22:20 25:9	14 80:9 95:5	11:3	355 3:5
77:14	33:5 34:14	14th 15:12	20.91A 11:21	376-2828
Yep 96:7	37:7 43:5	17:16	20.91A.060	3:14
yesterday	46:19,24	15 6:13	10:22 17:7	
43:11,12	47:3 51:11	10:13	20.98.025B	4
	51:14,14	150-some...	60:11	4 95:10
Z	52:15	20:2	2001 8:19	4th 18:2
Zfaty 3:12	53:14	1501 71:7	2003 8:1	4:00 2:9 4:2
3:13 12:22	54:23	1502 71:7	2005 8:1	40 9:25
12:23	60:23 68:4	1561 4:10	10:1,8,11	40th 3:5
13:22 14:4	69:1,1	6:16 7:3	2006 10:3	492 95:13,13
14:6 26:21	78:21,22	12:13	2007 8:1	5
29:6 31:16		56:14	32:15 34:9	5th 15:12
31:20 32:2	\$	1562 47:16	39:2	17:16
33:16,21	\$160 55:21	1571 4:11	2008 14:19	501 (c) (3)
34:19	56:2	19:11	26:6 29:16	65:23
35:15	\$170 56:3	31:10 87:2	68:18	74:16
36:22	\$180 56:2	1601 5:8	76:24 77:2	52 68:12,17
38:14	\$2200 55:5	1621 4:10	78:22 79:8	78:20
40:15	\$4,000 56:16	6:11 7:4	81:11,15	580 3:13
42:22 45:3	\$4,680 56:15	9:23 56:15	2008-030	6
45:23 46:9	56:15	17 45:2	12:12	6 48:9 78:24
46:12 47:6	\$400 56:14	18-bed 10:4	2008-05	6:16 2:10
47:18 48:8	\$50 55:21	19 95:10	11:24	4:2 96:9
48:11	\$6200 55:17	19th 96:6	53:24	626-8484 3:6
57:18,19	56:6	2	2009 1:13	644-3002
73:3 78:7	0	2 20:4,5	2:10 4:1	3:10
80:21,24	08 75:15	95:14	68:7 77:10	7
82:6,12	09 75:25	2-inch 20:23	2009-003 5:4	7 44:24
89:10,19	77:1	20 76:24	5:7	95:18,19
90:6,23	090312LAM	20th 6:8	2010 80:17	7-1-950
94:1,7,9	1:24	7:12 13:3	2017 24:11	20:25
94:24	1	14:10	204 80:10	7-9-105.1C
Zfaty's		15:17	213 3:6	21:20
29:14	1 26:6 68:18	16:19,20	22 80:19	7.9.141 9:5
74:25	79:8	17:5 24:20	22nd 81:11	7.9.150 9:2
75:12 76:5	1/2 95:13	29:21 30:3	82:7	9
80:2	10 78:24	30:8 33:23	24 71:8	900 95:9
zone 54:9	100 55:10	43:11 59:5	95:18	90071-3101
zoned 8:17	1069 18:2	68:7 69:14	25th 95:14	3:5
9:9	11 80:9	69:20,21	29 77:10	
zones 57:3	1115 95:22	70:17	80:14	
zoning 8:6	12 1:13 2:10	73:14	3	
9:2,5				

92651 3:14

92658-8915

3:10

92661:24

2:12 97:23

9418:2

949 3:10, 14

990 85:5

88:25

**1561 INDUS: USE PERMIT DENIAL RESOLUTION
DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION No. HO-2009-003

**A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY
OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING WITH PREJUDICE USE
PERMIT NO. 2008-034 TO ALLOW AN EXISTING GROUP
RESIDENTIAL USE TO CONTINUE AT 1561 INDUS
STREET, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA (PA2008-105)**

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.91A to the NBMC. Chapter 20.91A sets forth a process by which existing nonconforming uses in residential areas, including existing group residential care facilities (except for state-licensed drug or alcohol treatment homes serving six or fewer clients), must apply for use permits to remain in operation at their current location beyond February 2009; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., submitted Group Residential Use Permit applications for four sober living facilities located at 1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street and 20172 Redlands Drive, all located in the City of Newport Beach, California; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., located at 1561 Indus Street ("Use Location") in Newport Beach, California, is an existing group residential care facility operating an unlicensed "sober living" facility for 12 women in an existing single-family dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc. ("Use") pursuant to Ordinance No. 2008-05 within the applicable time period with respect to property located at 1561 Indus Street, and legally described as Lot 14, Tract 4307 in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-361-08), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of Orange County, requesting approval of Use Permit No. 2008-034 to allow a residential care facility to continue its operations as a 12 bed adult sober living facility for females only; and

WHEREAS, on February 20, 2009, a Hearing Officer held a noticed hearing in the City Hall Council Chambers, at 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California at which time the project application was considered. Notice of time, place and purpose of the public hearing was given in accordance with the Newport Beach Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented to, and considered by, the Hearing Officer at this meeting, and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009, when the

public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1561 Indus Street was established on or after December 2006, during the time when the location was part of Orange County unincorporated territory and subject to the Orange County Codified Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1561 Indus Street was established by Yellowstone in advance of the City's January 1, 2008, annexation of West Santa Ana Heights. Previous to January 1, 2008, the Yellowstone facility was subject to the regulations of the County of Orange, as such regulations apply to County unincorporated lands. The Orange County Codified Ordinances allows certain specified recovery facilities to establish in residential zones, provided that the facilities obtain a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission. More specifically, the use permit requirement applies to "Community Care Facilities" and "Congregate Care Facilities" which house from seven (7) to twelve (12), inclusive, persons requiring care (Section 7-9-141, Section 7-9-141.3[b], and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances); and

WHEREAS, an inquiry made by the City to the County of Orange's Planning Department ("OC Planning") in February 2009 showed that only one use permit was issued by the County of Orange that applies to any of Yellowstone's four operations, and that use permit was a temporary use permit (TPU 050001) authorizing the facility at 1621 Indus Street to hold 40 meetings at 1621 Indus Street within Calendar Year 2005. The County has no record of any of the four Yellowstone facilities (1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street, and 20172 Redlands Drive) having received use permits authorizing their operation as either Community Care Facilities or Congregate Care Facilities from the County of Orange's Planning Commission per the Orange County Codified Ordinances. Although County Planning staff and Code Enforcement staff informed City staff verbally and in writing (Exhibit 1, attached hereto) that sober living houses would be considered a Community Care Facility or a Congregate Care Facility, nothing in the record known to the City shows that the facilities were legally-established uses at any time Yellowstone operated them while the West Santa Ana Heights area was part of the County of Orange's unincorporated territory; and

WHEREAS, any person whose property in a residential district was rendered nonconforming by the passage of Ordinance No. 2008-05 adding Chapter 20.91A may

seek the issuance of conditional use permit to allow the continued use of an existing group residential care facility if the application was timely filed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NBMC Section 20.62.030 (Determination of Nonconformity), a nonconforming use is "Any use found to have been lawfully established and maintained, but which does not conform with the use regulations or required conditions for the district in which it is located by reason of adoption or amendment of this code or by reason of annexation of territory to the City, shall be deemed to be a nonconforming use. A nonconforming use includes a use that was lawfully established and maintained but is conditionally permitted in the district and has not obtained a use permit. *A use shall not be considered to have been "lawfully established and maintained" and is an illegal use if it was established or operated without required permits and licenses, including but not limited to permits and licenses required by any federal, state, or local government agency*" (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1561 Indus Street was not a legally-established use when the use was established within the Orange County unincorporated territory known as West Santa Ana Heights, and is not qualified to seek a use permit to continue the use in its current location; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1. The Hearing Officer hereby denies with prejudice Use Permit No. 2008-034.

Section 2. The action shall become final and effective fourteen (14) days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20, Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 14th day of April, 2009.

By: *Thomas W. Allen*
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST

Valerie L. Brown
CITY CLERK



Hearing Officer Resolution
1561 Indus Street
Use Permit No. 2008-034

EXHIBIT 1

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 3:19 PM
To: Kiff, Dave
Subject: RE: Not an MB Issue

Dave ~

The only property from your list with any kind of Use Permit is 1621 Indus with a 2005 Temporary Use Permit to hold meetings (attached).

Also, the OC Zoning Code definitions of the possible facilities are below.

See ya,

Mike

Congregate Care Facility: A facility, including a Congregate Living Health Facility as defined in State law, providing care on a monthly basis or longer and which is the primary residence of the people it serves. It provides services to the residents such as the following: dining, housekeeping, security, medical, transportation and recreation. Any commercial services provided are for the exclusive use of the occupants of the facility. Such a facility may be located in more than one (1) building and on contiguous parcels within the building site. It includes facilities offering occupancy on a monthly basis and longer such as hotels, resorts, etc., which have characteristics similar to the above.

Community Care Facility: Any facility which may or may not require a State license to provide nonmedical residential care or day care for children, adults or both, including physically handicapped and mentally incompetent persons. This includes child day care facilities/day care nurseries and family day care homes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 1:27 PM
To: Wellborn, Michael
Subject: RE: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Mike ---

Many thanks for that input. Can I ask for one more favor, just to confirm the below question:

- 1561 Indus Street houses 12 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2007
- 1621 Indus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2003
- 1571 Pegasus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005
- 20172 Redlands Drive houses 18 men, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005

1 -- Do your records show any Use Permits issued for these locations?

2 -- Can you refer me to the OCCO section that defines a Congregate or a Community Care Facility?

Dave

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 12:28 PM

To: Kiff, Dave

Subject: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Dave ~

In response to your inquiry to Tim and Nick, I have spliced on the relevant OC Zoning Code sections for Community Care and Congregate Care facilities (7-9-141 and 7-9-142).

Both allow up to six residents in a group home without any permit.

Both require a Use Permit from the Planning Commission for seven to twelve residents.

Mike

Sec. 7-9-141. Community care facilities.

Community care facilities serving six (6) or less persons and large family day care homes shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

Community care facilities serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons, except for large family day care homes, shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3470, § 4, 6-20-84; Ord. No. 3560, § 15, 12-17-85; Ord. No. 3655, § 5, 8-25-87; Ord. No. 3816, § 29, 3-12-91; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93)

Sec. 7-9-141.1. Reserved.

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.1 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to larger congregate care facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3655, § 6, Aug. 25, 1987. See now § 7-9-142.

Sec. 7-9-141.2. Child day care facilities/day care nurseries.

Child day care facilities/day care nurseries serving more than fourteen (14) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community or specific plan area (except in designated airport accident potential zones) where this use is not otherwise identified as a permitted use, subject to the approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3754, § 82, 5-16-89; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93; Ord. No. 3981, § 21, 4-22-97)

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.3 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to single room occupancy facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3834, § 2, adopted Aug. 20, 1991. See now § 7-9-138.

Sec. 7-9-141.3. Congregate care facilities.

(a) A congregate care facility serving six (6) or fewer persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

(b) A congregate care facility serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

A congregate care facility shall;

- (1) Demonstrate compatibility with adjacent development;
- (2) Provide adequate on site parking for residents and staff;
- (3) Provide adequate screening of the facility by landscaping and/or fencing; and
- (4) Limit signage and lighting.

(c) A congregate care facility serving more than twelve (12) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for either multifamily residential or hotels subject to the approval of a use permit by the planning commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

(d) Equivalent dwelling unit counts for congregate care facilities shall be determined by the following table. The consequent unit counts are to be subtracted from the total number of allowed dwelling units for a planned community or specific plan area, and will also determine consistency with area per dwelling unit zoning limitations.

TABLE INSET:

Configuration	Dwelling Unit Counts
2 or more bedrooms in the unit	1 dwelling
1 bedroom in the unit	.5 dwelling
0 bedroom in the unit	.25 dwelling
Medical care rooms	0 dwelling

Density bonuses may be granted to congregate care facilities in residentially-zoned areas in the same manner that they may be granted to standard residential projects per the housing element. (Ord. No. 08-015, § 2, 11-18-08)

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 2:18 PM

To: Chrisos, Nick [COCO]; Neely, Tim

Subject: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Tim and Nick –

Maybe a quick question for you. About six group homes in West Santa Ana Heights were added to the City after annexation in Jan 2008. The operators are saying that the County never required any kind of permit for these homes, despite the fact that at least four of them house 18 people each.

Is there anything in your codes for unincorporated areas that requires a Use Permit or other discretionary land use action for large group homes?

Dave Kiff
Assistant City Manager
949-644-3002

**1621 INDUS: USE PERMIT DENIAL RESOLUTION
DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION No. HO-2009-004

**A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY
OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING WITH PREJUDICE USE
PERMIT NO. 2008-035 TO ALLOW AN EXISTING GROUP
RESIDENTIAL USE TO CONTINUE AT 1621 INDUS
STREET, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA (PA2008-106)**

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.91A to the NBMC. Chapter 20.91A sets forth a process by which existing nonconforming uses in residential areas, including existing group residential care facilities (except for state-licensed drug or alcohol treatment homes serving six or fewer clients), must apply for use permits to remain in operation at their current location beyond February 2009; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., submitted Group Residential Use Permit applications for four sober living facilities located at 1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street and 20172 Redlands Drive, all located in the City of Newport Beach, California; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., located at 1621 Indus Street ("Use Location") in Newport Beach, California, is an existing group residential care facility operating an unlicensed "sober living" facility for 18 women in an existing single-family dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc. ("Use") pursuant to Ordinance No. 2008-05 within the applicable time period with respect to property located at 1621 Indus Street, and legally described as Lot 18, Tract 4307 in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-361-04), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of Orange County, requesting approval of Use Permit No. 2008-035 to allow a residential care facility to continue its operations as an 18 bed adult sober living facility for females only; and

WHEREAS, on February 20, 2009, a Hearing Officer held a noticed hearing in the City Hall Council Chambers, at 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California at which time the project application was considered. Notice of time, place and purpose of the public hearing was given in accordance with the Newport Beach Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented to, and considered by, the Hearing Officer at this meeting, and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009, when the

public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1621 Indus Street was established on or after August 2003, during the time when the location was part of Orange County unincorporated territory and subject to the Orange County Codified Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1621 Indus Street was established by Yellowstone in advance of the City's January 1, 2008, annexation of West Santa Ana Heights. Previous to January 1, 2008, the Yellowstone facility was subject to the regulations of the County of Orange, as such regulations apply to County unincorporated lands. The Orange County Codified Ordinances allows certain specified recovery facilities to establish in residential zones, provided that the facilities obtain a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission. More specifically, the use permit requirement applies to "Community Care Facilities" and "Congregate Care Facilities" which house from seven (7) to twelve (12), inclusive, persons requiring care (Section 7-9-141, Section 7-9-141.3[b], and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances). Congregate Care Facilities which house 13 or more persons are permitted with a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for multifamily residential dwellings or hotels (Section 7-9-141.3[c] and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances); and

WHEREAS, an inquiry made by the City to the County of Orange's Planning Department ("OC Planning") in February 2009 showed that only one use permit was issued by the County of Orange that applies to any of Yellowstone's four operations, and that use permit was a temporary use permit (TPU 050001) authorizing the facility at 1621 Indus Street to hold 40 meetings at 1621 Indus Street within Calendar Year 2005. The County has no record of any of the four Yellowstone facilities (1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street, and 20172 Redlands Drive) having received use permits authorizing their operation as either Community Care Facilities or Congregate Care Facilities from the County of Orange's Planning Commission per the Orange County Codified Ordinances. Although County Planning staff and Code Enforcement staff informed City staff verbally and in writing (Exhibit 1, attached hereto) that sober living houses would be considered a Community Care Facility or a Congregate Care Facility, nothing in the record known to the City shows that the facilities were legally-established uses at any time Yellowstone operated them while the West Santa Ana Heights area was part of the County of Orange's unincorporated territory; and

WHEREAS, any person whose property in a residential district was rendered nonconforming by the passage of Ordinance No. 2008-05 adding Chapter 20.91A may seek the issuance of conditional use permit to allow the continued use of an existing group residential care facility if the application was timely filed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NBMC Section 20.62.030 (Determination of Nonconformity), a nonconforming use is "Any use found to have been lawfully established and maintained, but which does not conform with the use regulations or required conditions for the district in which it is located by reason of adoption or amendment of this code or by reason of annexation of territory to the City, shall be deemed to be a nonconforming use. A nonconforming use includes a use that was lawfully established and maintained but is conditionally permitted in the district and has not obtained a use permit. *A use shall not be considered to have been "lawfully established and maintained" and is an illegal use if it was established or operated without required permits and licenses, including but not limited to permits and licenses required by any federal, state, or local government agency*" (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1621 Indus Street was not a lawfully established and maintained use when it was established within the Orange County unincorporated territory known as West Santa Ana Heights, and is therefore not qualified to seek a use permit to continue the use in its current location; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:


Section 1. The Hearing Officer hereby denies with prejudice Use Permit No. 2008-035.

Section 2. The action shall become final and effective fourteen (14) days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20, Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 14th day of April, 2009.

By: 
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST


CITY CLERK



Hearing Officer Resolution
1621 Indus Street
Use Permit No. 2008-035

EXHIBIT 1

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 3:19 PM
To: Kiff, Dave
Subject: RE: Not an MB Issue

Dave ~

The only property from your list with any kind of Use Permit is 1621 Indus with a 2005 Temporary Use Permit to hold meetings (attached).

Also, the OC Zoning Code definitions of the possible facilities are below.

See ya,

Mike

Congregate Care Facility: A facility, including a Congregate Living Health Facility as defined in State law, providing care on a monthly basis or longer and which is the primary residence of the people it serves. It provides services to the residents such as the following: dining, housekeeping, security, medical, transportation and recreation. Any commercial services provided are for the exclusive use of the occupants of the facility. Such a facility may be located in more than one (1) building and on contiguous parcels within the building site. It includes facilities offering occupancy on a monthly basis and longer such as hotels, resorts, etc., which have characteristics similar to the above.

Community Care Facility: Any facility which may or may not require a State license to provide nonmedical residential care or day care for children, adults or both, including physically handicapped and mentally incompetent persons. This includes child day care facilities/day care nurseries and family day care homes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 1:27 PM
To: Wellborn, Michael
Subject: RE: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Mike ---

Many thanks for that input. Can I ask for one more favor, just to confirm the below question:

- 1561 Indus Street houses 12 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2007
- 1621 Indus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2003
- 1571 Pegasus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005
- 20172 Redlands Drive houses 18 men, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005

1 -- Do your records show any Use Permits issued for these locations?

2 -- Can you refer me to the OCCO section that defines a Congregate or a Community Care Facility?

Dave

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 12:28 PM

To: Kiff, Dave

Subject: Not a M B Issue

Hi Dave ~

In response to your inquiry to Tim and Nick, I have spliced on the relevant OC Zoning Code sections for Community Care and Congregate Care facilities (7-9-141 and 7-9-142).

Both allow up to six residents in a group home without any permit.

Both require a Use Permit from the Planning Commission for seven to twelve residents.

Mike

Sec. 7-9-141. Community care facilities.

Community care facilities serving six (6) or less persons and large family day care homes shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

Community care facilities serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons, except for large family day care homes, shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3470, § 4, 6-20-84; Ord. No. 3560, § 15, 12-17-85; Ord. No. 3655, § 5, 8-25-87; Ord. No. 3816, § 29, 3-12-91; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93)

Sec. 7-9-141.1. Reserved.

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.1 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to larger congregate care facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3655, § 6, Aug. 25, 1987. See now § 7-9-142.

Sec. 7-9-141.2. Child day care facilities/day care nurseries.

Child day care facilities/day care nurseries serving more than fourteen (14) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community or specific plan area (except in designated airport accident potential zones) where this use is not otherwise identified as a permitted use, subject to the approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3754, § 82, 5-16-89; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93; Ord. No. 3981, § 21, 4-22-97)

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.3 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to single room occupancy facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3834, § 2, adopted Aug. 20, 1991. See now § 7-9-138.

Sec. 7-9-141.3. Congregate care facilities.

(a) A congregate care facility serving six (6) or fewer persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

(b) A congregate care facility serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

A congregate care facility shall;

- (1) Demonstrate compatibility with adjacent development;
- (2) Provide adequate on site parking for residents and staff;
- (3) Provide adequate screening of the facility by landscaping and/or fencing; and
- (4) Limit signage and lighting.

(c) A congregate care facility serving more than twelve (12) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for either multifamily residential or hotels subject to the approval of a use permit by the planning commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

(d) Equivalent dwelling unit counts for congregate care facilities shall be determined by the following table. The consequent unit counts are to be subtracted from the total number of allowed dwelling units for a planned community or specific plan area, and will also determine consistency with area per dwelling unit zoning limitations.

TABLE INSET:

Configuration	Dwelling Unit Counts
2 or more bedrooms in the unit	1 dwelling
1 bedroom in the unit	.5 dwelling
0 bedroom in the unit	.25 dwelling
Medical care rooms	0 dwelling

Density bonuses may be granted to congregate care facilities in residentially-zoned areas in the same manner that they may be granted to standard residential projects per the housing element. (Ord. No. 08-015, § 2, 11-18-08)

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 2:18 PM

To: Chrisos, Nick [COCO]; Néely, Tim

Subject: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Tim and Nick –

Maybe a quick question for you. About six group homes in West Santa Ana Heights were added to the City after annexation in Jan 2008. The operators are saying that the County never required any kind of permit for these homes, despite the fact that at least four of them house 18 people each.

Is there anything in your codes for unincorporated areas that requires a Use Permit or other discretionary land use action for large group homes?

Dave Kiff
Assistant City Manager
949-644-3002

**1571 PEGASUS: USE PERMIT DENIAL
RESOLUTION DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION No. HO-2009-005

**A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY
OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING WITH PREJUDICE USE
PERMIT NO. 2008-036 TO ALLOW AN EXISTING GROUP
RESIDENTIAL USE TO CONTINUE AT 1571 PEGASUS
STREET, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA (PA2008-107)**

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.91A to the NBMC. Chapter 20.91A sets forth a process by which existing nonconforming uses in residential areas, including existing group residential care facilities (except for state-licensed drug or alcohol treatment homes serving six or fewer clients), must apply for use permits to remain in operation at their current location beyond February 2009; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., submitted Group Residential Use Permit applications for four sober living facilities located at 1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street and 20172 Redlands Drive, all located in the City of Newport Beach, California; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., located at 1571 Pegasus Street ("Use Location") in Newport Beach, California, is an existing group residential care facility operating an unlicensed "sober living" facility for 18 women in an existing single-family dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc. ("Use") pursuant to Ordinance No. 2008-05 within the applicable time period with respect to property located at 1571 Pegasus Street, and legally described as Lot 8, Tract 4307 in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-361-14), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of Orange County, requesting approval of Use Permit No. 2008-036 to allow a residential care facility to continue its operations as an 18 bed adult sober living facility for females only; and

WHEREAS, on February 20, 2009, a Hearing Officer held a noticed hearing in the City Hall Council Chambers, at 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California at which time the project application was considered. Notice of time, place and purpose of the public hearing was given in accordance with the Newport Beach Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented to, and considered by, the Hearing Officer at this meeting, and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009, when the

public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1571 Pegasus Street was established on or after December 2004, during the time when the location was part of Orange County unincorporated territory and subject to the Orange County Codified Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1571 Pegasus Street was established by Yellowstone in advance of the City's January 1, 2008, annexation of West Santa Ana Heights. Previous to January 1, 2008, the Yellowstone facility was subject to the regulations of the County of Orange, as such regulations apply to County unincorporated lands. The Orange County Codified Ordinances allows certain specified recovery facilities to establish in residential zones, provided that the facilities obtain a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission. More specifically, the use permit requirement applies to "Community Care Facilities" and "Congregate Care Facilities" which house from seven (7) to twelve (12), inclusive, persons requiring care (Section 7-9-141, Section 7-9-141.3[b], and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances). Congregate Care Facilities which house 13 or more persons are permitted with a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for multifamily residential dwellings or hotels (Section 7-9-141.3[c] and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances); and

WHEREAS, an inquiry made by the City to the County of Orange's Planning Department ("OC Planning") in February 2009 showed that only one use permit was issued by the County of Orange that applies to any of Yellowstone's four operations, and that use permit was a temporary use permit (TPU 050001) authorizing the facility at 1621 Indus Street to hold 40 meetings at 1621 Indus Street within Calendar Year 2005. The County has no record of any of the four Yellowstone facilities (1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street, and 20172 Redlands Drive) having received use permits authorizing their operation as either Community Care Facilities or Congregate Care Facilities from the County of Orange's Planning Commission per the Orange County Codified Ordinances. Although County Planning staff and Code Enforcement staff informed City staff verbally and in writing (Exhibit 1, attached hereto) that sober living houses would be considered a Community Care Facility or a Congregate Care Facility, nothing in the record known to the City shows that the facilities were legally-established uses at any time Yellowstone operated them while the

West Santa Ana Heights area was part of the County of Orange's unincorporated territory; and

WHEREAS, any person whose property in a residential district was rendered nonconforming by the passage of Ordinance No. 2008-05 adding Chapter 20.91A may seek the issuance of conditional use permit to allow the continued use of an existing group residential care facility if the application was timely filed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NBMC Section 20.62.030 (Determination of Nonconformity), a nonconforming use is "Any use found to have been lawfully established and maintained, but which does not conform with the use regulations or required conditions for the district in which it is located by reason of adoption or amendment of this code or by reason of annexation of territory to the City, shall be deemed to be a nonconforming use. A nonconforming use includes a use that was lawfully established and maintained but is conditionally permitted in the district and has not obtained a use permit. *A use shall not be considered to have been "lawfully established and maintained" and is an illegal use if it was established or operated without required permits and licenses, including but not limited to permits and licenses required by any federal, state, or local government agency*" (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 1571 Pegasus Street was not a lawfully established and maintained use when it was established within the Orange County unincorporated territory known as West Santa Ana Heights, and is therefore not qualified to seek a use permit to continue the use in its current location; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1. The Hearing Officer hereby denies with prejudice Use Permit No. 2008-036.

Section 2. The action shall become final and effective fourteen (14) days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City

Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20, Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 14th day of April, 2009.

By: Thomas W. Allen
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST

Kelani L. Brown
CITY CLERK



Hearing Officer Resolution
1571 Pegasus Street
Use Permit No. 2008-036

EXHIBIT 1

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 3:19 PM
To: Kiff, Dave
Subject: RE: Not an MB Issue

Dave ~

The only property from your list with any kind of Use Permit is 1621 Indus with a 2005 Temporary Use Permit to hold meetings (attached).

Also, the OC Zoning Code definitions of the possible facilities are below.

See ya,

Mike

Congregate Care Facility: A facility, including a Congregate Living Health Facility as defined in State law, providing care on a monthly basis or longer and which is the primary residence of the people it serves. It provides services to the residents such as the following: dining, housekeeping, security, medical, transportation and recreation. Any commercial services provided are for the exclusive use of the occupants of the facility. Such a facility may be located in more than one (1) building and on contiguous parcels within the building site. It includes facilities offering occupancy on a monthly basis and longer such as hotels, resorts, etc., which have characteristics similar to the above.

Community Care Facility: Any facility which may or may not require a State license to provide nonmedical residential care or day care for children, adults or both, including physically handicapped and mentally incompetent persons. This includes child day care facilities/day care nurseries and family day care homes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 1:27 PM
To: Wellborn, Michael
Subject: RE: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Mike ---

Many thanks for that input. Can I ask for one more favor, just to confirm the below question:

- 1561 Indus Street houses 12 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2007
- 1621 Indus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2003
- 1571 Pegasus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005
- 20172 Redlands Drive houses 18 men, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005

1 -- Do your records show any Use Permits issued for these locations?

2 -- Can you refer me to the OCCO section that defines a Congregate or a Community Care Facility?

Dave

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 12:28 PM

To: Kiff, Dave

Subject: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Dave ~

In response to your inquiry to Tim and Nick, I have spliced on the relevant OC Zoning Code sections for Community Care and Congregate Care facilities (7-9-141 and 7-9-142).

Both allow up to six residents in a group home without any permit.

Both require a Use Permit from the Planning Commission for seven to twelve residents.

Mike

Sec. 7-9-141. Community care facilities.

Community care facilities serving six (6) or less persons and large family day care homes shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

Community care facilities serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons, except for large family day care homes, shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3470, § 4, 6-20-84; Ord. No. 3560, § 15, 12-17-85; Ord. No. 3655, § 5, 8-25-87; Ord. No. 3816, § 29, 3-12-91; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93)

Sec. 7-9-141.1. Reserved.

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.1 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to larger congregate care facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3655, § 6, Aug. 25, 1987. See now § 7-9-142.

1620
YS 01620

Sec. 7-9-141.2. Child day care facilities/day care nurseries.

Child day care facilities/day care nurseries serving more than fourteen (14) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community or specific plan area (except in designated airport accident potential zones) where this use is not otherwise identified as a permitted use, subject to the approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3754, § 82, 5-16-89; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93; Ord. No. 3981, § 21, 4-22-97)

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.3 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to single room occupancy facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3834, § 2, adopted Aug. 20, 1991. See now § 7-9-138.

Sec. 7-9-141.3. Congregate care facilities.

(a) A congregate care facility serving six (6) or fewer persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

(b) A congregate care facility serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

A congregate care facility shall;

- (1) Demonstrate compatibility with adjacent development;
- (2) Provide adequate on site parking for residents and staff;
- (3) Provide adequate screening of the facility by landscaping and/or fencing; and
- (4) Limit signage and lighting.

(c) A congregate care facility serving more than twelve (12) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for either multifamily residential or hotels subject to the approval of a use permit by the planning commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

(d) Equivalent dwelling unit counts for congregate care facilities shall be determined by the following table. The consequent unit counts are to be subtracted from the total number of allowed dwelling units for a planned community or specific plan area, and will also determine consistency with area per dwelling unit zoning limitations.

TABLE INSET:

Configuration	Dwelling Unit Counts
2 or more bedrooms in the unit	1 dwelling
1 bedroom in the unit	.5 dwelling
0 bedroom in the unit	.25 dwelling
Medical care rooms	0 dwelling

Density bonuses may be granted to congregate care facilities in residentially-zoned areas in the same manner that they may be granted to standard residential projects per the housing element. (Ord. No. 08-015, § 2, 11-18-08)

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 2:18 PM

To: Chrisos, Nick [COCO]; Neely, Tim

Subject: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

1921
YS 01621

Hi Tim and Nick –

Maybe a quick question for you. About six group homes in West Santa Ana Heights were added to the City after annexation in Jan 2008. The operators are saying that the County never required any kind of permit for these homes, despite the fact that at least four of them house 18 people each.

Is there anything in your codes for unincorporated areas that requires a Use Permit or other discretionary land use action for large group homes?

Dave Kiff
Assistant City Manager
949-644-3002

**20172 REDLANDS: USE PERMIT DENIAL
RESOLUTION DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION No. HO-2009-006

**A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY
OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING WITH PREJUDICE USE
PERMIT NO. 2008-037 TO ALLOW AN EXISTING GROUP
RESIDENTIAL USE TO CONTINUE AT 20172 REDLANDS
DRIVE, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA (PA2008-108)**

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.91A to the NBMC. Chapter 20.91A sets forth a process by which existing nonconforming uses in residential areas, including existing group residential care facilities (except for state-licensed drug or alcohol treatment homes serving six or fewer clients), must apply for use permits to remain in operation at their current location beyond February 2009; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., submitted Group Residential Use Permit applications for four sober living facilities located at 1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street and 20172 Redlands Drive, all located in the City of Newport Beach, California; and

WHEREAS, Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., located at 20172 Redlands Drive ("Use Location") in Newport Beach, California, is an existing group residential care facility operating an unlicensed "sober living" facility for 17 men in an existing single-family dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc. ("Use") pursuant to Ordinance No. 2008-05 within the applicable time period with respect to property located at 20172 Redlands Drive, and legally described as Lot 36, Tract 4307, in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-362-07), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of Orange County, requesting approval of Use Permit No. 2008-037 to allow a residential care facility to continue its operations as a 17 bed adult sober living facility for males only; and

WHEREAS, on February 20, 2009, a Hearing Officer held a noticed hearing in the City Hall Council Chambers, at 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California at which time the project application was considered. Notice of time, place and purpose of the public hearing was given in accordance with the Newport Beach Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented to, and considered by, the Hearing Officer at this meeting, and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009, when the

public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 20172 Redlands Drive was established on or after March 2005, during the time when the location was part of Orange County unincorporated territory and subject to the Orange County Codified Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 20172 Redlands Drive was established by Yellowstone in advance of the City's January 1, 2008, annexation of West Santa Ana Heights. Previous to January 1, 2008, the Yellowstone facility was subject to the regulations of the County of Orange, as such regulations apply to County unincorporated lands. The Orange County Codified Ordinances allows certain specified recovery facilities to establish in residential zones, provided that the facilities obtain a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission. More specifically, the use permit requirement applies to "Community Care Facilities" and "Congregate Care Facilities" which house from seven (7) to twelve (12), inclusive, persons requiring care (Section 7-9-141, Section 7-9-141.3[b], and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances). Congregate Care Facilities which house 13 or more persons are permitted with a use permit issued by the Orange County Planning Commission in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for multifamily residential dwellings or hotels (Section 7-9-141.3[c] and Section 7-9-150 of the Orange County Codified Ordinances); and

WHEREAS, an inquiry made by the City to the County of Orange's Planning Department ("OC Planning") in February 2009 showed that only one use permit was issued by the County of Orange that applies to any of Yellowstone's four operations, and that use permit was a temporary use permit (TPU 050001) authorizing the facility at 1621 Indus Street to hold 40 meetings at 1621 Indus Street within Calendar Year 2005. The County has no record of any of the four Yellowstone facilities (1561 Indus Street, 1621 Indus Street, 1571 Pegasus Street, and 20172 Redlands Drive) having received use permits authorizing their operation as either Community Care Facilities or Congregate Care Facilities from the County of Orange's Planning Commission per the Orange County Codified Ordinances. Although County Planning staff and Code Enforcement staff informed City staff verbally and in writing (Exhibit 1, attached hereto) that sober living houses would be considered a Community Care Facility or a Congregate Care Facility, nothing in the record known to the City shows that the facilities were legally-established uses at any time Yellowstone operated them while the

West Santa Ana Heights area was part of the County of Orange's unincorporated territory; and

WHEREAS, any person whose property in a residential district was rendered nonconforming by the passage of Ordinance No. 2008-05 adding Chapter 20.91A may seek the issuance of conditional use permit to allow the continued use of an existing group residential care facility if the application was timely filed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NBMC Section 20.62.030 (Determination of Nonconformity), a nonconforming use is "Any use found to have been lawfully established and maintained, but which does not conform with the use regulations or required conditions for the district in which it is located by reason of adoption or amendment of this code or by reason of annexation of territory to the City, shall be deemed to be a nonconforming use. A nonconforming use includes a use that was lawfully established and maintained but is conditionally permitted in the district and has not obtained a use permit. *A use shall not be considered to have been "lawfully established and maintained" and is an illegal use if it was established or operated without required permits and licenses, including but not limited to permits and licenses required by any federal, state, or local government agency*" (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, the Yellowstone facility located at 20172 Redlands Drive was not a lawfully established and maintained use when it was established within the Orange County unincorporated territory known as West Santa Ana Heights, and is therefore not qualified to seek a use permit to continue the use in its current location; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1. The Hearing Officer hereby denies with prejudice Use Permit No. 2008-037.

Section 2. The action shall become final and effective fourteen (14) days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City

Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20, Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 14th day of April, 2009.

By: Thomas W. Allen
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST

Melani L. Brown
CITY CLERK



**Hearing Officer Resolution
20172 Redlands Drive
Use Permit No. 2008-037**

EXHIBIT 1

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 3:19 PM
To: Kiff, Dave
Subject: RE: Not an MB Issue

Dave ~

The only property from your list with any kind of Use Permit is 1621 Indus with a 2005 Temporary Use Permit to hold meetings (attached).

Also, the OC Zoning Code definitions of the possible facilities are below.

See ya,

Mike

Congregate Care Facility: A facility, including a Congregate Living Health Facility as defined in State law, providing care on a monthly basis or longer and which is the primary residence of the people it serves. It provides services to the residents such as the following: dining, housekeeping, security, medical, transportation and recreation. Any commercial services provided are for the exclusive use of the occupants of the facility. Such a facility may be located in more than one (1) building and on contiguous parcels within the building site. It includes facilities offering occupancy on a monthly basis and longer such as hotels, resorts, etc., which have characteristics similar to the above.

Community Care Facility: Any facility which may or may not require a State license to provide nonmedical residential care or day care for children, adults or both, including physically handicapped and mentally incompetent persons. This includes child day care facilities/day care nurseries and family day care homes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 1:27 PM
To: Wellborn, Michael
Subject: RE: Not a M [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] Issue

Hi Mike ---

Many thanks for that input. Can I ask for one more favor, just to confirm the below question:

- 1561 Indus Street houses 12 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2007
- 1621 Indus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2003
- 1571 Pegasus Street houses 18 women, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005
- 20172 Redlands Drive houses 18 men, in a congregate/community care environment, and the operator states that they have done so since 2005

1 -- Do your records show any Use Permits issued for these locations?

2 -- Can you refer me to the OCCO section that defines a Congregate or a Community Care Facility?

Dave

From: Wellborn, Michael [mailto:Michael.Wellborn@rdmd.ocgov.com]

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 12:28 PM

To: Kiff, Dave

Subject: Not a M B Issue

Hi Dave ~

In response to your inquiry to Tim and Nick, I have spliced on the relevant OC Zoning Code sections for Community Care and Congregate Care facilities (7-9-141 and 7-9-142).

Both allow up to six residents in a group home without any permit.

Both require a Use Permit from the Planning Commission for seven to twelve residents.

Mike

Sec. 7-9-141. Community care facilities.

Community care facilities serving six (6) or less persons and large family day care homes shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

Community care facilities serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons, except for large family day care homes, shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3470, § 4, 6-20-84; Ord. No. 3560, § 15, 12-17-85; Ord. No. 3655, § 5, 8-25-87; Ord. No. 3816, § 29, 3-12-91; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93)

Sec. 7-9-141.1. Reserved.

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.1 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to larger congregate care facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3655, § 6, Aug. 25, 1987. See now § 7-9-142.

1630
YS 01630

Sec. 7-9-141.2. Child day care facilities/day care nurseries.

Child day care facilities/day care nurseries serving more than fourteen (14) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community or specific plan area (except in designated airport accident potential zones) where this use is not otherwise identified as a permitted use, subject to the approval of a use permit by the Planning Commission per section 7-9-150.

(Ord. No. 3754, § 82, 5-16-89; Ord. No. 3887, § 21, 3-23-93; Ord. No. 3981, § 21, 4-22-97)

Editor's note: Section 7-9-141.3 was repealed by § 21 of Ord. No. 3887, adopted Apr. 6, 1993. The section related to single room occupancy facilities and was derived from Ord. No. 3834, § 2, adopted Aug. 20, 1991. See now § 7-9-138.

Sec. 7-9-141.3. Congregate care facilities.

(a) A congregate care facility serving six (6) or fewer persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses and shall be regarded as a single-family dwelling for purposes of zoning and land use regulations.

(b) A congregate care facility serving seven (7) to twelve (12) persons shall be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for residential or agricultural uses subject to the issuance of a use permit by the Planning Commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

A congregate care facility shall;

- (1) Demonstrate compatibility with adjacent development;
- (2) Provide adequate on site parking for residents and staff;
- (3) Provide adequate screening of the facility by landscaping and/or fencing; and
- (4) Limit signage and lighting.

(c) A congregate care facility serving more than twelve (12) persons may be permitted in any district, planned community, or specific plan area zoned for either multifamily residential or hotels subject to the approval of a use permit by the planning commission pursuant to section 7-9-150.

(d) Equivalent dwelling unit counts for congregate care facilities shall be determined by the following table. The consequent unit counts are to be subtracted from the total number of allowed dwelling units for a planned community or specific plan area, and will also determine consistency with area per dwelling unit zoning limitations.

TABLE INSET:

Configuration	Dwelling Unit Counts
2 or more bedrooms in the unit	1 dwelling
1 bedroom in the unit	.5 dwelling
0 bedroom in the unit	.25 dwelling
Medical care rooms	0 dwelling

Density bonuses may be granted to congregate care facilities in residentially-zoned areas in the same manner that they may be granted to standard residential projects per the housing element. (Ord. No. 08-015, § 2, 11-18-08)

-----Original Message-----

From: Kiff, Dave [mailto:DKiff@city.newport-beach.ca.us]

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 2:18 PM

To: Chrisos, Nick [COCO]; Neely, Tim

Subject: Not a M B Issue

1921
YS 01631

Hi Tim and Nick –

Maybe a quick question for you. About six group homes in West Santa Ana Heights were added to the City after annexation in Jan 2008. The operators are saying that the County never required any kind of permit for these homes, despite the fact that at least four of them house 18 people each.

Is there anything in your codes for unincorporated areas that requires a Use Permit or other discretionary land use action for large group homes?

Dave Kiff
Assistant City Manager
949-644-3002

**1561 INDUS: REASONABLE ACCOMODATION
DENIAL RESOLUTION DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION NO. HO-2009-007

A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION NO. 2009-04 TO ALLOW RESIDENTS OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY LOCATED AT 1561 INDUS STREET, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA, BE TREATED AS A SINGLE HOUSEKEEPING UNIT (PA 2008-105)

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.98 to the NBMC. Chapter 20.98 sets forth a process to provide reasonable accommodations in the City's zoning and land use regulations, policies, and practices when needed to provide an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., with respect to property located at 1561 Indus Street, and legally described as Lot 14, Tract 4307 in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-361-08), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, requesting approval of a Reasonable Accommodation for the residents of the facility to be treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC); and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on February 20, 2009 in the City Hall Council Chambers, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California. A notice of time, place and purpose of the meeting was given in accordance with the Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented and considered at this meeting and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009 for action on the resolutions and where the public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, the both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC, the written decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a request for reasonable accommodation shall be based on the following findings, all of which are required for approval.

1. **Finding: That the requested accommodation is requested by or on the behalf of one or more individuals with a disability protected under the Fair Housing Laws.**

Facts in support of finding: The applicant submitted a written statement stating that every resident of the facility is in recovery from alcohol addiction. Federal regulations and case law have defined recovery from alcoholism and drug addiction as a disability,

because it is a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs one or more major daily life activities.

2. **Finding: That the requested accommodation is necessary to provide one or more individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.**

Facts do not support the finding: The exemption requested by the applicant is unnecessarily broad to achieve the goal of providing disabled housing. The request to be considered a Single Housekeeping Unit is essentially a request to be exempted from *all* of the provisions of Ordinance 2008-05 which place any sort of reasonable regulation on the operations of residential care facilities. This is not necessary, because there are many more narrowly tailored accommodations that could enable facility residents to enjoy the housing of their choice without depriving the surrounding neighborhood of reasonable conditions that mitigate the adverse secondary impacts that emanate from this facility.

The applicant's counsel asserts in a letter dated January 29, 2009, that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary "because the Property is not transient or institutional in nature such that it fits the definition of a non-licensed residential care facility." Even if the facility were not transient or institutional in nature, and did not clearly fit the definition of a sober living home, or unlicensed residential care facility, an exemption from the provisions of Ordinance No. 2008-05 is not necessary to afford its residents the opportunity to live in and enjoy a dwelling.

However, the applicant raised the issue of how the facility should be characterized in its necessity argument, and asserted the facility more closely resembles a Single Housekeeping Unit than any other type of residential use. Staff has analyzed the facility's appropriate use classification based on the applicant's submitted materials.

The nature of applicant's facility operations, as reported in the original application for reasonable accommodation submitted in May 2008, closely resembles a boarding house use. But for the fact residents are recovering alcoholics, the facility would be classified as a prohibited Group Residential use, or a Boarding or Rooming House as that term is defined in NBMC 20.05.030. (Residential Use Classifications) ("A residence or dwelling unit, or part thereof, wherein a room or rooms are rented under two or more separate written or oral rental agreements, leases or subleases or combination thereof . . .")

The applicant's May 2008 application for reasonable accommodation states, "The residents at the property reside separately at the property and interact within the property. There is individual use of common areas. The residents are responsible for their own meals, expenses and chores. Each individual resides at the property subject to a separate contractual arrangement with the applicant."

Dr. Anna Thames, CEO of Yellowstone, has also stated that the facility has no written leases with any of the residents. Rental agreements with residents are verbal. Again, the description of operations is much closer to the NBMC's definition of a boarding house or group residential use than a Single Housekeeping Unit, as the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit requires dwellings rented to bona fide Single Housekeeping Units to be occupied under a single written lease.

The self-reported pattern of facility operations and resident interaction in no way resembles the NBMC definition of a Single Housekeeping Unit. NBMC Section 20.03.030 (Definitions) defines a Single Housekeeping Unit as: "The functional equivalent of a traditional family, whose members are an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit, including the joint use of and responsibility for common areas, and sharing household activities and responsibilities such as meals, chores, household maintenance, and expenses, and where, if the unit is rented, all adult residents have chosen to jointly occupy the entire premises of the dwelling unit, under a single written lease with joint use and responsibility for the premises, and the makeup of the household occupying the unit is determined by the residents of the unit rather than the landlord or property manager."

Applicant's resident clients may be an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit who share common areas, but the applicant's own submittals indicate there is no joint responsibility for meals or expenses, no single written lease (or any written leases at all), and the makeup of the household is determined by the applicant rather than the residents.

NBMC Section 20.98.025(C) allows the City to consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation is necessary to provide the disabled individual an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling:

A. *Whether the requested accommodation will affirmatively enhance the quality of life of one or more individuals with a disability.*

If the requested accommodation is granted, any number of the applicant's current and potential clients will be able to live in a home in a single-family zone with other recovering alcoholics. This is a situation that can affirmatively enhance the quality of life of a person in recovery from addiction, unless overcrowding of the facility or institutionalization of the neighborhood interferes with the residents' re-integration into society. The applicant's sliding scale of rental rates offers a sober living environment to residents who might not otherwise be able to afford to live in a single-family home in this area.

- B. *Whether the individual or individuals with a disability will be denied an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice absent the accommodation.*

The exemption requested by the applicant is broader than necessary to achieve the goal of enabling disabled individuals an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice. There are more narrowly tailored exemptions that could enable disabled individuals to reside at the applicant's facility.

- C. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the requested accommodation is necessary to make facilities of a similar nature or operation economically viable in light of the particularities of the relevant market and market participants.*

The applicant does not state why being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make its facilities viable in light of the current market for the type of services it provides. The applicant states that each facility requires 15 residents in order to be financially viable, and provides a general summary of average income and expenses for all four facilities. The evidence presented does not lead to the conclusion that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make applicant's facilities financially viable.

- D. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature and operation in the community is sufficient to provide individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.*

In 2007, the City estimated that there were more than 315 sober living beds in the city (these are exclusive of the up to 213 ADP-licensed treatment beds). These numbers were compiled before applicant's facilities, with a total of 58 sober living and eight staff beds, were added to the city's supply. Operators of many sober living facilities within the city have reported decreased census and vacant beds, which could provide potential Yellowstone clients with an equal opportunity to live in a sober living environment without granting the accommodation. A recent agreement with Sober Living by the Sea, Inc., authorized SLBTS to provide up to 204 beds citywide. Many of these alternate sober living beds are probably not offered on a sliding fee scale based on ability to pay. The evidence does not support the applicant's contention that treating residents of its facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit will change the availability of the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature, or afford them a substantially greater access to an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the finding of necessity cannot be made in that the request is unnecessarily broad, the unit does not operate as the

functional equivalent of a single family unit, and the unit does not otherwise meet the criteria of a Single Housekeeping unit.

The City is not required to grant a request for accommodation that is not reasonable. Cities may find a requested accommodation unreasonable if it either (1) imposes an undue financial or administrative burden on the city, or (2) results in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a city program, often described as undermining "the basic purpose which the requirement seeks to achieve."

3. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City as "undue financial or administrative burden" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts in support of finding: Treating the facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit would not impose a currently identifiable undue financial or administrative burden on the City. If this reasonable accommodation request were granted for all four Yellowstone facilities, the applicant would be able to house a number of residents far in excess of the 66 individuals currently residing in the four homes. Currently unidentifiable financial or administrative burdens could arise as a result.

4. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program, as "fundamental alteration" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts do not support the finding: The purpose of the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit is to allow the determination of whether groups of related or unrelated individuals are living together in a dwelling as a single housekeeping unit. This definition is necessary because of the persistent attempts by landlords to establish illegal boarding houses in dwellings within the City.

Groups living as a single housekeeping unit can live together in any residential zone in Newport Beach. Groups not living as a single housekeeping unit are prohibited from establishing residences in any of the City's residential zones. There is an important exception to the total prohibition of groups not living as a single housekeeping unit -- groups not living as a single housekeeping unit in residential care facilities of any size.

All residential care facilities in the City have received a reasonable accommodation from the NBMC's restrictions on groups not living as a single housekeeping unit. The NBMC provides many opportunities for new facilities to establish, and has provisions for existing facilities to continue in their current locations with appropriate impact mitigation. Licensed facilities housing six or fewer residential can establish in any residential zone of the City.

The NBMC's Zoning Code also applies regulations to unlicensed and larger (more than seven residents) licensed facilities. These regulations are in place to ensure that the fundamental purposes of the Zoning Code can be achieved, and so the adverse secondary impacts higher density residential care facilities have on the surrounding neighborhood can be mitigated.

Pursuant to Section 20.98.025(D) of the NBMC, the City may also consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation would require a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program:

- A. *Whether the requested accommodation would fundamentally alter the character of the neighborhood.*

There were numerous letters, emails and phone calls from neighbors of the facilities that reported increasing negative secondary impacts on the neighborhood as more of the applicant's facilities established there in recent years. The impacts reported include: family and other visitors to the facilities; litter in the neighborhood which complainants attribute to the applicant's facilities, including cigarette butts, soda cans, and beer cans and bottles; facility residents traveling in groups between one facility and the others; meetings held regularly at one or more of the applicant's facilities, with outside attendees; excessive use of on-street parking by facility residents and their guests.

- B. *Whether the accommodation would result in a substantial increase in traffic or insufficient parking.*

Parking - The enclosed garage spaces and driveway parking spaces allow for the staff vehicles to be accommodated without impacting neighborhood parking.

Traffic and Generated Trips - The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) establishes and publishes standards for trip generation rates based on the use classification of a site. In the case of a single family dwelling, the standard trip rate is based on 9.57 average daily trips per dwelling. Trip rates for residential care facilities are based on 2.74 average daily trips per each occupied bed. Based on these standards, a 12-bed residential care facility is estimated to generate approximately 32.88 average daily trips. Applying this formula, the facility will generate average daily trips substantially in excess of surrounding single family dwellings.

5. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not, under the specific facts of the case, result in a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or substantial physical damage to the property of others.**

Facts in support of finding: A request for reasonable accommodation may be denied if granting it would pose "a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or result in substantial physical damage to the property of others." See 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(9). This is a very limited exception and can only be used when, based on the specific facts of a situation, a requested accommodation results in a significant and particularized threat. Federal cases interpreting this exception in the FHAA indicate that requested accommodations cannot be denied due to generalized fears of the risks posed by disabled persons.

WHEREAS, to approve a request for Reasonable Accommodation all five required findings contained Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC must be made; and

WHEREAS, specifically, findings Nos. 2 and 4 of Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC cannot be made; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:


Section 1. The Hearing Officer of the City of Newport Beach hereby denies with prejudice Reasonable Accommodation No. 2009-04, Request No. 1, that the residents of the facility to be treated as a single housekeeping unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC).

Section 2. This action shall become final and effective fourteen days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20 Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 14th DAY OF APRIL, 2009.

By: 
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST:


City Clerk



**1621 INDUS: REASONABLE ACCOMODATION
DENIAL RESOLUTION DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION NO. HO-2009-008

A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION NO. 2009-05 TO ALLOW RESIDENTS OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY LOCATED AT 1621 INDUS STREET, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA BE TREATED AS A SINGLE HOUSEKEEPING UNIT (PA 2008-106)

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.98 to the NBMC. Chapter 20.98 sets forth a process to provide reasonable accommodations in the City's zoning and land use regulations, policies, and practices when needed to provide an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone First Step House, Inc., with respect to property located at 1621 Indus Street, and legally described as Lot 18, Tract 4307, in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-361-04), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, requesting approval of a Reasonable Accommodation for the residents of the facility to be treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC); and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on February 20, 2009 in the City Hall Council Chambers, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California. A notice of time, place and purpose of the meeting was given in accordance with the Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented and considered at this meeting and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009 for action on the resolutions and where the public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, the both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC, the written decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a request for reasonable accommodation shall be based on the following findings, all of which are required for approval.

- 1. Finding: That the requested accommodation is requested by or on the behalf of one or more individuals with a disability protected under the Fair Housing Laws.**

Facts in support of finding: The applicant submitted a written statement stating that every resident of the facility is in recovery from alcohol addiction. Federal regulations and case law have defined recovery from alcoholism and drug addiction as a disability,

because it is a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs one or more major daily life activities.

2. **Finding: That the requested accommodation is necessary to provide one or more individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.**

Facts do not support finding: The exemption requested by the applicant is unnecessarily broad to achieve the goal of providing disabled housing. The request to be considered a Single Housekeeping Unit is essentially a request to be exempted from *all* of the provisions of Ordinance No. 2008-05 which place any sort of reasonable regulation on the operations of residential care facilities. This is not necessary, because there are many more narrowly tailored accommodations that could enable facility residents to enjoy the housing of their choice without depriving the surrounding neighborhood of reasonable conditions that mitigate any adverse secondary impacts that emanate from this facility.

The applicant's counsel asserts in a letter dated January 29, 2009, that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary "because the Property is not transient or institutional in nature such that it fits the definition of a non-licensed residential care facility." Even if the facility were not transient or institutional in nature, and did not clearly fit the definition of a sober living home, or unlicensed residential care facility, an exemption from the provisions of 2008-05 is not necessary to afford its residents the opportunity to live in and enjoy a dwelling.

However, the applicant raised the issue of how the facility should be characterized in its necessity argument, and asserted the facility more closely resembles a Single Housekeeping Unit than any other type of residential use. Staff analyzed the facility's appropriate use classification based on the applicant's submitted materials.

The nature of the facility operations, as reported in the original application for reasonable accommodation submitted in May 2008, closely resembles a boarding house use. But for the fact residents are recovering alcoholics, the facility would be classified as a prohibited Group Residential use, or a Boarding or Rooming House as that term is defined in NBMC 20.05.030. (Residential Use Classifications) ("A residence or dwelling unit, or part thereof, wherein a room or rooms are rented under two or more separate written or oral rental agreements, leases or subleases or combination thereof . . .")

The applicant's May 2008 application for reasonable accommodation states, "The residents at the property reside separately at the property and interact within the property. There is individual use of common areas. The residents are responsible for their own meals, expenses and chores. Each individual resides at the property subject to a separate contractual arrangement with the applicant."

Dr. Anna Thames, CEO of Yellowstone, has also stated that the facility has no written leases with any of the residents. Rental agreements with residents are verbal. Again, the description of operations is much closer to the NBMC's definition of a boarding house or group residential use than a Single Housekeeping Unit, as the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit requires dwellings rented to bona fide Single Housekeeping Units to be occupied under a single written lease.

The self-reported pattern of facility operations and resident interaction in no way resembles the NBMC definition of a Single Housekeeping Unit. NBMC Section 20.03.030 (Definitions) defines a Single Housekeeping Unit as: "The functional equivalent of a traditional family, whose members are an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit, including the joint use of and responsibility for common areas, and sharing household activities and responsibilities such as meals, chores, household maintenance, and expenses, and where, if the unit is rented, all adult residents have chosen to jointly occupy the entire premises of the dwelling unit, under a single written lease with joint use and responsibility for the premises, and the makeup of the household occupying the unit is determined by the residents of the unit rather than the landlord or property manager."

Applicant's resident clients may be an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit who share common areas, but the applicant's own submittals indicate there is no joint responsibility for meals or expenses, no single written lease (or any written leases at all), and the makeup of the household is determined by the applicant rather than the residents.

NBMC Section 20.98.025(C) allows the City to consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation is necessary to provide the disabled individual an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling:

- A. *Whether the requested accommodation will affirmatively enhance the quality of life of one or more individuals with a disability.*

If the requested accommodation is granted, any number of the applicant's current and potential clients will be able to live in a home in a single-family zone with other recovering alcoholics. This is a situation that can affirmatively enhance the quality of life of a person in recovery from addiction, unless overcrowding of the facility or institutionalization of the neighborhood interferes with the residents' re-integration into society. The applicant's sliding scale of rental rates offers a sober living environment to residents who might not otherwise be able to afford to live in a single-family home in this area.

- B. *Whether the individual or individuals with a disability will be denied an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice absent the accommodation.*

The exemption requested by the applicant is broader than necessary to achieve the goal of enabling disabled individuals an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice. There are more narrowly tailored exemptions that could enable disabled individuals to reside at the applicant's facility.

- C. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the requested accommodation is necessary to make facilities of a similar nature or operation economically viable in light of the particularities of the relevant market and market participants.*

The applicant does not state why being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make its facilities viable in light of the current market for the type of services it provides. The applicant states that each facility requires 15 residents in order to be financially viable, and provides a general summary of average income and expenses for all four facilities. The evidence presented does not lead to the conclusion that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make applicant's facilities financially viable.

- D. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature and operation in the community is sufficient to provide individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.*

In 2007, the City estimated that there were more than 315 sober living beds in the city (these are exclusive of the up to 213 ADP-licensed treatment beds). These numbers were compiled before applicant's facilities, with a total of 58 sober living and eight staff beds, were added to the city's supply. Operators of many sober living facilities within the city have reported decreased census and vacant beds, which could provide potential Yellowstone clients with an equal opportunity to live in a sober living environment without granting the accommodation. A recent agreement with Sober Living by the Sea, Inc., authorized SLBTS to provide up to 204 beds citywide. Many of these alternate sober living beds are probably not offered on a sliding fee scale based on ability to pay. The evidence does not support the applicant's contention that treating residents of its facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit will change the availability of the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature, or afford them a substantially greater access to an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the finding of necessity cannot be made in that the request is unnecessarily broad, the unit does not operate as the

functional equivalent of a single family unit, and the unit does not otherwise meet the criteria of a Single Housekeeping unit.

Even when an applicant can demonstrate necessity, the City is not required to grant a request for accommodation that is not reasonable. Cities may find a requested accommodation unreasonable if it either (1) imposes an undue financial or administrative burden on the city, or (2) results in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a city program, often described as undermining "the basic purpose which the requirement seeks to achieve."

3. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City as "undue financial or administrative burden" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts in support of finding: Treating the facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit would not impose a currently identifiable undue financial or administrative burden on the City. If this reasonable accommodation request were granted for all four Yellowstone facilities, the applicant would be able to house a number of residents far in excess of the 66 individuals currently residing in the four homes. Currently unidentifiable financial or administrative burdens could arise as a result.

4. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program, as "fundamental alteration" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts do not support the finding: The purpose of the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit is to allow the determination of whether groups of related or unrelated individuals are living together in a dwelling as a single housekeeping unit. This definition is necessary because of the persistent attempts by landlords to establish illegal boarding houses, and illegal dwelling units in dwellings within the City.

Groups living as a single housekeeping unit can live together in any residential zone in Newport Beach. Groups not living as a single housekeeping unit are prohibited from establishing residences in any of the City's residential zones. There is an important exception to the total prohibition of groups not living as a single housekeeping unit -- groups not living as a single housekeeping unit in residential care facilities of any size.

All residential care facilities in the City have received a reasonable accommodation from the NBMC's restrictions on groups not living as a single housekeeping unit. The NBMC provides many opportunities for new facilities to establish, and has provisions for existing facilities to continue in their current locations with appropriate impact residential zone of the City.

The NBMC's Zoning Code also applies regulations to unlicensed and larger (more than seven residents) licensed facilities. These regulations are in place to ensure that the fundamental purposes of the Zoning Code can be achieved, and so the adverse secondary impacts higher density residential care facilities have on the surrounding neighborhood can be mitigated.

Pursuant to Section 20.98.025(D) of the NBMC, the City may also consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation would require a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program:

- A. *Whether the requested accommodation would fundamentally alter the character of the neighborhood.*

There were numerous letters, emails and phone calls from neighbors of the facilities that reported increasing negative secondary impacts on the neighborhood as more of the applicant's facilities established there in recent years. The impacts reported include: family and other visitors to the facilities; litter in the neighborhood which complainants attribute to the applicant's facilities, including cigarette butts, soda cans, and beer cans and bottles; facility residents traveling in groups between one facility and the others; meetings held regularly at one or more of the applicant's facilities, with outside attendees; excessive use of on-street parking by facility residents and their guests.

- B. *Whether the accommodation would result in a substantial increase in traffic or insufficient parking.*

Parking - The enclosed garage spaces and driveway parking spaces would allow for the staff vehicles to be accommodated without impacting neighborhood parking.

Traffic and Generated Trips - The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) establishes and publishes standards for trip generation rates based on the use classification of a site. In the case of a single family dwelling, the standard trip rate is based on 9.57 average daily trips per dwelling. Trip rates for residential care facilities are based on 2.74 average daily trips per each occupied bed. Based on these standards, a 17-bed residential care facility is estimated to generate approximately 47 average daily trips. Applying this formula, the facility will generate average daily trips substantially in excess of surrounding single family dwellings.

5. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not, under the specific facts of the case, result in a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or substantial physical damage to the property of others.**

Facts in support of finding: A request for reasonable accommodation may be denied if granting it would pose "a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or result in substantial physical damage to the property of others." See 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(9). This is a very limited exception and can only be used when, based on the specific facts of a situation, a requested accommodation results in a significant and particularized threat. Federal cases interpreting this exception in the FHAA indicate that requested accommodations cannot be denied due to generalized fears of the risks posed by disabled persons.

WHEREAS, to approve a request for Reasonable Accommodation all five required findings contained Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC must be made; and

WHEREAS, specifically, findings Nos. 2 and 4 of Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC cannot be made; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1. The Hearing Officer of the City of Newport Beach hereby denies with prejudice Reasonable Accommodation No. 2009-05, Request No.1, that the residents of the facility be treated as a single housekeeping unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC).

Section 2. This action shall become final and effective fourteen days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20 Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 14th DAY OF APRIL, 2009.

By: Thomas W. Allen
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST:

Adani L. Brown
City Clerk



**1571 PEGASUS: REASONABLE ACCOMODATION
DENIAL RESOLUTION DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION NO. HO-2009-009

A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION NO. 2009-06 TO ALLOW RESIDENTS OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY LOCATED AT 1571 PEGASUS STREET, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA, TO BE TREATED AS A SINGLE HOUSEKEEPING UNIT (PA 2008-107)

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.98 to the NBMC. Chapter 20.98 sets forth a process to provide reasonable accommodations in the City's zoning and land use regulations, policies, and practices when needed to provide an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone Women's First Step House, Inc., with respect to property located at 1571 Pegasus Street, and legally described as Lot 8, Tract 4307 in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-361-14), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, requesting approval of a Reasonable Accommodation for the residents of the facility to be treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC); and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on February 20, 2009 in the City Hall Council Chambers, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California. A notice of time, place and purpose of the meeting was given in accordance with the Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented and considered at this meeting and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009 for action on the resolutions and where the public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC, the written decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a request for reasonable accommodation shall be based on the following findings, all of which are required for approval.

1. **Finding: That the requested accommodation is requested by or on the behalf of one or more individuals with a disability protected under the Fair Housing Laws.**

Facts in support of finding: The applicant submitted a written statement that every resident of the facility is in recovery from alcohol addiction. Federal regulations and case law have defined recovery from alcoholism and drug addiction as a disability,

because it is a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs one or more major daily life activities.

2. **Finding: That the requested accommodation is necessary to provide one or more individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.**

Facts do not support the finding: The exemption requested by the applicant is unnecessarily broad to achieve the goal of providing disabled housing. The request to be considered a Single Housekeeping Unit is essentially a request to be exempted from *all* of the provisions of Ordinance No. 2008-05 which place any sort of reasonable regulation on the operations of residential care facilities. This is not necessary, because there are many more narrowly tailored accommodations that could enable facility residents to enjoy the housing of their choice without depriving the surrounding neighborhood of reasonable conditions that mitigate any adverse secondary impacts that emanate from this facility.

The applicant's counsel asserts in a letter dated January 29, 2009 that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary "because the Property is not transient or institutional in nature such that it fits the definition of a non-licensed residential care facility." Even if the facility were not transient or institutional in nature, and did not clearly fit the definition of a sober living home, or unlicensed residential care facility, an exemption from the provisions of Ordinance No. 2008-05 is not necessary to afford its residents the opportunity to live in and enjoy a dwelling.

However, the applicant raised the issue of how the facility should be characterized in its necessity argument, and asserted the facility more closely resembles a Single Housekeeping Unit than any other type of residential use. Staff analyzed the facility's appropriate use classification based on the applicant's submitted materials.

The nature of applicant's facility operations, as reported in the original application for reasonable accommodation submitted in May 2008, closely resembles a boarding house use. But for the fact residents are recovering alcoholics, the facility would be classified as a prohibited Group Residential use, or a Boarding or Rooming House as that term is defined in NBMC 20.05.030. (Residential Use Classifications) ("A residence or dwelling unit, or part thereof, wherein a room or rooms are rented under two or more separate written or oral rental agreements, leases or subleases or combination thereof . . .")

The applicant's May 2008 application for reasonable accommodation states, "The residents at the property reside separately at the property and interact within the property. There is individual use of common areas. The residents are responsible for their own meals, expenses and chores. Each individual resides at the property subject to a separate contractual arrangement with the applicant."

Dr. Anna Thames, CEO of Yellowstone, has also stated that the facility has no written leases with any of the residents. Rental agreements with residents are verbal. Again, the description of operations is much closer to the NBMC's definition of a boarding house or group residential use than a Single Housekeeping Unit, as the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit requires dwellings rented to bona fide Single Housekeeping Units to be occupied under a single written lease.

The self-reported pattern of facility operations and resident interaction in no way resembles the NBMC definition of a Single Housekeeping Unit. NBMC Section 20.03.030 (Definitions) defines a Single Housekeeping Unit as: "The functional equivalent of a traditional family, whose members are an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit, including the joint use of and responsibility for common areas, and sharing household activities and responsibilities such as meals, chores, household maintenance, and expenses, and where, if the unit is rented, all adult residents have chosen to jointly occupy the entire premises of the dwelling unit, under a single written lease with joint use and responsibility for the premises, and the makeup of the household occupying the unit is determined by the residents of the unit rather than the landlord or property manager."

Applicant's resident clients may be an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit who share common areas, but the applicant's own submittals indicate there is no joint responsibility for meals or expenses, no single written lease (or any written leases at all), and the makeup of the household is determined by the applicant rather than the residents.

NBMC Section 20.98.025(C) allows the City to consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation is necessary to provide the disabled individual an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling:

- A. *Whether the requested accommodation will affirmatively enhance the quality of life of one or more individuals with a disability.*

If the requested accommodation is granted, any number of the applicant's current and potential clients will be able to live in a home in a single-family zone with other recovering alcoholics. This is a situation that can affirmatively enhance the quality of life of a person in recovery from addiction, unless overcrowding of the facility or institutionalization of the neighborhood interferes with the residents' re-integration into society. The applicant's sliding scale of rental rates offers a sober living environment to residents who might not otherwise be able to afford to live in a single-family home in this area.

- B. *Whether the individual or individuals with a disability will be denied an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice absent the accommodation.*

The exemption requested by the applicant is broader than necessary to achieve the goal of enabling disabled individuals an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice. There are more narrowly tailored exemptions that could enable disabled individuals to reside at the applicant's facility.

- C. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the requested accommodation is necessary to make facilities of a similar nature or operation economically viable in light of the particularities of the relevant market and market participants.*

The applicant does not state why being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make its facilities viable in light of the current market for the type of services it provides. The applicant states that each facility requires 15 residents in order to be financially viable, and provides a general summary of average income and expenses for all four facilities. The evidence presented does not lead to the conclusion that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make applicant's facilities financially viable.

- D. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature and operation in the community is sufficient to provide individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.*

In 2007, the City estimated that there were more than 315 sober living beds in the city (these are exclusive of the up to 213 ADP-licensed treatment beds). These numbers were compiled before applicant's facilities, with a total of 58 sober living and eight staff beds, were added to the city's supply. Operators of many sober living facilities within the city have reported decreased census and vacant beds, which could provide potential Yellowstone clients with an equal opportunity to live in a sober living environment without granting the accommodation. A recent agreement with Sober Living by the Sea, Inc., authorized SLBTS to provide up to 204 beds citywide. Many of these alternate sober living beds are probably not offered on a sliding fee scale based on ability to pay. However, evidence does not support the applicant's contention that treating residents of its facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit will change the availability of the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature, or afford them a substantially greater access to an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the finding of necessity cannot be made in that the request is unnecessarily broad, the unit does not operate as the

functional equivalent of a single family unit, and the unit does not otherwise meet the criteria of a Single Housekeeping unit.

Even when an applicant can demonstrate necessity, the City is not required to grant a request for accommodation that is not reasonable. Cities may find a requested accommodation unreasonable if it either (1) imposes an undue financial or administrative burden on the city, or (2) results in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a city program, often described as undermining "the basic purpose which the requirement seeks to achieve."

3. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City as "undue financial or administrative burden" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts in support of finding: Treating the facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit would not impose a currently identifiable undue financial or administrative burden on the City. If this reasonable accommodation request were granted for all four Yellowstone facilities, the applicant would be able to house a number of residents far in excess of the 66 individuals currently residing in the four homes. Currently unidentifiable financial or administrative burdens could arise as a result.

4. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program, as "fundamental alteration" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts do not support the finding: The purpose of the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit is to allow the determination of whether groups of related or unrelated individuals are living together in a dwelling as a single housekeeping unit. This definition is necessary because of the persistent attempts by landlords to establish illegal boarding houses, and illegal dwelling units in dwellings within the City.

Groups living as a single housekeeping unit can live together in any residential zone in Newport Beach. Groups not living as a single housekeeping unit are prohibited from establishing residences in any of the City's residential zones. There is an important exception to the total prohibition of groups not living as a single housekeeping unit – groups not living as a single housekeeping unit in residential care facilities of any size.

All residential care facilities in the City have received a reasonable accommodation from the NBMC's restrictions on groups not living as a single housekeeping unit. The NBMC provides many opportunities for new facilities to establish, and has provisions for existing facilities to continue in their current locations with appropriate impact residential zone of the City.

The NBMC's Zoning Code also applies regulations to unlicensed and larger (more than seven residents) licensed facilities. These regulations are in place to ensure that the fundamental purposes of the Zoning Code can be achieved, and so the adverse secondary impacts higher density residential care facilities have on the surrounding neighborhood can be mitigated.

Pursuant to Section 20.98.025(D) of the NBMC, the City may also consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation would require a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program:

A. *Whether the requested accommodation would fundamentally alter the character of the neighborhood.*

There were numerous letters, emails and phone calls from neighbors of the facilities that reported increasing negative secondary impacts on the neighborhood as more of the applicant's facilities established there in recent years. The impacts reported include: family and other visitors to the facilities; litter in the neighborhood which complainants attribute to the applicant's facilities, including cigarette butts, soda cans, and beer cans and bottles; facility residents traveling in groups between one facility and the others; meetings held regularly at one or more of the applicant's facilities, with outside attendees; excessive use of on-street parking by facility residents and their guests.

B. *Whether the accommodation would result in a substantial increase in traffic or insufficient parking.*

Parking - The enclosed garage spaces and driveway parking spaces would allow for the staff vehicles to be accommodated without impacting neighborhood parking.

Traffic and Generated Trips - The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) establishes and publishes standards for trip generation rates based on the use classification of a site. In the case of a single family dwelling, the standard trip rate is based on 9.57 average daily trips per dwelling. Trip rates for residential care facilities are based on 2.74 average daily trips per each occupied bed. Based on these standards, an 18-bed residential care facility is estimated to generate approximately 49.32 average daily trips. Applying this formula, the facility will generate average daily trips substantially in excess of surrounding single family dwellings. If the facility's bed count is reduced to the 13 beds permitted under the use permit operating standards of NBMC Chapter 20.91A.050, the facility could generate approximately 35.62 average daily trips.

5. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not, under the specific facts of the case, result in a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or substantial physical damage to the property of others.**

Facts in support of finding: A request for reasonable accommodation may be denied if granting it would pose "a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or result in substantial physical damage to the property of others." See 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(9). This is a very limited exception and can only be used when, based on the specific facts of a situation, a requested accommodation results in a significant and particularized threat. Federal cases interpreting this exception in the FHAA indicate that requested accommodations cannot be denied due to generalized fears of the risks posed by disabled persons.

WHEREAS, to approve a request for Reasonable Accommodation all five required findings contained Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC must be made; and

WHEREAS, specifically, findings Nos. 2 and 4 of Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC cannot be made; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

Section 1. The Hearing Officer of the City of Newport Beach hereby denies with prejudice Reasonable Accommodation No. 2009-06, Request No. 1, that the residents of the facility be treated as a single housekeeping unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC).

Section 2. This action shall become final and effective fourteen days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20 Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 14th DAY OF APRIL 2009

By: Thomas W. Allen
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST:

Ailani L. Brown
City Clerk



**20172 REDLANDS: REASONABLE
ACCOMODATION DENIAL RESOLUTION
DATED MARCH 14, 2009**

RESOLUTION NO. HO-2009-010

A RESOLUTION OF A HEARING OFFICER OF THE CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH DENYING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION NO. 2009-07 TO ALLOW RESIDENTS OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY LOCATED AT 20172 REDLANDS DRIVE, NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA, TO BE TREATED AS A SINGLE HOUSEKEEPING UNIT (PA 2008-108)

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 was adopted by the Newport Beach City Council on January 22, 2008, following noticed public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of Ordinance No. 2008-05 amended the City of Newport Beach's Municipal Code (NBMC) relating to Group Residential Uses; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 2008-05 added Chapter 20.98 to the NBMC. Chapter 20.98 sets forth a process to provide reasonable accommodations in the City's zoning and land use regulations, policies, and practices when needed to provide an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling; and

WHEREAS, an application was filed by Yellowstone First Step House, Inc., with respect to property located at 20172 Redlands Drive, and legally described as Lot 36, Tract 4307, in the City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, State of California (APN 119-362-07), as per map recorded in Book 153, Pages 18-20 of Miscellaneous Maps, requesting approval of a Reasonable Accommodation for the residents of the facility to be treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC); and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on February 20, 2009 in the City Hall Council Chambers, 3300 Newport Boulevard, Newport Beach, California. A notice of time, place and purpose of the meeting was given in accordance with the Municipal Code. Evidence, both written and oral, was presented and considered at this meeting and the hearing was continued to March 12, 2009 for action on the resolutions and where the public hearing was reopened to receive additional evidence, both written and oral from the applicant, staff and the public; and

WHEREAS, the both hearings were presided over by Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer for the City of Newport Beach; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC, the written decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a request for reasonable accommodation shall be based on the following findings, all of which are required for approval.

- 1. Finding: That the requested accommodation is requested by or on the behalf of one or more individuals with a disability protected under the Fair Housing Laws.**

Facts in support of finding: The applicant submitted a written statement stating that every resident of the facility is in recovery from alcohol addiction. Federal regulations and case law have defined recovery from alcoholism and drug addiction as a disability,

because it is a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs one or more major daily life activities.

2. **Finding: That the requested accommodation is necessary to provide one or more individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.**

Facts do not support the finding: The exemption requested by the applicant is unnecessarily broad to achieve the goal of providing disabled housing. The request to be considered a Single Housekeeping Unit is essentially a request to be exempted from *all* of the provisions of Ordinance No. 2008-05 which place any sort of reasonable regulation on the operations of residential care facilities. This is not necessary, because there are many more narrowly tailored accommodations that could enable facility residents to enjoy the housing of their choice without depriving the surrounding neighborhood of reasonable conditions that mitigate any adverse secondary impacts that emanate from this facility.

The applicant's counsel asserts in a letter dated January 29, 2009 that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary "because the Property is not transient or institutional in nature such that it fits the definition of a non-licensed residential care facility." Even if the facility were not transient or institutional in nature, and did not clearly fit the definition of a sober living home, or unlicensed residential care facility, an exemption from the provisions of 2008-05 is not necessary to afford its residents the opportunity to live in and enjoy a dwelling.

However, the applicant raised the issue of how the facility should be characterized in its necessity argument, and asserted the facility more closely resembles a Single Housekeeping Unit than any other type of residential use. Staff analyzed the facility's appropriate use classification based on the applicant's submitted materials.

The nature of the facility operations, as reported in the original application for reasonable accommodation submitted in May 2008, closely resembles a boarding house use. But for the fact residents are recovering alcoholics, the facility would be classified as a prohibited Group Residential use, or a Boarding or Rooming House as that term is defined in NBMC 20.05.030. (Residential Use Classifications) ("A residence or dwelling unit, or part thereof, wherein a room or rooms are rented under two or more separate written or oral rental agreements, leases or subleases or combination thereof . . .")

The applicant's May 2008 application for reasonable accommodation states, "The residents at the property reside separately at the property and interact within the property. There is individual use of common areas. The residents are responsible for their own meals, expenses and chores. Each individual resides at the property subject to a separate contractual arrangement with the applicant."

Dr. Anna Thames, CEO of Yellowstone, has also stated that the facility has no written leases with any of the residents. Rental agreements with residents are verbal. Again, the description of operations is much closer to the NBMC's definition of a boarding house or group residential use than a Single Housekeeping Unit, as the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit requires dwellings rented to bona fide Single Housekeeping Units to be occupied under a single written lease.

The self-reported pattern of facility operations and resident interaction in no way resembles the NBMC definition of a Single Housekeeping Unit. NBMC Section 20.03.030 (Definitions) defines a Single Housekeeping Unit as: "The functional equivalent of a traditional family, whose members are an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit, including the joint use of and responsibility for common areas, and sharing household activities and responsibilities such as meals, chores, household maintenance, and expenses, and where, if the unit is rented, all adult residents have chosen to jointly occupy the entire premises of the dwelling unit, under a single written lease with joint use and responsibility for the premises, and the makeup of the household occupying the unit is determined by the residents of the unit rather than the landlord or property manager."

Applicant's resident clients may be an interactive group of persons jointly occupying a single dwelling unit who share common areas, but the applicant's own submittals indicate there is no joint responsibility for meals or expenses, no single written lease (or any written leases at all), and the makeup of the household is determined by the applicant rather than the residents.

NBMC Section 20.98.025(C) allows the City to consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation is necessary to provide the disabled individual an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling:

- A. *Whether the requested accommodation will affirmatively enhance the quality of life of one or more individuals with a disability.*

If the requested accommodation is granted, any number of the applicant's current and potential clients will be able to live in a home in a single-family zone with other recovering alcoholics. This is a situation that can affirmatively enhance the quality of life of a person in recovery from addiction, unless overcrowding of the facility or institutionalization of the neighborhood interferes with the residents' re-integration into society. The applicant's sliding scale of rental rates offers a sober living environment to residents who might not otherwise be able to afford to live in a single-family home in this area.

- B. *Whether the individual or individuals with a disability will be denied an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice absent the accommodation.*

The exemption requested by the applicant is broader than necessary to achieve the goal of enabling disabled individuals an equal opportunity to enjoy the housing type of their choice. There are more narrowly tailored exemptions that could enable disabled individuals to reside at the applicant's facility.

- C. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the requested accommodation is necessary to make facilities of a similar nature or operation economically viable in light of the particularities of the relevant market and market participants.*

The applicant does not state why being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make its facilities viable in light of the current market for the type of services it provides. The applicant states that each facility requires 15 residents in order to be financially viable, and provides a general summary of average income and expenses for all four facilities. The evidence presented does not lead to the conclusion that being treated as a Single Housekeeping Unit is necessary to make applicant's facilities financially viable.

- D. *In the case of a residential care facility, whether the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature and operation in the community is sufficient to provide individuals with a disability an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.*

In 2007, the City estimated that there were more than 315 sober living beds in the city (these are exclusive of the up to 213 ADP-licensed treatment beds). These numbers were compiled before applicant's facilities, with a total of 58 sober living and eight staff beds, were added to the city's supply. Operators of many sober living facilities within the city have reported decreased census and vacant beds, which could provide potential Yellowstone clients with an equal opportunity to live in a sober living environment without granting the accommodation. A recent agreement with Sober Living by the Sea, Inc., authorized SLBTS to provide up to 204 beds citywide. Many of these alternate sober living beds are probably not offered on a sliding fee scale based on ability to pay. The evidence does not support the applicant's contention that treating residents of its facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit will change the availability of the existing supply of facilities of a similar nature, or afford them a substantially greater access to an equal opportunity to live in a residential setting.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the finding of necessity cannot be made in that the request is unnecessarily broad, the unit does not operate as the

functional equivalent of a single family unit, and the unit does not otherwise meet the criteria of a Single Housekeeping unit.

Even when an applicant can demonstrate necessity, the City is not required to grant a request for accommodation that is not reasonable. Cities may find a requested accommodation unreasonable if it either (1) imposes an undue financial or administrative burden on the city, or (2) results in a fundamental alteration in the nature of a city program, often described as undermining "the basic purpose which the requirement seeks to achieve."

3. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not impose an undue financial or administrative burden on the City as "undue financial or administrative burden" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts in support of finding: Treating the facility as a Single Housekeeping Unit would not impose a currently identifiable undue financial or administrative burden on the City. If this reasonable accommodation request were granted for all four Yellowstone facilities, the applicant would be able to house a number of residents far in excess of the 66 individuals currently residing in the four homes. Currently unidentifiable financial or administrative burdens could arise as a result.

4. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program, as "fundamental alteration" is defined in Fair Housing Laws and interpretive case law.**

Facts do not support the finding: The purpose of the NBMC's definition of Single Housekeeping Unit is to allow the determination of whether groups of related or unrelated individuals are living together in a dwelling as a single housekeeping unit. This definition is necessary because of the persistent attempts by landlords to establish illegal boarding houses, and illegal dwelling units in dwellings within the City.

Groups living as a single housekeeping unit can live together in any residential zone in Newport Beach. Groups not living as a single housekeeping unit are prohibited from establishing residences in any of the City's residential zones. There is an important exception to the total prohibition of groups not living as a single housekeeping unit -- groups not living as a single housekeeping unit in residential care facilities of any size.

All residential care facilities in the City have received a reasonable accommodation from the NBMC's restrictions on groups not living as a single housekeeping unit. The NBMC provides many opportunities for new facilities to establish, and has provisions for existing facilities to continue in their current locations with appropriate impact residential zone of the City.

The NBMC's Zoning Code also applies regulations to unlicensed and larger (more than seven residents) licensed facilities. These regulations are in place to ensure that the fundamental purposes of the Zoning Code can be achieved, and so the adverse secondary impacts higher density residential care facilities have on the surrounding neighborhood can be mitigated.

Pursuant to Section 20.98.025(D) of the NBMC, the City may also consider the following factors in determining whether the requested accommodation would require a fundamental alteration in the nature of the City's zoning program:

A. *Whether the requested accommodation would fundamentally alter the character of the neighborhood.*

There were numerous letters, emails and phone calls from neighbors of the facilities that reported increasing negative secondary impacts on the neighborhood as more of the applicant's facilities established there in recent years. The impacts reported include: family and other visitors to the facilities; litter in the neighborhood which complainants attribute to the applicant's facilities, including cigarette butts, soda cans, and beer cans and bottles; facility residents traveling in groups between one facility and the others; meetings held regularly at one or more of the applicant's facilities, with outside attendees; excessive use of on-street parking by facility residents and their guests.

B. *Whether the accommodation would result in a substantial increase in traffic or insufficient parking.*

Parking - The enclosed garage spaces and driveway parking spaces allow for the staff vehicles to be accommodated without impacting neighborhood parking. However, the weekly meetings and weekend visitors reported by neighbors and former residents of the facilities disproportionately consume available neighborhood parking.

Traffic and Generated Trips - The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) establishes and publishes standards for trip generation rates based on the use classification of a site. In the case of a single family dwelling, the standard trip rate is based on 9.57 average daily trips per dwelling. Trip rates for residential care facilities are based on 2.74 average daily trips per each occupied bed. Based on these standards, a 17-bed residential care facility is estimated to generate approximately 46.58 average daily trips. Applying this formula, the facility will generate average daily trips substantially in excess of surrounding single family dwellings.

5. **Finding: That the requested accommodation will not, under the specific facts of the case, result in a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or substantial physical damage to the property of others.**

Facts in support of finding: A request for reasonable accommodation may be denied if granting it would pose "a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals or result in substantial physical damage to the property of others." See 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(9). This is a very limited exception and can only be used when, based on the specific facts of a situation, a requested accommodation results in a significant and particularized threat. Federal cases interpreting this exception in the FHAA indicate that requested accommodations cannot be denied due to generalized fears of the risks posed by disabled persons.

WHEREAS, to approve a request for Reasonable Accommodation all five required findings contained Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC must be made; and

WHEREAS, specifically, findings Nos. 2 and 4 of Section 20.98.025(B) of the NBMC cannot be made; and

WHEREAS, the project qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 1 (Existing Facilities). This class of projects has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. This activity is also covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment (Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that this activity will have a significant effect on the environment and it is not subject to CEQA; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:


Section 1. The Hearing Officer of the City of Newport Beach hereby denies with prejudice Reasonable Accommodation No. 2009-07, Request No.1, that the residents of the facility be treated as a single housekeeping unit as defined in Section 20.03.030 of the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC).

Section 2. This action shall become final and effective fourteen days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of Title 20 Planning and Zoning, of the Newport Beach Municipal Code.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 14th DAY OF APRIL, 2009.

By: 
Thomas W. Allen, Hearing Officer

ATTEST:


City Clerk



**Additional Documents from
Yellowstone Presented at March 12,
2009 Hearing**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRE SAFETY INSPECTION REQUEST

STC.850 (REV 10-94)

See instructions on reverse.

AGENCY CONTACT'S NAME DORIS GREEN	TELEPHONE NUMBER (916) 322-1265	REQUEST DATE	PROGRAM A/DRF
EVALUATOR'S NAME NOT ASSIGNED YET	REQUESTING AGENCY FACILITY NUMBER NOT ASSIGNED YET	REQUEST CODE 2A	

LICENSING
AGENCY
NAME AND
ADDRESS

Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs
Licensing and Certification Branch
1700 K Street, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814-4037

CODES

1. ORIGINAL A. FIRE CLEARANCE
2. RENEWAL B. LIFE SAFETY
3. CAPACITY CHANGE
4. OWNERSHIP CHANGE
5. ADDRESS CHANGE
6. NAME CHANGE
7. OTHER

AMBULATORY		NONAMBULATORY		BEDRIDDEN		TOTAL CAPACITY
CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	
18	18	0	0	0	0	
FACILITY NAME YELLOWSTONE WOMEN'S FIRST STEP HOUSE						LICENSE CATEGORY ALCOHOL/DRUG FACILITY
STREET ADDRESS (Actual Location) 1571 PEGASUS STREET						NUMBER OF BUILDINGS 1
CITY SANTA ANA HEIGHTS						RESTRAINT NONE
FACILITY CONTACT PERSON'S NAME DR. A. M. THAMES (949) 678-9000 AMANDA KRAMER (949) 678-3214						HOURS 24+
SPECIAL CONDITIONS						

TO BE COMPLETED BY INSPECTING AUTHORITY


FIRE
AUTHORITY
NAME AND
ADDRESS

CLEARANCE/DENIAL CODE **1**

CODES

1. FIRE CLEARANCE GRANTED
2. FIRE CLEARANCE DENIED
 - A. EXITS
 - B. CONSTRUCTION
 - C. FIRE ALARM
 - D. SPRINKLERS
 - E. HOUSEKEEPING
 - F. SPECIAL HAZARD
 - G. OTHER

INSPECTOR'S NAME (Typed or Printed) Randall Cook	TELEPHONE NUMBER (714) 573-2256	CFIRS NUMBER 30065	OCCUPANCY CLASS R.3
INSPECTION DATE 1/14/09	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE Randall Cook		
EXPLAIN DENIAL OR LIST SPECIAL CONDITIONS			



9782

faxed 2-3-09

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRE SAFETY INSPECTION REQUEST

STD. 850 (REV. 10-94)

See instructions on reverse.

AGENCY CONTACT NAME DORIS GREEN	TELEPHONE NUMBER (916) 322-1265	REQUEST DATE	PROGRAM A/DRF
EVALUATOR'S NAME NOT ASSIGNED YET	REQUESTING AGENCY FACILITY NUMBER NOT ASSIGNED YET	REQUEST CODE 2A	

LICENSING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS
Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs
Licensing and Certification Branch
1700 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-4037

- CODES**
- 1. ORIGINAL A. FIRE CLEARANCE
 - 2. RENEWAL B. LIFE SAFETY
 - 3. CAPACITY CHANGE
 - 4. OWNERSHIP CHANGE
 - 5. ADDRESS CHANGE
 - 6. NAME CHANGE
 - 7. OTHER

AMBULATORY		NONAMBULATORY		BEDRIDDEN		TOTAL CAPACITY
CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	
15	15					15
FACILITY NAME YELLOWSTONE WOMEN'S FIRST STEP HOUSE, INC.						LICENSE CATEGORY ALCOHOL/DRUG FACILITY
STREET ADDRESS (Actual location) 20172 REDLANDS						NUMBER OF BUILDINGS
CITY SANTA ANA HEIGHTS						RESTRAINT NONE
FACILITY CONTACT PERSON'S NAME DR. A.M. (HONEY) THAMES/AMANDA KRAMER						HOURS 24H
SPECIAL CONDITIONS						

TO BE COMPLETED BY INSPECTING AUTHORITY

FIRE AUTHORITY NAME AND ADDRESS
*Orange County Fire Authority
1 Fire Authority Rd., Bldg A
Irvine, CA 92602
LH: 3283/Ann 2*

CLEARANCE/DENIAL CODE
1

CODES

- ☒ FIRE CLEARANCE GRANTED
- A. FIRE CLEARANCE DENIED
- A. EXITS
- B. CONSTRUCTION
- C. FIRE ALARM
- D. SPRINKLERS
- E. HOUSEKEEPING
- F. SPECIAL HAZARD
- G. OTHER

INSPECTOR'S NAME (Typed or Printed) Randall Cook	TELEPHONE NUMBER (714) 573-4256	CPRS NUMBER 30065	OCCUPANCY CLASS R3
INSPECTION DATE 12/8/08	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE <i>Randall Cook</i>		
EXPLAIN DENIAL OR LIST SPECIAL CONDITIONS			

FIRE SAFETY INSPECTION REQUEST

S.D. 350 (REV. 10-81)

See instructions on reverse.

AGENCY CONTACT NAME

ORIS GREEN

TELEPHONE NUMBER

(916) 322-1265

REQUEST DATE

PROGRAM

A/DRF

INSPECTOR NAME

NOT ASSIGNED YET

REQUESTING AGENCY FACILITY NUMBER

NOT ASSIGNED YET

REQUEST CODE

1A

LICENSING
AGENCY
NAME AND
ADDRESSDepartment of Drug and Alcohol Programs
Licensing and Certification Branch
1700 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-4037

CODES

1. ORIGINAL A. FIRE CLEARANCE
2. RENEWAL B. LIFE SAFETY
3. CAPACITY CHANGE
4. OWNERSHIP CHANGE
5. ADDRESS CHANGE
6. NAME CHANGE
7. OTHER

AMBULATORY		NONAMBULATORY		BEDRIDDEN		TOTAL CAPACITY
CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	
12	0	0	0	0	0	12
FACILITY NAME						LICENSE CATEGORY
YELLOWSTONE WOMEN'S FIRST STEP HOUSE, INC.						ALCOHOL/DRUG FACILITY
STREET ADDRESS						NUMBER OF BUILDINGS
156 LINDUS						1
CITY						RESTRAINT
SANTA ANA HEIGHTS						NONE
FACILITY CONTACT PERSON NAME						HOURS
AMANDA KRAMER (949) 678-3214, DR. A.M. THAMES (949) 678-9000						24+
SPECIAL CONDITIONS						

TO BE COMPLETED BY INSPECTING AUTHORITY

FIRE
AUTHORITY
NAME AND
ADDRESSOrange County Fire Authority
1 Fire Authority Rd.
Irvine, CA 92602

CLEARANCE/DENIAL CODE

1

CODES

1. FIRE CLEARANCE GRANTED
2. FIRE CLEARANCE DENIED
 - A. EXITS
 - B. CONSTRUCTION
 - C. FIRE ALARM
 - D. SPRINKLERS
 - E. HOUSEKEEPING
 - F. SPECIAL HAZARD
 - G. OTHER

INSPECTOR'S NAME (Typed or Printed)

Randall Cook

TELEPHONE NUMBER

(714) 573-6252

CPIAS NUMBER

30065

OCCUPANCY CLASS

R3

INSPECTION DATE

1/29/89

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

Randall Cook

EXPLAIN DENIAL OR LIST SPECIAL CONDITIONS

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRE SAFETY INSPECTION REQUEST

STD 450 (REV. 10-84)

See instructions on reverse.

AGENCY CONTACT'S NAME

DORIS GREEN

TELEPHONE NUMBER

(916) 322-1265

REQUEST DATE

PROGRAM

A/DRF

EVALUATOR'S NAME

NOT ASSIGNED YET

REQUESTING AGENCY FACILITY NUMBER

NOT ASSIGNED YET

REQUEST CODE

2A

LICENSING
AGENCY
NAME AND
ADDRESSDepartment of Drug and Alcohol Programs
Licensing and Certification Branch
1700 K Street, Third Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814-4037

CODES

1. ORIGINAL A. FIRE CLEARANCE
2. RENEWAL B. LIFE SAFETY
3. CAPACITY CHANGE
4. OWNERSHIP CHANGE
5. ADDRESS CHANGE
6. NAME CHANGE
7. OTHER

AMBULATORY		NONAMBULATORY		BEDRIDDEN		TOTAL CAPACITY
CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	CAPACITY	PREVIOUS CAPACITY	
18	18	0	0	0	0	
FACILITY NAME YELLOWSTONE WOMEN'S FIRST STEP HOUSE						
STREET ADDRESS (City/State/Zip) 1621 INDUS STREET						
CITY SANTA ANA HEIGHTS						
FACILITY CONTACT PERSON'S NAME DR. A. M. THAMES (949) 678-9000 AMANDA KRAMER (949) 678-3214						
SPECIAL CONDITIONS						
LICENSE CATEGORY ALCOHOL/DRUG FACILITY						
NUMBER OF BUILDINGS 1						
RESTRAINT NONE						
HOURS 24+						

TO BE COMPLETED BY INSPECTING AUTHORITY

FIRE
AUTHORITY
NAME AND
ADDRESS

CLEARANCE/DENIAL CODE

CODES

1. FIRE CLEARANCE GRANTED
 2. FIRE CLEARANCE DENIED
- A. EXITS
B. CONSTRUCTION
C. FIRE ALARM
D. SPRINKLERS
E. HOUSEKEEPING
F. SPECIAL HAZARD
G. OTHER

INSPECTOR'S NAME (Type or Print)

TELEPHONE NUMBER

CERIS NUMBER

OCCUPANCY CLASS

INSPECTION DATE

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

EXPLAIN DENIAL OR LIST SPECIAL CONDITIONS

