

## **Municipalities with Encampment Protocols in Canada**

Across North America, several cities utilize encampment protocols to govern where individuals who are unsheltered are permitted to set up their tent or temporary structure.

The following are Cities with encampment protocols, or clearly defined rules and processes around encampments:

- Halifax
- Brantford
- London
- Thunder Bay
- Prince George
- Kingston
- Niagara Region
- Windsor
- Winnipeg
- Vancouver
- Toronto
- St Catherines
- Sudbury
- Edmonton
- Victoria

All encampment protocols identified City parties involved in encampment response, including frontline staff and if applicable, teams responsible for coordination. Additionally, all protocols identified the roles and responsibilities of each team, generally via the aspects of the encampment response procedures they are responsible for.

All encampment protocols reviewed also included reporting mechanisms for the public to report on encampments and individuals who are unsheltered in the community that may require service and/or supports.

Several protocols included service levels for different types of response, including follow-up to a complaint or service request from the public, and enforcement periods. Less commonly, protocols included tiered responses based upon risks of the encampment (i.e., high, medium, low). This would change the parties involved in response and adapt the service levels required for intervention by staff and partners.

Level of detail varied across protocols, with some providing step-by-step procedures and recourse based on high-risk events, while others provided staff with greater flexibility in using their expertise when responding.

### **Analysis of Infrastructure to Support Overnight Accommodations at Sanctioned Encampment Sites**

Across North America, several approaches have been used to provide overnight sleeping accommodations to unsheltered populations. Given the needs of unsheltered individuals in our community and the impacts of extreme weather, colder weather jurisdictions were reviewed to identify the most common approaches to overnight accommodations. The following is a list of indoor, outdoor, and hybrid options that have been used to reduce harms for those living unsheltered.

Infrastructure	Jurisdictions Implementing Approach	Description
<b>Tents or tents on platforms</b>	Halifax, Victoria, Toronto (rapid housing initiative pilot), Portland, Denver, San Jose	<p>Recreational camping tents are most commonly used in sanctioned encampment areas across North America.</p> <p>In planned sanctioned encampments, tents are generally funded by the Service Manager (i.e., municipality or region) responsible for the program. In addition, many sanctioned encampment sites have wooden platforms that the tents are erected on top of, to provide additional protection from the elements and comfort for residents.</p> <p>In Denver, where extreme cold weather is an issue, ice finishing tents were purchased for residents to ensure consistency of service and to provide protection against the extreme cold.</p> <p>In some cases when an unsanctioned encampment becomes sanctioned, the tents initially brought to the site by residents are allowed to remain.</p>
<b>Tiny homes or cabins</b>	Waterloo Region, Kingston, Fredericton, Oakland	<p>Tiny homes or cabins are prefab wooden structures that are installed at the site. Some cabins resemble a studio with a hot plate and mini-fridge, and bed, while tiny homes often have more elaborate setups which may include a bathroom, shower, and personal storage space. Commonly each cabin will be heated and include access to electricity.</p> <p>In all cases, the structure provides a locked, private space with protection against the elements for residents to reside in.</p>
<b>Sprung structure with cots</b>	Toronto, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Fresno, Portland	<p>As part of its respite model, Toronto has purchased sprung structures, which are comparable to a temporary refuge facility, with a dorm-like open layout, and cots as sleeping materials. The site provides protection against extreme heat and cold, as well as facilities to prepare food, a recreation/dining area, staff offices, and outdoor areas. Sites are also</p>

		equipped with private showers, bathrooms, running water and electricity. Sprung structures are used in locations across the United States as emergency shelters.
--	--	--

Sanctioned encampment areas with recreational tents, ice fishing tents, or tents on wooden platforms have minimal upfront capital costs associated, but do not provide the level of mitigation of environmental risks, safety, or privacy as tiny homes, cabins, or sprung structures with cots. As such, this approach is often regarded as a shorter-term solution for individuals who are unsheltered, while working towards the longer-term outcome of housing.

Tiny homes and cabins provide a wider range of benefits to residents in terms of their ability to provide built-in amenities such as a mini-fridge and hot plate, and in some cases washroom, shower, and dedicated storage areas. Each tiny home or cabin also provides a private, locked area that residents can call their own, which gives residents a feeling of autonomy and security. Unfortunately, given the complex co-occurring needs for many who are living unsheltered, this can present challenges. A locked door can be a safety concern for individuals who use substances if significant harm reduction/ overdose prevention measures aren't in place, such as non-intrusive wellness checks from staff and peer-to-peer witnessing/spotting. As a result, tiny homes/cabins are more commonly paired with medium or high barrier models that operate similarly to transitional housing, requiring residents to pay to stay. Notably, Waterloo Region's 1001 Erb St location that welcomed residents in June 2023 operates a lower barrier model with cabins.

Respite sites (sprung structures) operate within indoor facilities that resemble an overnight emergency shelter environment, often implementing a lower barrier operating model. The site provides significant protection against extreme heat and cold, but has significant costs associated with upfront capital expenditure in purchasing or leasing a sprung structure, as well as increased operating costs resulting from its operating model (i.e., in Toronto residents are provided three meals, and light beverages and snacks throughout the day). Another limitation is that cots, much like tents, do not provide an accessible environment for residents, and residents report that the open layout affords very little privacy and limited safety.

#### Analysis of Operational Models Utilized at Sanctioned Sites

The following charts were created utilizing information collected from other jurisdictions across Canada, including Victoria, Toronto, Waterloo Region, Fredericton, Halifax, and Winnipeg, as well as jurisdictions in the United States such as Portland, Chicago, Tacoma, San Jose, Oakland, and Denver, regarding operating models targeted toward people who are unsheltered.

Operating Model	Jurisdictions Implementing Approach	Description of Model
<b>Sanctioned, Self-Governed Low Barrier Model</b>	Halifax, Victoria, San Jose (CA)	Sanctioned Encampment site is sanctioned by the Service Manager (i.e., municipality or region) but managed by a community organizer or coalition of encampment residents who operate and manage the site with little to no government involvement.
<b>Sanctioned, Fully Managed Low Barrier Model</b>	Waterloo Region, Toronto (rapid housing pilot), Toronto (respite shelter), Kingston, Tacoma (WS), Chicago (IL), Oakland (CA)	Sanctioned Encampment site operates like an emergency shelter with 24/7 staff and supports but differs in that it adapts the service to address the needs of individuals with the highest acuity. The site is sanctioned by the Service Manager, but commonly managed by a funded operator, with many onsite and in-reach supports offered by community stakeholders and City staff.
<b>Sanctioned, Fully Managed Medium Barrier Model</b>	Portland (OR), Denver (CO)	Site operates similarly to an emergency shelter with 24/7 staff and supports, utilizing a medium barrier model for individuals with medium-high acuity. The site is sanctioned by the service manager, but commonly managed by a funded operator, with some onsite and in-reach supports offered.
<b>Transitional Model</b>	Fredericton, Winnipeg	Site is sanctioned by the service manager but managed by a funded operator. Commonly, less supports are offered onsite, as the site operates like a transitional housing model, for individuals with medium-low acuity (i.e., some sites have a blend of people who are unsheltered and previously living precariously). Service is often rooted in abstinence-based approaches and work readiness programs.

\* Depends on model of housing utilized (i.e., tent, tent with platform, cabin, tiny home, indoor respite, modular unit)

Self-governed sanctioned encampments provide several benefits for individuals who are living unsheltered, in that it provides the highest level of autonomy, self-determination, and potential for skill development, and addresses a gap for low barrier service in the community. This approach takes advantage of peer coordination and requires less operational funding for staffing than other approaches due to its use of informal and existing supports (i.e., existing community groups and outreach supports).

Fully managed low- and medium-barrier sanctioned encampments provide broadly similar service models. Each model identifies and collaborates with community supports that provide ongoing in-reach services directly to residents. The primary difference in approaches is that commonly a low barrier model provides residents with a greater level

of autonomy, is accessible to couples and people with pets, employs more varied and intensive in-reach services, and has a much greater focus on harm reduction, as is commonly required by people with complex co-occurring needs. Another notable difference is that a low barrier service would address a service gap within the community, while a medium barrier service is most likely to resemble service models already being offered at an overnight emergency shelter.

Implementing a medium- or high-barrier approach may be problematic given the target population of individuals who are living in encampments. In jurisdictions across North America, unsheltered populations living in encampments have consistently expressed apprehension toward accessing emergency shelter, given common barriers (i.e., access for couples and people with pets) and specific needs (i.e., harm reduction-friendly environment, less institutional approach). Re-introducing another medium- or higher-barrier service would increase redundancy in the system and is unlikely to have a significant uptake from individuals with the highest acuity, which may result in an inefficient use of funds.

Despite high upfront capital costs, deeply affordable supportive housing is the most cost-effective, human rights-based solution to addressing the short- and long-term needs of individuals who are living in encampments.

Jurisdictional Scan of Sanctioned Sites and Operating Models

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
<b>Location(s)</b>	Victoria, Halifax, San Jose	Waterloo, Toronto (rapid housing pilot), Toronto (respite), Kingston (Our Livable Solutions), Tacoma, Chicago, Oakland	Portland, Denver	Fredericton, Winnipeg
<b>Operation of Site</b>	Site is sanctioned by the service manager but managed by community organizer or encampment members that operate and manage the operations within the encampment with little to no government involvement.	<p>Site operates like an emergency shelter with 24/7 staff and supports, utilizing a low barrier model for individuals with highest acuity.</p> <p>The site is sanctioned by the service manager, but managed by a funded operator, with many onsite and in-reach supports offered.</p>	<p>Site operates similarly to an emergency shelter with 24/7 staff and supports, utilizing a medium-high barrier model for individuals with medium-high acuity.</p> <p>The site is sanctioned by the service manager, but managed by a funded operator, with some onsite and in-reach supports offered.</p>	Site is sanctioned by the service manager but managed by a funded operator. Commonly, less supports are offered onsite, as the site operates like a transitional housing model, for individuals with medium-low acuity (i.e., some sites have a blend of people who are unsheltered and living precariously).
<b>Sleeping Materials</b>	Includes a wide range of options and possibilities (i.e., tents, tents with platforms, cots, cabins, tiny homes, modular housing), irrespective of the program model selected. Most commonly, the lower barrier sites utilize tents with or without platforms underneath for additional support. Higher-barrier sites and sites that operate similar to a transitional housing environment more commonly utilize tiny homes, cabins, or modular housing.			
<b>Staffing Models (including security)</b>	<p>Halifax has no permanent onsite staff or security. City- or community-led outreach visit the sites intermittently.</p> <p>In Victoria, peers have designated roles within the site.</p> <p>In San Jose, Hope Village was initially unsanctioned and peer-led, before the City leased the land and</p>	<p>Waterloo utilizes four frontline staff on-site on a 24/7 basis. Health supports are a minimum of 15 hours per week.</p> <p>Toronto’s pilot utilized a single staff on-site 9-5, with additional support from community partners. Security was present within the park to dissuade new tents from setting up.</p>	<p>In Portland, the site will be managed on a 24/7 basis, with a 15:1 client to staffing ratio.</p> <p>In Denver, the site will be managed on a 24/7 basis. All staff will be trained in trauma informed care, person centered language, de-escalation, conflict mediation, crisis response, and site operations and logistics.</p>	In Fredericton, the site is staffed by 12 Neighbours non-profit, who are also responsible for constructing the tiny homes. The site has three resident support staff, and an addictions and mental health coordinator onsite.

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
	hired an operator to assist in organizing the site.	Toronto’s respites all have 24/7 security onsite, with varying staffing models depending on capacity and location of site.		
<b>Site Security</b>	<p>Halifax sites do not have fencing, and no distinct entry points.</p> <p>The Victoria site had fencing around the site, as well as 24-hour security. 24-hour security was put in place. Additionally, at night, one of the two points of entry to the site were locked.</p> <p>San Jose’s Hope Village had a fence around the perimeter of the site, but no hired security.</p>	<p>Waterloo has a security booth with one (1) security guard working 24/7 and fencing around the site.</p> <p>Toronto (respites) are located indoors and have a single, staffed entryway with security onsite.</p> <p>Toronto (pilot) is outdoors, with no fences and no distinct entryways or staffed entrances or exits. The park maintained a security presence to prevent new tents from being erected.</p> <p>Tacoma utilizes 24/7 onsite security. Also, fencing is erected around the site, and access to the site is limited to a single, staffed entryway.</p>	<p>In Portland, sites would only have one entrance and exit, and weapons checks would be conducted there. Service providers running the sites would be responsible for security inside and within a 1,000-foot perimeter of the camps. Additionally, each site offers a 24/7 hotline staffed by service provider for complaints or questions about the site or perimeter issues.</p> <p>In Denver, each site has a perimeter fence with a single point of entry that is constantly managed by staff. Only residents of the site will be permitted to enter.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, there is no security onsite.</p>
<b>Maximum Number of Tents and Spacing Requirements within Sanctioned Areas</b>	<p>In Halifax, there is a designated overall space outlined for each site, but no specific space requirements for each tent. Each site permits a maximum of four tents.</p> <p>In Victoria each tent was given a 10 metre-squared living space, and</p>	<p>In Tacoma each tent was provided a 10 square-foot living space.</p>	<p>In Portland, each site will have a maximum of 150 pods and/or tents, for up to 200 people.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, 36 tiny homes were built in the first phase of the project, with another 50 planned for 2023.</p> <p>In Winnipeg, 22 tiny (modular) homes are currently built, with more planned.</p>

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
	<p>clear pathways between tents were required.</p> <p>There was a total of 20 tents in San Jose’s Hope Village.</p>			
<b>Pay to stay at the site</b>	<p>No payment required.</p>	<p>Waterloo’s 1001 Erb Street location receives each individual staying at the sites Ontario Works or Ontario Disability Support Program shelter portion.</p> <p>No payment required.</p>	<p>No payment required.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, the site receives each individual staying at the sites’ Ontario Works shelter portion. This is consistent with transitional models implemented in other jurisdictions.</p>
<b>Intake Policies</b>	<p>In Halifax, there are no intake policies due to the nature of the service being unsupervised.</p> <p>In San Jose and Victoria, the sites were previously unsanctioned, so the individuals at that site moved to the sanctioned encampment area.</p>	<p>Toronto (respite) intakes are completed by a centralized intake process and is open to all individuals experiencing homelessness in Toronto.</p> <p>Toronto (rapid housing pilot) did not include an intake process, as the pilot was developed for a site with existing encampments.</p> <p>Tacoma (WS) all adults experiencing homelessness are welcome to access the site.</p> <p>In Chicago (IL), only individuals in high-risk encampments were</p>	<p>In Portland all residents must be referred by Outreach workers. No walk-ins are permitted.</p> <p>In Denver, resident placement is conducted through street outreach and referrals. Residents are then screened and provided relocation assistance, before signing an intake and use agreement at the site.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, the non-profit agency operating the site work with Fredericton’s Social Development Department to contact people to gauge their interest and fit for staying at the site.</p> <p>In Winnipeg, the modular/tiny homes are being occupied by people who were previously living in encampments.</p>



Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
		offered a placement in their low barrier shelter.		
<b>Intake: Pets Permitted Onsite</b>	All sites permit pets.	In Toronto (pilot), sites have partnered with community agencies (i.e., SPCA, Humane Society) to offer spay/neuter programs, food, grooming, and other care for animals.  All sites permit pets.	In Denver, pets are permitted in each individual shelter.	Yes, pets are permitted in Fredericton.
<b>Intake: Couples Permitted Onsite</b>	Yes, all sites permit couples.	Yes, although in Waterloo each individual was still assigned their own cabin.  All sites permit couples.	In Denver, couples are permitted in each individual shelter.	Yes, couples are permitted in Fredericton.
<b>Discharge Policies</b>	In Halifax, significant health and safety issues, or a violation of another policy (i.e., four tents per site) are required for an individual to be moved from their location.  In San Jose, the lease was not renewed for the site due to	Significant health and safety issues are required for an individual to be moved from their location.	In Portland, there is a clear, legislated process for clearing an encampment, which includes a notice being placed on or nearby the tent once it has been deemed to be abandoned. The notice would include a date in which the notice was issued and the date the notice	Fredericton’s discharge policies were not published or shared.

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
	<p>complications with being too close to an airport. A new site has not since been identified, and all residents were given motel vouchers for thirty days on discharge.</p>		<p>would expire. Upon expiry, all personal property within the individual(s) personal space allotment would be stored, removed, and/or disposed based upon conditions outlined. Additionally in Portland, there will be no strict time limit on duration of stay at the site.</p> <p>In Denver, staff utilize a multi-step, restorative accountability process that is led by staff and promotes the safety and well-being of all residents, staff, volunteers, and neighbors, prior to discharge.</p>	
<p><b>Oversight and Appeal Body</b></p>	<p>In Victoria, due to the self-governing nature of the site, site residents are responsible for governing the site and developing their own roles and responsibilities with some support from community stakeholders and the municipal government.</p> <p>In Halifax, the municipality funded the United Way to bring together a lived experience committee, to ensure the voices and perspectives of persons with lived experience of homelessness are heard in the decision-making process by providing feedback to the</p>	<p>In Toronto (pilot), a robust local taskforce utilized expertise of leaders from health, housing, community agencies, and residents, as well as staff from relevant City divisions to help steer and strategize around best practices implemented at sanctioned encampment areas.</p> <p>Toronto (respite) have developed Toronto Respite Standards to govern the services offered, role of staff, etc.</p>	<p>Generally, there is less resident input in high barrier jurisdictions, and more rigid rules and structures are already in place.</p>	<p>Fredericton has its own board that helps direct the services and supports available at the site.</p>

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
	<p>municipality on its approach and policies related to homelessness.</p>			
<p><b>Harm Reduction Supports and Services</b></p>	<p>In Halifax, in-reach services are provided to individuals who are living in encampments from outreach providers in the community, and sharps containers are provided onsite.</p> <p>In Victoria, people with lived and living experience (peers) of substance use are very often the first, and only responders to overdoses in encampments. As such, peers were resourced and supported to continue to do this life-saving work.</p>	<p>In Waterloo, the service provider for this location operates in a very low barrier and high harm reduction model to address the specific needs of the encampment population. As such, they have a full suite of harm reduction supplies available to residents.</p> <p>In Tacoma, people who use substances will be permitted to stay onsite. Site contracts out to an outreach agency who provide sterile injecting equipment, safer sex supplies, MRSA prevention wound care kits, and Naloxone (opiate overdose reversal drug) to people who use substances.</p> <p>In Toronto (respite), all sites must adhere to Toronto Respite Standards. Use is not tolerated within the site (although some safe consumption areas are being developed). Harm reduction supplies are provided.</p>	<p>In Portland, all drugs and alcohol are banned in common areas. Substance use treatment programs are available onsite.</p> <p>In Denver, drugs and alcohol are not permitted onsite.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, the focus is recovery-oriented, and includes substance use counselling.</p> <p>In Winnipeg, the site practices harm reduction, providing unused pipes and needles.</p>

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
		<p>In Chicago, their low barrier shelter offers a harm reduction approach to people using substances, including counselling and treatment.</p> <p>Additional approaches identified in research include overdose prevention sites or supervised consumption facilities (including for both injection and inhalation of substances) run by workers that include people with lived experience. Additionally, these settings should also have integrated safe supply programs for residents.</p> <p>In Kingston, staff with harm reduction training and other substance use counselling services are offered onsite.</p>		
<b>Integrated Health Supports</b>	<p>Integrated health supports are commonly provided regardless of the service model employed. The lower barrier models often have more robust and intensive services provided, including ongoing case management.</p> <p>In Waterloo, health Partners have committed to 15 hours per week of nursing, social work, and other health support staff. In Victoria, COVID-19 pandemic health outreach teams were developed and deployed to provide health, harm reduction, and mental health supports in the encampments. In Toronto (pilot), intensive clinical health support was provided by Inner City Health Associates, a local agency staffed by doctors, registered nurses, counselors, and other health professionals.</p>			

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
<b>Housing Supports</b>	Halifax uses an integrated team-based approach designed to provide comprehensive community-based support to help people remain stably housed.	<p>In Toronto (pilot), a targeted use of existing housing resources for those staying in the Dufferin Grove encampment was implemented, so that everyone could move to a suitable shelter space, or into housing.</p> <p>In Waterloo, there will be two dedicated housing plan, support staff, FTEs onsite.</p> <p>In Toronto (respite), all locations have staff dedicated to developing individualized housing plans and case management.</p> <p>In Tacoma, housing navigation is a part of the site management team's expertise and focus.</p> <p>In Chicago, intensive housing supports are offered onsite via the City's outreach team, with connections to the City's Coordinated Entry System, which connects people to housing.</p>	In Denver, wellness screenings are conducted daily, creating links to hotels and health care services	In Fredericton, individuals are permitted to stay long-term at the site.

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
<b>Additional Supports</b>	<p>All sites provide some in-reach supports.</p> <p>Lower barrier sites are most likely to provide a wider range of in-reach supports (ID clinics, income tax clinics, legal support), while higher barrier sites often have more abstinence-based and employment-readiness supports.</p> <p>In New Brunswick for example, which operates its site as a transitional housing model, the site includes a social enterprise centre with a café and retail store, and an area onsite where homes are built to train people in carpentry, roofing, insulation, etc.</p>			
<b>Access to Potable Water</b>	<p>All sites provide residents with potable water access onsite.</p>	<p>In Waterloo, potable water is supplied in the main community building with a large holding tank under the building that is refilled weekly.</p> <p>Potable water was available onsite in Tacoma.</p> <p>Potable water is available onsite in Chicago’s low barrier shelter/respice.</p> <p>In Kingston’s cabin solution, no running water is available onsite.</p>	<p>In Portland, access to potable water is available onsite.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, each tiny home has its own sink.</p> <p>In Winnipeg, each unit has a sink.</p>

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
<b>Access to Washrooms</b>	<p>Halifax permits use of its existing washroom facilities at sites with sanctioned encampments or provides portable toilets.</p> <p>In Victoria, washrooms were provided by the municipality. Residents took care of cleaning the washroom.</p> <p>In San Jose, portable washrooms were provided at the site.</p>	<p>Toronto (pilot) utilized two portable toilets, extended hours for City washroom building. Facilities were cleaned twice daily.</p> <p>In Waterloo, there were four onsite shower, and washroom units. One additional fully accessible/barrier free washroom/shower.</p> <p>Washrooms are available onsite in Tacoma and Chicago.</p> <p>In Kingston, there are no washrooms onsite.</p>	<p>In Portland, washrooms are available onsite.</p>	<p>In Fredericton and Winnipeg, each tiny home has its own washroom.</p>
<b>Access to Showers</b>	<p>In Victoria, a mobile shower unit was brought to the site and residents were also able to access showers at two nearby service providers.</p> <p>In San Jose, showering facilities were provided at the site.</p>	<p>In Waterloo, there were four onsite shower, and washroom units. One additional fully accessible/barrier free washroom/shower. The grey/black water from sinks and showers/toilets goes into a holding tank under the community building; this tank is emptied two times per week.</p> <p>Showers are available onsite in Tacoma and Chicago.</p>	<p>In Portland, showers are available onsite.</p>	<p>In Fredericton, each tiny home has its own shower.</p> <p>Winnipeg has accessible showers available onsite.</p>

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
<b>Access to Electricity, Heating, and Cooling</b>	<p>No electricity available onsite in Halifax or San Jose.</p> <p>In Victoria, a warming tent was provided and staffed by a Service Provider for eight hours a day. Additional outlets and electricity use provided by municipality.</p>	<p>No electricity access in Tacoma, currently exploring options.</p> <p>No electricity available at Toronto (pilot).</p> <p>In Waterloo, each cabin/unit has electricity (and own breaker panel), A/C, baseboard heater.</p>	<p>In Portland, tents have access to electricity within a common area, as well as Wi-Fi.</p> <p>In Denver, the site has a temporary electric panel with its own meter.</p>	<p>Yes, each unit in Winnipeg and Fredericton has access to electricity.</p>
<b>Common Spaces and/or Private Areas</b>	<p>In Victoria, a warming tent was provided and staffed by a Service Provider for eight hours a day.</p> <p>No provided common space in Halifax sanctioned encampment areas.</p>	<p>In Toronto (respites), common areas were limited depending on the layout of the site. Sprung structures in particular have very few private areas.</p> <p>In Toronto (pilot), an onsite Information &amp; Help Centre was established to assist with streamlining connections to services, which was staffed by a Project Coordinator onsite five days a week, seven hours a day.</p> <p>In Chicago’s low barrier/shelter model, encampment residents have access to common spaces and private areas inside the shelter.</p>	<p>In Portland, common space will be offered at each ‘temporary alternative shelter site.’</p>	<p>In both sites, there are common spaces within the site to be accessed by all residents.</p>
<b>Food</b>	<p>In Halifax, no meals are provided.</p> <p>In Victoria, meals were delivered twice daily to the site and</p>	<p>Toronto (respites) provides three catered meals every day, along with snacks and water throughout the day.</p>	<p>In Portland, food is provided to residents onsite twice a day, plus snacks.</p>	<p>A community kitchen and equipment are provided to give residents the ability to cook meals onsite.</p>



Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
	<p>encampment residents were provided an honorarium to deliver meals tent to tent.</p> <p>In San Jose, meals were donated by local churches and schools.</p>	<p>Toronto (pilot) provided meals via a community partner to residents on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>In Tacoma, meals are available onsite at the community kitchen.</p> <p>In Chicago, three meals are provided every day.</p>	<p>In Denver, food is provided through partnerships with faith community and existing food service providers</p>	<p>Most cabins, tiny homes, or modular spaces are equipped with a mini fridge, sink and hot plate.</p>
<b>Garbage Pickup</b>	<p>All sites have ongoing garbage pickup schedules that utilize municipal resources.</p> <p>Peer cleanup crews were utilized in Victoria, as well as a Cleanup Crew Team and Parks Ambassadors in Toronto (pilot) doing wellness checks and park maintenance.</p> <p>In Portland, trash cleanup in the 1,000 ft. perimeter (at least weekly; hazardous material removed immediately).</p>			
<b>Storage of Personal Items</b>	<p>At all sites, personal items were to be kept inside of tent or defined area for personal space.</p>	<p>In Waterloo, individuals have access to their own cabin and can keep their personal belongings inside a locked space.</p>		<p>In Fredericton, individuals have access to dedicated storage space within their tiny home.</p>
<b>Current Plans for Sites</b>	<p>Victoria is investing \$1.8M in operating funding and \$300K in capital funding to create a new Access Hub that will be operated by a community agency.</p> <p>Halifax has recently approved 9 additional designated encampment sites in the City to help with the increased number of individuals.</p>	<p>Waterloo is actively looking to establish additional outdoor shelter sites in Kitchener and Cambridge.</p> <p>Toronto will be reporting back to Council in 2025 on a cost analysis of increasing shelter and respite capacity across the City, including temporary modular and micro-shelter options.</p>	<p>Portland was only going to offer tent shelters, but the state requested sleeping pods to receive funding. The state provided \$6M in funding for the purchase of sleeping pods. Portland only has enough funding to operate three of the six planned large-scale outdoor shelters.</p>	<p>12 Neighbours Community Inc.in Fredericton is receiving an additional \$13.3M in funding from the provincial and federal governments to build more micro-homes.</p>

Item	Self-Governed, Lowest Barrier Models	Fully Managed, Low Barrier Model	Fully Managed, Medium-High Barrier Model	Transitional Model
		Kingston has ended the sleeping cabin program in March 2024.		

## Operational Principles of a Fully Managed, Low Barrier Service Model

There are several distinct components that make an overnight accommodation setting *low barrier*. The following considerations are being made regarding principles of a low barrier operating model to be implemented at sanctioned site(s):

1. Adequate staffing is required to provide intensive case management and to manage the day-to-day operations of the site. Staff should be trained in trauma-informed care, de-escalation, conflict mediation, crisis response, and harm reduction, including how to administer naloxone.
2. Intake requirements should be minimal. There should be few barriers to accessing the site preventing access for people who actively use substances, couples who want to cohabitate, and people with pets.
3. Operating staff should be more lenient than a medium or high-barrier shelter when applying service restrictions. Instead, the site should focus on de-escalation, conflict mediation, and restorative approaches that avoid discharge if possible.
4. Overly institutional elements of service delivery should be de-emphasized at the site, including the requirement to be within your tent or cot at a specific time and to participate in onsite programming.
5. Residents should be encouraged to participate in decision-making processes that affect them, to adapt the service model to the specific needs of residents at the site.
6. Harm reduction is an evidence-based, human-centred approach that utilizes a set of strategies, policies, or programs designed to reduce substance-related harm without requiring abstinence and ensures that individuals using substances are not excluded from a range of supports and services that would be valuable to their health, wellbeing, and housing prospects.

7. Intensive, integrated physical and mental health services and supports are provided onsite to residents via partnership(s) with community health providers, including doctors, nurses, counsellors, social workers, and other professionals with capacity to provide ongoing, preventative, and intensive supports.
8. Housing workers should collaborate with residents to create customized housing plans and provide ongoing, intensive support to each resident to find suitable housing.
9. Sites should partner with other community agencies that provide legal supports, employment supports, ID clinics, income tax clinics, and any other services or supports requested by residents at the site that will benefit their health, wellbeing, and ability to acquire housing.
10. Sites should provide access to basic needs, such as access to potable water, washroom access, and shower access, to ensure residents have a dignified, respectful environment to maintain their health and hygiene.

While medium- and high-barrier operating models may implement some of the features identified above, the suite of features of a low barrier model are distinct in that they systematically encourage client autonomy, respect, and dignity, particularly for individuals with higher acuity and complex co-occurring needs. There are other aspects of service that are compatible across models, including garbage and waste disposal policies; space for storage of personal items; access to electricity, heat, and cooling; and the provision of additional in-reach services such as ID clinics, income tax clinics, legal services.

Capital Cost Analysis for **the Development** of a Fully Managed, Low Barrier Sanctioned Site Model for 25 Individual Structures

The below tables represent quotes received for the development of a sanctioned site model for 25 individual structures. It is important to note that none of the following quotes include cost estimates for grading, machinery required for site servicing, or electrical connections which the City will be responsible for. Staff estimate the cost for preparing the site for the individual structures to be around \$330K.

Pallet Structures			
Resources	Itemized	One-Time Cost per Site	One-Time Cost per 6 Sites
Pallet Villages	One 70 sq ft. structure @ \$21,070 each x 25 structures	\$731,481 / site	\$4,388,886 / 6 sites
Main Building	Common area for bathrooms, showers, offices, eatery, staff washroom	\$325,000 / site	\$1,950,000 / 6 sites
Site Servicing	Supplies for staff, electricity, water, Wifi	\$60,000 / site	\$360,000 / 6 sites
Site Preparation	Site grading, hydro, water, sewers, etc.	\$330,000 / site	\$1,980,000 / 6 sites
<b>Annual Total per Site</b>		<b>\$1,446,481 / site</b>	<b>\$8,678,886 / 6 sites</b>

\*The above estimate for the structures was presented in USD and the exchange rate as of August 1, 2024, was used for this calculation.

<b>Modular Structures</b>			
<b>Resources</b>	<b>Itemized</b>	<b>One-Time Cost</b>	<b>One-Time Cost per 6 Sites</b>
Private Sleep Cabins	One 106 sq ft. structure @ \$22,500 each x 25 structures	\$562,500 / site	\$3,375,000 / 6 sites
Main Building	Common area for bathrooms, showers, offices, eatery, staff washroom	\$575,000 / site	\$3,450,000 / 6 sites
Site Servicing	Supplies for staff, electricity, water, Wifi	\$60,000 / site	\$360,000 / 6 sites
Site Preparation	Site grading, hydro, water, sewers, etc.	\$330,000 / site	\$1,980,000 / 6 sites
<b>Total per Site</b>		<b>\$1,527,500 / site</b>	<b>\$9,165,000 / 6 sites</b>

Cost Analysis for **Operating** a Fully Managed, Low-Barrier Sanctioned Site Model for 25 Individual Structures

Resources	Itemized	Annual Cost per site	Annual Cost per 6 sites
24/7 Staffing	One Site Lead @ \$34/hr Three frontline staff per shift @ \$27/hr	\$1,415,232 / site	\$8,491,392 / 6 sites
Security	Two security guards on twelve hr shifts, seven days a week @ \$25/hr	\$436,800 / site	\$2,620,800 / 6 sites
Food	Snacks, water, and 3x meals @ \$50/pp daily for 25 individuals	\$456,250 / site	\$2,737,500 / 6 sites
	Snacks, water, and 3x meals @ \$50/pp daily for 25 couples	\$912,500 / site	\$5,475,000 / 6 sites
Supplies	Towels, Toilet Paper, Shampoo, Soap, etc. For 25 individuals	\$8,000 / site	\$48,000 / 6 sites
	Towels, Toilet Paper, Shampoo, Soap, etc. For 25 couples	\$16,000 / site	\$96,000 / 6 sites
Washrooms and Sink Rentals	\$845/mth/ Port-o-Let * (would require 4 Port-o-Let's per site)	\$40,560/year/site	\$243,360 / 6 sites
Utilities	Unknown cost at this time		

General Maintenance and Repair	Unknown cost at this time		
Administration	Unknown cost at this time		
<b>Annual Total per Site</b>		<b>\$2,356,842 - \$2,821,092</b>	<b>\$14,141,052 - \$16,926,552</b>

\* Depending on what amenities are included on site

### Shelter Allowance Portion of Social Assistance Benefits Received for Rent

The jurisdictional scan revealed that some sites received the shelter allowance portion of individuals' social assistance benefits to help offset operational costs. The chart below outlines potential revenue sources that could assist with the ongoing operational expenses of the site.

<b>Ontario Works</b>			
Residents	Shelter Allowance Portion of Benefit	Total Revenue Monthly Amount	Total Revenue Annual Amount
25 Individuals	\$390/month	\$9750/month	\$117K/year
25 Couples	\$642/month	\$16,050/month	\$193K/year
<b>Ontario Disability Support Program</b>			
25 Individuals	\$582/month	\$14,550/month	\$175K/year
25 Couples	\$915/month	\$22,875/month	\$275K/year

### Individuals with Lived Experience Feedback Regarding Sanctioned Encampment Sites

In March 2024, client feedback surveys were completed with 31 encampment residents to evaluate how the Encampment Protocol has been working for them thus far. Residents from a variety of encampments were selected, with size, geography and



popularity in mind. As part of this survey, individuals were asked if they had any thoughts or ideas on how the City should consider managing encampments. The topic of sanctioned sites was brought up frequently, and client opinions were recorded both qualitatively and quantitatively. The results are outlined below.

<b>Client Feedback on Approaches to Managing Encampments: Opinions on Sanctioned Sites</b>	
In Favour of Sanctioned Sites	10%
In Favour of Sanctioned Sites <i>plus</i> the Encampment Protocol	6%
Not in Favour of Sanctioned Sites, Prefer the Encampment Protocol	58%
No opinion	26%
Total Number of Clients Surveyed: 31	