

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of Deliaberry@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2019 7:52 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council

Your Name Delia Craigberry
Your Email Deliaberry@yahoo.com
Street 3540 Karen Ave S
City Salem
State OR
Zip 97302

Message Homeless compromise: No tents during the day. I think most people are somewhat compassionate about the homeless but a permanent tent camp is not a viable solution either. This is a compromise on both sides.

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 12/5/2019.

Amy Johnson

From: noreply@cityofsalem.net on behalf of Roxymichele2@gmail..com
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2019 9:41 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Contact City Council

Your Name Roxanne Baxter
Your Email Roxymichele2@gmail..com
Your Phone 5036892773

Message I have been reading about possible purchase of Hope Crest Facility. Finally an intelligent solution to Homeless problem in Salem. Before we completey lose downtown to Homeless please consider purchasing Hope Crest. In the long run the tax revenue you are going to lose from businesses leaving and property owners moving because of homeless problem Hope Crest seems like a very viable solution. Humane and acceptable to Salem residents! The homeless issue must be addressed. Now!

This email was generated by the dynamic web forms contact us form on 12/6/2019.

Amy Johnson

From: Bob Elliott <robert.eugene.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2019 11:05 PM
To: citycouncil; mordhorst.lyle@co.polk.or.us
Subject: Salem council may set aside city property as designated camping sites for the homeless

At least you are trying to do something good for them. Thank you. Unfortunately many will walk West on Hwy 22 and go just past Wallace Marine Park boat ramp and live along the river bank till high water comes. Check out this article from Statesman Journal:

Salem council may set aside city property as designated camping sites for the homeless

<https://www.statesmanjournal.com/story/news/2019/12/02/salem-council-trims-homeless-sidewalk-ban-designated-camping-sites/4335166002/>

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: Bob Elliott <robert.eugene.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2019 8:28 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Safe Parking Programs Help Homeless Sleeping in Cars - CityLab

After seeing the news about the idea of homeless sleeping in cars I found this article. Basic info and City Staff can contact the cities to see what works. Bob Elliott <https://www.citylab.com/equity/2019/02/homeless-safe-parking-lots-sleeping-in-cars-city-programs/581128/>

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: Bob Elliott <robert.eugene.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2019 8:30 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Safe Parking Pilot Program | Beaverton, OR - Official Website

Here in Oregon. Bob Elliott
<https://www.beavertonoregon.gov/2235/Safe-Parking-Pilot-Program>

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: Bob Elliott <robert.eugene.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2019 8:33 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: Homelessness: Cities designate "safe" parking lots to sleep in for people living in cars - Vox

Many sites on line with car camping ideas. Bob Elliott <https://www.vox.com/the-highlight/2019/10/11/20897485/california-homeless-safe-parking-lots-cars-rvs>

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: Bob Elliott <robert.eugene.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 05, 2019 8:39 PM
To: citycouncil
Subject: homeless parking lots near me - Google Search

This site says State of Oregon Yellow Lot 641 is available for homeless parking? All ready going on in Salem? Someone needs to check this out. Bob Elliott
<https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&hl=en-us&q=homeless+parking+lots+near+me&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj4mbv0mKDmAhUTt54KHaXEBcoQ1QlwFHoECAwQAq&biw=375&bih=622>

Sent from my iPhone

Amy Johnson

From: Justin Lomax <jblomax@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2019 7:39 AM
To: citycouncil
Subject: homeless proposals

Dear City Councilors, I'm writing regarding recent proposals to set aside a city property for the homeless population and allow car camping in Salem. Other cities have tried this with unintended consequences that have destroyed the quality of life for residents and businesses where such camping occurs. Portland and Seattle residents now have to deal with derelict vehicles parked in front of their residences and businesses that are filled with debris and hazardous waste, often left by meth and heroin users who rent them out on a short-term basis. The downtown Eugene area has been taken over by disruptive individuals who are driving businesses out. We have to deal with the homeless issue with clear understanding that there are two distinct, new elements to the current crisis – flagrant drug use by individuals who have no concern for the community around them and the transient nature of today's homeless population. Salem risks attracting even more chronic homeless from around the country with its policies. I attended a public forum this summer on the proposed Sit Lie Ordinance and was struck by two speakers from the homeless community who described coming to Salem while they were already homeless. One came from Phoenix, AZ and the other Chico, CA and both were clear that they did not see any reason to change their chosen lifestyle but instead expected Salem residents to meet their needs for service. This is something Salem leaders have to be clear about – we cannot help our fellow Salem residents who have fallen into homeless due to circumstances beyond their control if we continue to attract others wanting to unconditionally benefit from our goodwill and tax-payer funded services.

V/R,

Justin Lomax
Salem, OR

Amy Johnson

From: Lynelle Wilcox <lynelle@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2019 3:01 AM
To: Chuck Bennett; Lynda Rose; Steve Powers; Tami Carpenter; Cara Kaser; Tom Andersen; Brad Nanke; Jackie Leung; Matthew Ausec; Chris Hoy; Vanessa Nordyke; Jim Lewis; Kristin Retherford; Jerry Moore; Kathy Sime; Dan Atchison; CityRecorder
Subject: Testimony for 12/9 City Council meeting: camping ban edit requests

Thank you all for your work about ways to support businesses and people who are unsheltered. I was surprised and thrilled about the City Council's decision to have city staff identify possible locations for designated camping areas. That decision seems like a shift towards so many possibilities.

As a pretty new accidental homeless advocate, I wondered what meetings and conversations homeless advocates might have to share ideas and develop proposals and options about how our community might come together to make designated camp areas into a reality. I know HomeBase Shelters of Salem (HBSS) has done significant research about that topic, and they planned to meet with the city's Emergency Preparedness Manager - Gregory Walsh, to discuss ideas. Yet Mr. Walsh advised HBSS that he was asked to plan about camping with city officials, so he advised HBSS that it would be best to meet and plan after Monday's City Council meeting. Until then, advocates don't know what the staff report and connected decisions might be.

Knowing that the city has a deficit of funds, it seems like there would not be much money, if any, from the city, so this might be a connecting project for our community to come together to make designated camping into a reality. And it seems like timelines will be very tight, so I spent a good part of the week doing research about camping programs.

Things I learned:

~~~~~  
I loved the articles about the Olympia mitigation sites - they reflect what a positive difference a grid design, toilets, and trash disposal can make!

I thought Olympia opted to provide organized camping areas so people had a more organized way to camp with some basic hygiene amenities. I had not realized that the mitigation site was created as a way to offer places for people to be, so that the City could move forward with lawful removal of unsanctioned encampments:

*"Why Establish a Mitigation Site?*

*The City is faced with the urgent need to respond to the growing concentration of unmanaged homelessness in the Downtown core and the associated public health and safety concerns.*

*Beyond the need to provide safer conditions for the community and homeless individuals, the City is also responding to case law established by the Ninth Circuit Court in Martin v. City of Boise in September 2018. This case law limits cities from enforcing trespass on public property.*

*The City has now completed its review and is again moving forward with the lawful removal of unsanctioned encampments using the best practices available.*

*The City is trying to balance the health and safety concerns of the larger community with the limitations imposed by the Ninth Circuit Court by establishing a mitigation site. Mitigation sites are temporary, legal camping sites that provide a level of order, safety, dignity and cleanliness to reduce human suffering and the impacts of unmanaged camping on the community.*

*The City identified the City-owned parking lot at Olympia and Franklin as the most viable location for the temporary mitigation site. While the downtown core is in no way an ideal location for any sort of camping, we must address the immediate situation where it exists.*

*The Olympia/Franklin mitigation site is not a permanent end state. It is the first step to manage a growing, unsustainable and immediate situation in Downtown. The City will continue to look for more viable alternatives, and will reassess the situation in six months.*

*This Oly/Franklin Mitigation Site includes:*

- *Basic hygiene services (portable toilets, potable water, garbage collection)*
- *On-site host(s) managed by the Union Gospel Mission*
- *Orderly set-up (fencing, painted rows with 10x10 spaces, consistently sized tents on pallets)*
- *A code of conduct and safety protocols"*

[http://m.olympiawa.gov/community/homelessness/Mitigation-Sites.aspx?fbclid=IwAR05Y9hJZcApmItkwn5nH-nl\\_-8uGB0l1TGeseeZXBcLDaOqOpP1G7NQ2BQ](http://m.olympiawa.gov/community/homelessness/Mitigation-Sites.aspx?fbclid=IwAR05Y9hJZcApmItkwn5nH-nl_-8uGB0l1TGeseeZXBcLDaOqOpP1G7NQ2BQ)

~~~~~  
Reading more about Olympia's mitigation site, after establishing one mitigation site, Olympia looked for a year and a half for a second mitigation site and identified that:

"... this is a great mitigation site," Olympia City Manager Steve Hall said. "But, then when we started layering on the need for infrastructure costs, it maybe doesn't make sense to add all that infrastructure cost unless it's a good site for long-term supportive housing and... maybe this isn't a good site for long-term supportive housing."

Ultimately, the council agreed that all planning for the site should pause, at least for now. But every member who spoke agreed on the need for a regional response to housing and homelessness, and for an interlocal agreement to lay out how the council might coordinate and fund that response.

"I just wonder if the effort for this group would be to spend time on an interlocal agreement, make a commitment that we want to work regional to deal with affordable housing issues, then, as we get that figured out in terms of our roles and responsibilities, basically it's a powerful statement that we're working together to solve this as a region," Lacey City Manager Scott Spence said. "Then we start working on these one-off projects."

from: <https://www.theolympian.com/news/local/article236415673.html>

This article led me to take pause ~ a city that already has one mitigation site and wants another site took a year and a half to find a suitable location, only to decide that the cost to prepare the site for camping use might not be the best use of funds if the location would not also support long term supportive housing. After reading this, I wondered how our city could find and prepare a site, even with fewer preparations, within a week, or even a month.

~~~~~  
Then I read more about the first mitigation site:

*"... Olympia has embarked on what some might say is a radical idea: Replace people camping in parks with an official government-approved tent city. It's what Olympia calls "the mitigation site."*

*"I'll be honest with you, there's been a lot of challenges," said Colin DeForrest Olympia's Homeless response coordinator*

*DeForrest has been the de facto mayor of the mini-community for the last year of operation.*

*"Prior to opening this, we had over a hundred unmanaged tents in our downtown. There was over 300 unmanaged tents in city-owned parking lots, and it created a very unsafe environment," said DeForrest.*

*Safety is everywhere at the mitigation site, which is on a city-owned parking lot is surrounded by an enclosed fence with a gate and dedicated police patrols. Those who call this tent city home are offered a 10 foot by 10-foot area to set up camp, and the site has a lot of rules.*

*Like no drugs or alcohol, those living on the site must use the onsite bathrooms, dispose of trash, and agree to the supervision of the camp hosts who live on site.....*

*But the system isn't ideal in some instances; it's bordering on being unhealthy.*

*"Cleaning is a challenge. I mean, there's three of our biggest challenges will say for this site are not what people would think of its food how do you store food in an outdoor setting, it's bikes if you look around bikes are like a currency out here that's a challenge, and then stuff," DeForrest said.*

*With the trash comes unwelcome visitors, the tent city has a rat problem. Traps are visible around the site. On top of that, there are the health issues that come whenever you have a group of people living together.*

*"We've had individuals that have died onsite," added DeForrest.....*

*DeForrest says this camp is still a work in progress.*

*"There's definitely been a lot of positives, but as I said there's challenges," DeForrest said.*

*Those challenges are spelled out in a presentation coming next week. Laying out a laundry list of long term problems:*

- The campsite is struggling to accommodate those with mental health and addiction problems*
- The location has become a target for "people on the outside" - drug pushers, and others who prey on the homeless.*
- And - bottom line - no matter how good the tent, they are not as sustainable as permanent housing.*

*"It's a huge challenge for our community for business owners also. So we continue to try and hear all the voices and do our best to respond in the best way that we can," DeForrest said.*

*Out of the 130 plus people that live on that site, 36 people have been connected to housing, 65 people have been connected to outreach services, and 20 individuals became employed.... "*

*from: [https://www.khq.com/news/khq-investigates-olympia-s-mitigation-site/article\\_ae541450-f148-11e9-9d62-a7700b52984a.html](https://www.khq.com/news/khq-investigates-olympia-s-mitigation-site/article_ae541450-f148-11e9-9d62-a7700b52984a.html)*

This article led me to take more pause ~ rules make sense and are desirable, yet when many unsheltered individuals struggle with mental health and/or addiction, it seems like rules and codes of behavior would result in excluding many people who are unsheltered and need protection from the elements, so those individuals would still be trying to camp somewhere else.

If Olympia's mitigation site works partly because they have police patrols, and they have camp hosts who live on site, are those things necessary? If so, do we have adequate police staffing for them to do patrols? And do we have people (and funds?) to have live-in hosts? Could rotating volunteers be a viable alternative for security and camp-hosting/ managing? Could we find enough volunteers? If so, how can we train enough people, fast enough? (The demographic and situation seems different enough that warming center training would not be adequate.)

The challenges the Olympia mitigation site experiences would seem to also be challenges we'd face - how would we deal with food storage, bikes, and people's belongings? How would we deal with the reality that a site could become a place where drug pushers and predators prey on our unsheltered neighbors? Each of those things can be planned for, yet how can we plan quickly enough?

~~~~~  
Some universities are participating in a project of rotating tent cities.

It stood out for me that even with working with the parent organization Share/Wheel, that has a history of successful camps, it was a long process to plan and coordinate the university camp:

"The long process of bringing a tent city to campus started when student representatives of the Tent City Collective started working on a proposal to host TC3. In response, the University formed a working group, facilitated by Clark. The working group met a half a dozen times followed by public meetings, email comments, phone calls, and conversations with Seattle University and Seattle Pacific University, both of which have hosted TC3 in the past. Clark approached the issue from a very Evans School

perspective. What is the project definition, who are the constituents, how will this affect day-to-day operations, and does this align with our mission?

TC3 itself was a very important partner in this process. The collective has a clear and established self-governance, and a history of successful camps. That made a difference."

from: <https://evans.uw.edu/about/news/tent-city-uw>

How can we coordinate something similar, quickly, without the advantage of a partner who is experienced and successful at setting up temporary homeless camps?

~~~~~  
The TC3 camp seems to work, yet the one in this article has 14 pages of rules, and 5 camp leaders for a camp of 65 homeless individuals, and it seems to create a hierarchy of homeless people - those who get into approved camp areas, and those who don't and still need to camp, illegally.

see: <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/homeless/a-homeless-camp-in-our-backyard-please-seattle-pacific-university-says/>

I wondered what rules, structure, and staffing would be effective for designated camp areas in Salem, and if it's possible to prevent that hierarchy dynamic?

~~~~~  
This article speaks about planning and costs to operate Olympia's mitigation site:

"In practical terms, it means 80 to 120 city-provided tents will be set up on 10-by-10-foot parcels, with portable toilets, garbage services and running water supplied.

The idea, DeForrest explained, is to provide emergency stabilization and triage to a growing population of individuals experiencing homelessness.

Much like in Tacoma, Olympia's response will go beyond setting up one sanctioned tent city in a single parking lot. For starters, DeForrest said, a second mitigation site — outside of downtown — is "a must."

More importantly, he said, is establishing an arrangement where future residents of the mitigation site "flow" through a functioning system that helps move them toward stable housing.....

What's clear is that if all of this comes together as the city envisions, it will represent a significant improvement to what Tacoma has experienced at its Dome District stability site. Opened in June 2017, Tacoma's massive endeavor — which houses about 80 individuals a night — was initially envisioned as the second phase in a three-part plan. The third phase was to involve moving individuals out of the stability site and into better housing.

Of the envisioned Phase 3, Pauli told The News Tribune: "I feel very confident in saying that was not a success." It's one thing DeForrest is trying to prevent in Olympia. "When I look at (Tacoma's) stability site, one of the things that was challenging is people got stuck there," DeForrest said. "I know there are still people there who were there when we opened that site. "There's a lack of flow to the system in (Tacoma), so one of the things we're trying to create here."

Unsurprisingly, cost is also a concern.

*DeForrest said **Olympia's mitigation site — which he views as a hybrid between Tacoma's initial efforts at a large, unauthorized encampment along Portland Avenue and the Dome District stability site — will cost about \$100,000 annually.***

While it's not an apples-to-apples comparison, Tacoma spent roughly \$170,000 on its relatively brief mitigation effort, while the Dome District and is budgeted at more than \$2 million a year. Much of the difference, DeForrest said, is in the staffing. Tacoma's Dome District stability site contracts with Catholic Community Services to provide services and oversight. Olympia's mitigation site will be "self-governed," monitored by two on-site "hosts" who will live in tiny homes and receive a monthly stipend.

A level of self-governance already exists at the city's current encampments, and the intent is to capitalize on that, DeForrest said.

DEFINING SUCCESS

Amidst all of the challenges presented by Olympia's new, outside-the-box approach, perhaps one of the biggest will be setting clear expectations about what success ultimately looks like.

In Tacoma, DeForrest observed, the metric was based on how many individuals were moving out of the stability site and into more permanent housing. While important and an end goal in Olympia as well, he said, his experience in Tacoma has helped shape the way he's hoping to define success this time.

"In Tacoma, we set up the stability site, and ... there was this expectation that, 'Oh, we're going to set up this site and our gauge of success is going to be how quickly they get housed.'" he said. "Which, of course, is a gauge of success, but it's not realistic.

"There's just simply a housing shortage, and we're dealing with the same thing — and even more so — down here in Olympia." In other words, whether the mitigation site experiment is worthwhile in Olympia, at least in DeForrest's view, will rest on other conditions improving downtown.

For instance, DeForrest said, the city's "clean team" is picking up roughly 1,000 dirty needles a month. Human waste is also a constant problem, for the clean team and business owners alike. "As crazy as that sounds," he said, "that's going to be some of gauges of this successful or not."

from: <https://www.thenewstribune.com/news/local/news-columns-blogs/matt-driscoll/article222284000.html>

With Salem's intent for designated camping to be temporary, this article led me to see that similar intent in Olympia was not realized because there were not enough options for permanent housing. Does spending more money for a temporary option shift dollars and focus from work to actually house people?

Olympia's site was estimated to cost about \$100,000 annually, and that is with the site being "self-governed", monitored by two on-site "hosts" who will live in tiny homes and receive a monthly stipend. If we are not ready to have a self-governed camp area, how do we staff a camp effectively? What would the staffing cost be, if we don't have volunteer capacity to meet the need? DO we have enough volunteer capacity? Which partners, groups, churches, businesses might step up to meet volunteer needs? What relationships and outreach needs to happen to get the volunteers we'd need?

And it took experience for DeForrest to identify success metrics that are more meaningful and feasible to him than the metric of people being housed. If we set up designated camping area(s), what metric would be our measure of success? Do we need to choose that first, so that site selection and planning can happen in ways that support whatever success metric we choose? How fast can we choose our metric, so we could implement designated camping area(s) quickly to support that metric?

~~~~~  
I read many more articles, yet the examples above give the gist of the complexities, and they give a taste of the relevant questions that come up.

Any or all of these questions might be answerable, and there might be paths to create viable designated camping areas. Yet the articles I've read lead me to think that if designated camping areas can be done effectively, it would take more time, work, planning, and training than we can accomplish in a few weeks, or even a couple of months. Rushing in will only make things worse.

**For that reason, I urge you to consider two alternate options:**

1. Delay implementation of the camping ban until spring 2020. At that point, we'd be past winter weather, and there will be more housing options available to unsheltered individuals. It is very likely that 100 or more people would be housed and off the streets around then. Arches might have extended hours by then. SafeSleep United would probably have more capacity for unsheltered women to sleep by then.
2. Or, if a camping ban is not delayed till spring, then instead of designating areas for camping, consider areas where the camping ban would be implemented reactively, instead of proactively? Criteria for reactive camping ban implementation might be that camps are tidy, out of plain view, away from rivers/creeks, and behaviors are not disruptive? Perhaps Cascade Park (and/or other parks?) fit that description, as well as remote camps people might set up out of plain view? This option would allow people to camp out of sight, as long as littering is not happening, and as long as behavior is appropriate.

I am also requesting an edit to allow temporary small shelter. Existing ordinance language would seem to ban any shelter that has a roof and at least one enclosed side. Whether or not we have designated camping areas, some people will still need to sleep outdoors away from camps, and will still need shelter from the elements. Please consider language that would allow people to have a pup tent or other small shelter, as long as it is taken down and put away by 7am.

♥♥.°.\*''\*.♥.°.\*♥\*..\*♥\*..°.\*''\*.♥.°.\*''\*.♥♥.°.\*''\*.♥♥.°.\*''\*.♥♥

the highest art is the art of living an ordinary life in an extraordinary manner.

and...

with our thoughts, we make the world.

♥♥.°.\*''\*.♥.°.\*♥\*..\*♥\*..°.\*''\*.♥.°.\*''\*.♥♥.°.\*''\*.♥♥.°.\*''\*.♥♥