

**REDMOND COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS TASK FORCE**  
**MEETING 5 SUMMARY - JULY 29, 2015**

**Task Force Members in Attendance:**

Meghan Altimore, Steve Daschle, Gary Smith, Carolyn Mansfield, Marian LaBeck, Derek Wentorf, Tim Short, Al Rosenthal, Lara Bolger, Andrea Liggett

**Staff in Attendance:**

Charlie Gorman, Colleen Kelly, Brooke Buckingham, Jane Christenson, Karen Reed-Facilitator

**Welcome, Introductions, Review of Agenda**—Karen welcomed the group.

**Approval of Meeting 4 Summary** – Meeting summary approved as submitted.

**Public comment** - Karen shared additional public comment submitted online. Hard copy of comment shared.

**Discussion: What have we learned? What remains unknown? How have our individual perspectives shifted—or not? What does this suggest in terms of solutions we should be offering?** This discussion was a check-in with group to see what group has learned over course of time together and what is still unknown, how this impacts the Task Force recommendations, as well as observation regarding scope of services provided in County and locally.

- The last meeting felt a little overwhelming in quickness of action to adopt a ballot. There is a lot to process. One thing learned is the concerns raised by business community—was not aware of the criminal behavior, trespassing and other concerns they have. Still not sure we are able to clearly make a connection between those concerns and the homeless population. Not sure if some of the action we take is going to reduce crime.
- Acknowledgment that there is some overlap between concerns raised by the community around public safety and homelessness and some solutions that can address this.
- Some concerning behaviors are from homeless individuals suffering from addiction. Not a lot of services for people facing addiction. This is a regional issue not a Redmond issue.
- Transportation is common issue for all homeless populations.
- Can have both law enforcement and social service response to the issues raised and we need this balance.
- Concern about providing services resulting in increase in homeless.
- Scarcity of resources for all kinds of services – hopefully guidance to policymakers on how best to prioritize services (best bang for buck).
- Providers struggling with this prioritization question locally and at a national level.

- Poverty creates challenges. There are root causes – need systems to address root causes and this is not issue that Redmond can resolve.
- Do we have any examples of communities that have had success? Some pockets of success (Utah)
- We are seeing the impact of “suburbanization of poverty” – as urban areas are becoming more affluent, poverty is moving to the suburbs.
- Tent City – what is process for background check? And criteria for admission (e.g. drug use)?
- Tension between doing background checks and accepting that individual, as opposed to turning them away (and not knowing where that individual is). The group discussed the background check practices at Camp Unity.
- System issues may compromise ability to help people and intervene (e.g. individual who was ready for treatment was not allowed back at the clinic).
- Paradox regarding known drug dealers who are not homeless – and being unable to get them arrested, and arresting those who are homeless using drugs. Is enforcement the same?

**Discussion: Revised Problem Statement, Including Statement of “What Success Looks Like” – Review, Offer Edits and Approve**

Panhandling is on list of problem behaviors but is not illegal (others on list are) - suggestion to add panhandling as a separate bullet (approved).

Review of proposed edits offered by Gary Smith –

Introduction Section:

- Add note that Redmond is a caring community (approved);
- Text related to crime and homelessness (vote to retain original text); additional text identifying various populations of homeless (approved);
- Clarifying language regarding Eastside issues (retain original redline);

Issues and Conditions of Concern, Concerns arising from these conditions:

- Add text about hardships of homeless families and individuals in concerns section (approved).
- Discussion about changing header statements in different sections to be clearer: “The Task Force understands that the following conditions of concern to community” (approved).
- Add reference to *families* when speaking to homeless—individuals *and families* (approved).

Constraints & obstacles: Difficult for the Homeless to Help Themselves

- Transit passes language moved up in the list (approved).
- Add difficulty in permitting homeless encampment sites—move up from next section (approved)
- Add statement about lack of coordinated process for homeless facilities (approved)

## Review of proposed edits by Andrew Koeppen –

- Breakdown of family language (not approved)
- State regulation language (not approved). Suggestion to instead add that this is also a state and national problem to existing problem statement language (approved)
- Language regarding faith communities' ability to serve in non-profits due to federal/state restrictions (not approved). Discussion noted that agencies are not necessarily excluding faith communities based on law but might be program operations/policies in place to make services welcoming for clients served-in some cases, this means those services occur off site. (not approved)
- Government overregulation (not approved), but in lieu of that the following was approved: "Multiple government agencies with various grant and regulatory requirements creates a burden on agency operations."

Discussion on added section, "What does success look like?"

- Issue with Actual/perceived statement –say the "improved sense of public safety"
- Change downtown to "in the City"
- Remove "visible homelessness" and just say reduction in loitering....
- Better outcomes for homeless individuals – remove "to be safe" "

### **Criteria for Task Force Recommendations: Review and Approve**

Add "respond to community's concerns" to the last item (positive community impact). As amended, criteria are approved.

### **Review Populated Ballot of Ideas, Offer Amendments and Clarification**

Karen introduced the discussion. The goal is to figure out if there anything on list that is out of scope with the criteria adopted, or that needs more clarification, or could be consolidated with another item? We want to be sure Task Force members are clear about each item they will be asked to vote on, and that we have a complete list.

### Section A – Improving public safety and reducing crime

- Note that other panhandling ordinances could be responsive, not just those adopted by Tacoma and Pierce County.
- Include item G1 (panhandling signage) in this section.
- Add separate item for community education program that could include panhandling signage.
- Addition of neighborhood resource officers

### Section B—expand, improve services to homeless/sheltered individuals

- Remove item B.1 – it's a regional advocacy issue, not a city action item.

- B.4 Day center – change timeframe for implementation to near/long term
- B.9 –after discussion, confirmed it is in scope and will stay on ballot.
- Add item on adding shower service –separate from a whole day center.

Section C--Expand, improve and/or mitigation impacts of shelter and housing options for the homeless, others facing housing barriers

- C.1 - Noted that city and faith communities will both need to engage as possible lead and/or partner.
- C.3 –Reworded to better capture intent of sponsor, distinguish from C.2
- C.9 –Vague. Note there are many options that can be pursued to increase affordable housing.
- C.10 – Change to “study the feasibility” of service relocation.
- C.11 –Change to “create a City” flexible funding pool
- C.12 – Change to say “expand” rather than “create a fund to help folks get 1<sup>st</sup> /last month’s rent, etc.
- C.13 –Move to advocacy section
- C.14 –Be clearer about wording and leave on ballot. Karen will work with Andrew.
- C.16- Given the challenge under law of requiring people to work for free in small businesses this was removed as not feasible.

Section D—Improve public (business/ residents) understanding / ability to assist

- Clarify D.2 / D.3 – 2 positions? Yes. Funded by City.
- D.4 – change “low skills” to “entry level”
- Remove D.5 duplicative
- Remove D.6 as out of scope—not practicable.

Section E—Advocacy

- E.5 – remove not responsive to problem
- E.6 – note would require change in state constitution.

Section F--Other

- F.3 Duplicative of B.6
- F.9 –convert to advocacy item

Section G—Staff Ideas

- G.1 Separate panhandling idea into two—signs, and community education campaign that may include signs. Move to Section A.
- G.2, G.3—move to Section C.

Karen reviewed next steps. Next meeting is last meeting unless decision to meet again. Will focus on ballot results, any adjustments the Task Force wants to make to those results, and the draft report. Staff will have revised ballot to group by Friday. Meeting adjourned at 9:15.