

1. Agenda

Documents:

[TASK FORCE MEETING 5 AGENDA V 7 13.PDF](#)

2. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[072915MEETINGMATERIALS.PDF](#)

REDMOND COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS TASK FORCE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2015

6:30 – 9:00 pm

City Council Conference Room, City Hall, First Floor (right across from Council Chambers)

AGENDA--MEETING 5

1. **Welcome, Introductions, Review of Agenda** (5 min.)
2. **Approval of Meeting 4 Summary** (3 min.)
3. **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?** (40 min.)
4. **Discussion: Revised Problem Statement, Including Statement of “What Success Looks Like” – Review, Offer Edits and Approve** (20 min.)
5. **Criteria for Recommendations: Review and Approve** (10 min.)
6. **Review Populated Ballot of Ideas, Offer Amendments and Clarification** (60 min.)
7. **Homework: Complete Ballot (to be sent by email) and forward to Karen by Tuesday August 4.**
8. **Review Task Force Report Outline** (10 min.)
9. **Proposal for last meeting Agenda (August 12)**
 - a. Review, discuss and potentially amend voting results.
 - b. Identify additional comments to accompany recommendations.
 - c. Review draft report
 - d. Determine whether a small set of “priority recommendations” will be identified” (by consensus vote)
 - e. Review and agree upon “roll out” plan – who should hear about the work of the Task Force? Schedule for Council presentation.

Draft Problem Statement

The Redmond community – residents, business owners, nonprofit service organizations, the faith community, and city hall – have observed an increase in street level issues and homelessness in the past three years. The impacts are most notable in downtown Redmond, but are occurring in other areas of the City, as well as throughout the entire Eastside and all of King County: residents observe more loitering, panhandling, people sleeping outdoors in commercial areas and parks. Indeed urban and suburban homelessness is an issue of growing concern nationally. The City has also experienced an increase in property crimes in the last three years, which may or may not be directly attributable to the increased homeless population.

The homeless are not a monolithic population – they have many stories, have travelled many different paths to becoming homeless. What it will take to help each of them become stably housed are similarly varied.

And Redmond is not an island in its experience. While impacts are being felt locally, Redmond and its service agencies are part of a larger countywide system that has been established to address homelessness, poverty, mental illness and addiction on a regional and countywide basis. That system does not focus on city borders. While we feel these impacts in Redmond, they are also felt in other cities across King County: it will take the work of all in our region to solve these problems.

The Task Force identified the following issues and conditions to be of greatest concern:

- ProblemStreet behaviors including loitering, trespassing in private buildings to use restrooms, get clean and sleep; panhandling; drug deals taking place on streets, alleys, parks and trail areas
- Property damage including breaking of locks on buildings to gain access to private buildings
- Visible street homelessness
- Mental illness and addiction issues suffered by the homeless

Concerns arising from these issues and conditions include:

- Redmond becoming less safe for residents and visitors
- Businesses experiencing more aggressive behavior from homeless individuals
- Redmond becoming a less attractive place for business and visitors
- Residents afraid to use the library due to groups of young apparently homeless adults loitering in the vicinity
- Landlords losing tenants, employers losing employees, and increased labor costs in response due to frightening interactions with the homeless
- Residents afraid to use public trails and parks due to groups of apparently homeless individuals living or loitering in these areas
- Landlords and property owners suffering property damage, having to expend funds to repair damage and prevent future damage

- Concern for the human suffering experienced by individuals living on the streets, parks and open spaces of our city.

Constraints and obstacles to addressing these concerns and issues include:

- **Lack of Places for Homeless Individuals to Be**
 - Lack of sufficient shelter to house homeless individuals
 - Lack of affordable housing
 - Lack of day centers where homeless individuals can be during the day
 - Lack of hygiene centers where homeless individuals can get clean, take care of basic bodily needs
 - A regionalized system for ~~youth~~-homelessness that has only one shelter for young adults (18-24) in all of East King County, and that shelter –the Landing – is located in downtown Redmond
- **Difficult for the Homeless to Help Themselves**
 - An increasingly mobile society, with less family support available to people who fall on hard times
 - Lack of job opportunities, particularly lack of jobs that will pay enough to afford housing in the City /Eastside
 - Difficulty in saving enough money to afford first, last month’s rent and security deposit in order to move out of shelters
 - Lack of knowledge on the part of both the homeless and the public about resources available to assist the homeless
 - Lack of services, including mental health care, job training, addiction services
 - Lack of outreach services to connect homeless to services they need
 - Lack of transit passes to help homeless get to their jobs
 - Lack of places for the homeless to securely store their belongings
- **Hard for Supportive Agencies to Help Homeless Individuals**
 - Lack of public understanding of the complexity of homelessness
 - Difficulty in finding and permitting sites for tent camps
 - Some homeless opt out of staying in shelters or using services available to them
 - Growing poverty in the region, increasingly generational poverty
 - Growing population means more people with challenges
 - Lack of adequate resources to address the challenges

Our task is to find actionable recommendations that the Redmond community can take to address these issues in the near term. We believe our action recommendations will result in meaningful improvement in the problems and challenges we observe.

New proposed text:

What does success look like?

Success for us in response to the challenge of homelessness in Redmond will take several forms:

- Improved public safety—both perceived and actual.
- A reduction in visible homelessness--loitering, trespass and other similar incidents downtown and in our parks and trails.
- Greater understanding by residents and businesses of the complexity of homelessness, and greater engagement by residents and businesses to constructively respond to this challenge.
- Better outcomes for homeless individuals: they are able to connect to the services and housing they need to be safe.
- Enhanced capacity for our city, local service providers and faith community to help homeless individuals in a variety of ways.
- Redmond City Hall promoting collective action by eastside cities to address the challenge of homelessness.

Elimination of homeless individuals from our City is not the goal. Redmond can and should continue to be a safe and compassionate community.

Revised Criteria for Task Force Recommendations

Per Discussion at Meeting 4

Recommendations would be included for consideration by the Task Force if they meet all these criteria:

- **Actionable** – it is possible-feasible to implement this recommendation as a community (stakeholders needed are part of Redmond community and have means to take action necessary to accomplish the change sought). Include consideration of financial feasibility (without setting a specific threshold for what is feasible).
- **Financially Willing Sponsors** – if the action involves public or private funding, the Task Force member ~~sponsor~~ing-of the idea must be willing to advocate for the raising of the money (from private or public sector as appropriate)
- **Consistent with federal law** – could involve a recommended change in state law.
- Short-Term or Near Term Timeline – can be implemented within 1-5 years.
- Positive Community Impact – It is reasonable to expect that implementation of the recommendation will result in overall positive community impact.

Redmond Community Homelessness Draft Ballot to Provide Initial Rating on Action Items v.7.29.15

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members <i>Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.</i>	TF Member Rating 5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement <i>Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.</i>	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners? Lead = L Other partners needed = P							
							City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service /Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals
A. Improving public safety and reducing crime	A.1	Increase police bike patrols in downtown, by retail properties and on trails.		\$\$\$\$	ST/NT	Timing would depend on outcome of upcoming levy	L							
	A.2	Adopt panhandling ordinance like those in Tacoma and Pierce County		\$	ST	Panhandling is one of the topics selected for attention by the multi-city police and human services work group. Staff recently completed some relevant research (See Appendix A)	L	P	P	P	P		P	
	A.3	Require panhandlers to get a license		\$	ST	Current cost of a business license is \$107 for one year and license is tied to a physical address. Potential challenges related to enforcement	L							
B. Expand, Improve services to homeless/sheltered individuals	B.1	Increase City funding for mental health care access		\$-\$\$\$	ST/NT	This is an issue of scale. Increase funding by how much? Or increase funding to accomplish what specifically? (City contributions are generally very small in relation to county and state funding).	L	P	P	P	P		P	
	B.2	Triple the City's Human Services funding pool – and target the money to fund upstream interventions to prevent homelessness		\$\$\$\$\$	NT-LT	Current annual contribution from the General Fund is about \$850K	P	L	L	L	P			
	B.3* revised	Launch a local transportation service to help homeless individuals get to and from needed services, shelters and jobs. Could involve Metro Transit, City, Nonprofits, and/or Faith Community.		Staff estimates \$90-\$100/hr = driver/ins/gas/maint plus cost of vehicle	ST-NT	Potential to leverage current efforts re: community shuttle proposal. Also consulted with staff regarding specific funding sources noted. See attached (Appendix B)	L	P	P	L				
	B.4	Create day center(s) in Redmond that can serve women and families, men and young adults, providing hygiene facilities, transit connections, job search assistance, service information.		\$\$\$\$\$	LT	New facilities are most expensive and time consuming; separate facilities for each population would be especially so	P			P	L			
	B.5	Increase funding for outreach workers		\$\$\$	ST-NT	This is an issue of scale also. FTE salary and benefits = \$55-70K	L				L			
	B.6	Provide job training and positions for homeless individuals in the community. Explore partnership with DSHS or Workforce Development Council to create public works projects to employ and train homeless individuals.		\$\$\$	ST-LT	This could be either an expansion of existing programs (Hopelink, e.g) or could involve starting something new. Need additional time to explore feasibility with DSHS and Worksource.	P	P		P	L			
	B.7	Increase the number of transit passes available to the homeless		\$-\$\$\$	ST	This is a matter of scale/priority	P			P	P		L	

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members <i>Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.</i>	TF Member Rating	Estimated Cost	Timeframe to Implement	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners?										
			5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	\$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.		Lead = L Other partners needed = P	City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service /Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals		
			Task Force Members Complete This column: Rate every idea 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5. You can rate everything a “5” or a “1” or something in between.														
	B.8	Create additional day center resources on the Eastside to meet regional needs/ open a regional day center		\$\$\$\$--per center	ST-NT due to costs	Assuming this suggestion is to expand existing day center services (FOY in Redmond, CFH in Bellevue for men and Sophia Way in Bellevue for women). Costs are for additional staffing and space	P								L		
	B.9*	Encourage local service providers to give people who get services such as shelter, subsidized housing, welfare, community services, etc., a receipt showing how much that service cost. This is to remind the person receiving the service/shelter that the community paid for the service they received, and that the service wasn't free. Then create a system where that bill can be paid back.		\$\$?	ST	Not sure how to estimate cost of developing a payback system. Would like to hear from agency reps on this.						L					
C. Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts of shelter and housing options for the homeless, others facing housing barriers	C.1	City and faith communities should engage to identify homeless encampment locations on the Eastside		\$	ST	Is this suggestion to identify other faith communities willing to host encampments or something broader?	L/P				L/P				P		
	C.2	Partner with King County Housing Authority to provide housing opportunities for lower income households not currently benefitting from the incentive zoning program. General approach would involve KCHA providing subsidies to families at 30% AMI in order to allow them to afford currently units priced at 50% or 80% AMI under.		\$--staff time only	ST	City has explored this and is open to pursuing. One concern has been how to induce developers to participate in the program.	L	P									
	C.3	Extend City's inclusionary zoning ordinance to include units affordable to households making 50% or less of average median income (down from current 80%)					This is a subset of C.2. and can be eliminated as a separate item										
	C.4	Create a City-owned car camping site, where people could pay to stay for up to 1 month.		\$--\$\$	ST/NT	Cost would depend on site and what staffing/support/maintenance would be required. Could also be pursued under leadership of business, faith community or nonprofits rather than city.	L	P	P	P	P						
	C.5	Create a city owned rest stop (require payment for use)		\$\$-\$\$\$\$	NT-LT	Cost would depend on whether there is an existing facility that could be used and on staffing/support/maintenance costs. Is this needed if any of the day center options are supported?	L										
	C.6	Reduce the cost of securing temporary use permits for tent cities		\$	ST	City is currently exploring options	L										

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members <i>Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.</i>	TF Member Rating 5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners?								
							City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service / Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals	
			Task Force Members Complete This column: Rate every idea 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5. You can rate everything a “5” or a “1” or something in between.												
	C.7	Expand capacity at The Landing		\$\$\$\$-\$\$\$\$\$	ST-NT-LT	Current site is at capacity. Expanding capacity would require renovation or relocation. Agency preference would be for renovation.	P				L				
	C.8	Create storage lockers for homeless individuals		\$-\$\$	ST	Cost would depend on location	P	P		L	L				
	C.9	Increase affordable housing options				This is too vague to rate as is. Attached is a summary of key ideas generated by a recent Seattle Task Force and how they compare to current policy/practice in Redmond (See Appendix C)	P				P	L			
	C.10	Consider relocation to elsewhere within Redmond of community services from present place of business to one with less impact on downtown businesses, residents.		\$\$\$\$-\$\$\$\$\$	LT	Clarity needed—Is this a suggestion not to allow social service organizations in the downtown; not to allow shelters/camps in the downtown; something else? Siting in general is a significant challenge for social service providers	P	P	P	P	L				
	C.11	Expand the “Flexible Funding Pool” that can help people stay in their homes with emergency loans, grants.		\$--\$\$\$\$	ST-NT	This is a matter of scale/priority	P				L		P		
	C.12	Create a fund to help those living in shelters to secure 1 st & last month’s rent, security deposits, in order to move into permanent private housing.		\$-\$\$\$\$	ST-NT	This is a matter of scale/priority	P	P	P	L	P				
	C.13*	Establish a shelter in East King County to serve homeless individuals suffering from addiction.		\$\$\$\$\$	LT	Creating a new facility of this time is both a long-term and expensive undertaking. Would likely require an organization willing and able to run a capital campaign. Might be able to access some operating funds from KC Dept of Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Services	P				L		P		
	C.14*	Require shelters that allow residents to use drugs to require that such use occur on premises		\$	ST	From the city attorney: <i>The City would want to be clear that it is not sanctioning drug use by individuals and that individuals who possess or use drugs on the premises are not exempt from arrest and prosecution for drug-related offenses. This is on the theory that cities cannot allow what the state prohibits and vice versa</i>					L				
	C.15*	Long term (>30 days, perhaps less than 6 months) tent/camping area that is served by public transit. Camping area would have showers, lockers, picnic tables, etc. would be		\$\$\$\$	NT-LT	Cost would depend on the site and site development required	P	P			L				P

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members <i>Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.</i>	TF Member Rating 5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners? Lead = L Other partners needed = P								
							City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service / Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals	
		regularly patrolled by police, and have strict quite times, open drug/alcohol use. It would be open to anyone-- not just the homeless.													
	C.16 *	Create a shelter program where those staying at the shelter would be required to volunteer in partnering with small businesses for some period of time on an unpaid basis – to get work experience they can use to become independent.		\$\$\$-\$\$\$\$\$	NT-LT	Cost could be lower (but still significant) if approach is applied to existing shelter programs; cost is very high if based on a whole new shelter program	P	P	P		L				
	C.17 *	Both Camp Unity and Tent City IV would each appreciate a permanent site so they don't have to move every 90 days. The moves add cost to their operations and a great deal of uncertainty.		\$	ST-NT		L/P			L/P	P				
D. Improve public (business, residents) understanding / ability to assist	D.1	Develop printable literature/public education program for Redmond residents to identify how to help the homeless, who to call for various issues.		\$\$	ST	Basic literature development is in progress now. Public education program would need to be developed/implemented	L	P	P	P	P		P	P	
	D.2	Create an independent outreach position not tied to any particular organization to continually assess the make-up, needs and travel patterns of the local homeless population. This person would also distribute information on available services.		\$\$\$	ST-NT	Assumed this suggestion is for the city to create a Homelessness Specialist/Outreach position?	L?								
	D.3	Create a staff position focused on creating volunteer opportunities for community members to positively impact homelessness.		\$-\$\$\$	ST-NT	Cost would depend on the hosting organization. Could this idea be merged with D2 for efficiency?	L?	P	P	P	P		P		
	D.4	Offer low-skill positions (grounds-keeping, exterior painting, cart return) to homeless individuals		\$	ST	Is this suggestion for business or residents or both?	P	L		P	P				
	D.5	Develop job training and placement programs with business participation in creating job listings				Duplicative of B.6 so did not rate again.									
	D.6	Establish a system where homeless can secure access to shelter and services in exchange for helping Redmond small businesses		\$\$	ST	This is a programmatic question for shelter providers. Are any of them willing to do this? Cost would be to pay for someone to set up business placements and then to monitor and track participation.		P		P	L				
	D.7	Create a periodic "day of caring" in the City where service providers (city, library,		\$	ST	Underway; Redmond Library is serving as lead	P	P	P	P	L		L		

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members <i>Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.</i>	TF Member Rating 5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners? Lead = L Other partners needed = P							
							City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service / Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals
		nonprofits, etc.) private businesses and residents can come together and provide services to the homeless (haircuts, job search, healthcare, etc. -- based on Bothell model)												
E. Advocacy Partnerships depend on support for the advocacy idea	E.1	Support the County's Best Starts for Kids Levy		NA	Immediate	See Appendix D	P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
	E.2	Engage significant advocacy at the state and national level to restore funding for a robust mental health system		\$	ST-NT-LT		P	P	L	P	P		P	P
	E.3	Advocate with the state to make it easier to access and distribute Community Housing Grant (CHG) and Housing Support Program (HSP) funds		\$	ST-NT		P	P	P	P	L	P	P	P
	E.4*	Advocate for local District High Schools to teach budgeting, long term planning, consequences of single parenthood, work ethics, responsibility for one's action, and self-reliance.			ST-NT		P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
	E.5*	Advocate for Schools and government to encourage strong families by eliminating policies that discourage parents and children from communicating. For example, school policies that allow schools to provide IUDs for girls without notifying parents, privacy laws that prevent parents from knowing what their 13+ year olds are doing (medical records), etc.			ST-NT		P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
	E.6*	Advocate for a change in State law and city code not to raise property taxes on the owner of the property until the property is sold. Raising taxes on marginal people makes their homes unaffordable, raising taxes on owners who rent out homes forces them to raise rents.			ST-NT		P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
	E.7*	Advocate for changes to state law and local code that would prevent homeless persons			ST-NT		P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members <i>Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.</i>	TF Member Rating 5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners? Lead = L Other partners needed = P							
							City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service / Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals
		with illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia from receiving any assistance from the local community for some period of time. (subject to federal law limitations)												
	E.8*	Advocate for changes to state law and City code so that a person getting a trespass citation is not be eligible to stay in local shelters. (subject to federal law limitations).			ST-NT		P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
	E.9*	Advocate for a change in state law/constitution that would allow the City to pay up to 50% of a down payment on a home. If the home appreciates, when it sells the city would receive 50% of the increase.		City could make or lose money depending on housing market	NT-LT	Would require support of the city council to pursue	L	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
F. Other	F.1	Create an Eastside coalition of community stakeholders (cities, businesses, residents, faith community, service providers) to address homelessness in the Eastside		\$	ST	The Eastside Homelessness Advisory Committee exists and meets monthly. Perhaps expand this group to include business reps and interested residents?	L	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	F.2	Adopt legislation barring major residential rent hikes from going into effect in less than 60-90 days.			ST-NT	From the city attorney: RCW 35.21.830 provides that “The imposition of controls on rent is of statewide significance and is preempted by the state.” Just to clarify this would be an issue of state advocacy—not local	P	P	L	P	P	P	P	P
	F.3	Fund job training programs		\$-\$\$\$	ST-NT	This is a question of scale/priority; Expand capacity of existing programs and by how much; create a new program with a particular focus? Consolidate with B.6/D.5?	P	P	L	P	P			
	F.4	Convene an ongoing commission of all stakeholders to meet at least quarterly to review progress & discuss ongoing issues		\$	ST	Is this a suggestion to continue the Task Force as an oversight group?	L	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
	F.5	Close The Landing		\$-\$\$\$\$	ST-NT-LT	Would require a willingness by the organization; cost could be low if just closing, but potentially very high if re-locating. Implications for Redmond’s role as a regional partner in addressing homelessness.					L			
	F.6	Take additional action to ensure the Redmond Library is not used a hang-out by homeless individuals				What specific actions should be taken and by whom?								
	F.7*	Reduce the amount of government money spent on homelessness. Fewer government				Too vague to rate as is. What services should no longer be supported? Hard to estimate cost savings								

CATEGORY	Item #	Action Items Proposed By Task Force Members Asterisked (*) items suggested after Meeting 4.	TF Member Rating 5 – I strongly support 4 – I support 3 – I neither support or oppose 2 – I oppose 1 – I strongly oppose	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement Short Term = 1-2yrs. Near Term = 2-5 yrs. Long Term = > 5 yrs.	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups – Which should lead implementation? Who are necessary partners? Lead = L Other partners needed = P							
							City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service / Shelter Providers	Low Income Housing Providers	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County,	Homeless Individuals
		services may be better than more, as fewer services will require people to help family and each other				or expense as consequences are difficult to predict.								
	F.8*	Reduce the regulatory/tax burden on new small businesses so that it is easier for homeless individuals to start their own business				Too vague to rate as is. What specific changes are recommended that can be implemented in Redmond?		P	L	P				
	F.9*	Consolidate the number of government agencies serving the homeless to streamline operations and reduce overlapping and conflicting services.				The city has little ability to control this, so not sure how to rate								
G. Staff Ideas	G. 1	Consider installing signs discouraging panhandling. This could be a stand-alone strategy or part of a broader community education campaign		\$	ST	See Appendix E	L							
	G. 2	What if “everyone” in Redmond read the same book on homelessness and then had community conversations?		\$	ST	Focus here is on community engagement/education	P	P	P	P	P	P	L	P
	G. 3	Develop a “sponsorship” program; housed person or family A “adopts/sponsors” homeless person or family B. This could range from just developing a relationship to providing up to a set amount of financial support to becoming a host home		\$\$	ST-NT		P	P	P	L?	L?			P

Results will be tallied to show frequency distribution of TF member ratings of each idea, (& retain staff/stakeholder screen info)

% rating 4-5

% rating 3

% rating 1-2

Greater or equal to 80% voting 4-5 = consensus item 60-79% voting 4-5 = recommendation item

Handling Panhandling

Basic panhandling information, current ordinances in east King County, and approaches to panhandling from around the country.

Panhandling in Profile



A panhandler in Kirkland

- A typical panhandler is a disabled, unemployed, middle-aged single male who is a racial minority. He may have substance abuse problems, few family ties, a high school education, and laborer’s skills. Most do not have diagnosed mental illness. ¹
- Average daily income from panhandling varies by area- \$50-\$60 a day in “good areas of Seattle” and \$10 in “not so great neighborhoods.”² A 2013 San Francisco survey of panhandlers found the average to be less than \$25 per day.³
- Common reasons for panhandling: Unemployment, disability. ⁴

Existing Ordinances in Washington State

	<i>Ordinance</i>	<i>Penalty</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>
<i>Covington</i>	“Aggressive solicitation” shall mean to approach, speak or gesture to a person in such a manner as would cause a reasonable person to feel fearful of safety to their person, another person or property in the person’s possession; (Ord. 06-10 § 2).	Misdemeanor.	
<i>Issaquah</i>	“It shall be unlawful for a person to make coercive solicitation. It shall be unlawful for a person to make coercive solicitation. It shall be unlawful to make solicitation to pedestrians on public property after sunset or before sunrise. It shall be unlawful to solicit at the On-ramp or off-ramp to state route or interstate highway & within 300 feet of select intersections.” (Ord. 2513 § 1, 2008).	Misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for up to 90 days.	Also prohibited roadside fundraisers such as carwashes, Firefighter’s Fill the Boot
<i>Pierce County</i>	Panhandlers must stay at least 25 feet away from people using ATM machines, pay phones, gas stations or other exposed public areas in unincorporated Pierce County; prohibits solicitations to occupants of vehicles on public roadways. (Ordinance No. 2008-45).	Misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for up to 90 days.	
<i>Seattle</i>	Defines to beg, aggressively beg, obstruct pedestrian or vehicular traffic, and public place - A person is guilty of pedestrian interference if he or she intentionally obstructs pedestrian or vehicular traffic or aggressively begs in a public place. (Municipal Code Sec. 12A.12.015). “Sitting or lying down on a public sidewalk between 7:00 am and 9:00 pm between Puget Sound, S. Jackson, I-5, and Denny Way/Broad St. (SMC 15.48.040) (does not apply in parks; contact SPD non-emergency line, OR 1-800-324-7273) & Reyes, 2013 (Sept. 11, 2002) Union Gospel Service, 2013 (Reyes, 2013) (Sept. 11, 2002) Emergency Services Administration.	Misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment.	2010-2012: 24 reports of aggressive panhandling, 105 accounts of obstructing 2010-2011: 45 defendants found guilty, 15% of all cases mentally incompetent.

What's Worked

Donor-oriented approaches:

Redirected Giving: The City of Denver repurposed 86 parking meters to facilitate giving to charitable organizations rather than panhandlers. The meters feature credit card functionality and quantified information such as "\$1.50 buys a meal." The city estimates that the meters bring in \$100k annually and have reduced panhandling by 90%. Similar programs are being implemented in Miami, Pasadena, Nashville, and Memphis.



Targeted Information: Evanston, IL's award-winning anti-panhandling program focused efforts on identifying donors. Data collected by Evanston PD from local businesses and revealed that Northwestern University students were major donors to panhandlers, so information distribution efforts were focused on and around campus. The program also featured volunteers called "intervenes" who identified donors on the street and discretely approached them afterwards to explain the problem of panhandling and provided alternative giving options. Evanston claims a 64% reduction in panhandlers in the target area.

Time, Manner & Place Restrictions:

Courts have usually upheld laws restricting the time, manner, and place in which panhandling may occur. However, most of the evidence showing these restrictions reduce panhandling is anecdotal. Some examples of common restrictions are:

Time: Panhandling at night or near ATMs is prohibited in some cities (Calgary, AB, Minneapolis, MN.)

Manner: Aggressive panhandling (asking repeatedly & immediately following being denied, following, or in a way that blocks sidewalks or roads is frequently the subject of restrictions (Seattle, Oklahoma City, OK and others.) Seattle's ordinance prohibiting aggressive panhandling was upheld in court because it distinguished between conduct calculated to harm from passive panhandling.

Place: Areas used for public transportation such as subways, train stations, bus stops, and airports are off-limits to panhandlers (New York City, Akron, OH, others.)

What Hasn't Worked

Panhandler-oriented approaches

Total Ban on Panhandling: Out-right bans have been repeatedly struck down by the Courts on the basis that panhandling in public areas is considered free speech (New Orleans, Michigan, Utah, Phoenix, LA, Florida, California, and others.)

Sit/Lie Ordinances: These ordinances prohibit sitting or lying on the sidewalk during certain hours of the day. They are frequently challenged by homeless advocacy groups and have been overturned in some cities (Portland, OR.) Research from Berkeley found the ordinances to be ineffective in connecting people to services or increasing shopping traffic.

Vague or Redundant Language restricting Panhandling: Attempts to ban panhandling in medians, or near intersections have been struck down in Everett, WA, Medford, OR, and Portland, ME on the basis that they can be enforced through other laws (EG: disorderly conduct.)

What Might Work

Signage: Placing signs in common panhandling areas such as off-ramps and intersections (Arlington, Spokane, Kirkland.)

Less-hospitable Landscaping: Landscaping common panhandling areas to make them less accessible or hospitable, using barriers such as walls or boulders (CA, Spokane.)

Informative Campaigns to General Public: In contrast to the Evanston program which identified donors specifically, these campaigns distribute information to the entire region through mailers, presentations (Spokane, Atlanta.)

Panhandling Licenses: Panhandlers must register for a permit or be fined (Greensboro, NC.)

References

- (2015, June 23). Retrieved from Denver's Road Home: <http://www.denversroadhome.org/>
- Aitchison, S. (2012, September 14). Are Seattle's panhandler's too aggressive? *Real Change*, pp. <http://realchangenews.org/2012/09/14/are-seattle-s-panhandlers-too-aggressive>.
- Burkhalter, A. (2014, August 6). With ban on panhandling, Snohomish County, city of Arlington exemplifies national trend. *Real Change*, pp. <http://realchangenews.org/2014/08/06/ban-panhandling-snohomish-county-city-arlington-exemplifies-national-trend>.
- Criscione, W. (2014, August 2). City, Downtown Spokane Partnership campaign to target panhandling. *The Spokesman-Review*, pp. <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2014/aug/02/city-downtown-spokane-partnership-caign-to/>.
- Evanston, I. P. (1995). *Anti-Panhandling Strategy*. Evanston, IL: City of Evanston.
- Green, A. (2009, June 23). Sit-Lie Law Ruled Unconstitutional. *The Oregonian*, p. <http://www.oregonlive.com/news/oregonian/index.ssf?/base/news/1245725707301860.xml>.
- Keyes, S. (2013, October 30). Everything you think you know about panhandlers is wrong. *ThinkProgress.org*, pp. <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/10/30/2856411/panhandling-stats/>.
- Municipal Research and Services Center. (2015, June 25). *Nuisances: Regulation & Abatement*. Retrieved from www.mrsc.org: <http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Legal/Regulation/Nuisances-Regulation-and-Abatement.aspx>
- Reese, F. (2013, August 16). Court Rules Michigan Anti-Panhandling Law Unconstitutional. *MintPress News*, pp. <http://www.mintpressnews.com/court-rules-michigans-anti-panhandling-law-is-unconstitutional/167062/>.
- Scheidegger, K. S. (1992). *A Guide To Regulating Panhandling*. Sacramento, CA: Criminal Justice Legal Foundation.
- Scott, M. (2002). *The Problem of Panhandling*. Retrieved from Center for Problem-Oriented Policing: <http://www.popcenter.org/problems/panhandling>
- Scott, M. S. (2003). *Panhandling*. Washington DC: US Department of Justice.
- Selbin, J. (2012). *Does Sit-Lie Work: Will Berkeley's "Measure S" Increase Economic Activity and Improve Services to Homeless People?* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Law.
- Simms, R. (2015, June 11). Decline of Panhandling Citations in Spokane. *krem.com*, pp. <http://www.krem.com/story/news/local/spokane-county/2015/06/11/decline-of-panhandling-citations-in-spokane/71057328/>.
- Thomas, L. (2013, October 3). The truth behind the cardboard signs of Seattle's panhandlers. *MyNorthwest.com*, pp. <http://mynorthwest.com/646/2367610/The-truth-behind-the-cardboard-signs-of-Seattles-panhandlers>.
- Winters, C. (2015, April 15). ACLU takes aim at Everett Panhandling Ordinance. *HeraldNet*, p. <http://www.heraldnet.com/article/20150415/NEWS01/150419359>.
- Wolf, J. (2007, September 19). Denver to roll-out more homeless meters. *9News*, p. <http://archive.9news.com/news/story.aspx?storyid=77476&catid=222>.

Information regarding Transportation Funding—prepared by Transportation Planning Staff

PSRC Special Needs Transportation Funding

- This is the most relevant grant source for special needs transportation (e.g. shuttle / faith based services)
- The primary focus is on seniors and individuals with disabilities, support for low income and homeless needs is less clear
- Who can apply: transit agencies, jurisdictions, non-profits
- There has been interest in the City potentially applying for funds in the next grant cycle to support a shuttle in the downtown
- 50% local match required
- Concerns: recent federal changes have made funding more scarce, and funding likely requires service to have eligibility restrictions (age/disability)
- PSRC Contact: Gil Cerise - 206-971-3053

<http://www.psrc.org/funding/special/>

WSDOT Regional Mobility Grant

- Focuses on service or routes that carry lots of people; less relevant for special needs transportation (e.g. shuttle / faith based services)
- Usually funds:
 - Transit Lanes
 - Transit Centers
 - Transit service with high ridership
 - New buses
 - Transportation Demand Management programs in congested corridors
- Who can apply: Likely limited to Transit agencies, Jurisdictions (have not seen a non-profit awarded a grant in the past)

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Transit/Grants/mobility.htm>

Comparison of Seattle’s Affordable Housing Recommendations (from HALA Task Force) to City of Redmond’s Affordable Housing Practices—Prepared by Housing Planner

July, 2015

1. Tax breaks for landlords who agree to restrict rents at existing properties:

Not sure exactly if this is what the article is referring to but sounds like: Multifamily tax exemption program? City of Redmond (COR) has considered looking into this in more detail, especially for application in specific areas.

2. Support for land trusts that preserve permanent affordability:

City may be supportive of this if a developer or non-profit was interested in creating an affordable land trust.

3. Easier housing access for people with criminal records:

The City has not specifically addressed this.

4. Reduced parking quotas for residential development:

The City has provisions to allow reduced parking when a developer provides a Traffic Impact Analysis and it can be shown that the project will result in a lower parking demand. We have done this for the 160th senior affordable project, for example, as well as the two existing residential suites (“apodment”) projects in Downtown.

5. Housing Levy:

This is one of a number of items being considered by the ARCH Executive Board in their review and study of dedicated funding sources for housing.

6. Residential developers allowed to build taller in newly developed “upzones” in return for either building affordable housing units in their projects or paying into a fund for the city to build them:

This is essentially the inclusionary program that the City of Redmond has had in place since 1994 with the adoption of the Downtown Neighborhood Plan update. At that time, density limits (units per acre) became based instead on parking and site requirements instead of a *unit per acre* calculation, resulting in an area wide upzone. With the upzone, the City instituted the inclusionary housing requirements so that all new developments of 10 or more dwelling units would provide 10% of the total units as affordable to individuals or families with incomes at 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

We also have provisions for alternative compliance which includes paying a “fee-in-lieu” instead of providing housing. We encourage the creation of the housing units over the fee-in-lieu payment.

This program has been the most successful in creating affordable homes, primarily rental, though some ownership. Most of the affordable dwelling units we have established through these requirements are affordable at 80% AMI; our requirements also allow 50% AMI, in which case the number of affordable units required of the developer is 5% of the total units.

We now have 379 contracted affordable units, which will continue to be affordable for the next approximately 40-50 years. ARCH administers this program for the City.

7. Commercial developers will pay a linkage fee based on square footage to fund affordable housing:

This is also one of the items the ARCH Executive Board has been looking in to re: dedicated funding source. The COR has not separately considered this option.

8. Residential projects taking advantage of upzones will be permitted an extra one or two stories and they will need to make 5 to 7 percent of their units affordable to households with incomes at or below 60 percent of the AMI:

In Overlake and Downtown, our Affordable Regulations, RZC 21.20.030(H) provide for the affordable housing bonus units to be implemented through an obtaining an additional floor. In Downtown, (for example), developers receive a square footage density credit equal to the square footage of the affordable housing units provided. This square footage credit can be converted to Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) certificates.

9. Six percent of single-family zone neighborhoods, those adjacent to denser urban villages, will be upzoned as well.

The City of Redmond has encouraged more density within single family areas through alternative housing types including cottages, Size-Limited and Backyard Homes, and Multiplex (i.e. duplex) homes.

In the early 1990’s, the City created provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and was a pioneer in allowing detached ADUs on single family lots. Since 2002, we have worked with individual neighborhood Citizen Advisory Committees to discuss community needs and appropriate housing strategies within their neighborhoods. With each neighborhood plan update, we review various ways to incorporate more housing opportunities through our land use regulations which have included cottages, multiplex homes within single family areas, (e.g. duplexes, triplexes), backyard homes and size-limited homes as well as affordable housing options. These alternative housing strategies, including inclusionary requirements, have been successfully adopted for most city neighborhoods through this “grass roots” process.

Redmond’s Comprehensive Plan states that the overall goals for housing are two-fold: 1) to increase the overall supply of housing; and, 2) to create opportunities for alternative forms of housing such that people have more choice in housing type. The City of Redmond has been successful in creating an

increase in supply and moderate success in creating a greater variety of housing through these incentives.

10. New Housing Alternatives Via Upzones – Are They “Affordable”?

In our efforts to increase housing supply and variety, homes created through land use regulations may be only “relatively” affordable compared to new standard single family detached homes. The average new home built in Redmond is now just under 3,200 square feet: with size limits on cottages and other alternative forms of housing, they may be less expensive only because they may be 1/3 to ½ the size of a detached single family home. While we continue to believe increasing housing supply and variety is an important goal, we also understand that there are limitations to creating affordability through land use regulations. Our experience has been that dwellings built through land use regulations (if no affordable covenant) are not “affordable” in the strict definition of the term, i.e., persons with incomes at 80% AMI with a minimum down payment could not afford to purchase a duplex or a cottage home now for sale in Redmond.

Best Starts for Kids: Key Provisions of Proposed Ordinance



Levy Amount

A six-year levy lid lift at a rate of 14 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value, which would raise about \$58 million in the first year and a cumulative \$392.3 million, at a cost to the average King County homeowner of about \$56 per year.

Investing Early

Fifty percent of the revenue would be invested in strategies focused on children under age five and pregnant women, including a modest investment to sustain and expand parent and child health services that are delivered through the county's Public Health Centers. The science and evidence shows us that the earlier we invest, the greater the return for both the child's development and our society.

Sustaining the Gain

Thirty-five percent would be invested in strategies focused on children and youth aged five through twenty-four. The science and research tells us that the brain continues to develop during this time and that prevention strategies strategically addressed at key developmental stages or transition points in a young person's life help to sustain gains made earlier in life.

Communities Matter

Nine percent would be invested in community-level strategies through expansion and sustainability of the partnership between King County and The Seattle Foundation on Communities of Opportunity (COO). COO is based on the latest research and evidence regarding the impact of place on a child's success and the importance of supporting communities in building their own capacity to create positive change.

Outcomes-Focused and Data Driven

Six percent would support evaluation, data collection and improving the delivery of services and programs for children and youth. This will ensure Best Starts for Kids strategies are tailored for children from every background in King County and that we deliver on the results for every child in King County.

Initial Collections

Initial levy collections would be used to create a family and youth homelessness prevention initiative modeled on a successful pilot implemented by organizations serving survivors of

domestic violence, to fund additional scientific research to expand the reach of prevention strategies to all King County families, and to establish a reserve for the levy fund.

Advisory Boards

The ordinance proposes that the county establish advisory boards for Best Starts for Kids, with the existing governance group for COO acting as the advisory board for that portion of the levy funds. The King County Department of Community and Human Services will be accountable for financial oversight and reporting responsibilities.

Implementation

In order to reduce inequities in our County, Best Starts for Kids strategies are designed to be both universal and targeted, with the large majority of Best Starts for Kids levy funding competitively bid in outcomes-focused contracts to community-based organizations. This will help ensure that the strategies are implemented in a manner that is appropriate for all cultural and ethnic groups and that each child and her caregivers receive the tools and level of support they need. Should the council place this measure on the ballot and the voters approve it, the county will refine outcomes and indicators through development of a detailed implementation plan with input and consultation from the community.

Please Give to a Local Charity



help reduce panhandling
redmond.gov/give



Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force

Draft Task Force Report Outline

1. Executive Summary (1 p)
2. Introduction (1 p)
 - a. Creation of Task Force
 - b. Members
 - c. Process / Work plan /Timeline
3. Task Force Adopted Problem Statement and What Success Looks Like (2-3 pp)
4. Criteria for Task Force Recommendations (1 p)
5. Recommendations (3-5 pp)
 - a. Presented in Matrix Format, with additional comments as agreed
6. Next Steps (1 p.)
7. Attachments:
 - a. Task Force Members
 - b. Complete Ballot Results
 - c. Summary of recommendations from community meeting and focus groups (?)

Proposed edits to Problem Statement from Andrew Koeppen:

Under the caption:

The Task Force identified the following issues and conditions to be of greatest concern:

Add the following:

- Breakdown of families, single parenthood, drug addiction, and father-absent homes significantly increase the odds of families and children entering into a cycle of poverty and homelessness.
- Some Federal/State regulation and taxation policies are making it harder for those who are homeless or living in poverty to get out of their situation and pushing people on the brink of homelessness and poverty into those situations.

Under the caption:

- **Hard for Supportive Agencies to Help Homeless Individuals**

Add the following:

- Non-profits that receive funding from Federal and State government are required to exclude faith communities from providing faith-based services which would provide support and help the homeless reintegrate successfully into society.
- Government over-regulation increases the burden on nonprofits seeking to provide services to the homeless.