

1. Agenda

Documents:

[TASK FORCE MEETING 6 AGENDA V 8 2.PDF](#)

2. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[081215MEETINGMATERIALS.PDF](#)

REDMOND COMMUNITY HOMELESSNESS TASK FORCE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2015

6:30 – 9:00 pm

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

AGENDA--MEETING 6

- 1. Welcome, Introductions, Review of Agenda (5 min.)**
- 2. Approval of Meeting 5 Summary (3 min.)**
- 3. Review Balloting Results, Offer Amendments, Clarification and Comments (75 min.)**
 - a. Priority items?**
- 4. Review Draft Task Force Report (30 min.)**
 - a. Executive Summary TBD**
 - b. Mission / Process / membership**
 - c. Problem Statement (as revised 7.29)**
 - d. Criteria**
 - e. Recommendations**
 - f. Attachments**
 - i. Members**
 - ii. Ballot**
- 5. Proposal for Task Force “Roll Out” Plan: Council Presentation September 22 (25 min.)**
- 6. Closing Comments (10 min.)**

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 1st /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.

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each					% of Each Rating					Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Public Safety	A.1	Increase police bike patrols in downtown, by retail properties and on trails.	0	0	1	4	9	0%	0%	7%	29%	64%	93%	7%	0%	C
Public Safety	A.2	Adopt panhandling ordinance or other effective approaches to regulating panhandling	1	1	4	3	5	7%	7%	29%	21%	36%	57%	29%	14%	
Public Safety	A.3	Require panhandlers to get a license	5	2	3	2	2	36%	14%	21%	14%	14%	29%	21%	50%	
Public Safety	A.4	Implement a community awareness campaign which may or may not include posting signs discouraging panhandling.	0	1	1	6	6	0%	7%	7%	43%	43%	86%	7%	7%	C
Public Safety	A.5	Post signs city has developed to discourage panhandling	1	3	4	3	3	7%	21%	29%	21%	21%	43%	29%	29%	
Public Safety	A.6	Additional neighborhood resource officers	1	0	5	2	6	7%	0%	36%	14%	43%	57%	36%	7%	
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.1	Triple the City's Human Services funding pool – and target the money to fund upstream interventions to prevent homelessness	1	1	5	3	4	7%	7%	36%	21%	29%	50%	36%	14%	
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.2	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.	1	1	5	4	3	7%	7%	36%	29%	21%	50%	36%	14%	
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.3	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.	2	1	3	2	6	14%	7%	21%	14%	43%	57%	21%	21%	
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.4	Increase funding for outreach workers	2	1	5	3	3	14%	7%	36%	21%	21%	43%	36%	21%	

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each					% of Each Rating					Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.5	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.	1	0	3	7	3	7%	0%	21%	50%	21%	71%	21%	7%	R
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.6	Increase the number of transit passes available to the homeless	2	2	1	2	7	14%	14%	7%	14%	50%	64%	7%	29%	R
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.7	Create additional day center resources on the Eastside to meet regional needs/ open a regional day center	1	0	2	3	8	7%	0%	14%	21%	57%	79%	14%	7%	C
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.8	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.	8	3	1	0	2	57%	21%	7%	0%	14%	14%	7%	79%	
Providing More Enhanced Services	B.9	Shower program for the homeless. Organizations with shower facilities would allow volunteers to coordinate showers for homeless people on certain times and days	2	1	3	4	4	14%	7%	21%	29%	29%	57%	21%	21%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.1	City and faith communities should engage to identify homeless encampment locations on the Eastside	1	1	5	3	4	7%	7%	36%	21%	29%	50%	36%	14%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	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.	1	0	1	4	8	7%	0%	7%	29%	57%	86%	7%	7%	C

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each					% of Each Rating					Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.3	Extend City's inclusionary zoning ordinance to require some units affordable to households making 50% or less of average median income (down from current 80%)	1	1	3	2	7	7%	7%	21%	14%	50%	64%	21%	14%	R
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.4	Create a City-owned car camping site, where people could pay to stay for up to 1 month.	5	2	1	3	3	36%	14%	7%	21%	21%	43%	7%	50%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.5	Create a city owned rest stop (require payment for use)	3	3	5	2	1	21%	21%	36%	14%	7%	21%	36%	43%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.6	Reduce the cost of securing temporary use permits for tent cities	4	0	4	2	4	29%	0%	29%	14%	29%	43%	29%	29%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.7	Expand capacity at The Landing	4	3	2	1	4	29%	21%	14%	7%	29%	36%	14%	50%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.8	Create storage lockers for homeless individuals	2	1	2	4	5	14%	7%	14%	29%	36%	64%	14%	21%	R
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.9	Increase affordable housing options	1	0	3	3	7	7%	0%	21%	21%	50%	71%	21%	7%	R
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.10	Study feasibility of relocating community services from present place of business to one with less impact on downtown businesses, residents.	5	2	4	0	3	36%	14%	29%	0%	21%	21%	29%	50%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.11	Create a city "Flexible Funding Pool" that can help people stay in their homes with emergency loans, grants.	1	0	1	7	5	7%	0%	7%	50%	36%	86%	7%	7%	C

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each					% of Each Rating					Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.12	Expand funds to help those living in shelters to secure 1 st & last month's rent, security deposits, in order to move into permanent private housing.	1	0	2	4	7	7%	0%	14%	29%	50%	79%	14%	7%	R
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.13	Change city code to require that if a shelter doesn't screen out residents for drug use that it requires any drug use occur on premises and individuals arrested offsite for drug use will be evicted from the shelter.	8	1	2	0	3	57%	7%	14%	0%	21%	21%	14%	64%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.14	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 regularly patrolled by police, and have strict quiet times, open drug/alcohol use. It would be open to anyone-- not just the homeless.	5	1	4	3	1	36%	7%	29%	21%	7%	29%	29%	43%	
Expand, Improve and/or Mitigate Impacts	C.15	Identify/Create permanent sites for Camp Unity and Tent City 4 so they do not have to move every 90 days.	4	1	3	4	2	29%	7%	21%	29%	14%	43%	21%	36%	
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.1	Develop printable literature/public education program for Redmond residents to identify how to help the homeless, who to call for various issues.	0	0	3	3	8	0%	0%	21%	21%	57%	79%	21%	0%	R
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.2	The City should 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.	2	2	5	2	3	14%	14%	36%	14%	21%	36%	36%	29%	

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each					% of Each Rating					Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.3	Create a staff position focused on creating volunteer opportunities for community members to positively impact homelessness.	2	3	6	2	1	14%	21%	43%	14%	7%	21%	43%	36%	
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.4	Offer entry level positions (grounds-keeping, exterior painting, cart return) to homeless individuals	2	1	6	4	1	14%	7%	43%	29%	7%	36%	43%	21%	
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.5	Create/Support a periodic “day of caring” in the City where service providers (city, library, nonprofits, etc.) private businesses and residents can come together and provide services to the homeless (haircuts, job search, healthcare, etc. -- based on Bothell model)	0	3	2	5	4	0%	21%	14%	36%	29%	64%	14%	21%	R
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.6	Coordinate a “Redmond Reads” Initiative encouraging “everyone” in Redmond to read the same book on homelessness and then participate in community conversations about it.	1	3	6	3	1	7%	21%	43%	21%	7%	29%	43%	29%	
Improve public (business, residents) understanding	D.7	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	4	3	3	3	1	29%	21%	21%	21%	7%	29%	21%	50%	
Advocacy	E.1	Support the County’s Best Starts for Kids Levy	2	0	2	3	7	14%	0%	14%	21%	50%	71%	14%	14%	R
Advocacy	E.2	Engage significant advocacy at the state and national level to restore funding for a robust mental health system	1	0	1	5	7	7%	0%	7%	36%	50%	86%	7%	7%	C

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each % of Each Rating										Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Advocacy	E.3	Advocate with the state to make it easier to access and distribute Community Housing Grant (CHG) and Housing Support Program (HSP) funds	1	0	3	4	6	7%	0%	21%	29%	43%	71%	21%	7%	R
Advocacy	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.	2	3	5	0	4	14%	21%	36%	0%	29%	29%	36%	36%	
Advocacy	E.5	Advocate for a change in State Constitution 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.	9	2	1	1	1	64%	14%	7%	7%	7%	14%	7%	79%	
Advocacy	E.6	Advocate for changes to state law and local code that would prevent homeless persons with illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia from receiving any assistance from the local community for some period of time. (subject to federal law limitations)	8	2	1	1	2	57%	14%	7%	7%	14%	21%	7%	71%	
Advocacy	E.7	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).	7	2	1	2	2	50%	14%	7%	14%	14%	29%	7%	64%	
Advocacy	E.8	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.	4	2	4	2	2	29%	14%	29%	14%	14%	29%	29%	43%	
Advocacy	E.9	Advocate for a new shelter in East King County to serve homeless individuals suffering from addiction.	1	1	6	3	3	7%	7%	43%	21%	21%	43%	43%	14%	
Advocacy	E.10	Advocate to consolidate the number of government agencies serving the homeless to streamline operations and reduce overlapping and conflicting services.	2	2	6	2	2	14%	14%	43%	14%	14%	29%	43%	29%	

Task Force Recommendations 08/12/15

Summary of Recommendations			Quantity of Each					% of Each Rating					Combined Rating			Results
Category	Item	Action	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	4 and 5	3	2 and 1	
Other	F.1	Create an Eastside coalition of community stakeholders (cities, businesses, residents, faith community, service providers) to address homelessness in the Eastside	2	1	3	3	4	15%	8%	23%	23%	31%	54%	23%	23%	
Other	F.2	Adopt legislation barring major residential rent hikes from going into effect in less than 60-90 days.	3	3	3	0	5	21%	21%	21%	0%	36%	36%	21%	43%	
Other	F.3	Convene an ongoing commission of all stakeholders to meet at least quarterly to review progress & discuss ongoing issues	0	0	3	5	5	0%	0%	23%	38%	38%	77%	23%	0%	R
Other	F.4	Close The Landing	12	1	0	0	1	86%	7%	0%	0%	7%	7%	0%	93%	
Other	F.5	Take additional action to ensure the Redmond Library is not used as a hang-out by homeless individuals	2	3	5	2	2	14%	21%	36%	14%	14%	29%	36%	36%	
Other	F.6	Reduce the amount of government money spent on homelessness. Fewer government services may be better than more, as fewer services will require people to help family and each other	10	2	1	0	1	71%	14%	7%	0%	7%	7%	7%	86%	
Other	F.7	Reduce the regulatory/tax burden on new small businesses so that it is easier for homeless individuals to start their own business	5	1	4	2	2	36%	7%	29%	14%	14%	29%	29%	43%	

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

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. Conclusions Next Steps (1 p.)
7. Attachments:
 - a. Task Force Members
 - b. Summary of recommendations from community meeting and focus groups
 - c. Complete Ballot Results

Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force

DRAFT Task Force Report

Executive Summary

The Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force was created by Mayor John Marchione in late April of 2015, after a very strong showing of concern about homelessness in a Redmond community meeting held in March 2015. The Task Force was composed of 14 members representing a broad cross section of the City, including businesspeople, residents, members of the faith community, and staff from major nonprofit service agencies in Redmond. The mission of the Task Force was to ***“...seek to better understand the scope and causes of homelessness in Redmond, the systems in place to address homelessness, and...consider[ing] the range of concerns and potential solutions identified by the community...identify and recommend a set of short- and longer-term actions that our community can undertake to address these issues.”***

The Task Force met six times, from April through August, 2015. Task Force meetings were open to public observation and the public comment was taken online. The Task Force heard briefings on homelessness in Redmond and King County, the systems in place to address the needs of homeless families and individuals, and current City practices. The Task Force reviewed the concerns of the community as expressed in the March community meeting, and received additional input from two sets of local business owners in Redmond. Task Force members also heard from staff at The Landing, a shelter for young adults located in downtown Redmond.

Task Force members all participated in at least one site visit of a facility in Redmond providing either services or housing to homeless individuals. In addition, focus groups with five different sets of homeless individuals (4 groups in Redmond, 1 in Bellevue) were conducted and transcribed for the Task Force.

The Task Force believes that the Redmond community is a caring community that wants to address homelessness. City residents, business owners, nonprofit service organizations, the faith community, and those in city hall have all 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. 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.

While these impacts are 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. That system does not focus on city borders. It will take the work of all in our region—as well as state and national effort-- to solve these problems.

This report identifies **XX** separate action items that the Task Force believes the larger Redmond community should pursue to address homelessness here in our City. The Task Force believes a balanced approach is needed: Redmond should be both a safe community and a compassionate community. The

Task Force recommendations range from public safety measures, to work to increase services and housing available to homeless families and individuals, to advocacy. The recommendations will require the participation of all parts of the community – not just City Hall.

The Task Force defines success in response to the challenge of homelessness in Redmond to include:

- An improved sense of public safety.
- A reduction in loitering, trespassing and other similar incidents in the City.
- 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.
- Enhanced capacity for the 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. The Task Force believe the recommendations outlined in this report can move us forward on this path.

Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force

DRAFT Task Force Report

Introduction

- **Task Force Mission**

The Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force was created by Mayor John Marchione in late April of 2015. The creation of the Task Force came after a very strong community showing of concern about homelessness in a Redmond, at a community meeting sponsored by the City on March 12, 2015 at which over 100 residents and business owners registered a wide array of concerns and ideas to address those concerns.

We were charged by Mayor Marchione with the following mission:

The Task Force will seek to better understand the scope and causes of homelessness in Redmond, the systems in place to address homelessness, and will consider the range of concerns and potential solutions identified by the community. The Task Force will identify and recommend a set of short- and longer-term actions that our community can undertake to address these issues.

- **Task Force Membership**

The Task Force consists of fourteen (14) members, representing a diversity of resident, business, service provider and faith community interests in Redmond. The members of the Task Force and our affiliations are identified at **Attachment A**.

- **Our Process**

The Task Force met six times, from April 29 through August 12. Each meeting lasted two-and a half to three hours. We were supported by a team of City staff including the Deputy Director of the Planning Department, the Police Chief, and the Assistant to the Mayor. The City also secured an independent facilitator to help shape our work plan and facilitate our meetings.

The Task Force meetings were open to the public and all the agendas and materials reviewed by the Task Force were posted on the City's website, as were summaries of our meetings. We did not take oral comments at our meetings but encouraged written comments via the City website; a few comments were received and copies were provided to us. We were also provided with a summary of all the comments from the March 12 community meeting (see **Attachment B**) and had access the full meeting notes as posted on the City's website.

At the beginning of our deliberations, we adopted a charter to guide our decision making process. We spent most of our first three meetings learning about homelessness in Redmond. We began by hearing from lead staff for the King County Committee to End Homelessness, detailing the nature of homelessness across the County.

We heard from staff about the City’s mission and vision with respect to homelessness. City staff developed materials mapping the locations of homeless shelters and facilities across East King County. We heard from the Police Chief about how the Department approaches homelessness, and the cost of traditional arrest-book-prosecute-jail approaches. We heard about the City’s existing outreach efforts to connect homeless with services, and how the City is working with peer cities on the Eastside to compare different approaches to addressing homelessness.

We heard a presentation from some downtown business owners who have been challenged with aggressive panhandling and trespass issues. Several task force members have experienced similar problems and also contributed to this discussion. City staff also conducted a focus group with some city business operators from other parts of town about their concerns and experiences dealing with homeless individuals, and we were provided a transcript of that session. We also were able to hear from and ask questions of staff from Hopelink about how The Landing, a shelter for young adults agenda 18-24 located in downtown Redmond, is operated.

City staff kept a running list of all our information requests and we were presented responses to all these questions.

Between meetings, we completed “homework” about our issues of concerns and perceptions of the underlying causes. In addition, a series of site visits were arranged for us at local shelters and similar facilities, including:

- Congregations for the Homeless Day Center
- The Landing Shelter (Operated by Friends of Youth)
- Camp Unity
- Avondale Park Shelter/Transitional Housing (Operated by Hopelink)
- The Sophia Way Shelter
- Open Kitchen Meal Program (Operated by Redmond United Methodist Church)

All Task Force members attended at least one site visit. We had the opportunity to share our perspectives and reactions to these visits at a later Task Force meeting.

We wanted to ensure that we heard the perspectives of homeless individuals. For this purpose, City staff, with help of some Task Force members, arranged five meetings with several small groups of homeless individuals. The groups were quite varied—from mothers with children, living in the Avondale Housing project operated by Hopelink in Redmond, to young adults staying at The Landing, to men living on the streets and in city parks. The purpose of these meetings was to ask these individuals to share in their own words how they become homeless, what they feel they need to get out of homelessness, and what they would like others to know about them and their situation. The meetings were recorded and transcribed for us—over 150 pages of conversation--that provided a wealth of insight into the complexity of homelessness in our City, and the underlying causes of homelessness. Their words helped shape the recommendations in this report.

We spent our last three meetings approving criteria for our recommendations and then developing, reviewing and revising potential recommendations, arranged into six categories:

- 1. Improving public safety and reducing crime**
- 2. Expand, Improve services to homeless/sheltered individuals**

3. **Expand, Improve and Mitigate Impacts of shelter and housing options for the homeless, people with barriers to market housing**
4. **Improve public (business, residents) understanding / ability to assist**
5. **Advocacy**
6. **Other**

All Task Force members proposed recommendations, and staff offered a few as well. City staff developed an estimate for each item as to cost and time to implement. Staff and Task Force members together identified who the probable “lead” was for each item, and who would be necessary partners.

Over two meetings, we worked to get all the ideas on the table, clarify what each meant, eliminate items not within the scope of our mission and adopted criteria, and consolidate items where appropriate. We ended up with 54 separate items. We individually rated each idea by completing a “ballot.” Results were tabulated and presented at the last meeting. Per our charter, items supported by at least 80% of the Task Force members voting were considered to be “**consensus**” items; items supported by at least 60% but less than 80% were considered to be “**recommended**” items.” At our last meeting, we discussed and amended some of the voting results, and TBD ---selected the items we wanted to call out as our priority recommendations. We also reviewed this report in draft form as prepared by our facilitator, offered edits and agreed to a process for finalizing the report.

The Challenge

The Task Force approved the following “**problem statement**” and definition of “**what success looks like**”

- **Problem Statement**

The Redmond community is a caring community that wants to address homelessness. City R—residents, business owners, nonprofit service organizations, the faith community, and those in city hall – have all 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. R—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. Homelessness affects families with children, teens, young adults, mature adults, middle-aged and senior adults. —Tthere are y have many reasons why individuals become stories, have travelled many different paths to becoming homeless. What it will take to help each of them individual become stably housed isare 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 limpacts we feel in Redmond, they are also felt in other cities across King County: it will take the work of all in our region —as well as state and national effort-- to solve these problems.

The Task Force understands that identified the following issues and conditions are of to be of greatest concern to the community:

- Problem 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
- Panhandling
- The hardships of homeless families and individuals.

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 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 families and 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 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 transit passes to help homeless people get to their jobs and needed services
- 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
- Difficulty in finding and permitting sites for homeless encampments tent camps
- Lack of an effective coordinated regional process to identify sites where homeless facilities can locate
- **Hard for Supportive Agencies to Help Homeless Families and 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
 - Multiple government agency regulations and grant requirements create a burden on agency operations.

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.

- **What does success look like?**

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

- Improved sense of public safety—~~both perceived and actual.~~
- A reduction in ~~visible homelessness~~—loitering, trespassing and other similar incidents in the City 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.

Criteria for Task Force Recommendations

Our mission statement includes consideration of all homeless populations within the City. The Mayor specifically requested recommendations that the city – the government, residents, businesses, faith community – could act on to address the concerns and issues we identified and that we heard from the community. We chose to focus on items that could be meaningfully addressed within at most five years. To help focus our recommendations to respond to the Task Force’s mission, we adopted the following criteria screen for recommendations. Recommendations would be included for consideration by the Task Force if they meet all these criteria:

- **Actionable** – it is 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 dollar threshold for what is feasible).
- **Financially Willing Sponsors** – if the action involves public or private funding, the Task Force member sponsoring 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, and respond to the community’s concerns.

Recommendations

- **General Observations**

The complexity of the issue of homelessness, and the issues and challenges faced by homeless families and issues, means that there is no “silver bullet.” It will take a wide variety of strategies, and partners, to respond to the many challenges presented in this community.

Moreover, as noted above, homelessness is an issue that doesn’t respect city boundaries. The systems set up to address homelessness are regional—by which we mean Countywide-- and statewide. This doesn’t mean that our community cannot or should not take action. But we need to be mindful about the larger systems context in which our actions occur.

- **Recommendations**

Table 1 presents our recommendations by category, flagging those we call out as priorities. As noted above, we identified six categories of recommendations:

1. **Improving public safety and reducing crime**
2. **Expand, Improve services to homeless/sheltered individuals**
3. **Expand, Improve and Mitigate Impacts of shelter and housing options for the homeless, people with barriers to market housing**
4. **Improve public (business, residents) understanding / ability to assist**
5. **Advocacy**
6. **Other**

Why did we pick these six categories? We think it is important to provide general context on this question. Overall, the categories reflect our major areas of discussion in Task Force meetings, and reflect the complexity of homelessness. Specifically, we note:

1. **Improving public safety and reducing crime:** Several members of the Task Force and others from the community shared personal experiences of scary and/or criminal activity on or near their properties that they have reason to believe are directly related to the increased numbers of homeless individuals in the City. The Task Force feels strongly that a balanced approach is necessary to respond to these concerns: Redmond should be both a safe community, and a compassionate community. At the March 2015 community meeting, public safety concerns were mentioned more frequently than any other category of issue. We must be responsive to these very real concerns and issues.
2. **Expand, improve services to homeless/sheltered individuals:** We heard from many people—both speakers and Task Force members-- that there are insufficient services to meet the needs of homeless individuals in Redmond, the Eastside, and the County. Services needs range from outreach—connecting people to housing and services; to basic hygiene facilities; to health care; to life skills training. A major discussion point for us was the lack of a day center in Redmond, and lack of day center capacity throughout East King County.
3. **Expand, improve, and mitigate impacts of, shelter and housing options for the homeless, people with barriers to market housing:** At the most basic level, people will remain homeless if there is no housing or shelter for them. And it is very hard for many homeless individuals and families to save enough money to be able to put down first and last month's rent and a security deposit. While there is a recognition that services need to be sited somewhere, the Task Force encourages provider agencies to focus more effort on mitigating actual and potential impacts to surrounding areas.
4. **Improve public (business, residents) understanding / ability to assist:** We observe that there is a general lack of understanding about the complexity of homelessness and a lack of knowledge about resources available in our community to help homeless people. Additionally, there are many potential skills and resources available to assist with these issues in the business and residential community—not to mention that City efforts need community support. The faith community has effectively channeled support from businesses and residents for years, and has long been a major

player in providing services and housing to homeless individuals in Redmond. In sum, the community cannot expect or assume that City Hall can just make the issue of homelessness disappear. We must find ways to engage all parts of our community if we are to succeed.

5. **Advocacy:** Because homelessness is a regional, statewide and national issue, we must engage partners outside city boundaries to help make the systemic changes necessary.
6. **Other:** There are other actions we recommend that did not fall neatly into one of the categories above.

As noted, we tiered our recommendations into two levels: **consensus** items receiving support of at least 80% of Task Force members voting, and **recommendation** items, receiving support of at least 60% but less than 80% of Task Force members voting. Table A indicates below which tier each item falls into, as well as the expected cost of implementing the item (roughly—if it can be estimated at this time), the estimated time frame for implementation (short term, near term, long term) and who we anticipate the lead would be and who would be necessary partners. In some cases we offer additional comments about the recommendations.

For a complete list of all the items on which we voted, and the voting results, see **Attachment C**.

Table 1: Matrix of Recommendations

KEY:			
Task Force Rating: R = Recommendation Item (60-79% support) C = Consensus Item (80%+ support)	Estimated Cost \$ = <\$25K \$\$ = \$25-50K \$\$\$ = \$50-100K \$\$\$\$ = \$100 – 500K \$\$\$\$\$ = > \$500K	Timeframe to Implement <i>ST = Short Term -- 1-2yrs.</i> <i>NT = Near Term -- 2-5 yrs.</i> <i>LT = Long Term -- > 5 yrs.</i>	Stakeholder Groups That Should Participate in Implementation L = Lead P = Other partner needed

Item #	Description	Task Force Rating	Estimated Cost	Timeframe to Implement	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups That Should Participate in Implementation									
						L = Lead P = Other partner needed									
						City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service /Shelter Providers	Housing Providers	Low Income	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County	Homeless Individuals	
Category A: Improving public safety and reducing crime															

Item #	Description	Task Force Rating	Estimated Cost	Timeframe to Implement	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups That Should Participate in Implementation								
						L = Lead P = Other partner needed								
						City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service /Shelter Providers	Housing Providers	Low Income	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County	Homeless Individuals
Category B: Expand, Improve <u>services</u> to homeless/sheltered individuals														
Category C: Expand, Improve and Mitigate Impacts of <u>shelter and housing</u> options for the homeless, people with barriers to market housing														

Item #	Description	Task Force Rating	Estimated Cost	Timeframe to Implement	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups That Should Participate in Implementation								
						L = Lead P = Other partner needed								
						City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service / Shelter Providers	Housing Providers	Low Income	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County	Homeless Individuals
Category D: Improve public (business, residents) understanding / ability to assist														

Item #	Description	Task Force Rating	Estimated Cost	Timeframe to Implement	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups That Should Participate in Implementation								
						L = Lead P = Other partner needed								
						City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service /Shelter Providers	Housing Providers	Low Income	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County	Homeless Individuals
Category E: Advocacy														

Category B:

Item #	Description	Task Force Rating	Estimated Cost	Timeframe to Implement	Additional Notes/Comments	Stakeholder Groups That Should Participate in Implementation								
						L = Lead P = Other partner needed								
						City	Business Community	Residents	Faith Community	Nonprofit Service /Shelter Providers	Housing Providers	Low Income	Other Cities, local gov't agencies, County	Homeless Individuals
Category F: Other														

Conclusions and Next Steps

Redmond should be a safe and compassionate community. We are fortunate in Redmond to have the benefit of City support, as well as excellent nonprofit service organization and faith community programs for homeless families and individuals. Still, there is more we can do as a community, and we offer our recommendations in the hope that we can continue to expand upon the good work to date.

That said, there is no silver bullet, and we cannot solve this problem by acting solely within the City borders: broader regional engagement is needed.

We thank the Mayor for creating this Task Force and we hope that our recommendations will help shape the community's response to the serious challenges of homelessness in Redmond—and encourage the broader regional discussion and engagement that we believe needs to occur.

We encourage the creation of an “implementation committee” to work towards accomplishing our recommendations. And, we encourage the City to identify metric of success, building off our definition of success as set forth in our report.

We ask to be reconvened in six months to hear about progress being made in response to our recommendations.

Finally, we wish to extend our particular thanks to the City staff team for their excellent work on our behalf. We are grateful for their professionalism, responsiveness, advice and input throughout this project.

Attachment A

Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force Members & Support Team

Name	Affiliation
Task Force Members	
Meghan Altimore*	Hopelink
Lara Bolger	Redmond United Methodist Church
Steve Daschle	Human Services Commission
Chris Falco	Downtown business owner
Andrew Koeppen	Public Safety Commission/Realtor/ Business owner
Marian LaBeck	Library
Andrea Liggett	Downtown Resident
Pam Mauk	Together Center
Carolyn Mansfield*	Human Services Commission
Al Rosenthal	Downtown Property/ Business Owner
Tim Short*	Downtown Business Owner
Gary Smith	St. Jude's
Derek Wentorf	Friends of Youth
Tasha Witherspoon	Downtown Apartment Manager
Support Team	
Colleen Kelly	Asst. Director, Comm. Planning Services
Brooke Buckingham	Sr. Planner, Human Services
Chief Ron Gibson	Police Chief
Commander Charlie Gorman	Police Dept.
Jane Christenson	Deputy City Administrator
Karen Reed	Karen Reed Consulting, LLC, Facilitator

*Steering Committee Members appointed by Mayor

Attachment B

[2 p. Summary of Info from March Community Meeting]

Attachment C

Tabulated Ballot Results As approved by Task Force at Meeting 6

Redmond Community Homelessness Task Force

DRAFT Communications Roll-out Plan

Goal: Confirm actions to be taken in order to broadly disseminate the Task Force recommendations within the community, to build understanding of, and support for, the Task Force recommendations.

Key Messages:

1. The problem of homelessness in Redmond is serious, and it is complex.
2. The problem creates concerns for economic vitality of the City, public safety and the wellbeing of the homeless.
3. The Task Force process has engaged business leaders, residents, the faith community, nonprofit service agencies and the City.
4. Everyone has a role in improving the situation. The Task Force has identified XX strategies to address homelessness in the City. These strategies will require action by not only the City, but also other eastside Cities and the County, human services providers, the business community, faith community, and residents.
5. The Task Force strategies cover 6 basic areas:
 - a. Improving public safety and reducing crime
 - b. Expanding and improving services to homeless/sheltered individuals
 - c. Expanding, improving and/or mitigating impacts of shelter and housing options for the homeless and others facing housing barriers
 - d. Improving public understand and the public's ability to assist in improving the situation
 - e. Advocacy
6. The situation won't be fixed in a day, or a year, but substantial progress can and should be made over the next one to five years.
7. Progress will require additional resources—not just from the City.
8. A small subcommittee of stakeholders with interest/background in public safety and human services should be created and charged with developing an implementation plan for the Task Force's recommendations, with support from City Staff.
9. The Task Force seeks to be reconvened in **six months** to hear a progress report on implementing our recommendations.

Audiences / Communication Strategies/Timing:

	Audience	Strategy	Timing
1	City Council	PPT presentation by steering committees supported by C. Kelly, R. Gibson, Jane Christenson as needed Issue press release/public notification prior to this session.	September 22 7:30 pm (all TF members welcome to attend)
2.	Committee to End Homelessness	PPT presentation by steering committee, supported by C. Kelly	

	Audience	Strategy	Timing
3.	Eastside Homelessness Advisory Committee	PPT presentation by steering committee, supported by C. Kelly	
4.	Redmond Human Services Commission	PPT presentation by steering committee, supported by C. Kelly, R. Gibson	
5.	Redmond Public Safety Advisory Committee	PPT presentation by steering committee, supported by C. Kelly, R. Gibson	
6.	Redmond Rotary/Kiwanis groups	PPT presentation by steering committee, supported by C. Kelly, R. Gibson	
7.	Neighborhood councils	PPT presentation by steering committee, supported by C. Kelly, R. Gibson	
8.	Local Newspaper?		
9.	Faith Communities	Convened by L. Bolger, G. Smith, A. Liggett	
10.	Suburban city managers group	PPT presentation by J. Christensen, supported by C. Kelly, R. Gibson	