

**From:** [potluck44@gmail.com](mailto:potluck44@gmail.com)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Question for council meeting on Tuesday  
**Date:** Monday, August 7, 2023 10:02:06 AM

---

I understand that the City has to become compliant with the Federal ruling regarding camping on public property but I am wondering when you ask the campers to move along due to the restrictions that will be in place will you have to give them the option of housing or shelter as in the past? If so will there be adequate shelters available and if not then what?

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Item 16.1 Camping, 8-08-23 Agenda  
**Date:** Monday, August 7, 2023 3:18:17 PM  
**Attachments:** [2023-08-07 Letter to S.R. City Council.docx](#)

---

**From:** Adrienne <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 7, 2023 12:37 PM  
**To:** \_CityCouncilListPublic <[citycouncil@srcity.org](mailto:citycouncil@srcity.org)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 16.1 Camping, 8-08-23 Agenda

**Homeless Action!**  
**707-742-3733**  
[www.HomelessAction.net](http://www.HomelessAction.net)

August 7, 2023

Dear Santa Rosa City Council Members and Staff,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the new camping ordinance, Item 16.1 on your August 8 agenda. It includes an extreme number of places where homeless people will not be allowed to live including, within 25 feet of...

a driveway  
loading dock  
building entrance or exit  
fire hydrant  
fire lane  
public transit

Where does this leave?

Please, take a minute and walk around your neighborhood, nearby business area. Tell us how many, and what are the dimensions, of places you find where a homeless person would be allowed to camp, sit, lay down, sleep or place personal items?

In addition to this list, there is another list of requirements for how exactly people must place their tent or sleeping bag if there are no openings at the shelter or elsewhere. It includes nothing "under a tree canopy or within vegetation that could aid in spreading a fire."

Together, these lists make easy excuses to give homeless people citations and generally harass them. How much money in police time and processing will this cost?

We cannot begin to express how inhumane this ordinance is. Just imagine your own life, your own self, living outside in today's heat. Imagine that you would not be allowed to put your tent up in the shade or near any bit of grass.

Imagine that you are given a list of places where you cannot sit or park but there is no list of where you can. (As you know, the shelters and other options almost always have waiting lists.)

In addition, please look at this meeting's Litigation Report, SCV-273655. You will see 100+ names of those who are targeted for "service of complaint for... Public Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Willful Misconduct, and Violation of Fish and Game Code§ 5650(a)(l)." These will primarily be homeless people.

We believe that the city should spend the money that would go to the SCV-273655 enforcement and the enforcement of this ordinance to support homeless people.

We realize that the City of Santa Rosa does invest in support of homeless people and that this investment has increased in the years since we began talking to you about it. We applaud you for the work you have done and the work you do in this area.

We also understand the fire danger. We live here.

We see the dry landscape and feel the wind that is so reminiscent of the Tubbs Fire. And we know that homeless people living outside often cook or build evening campfires because food and warmth are essential for survival.

For this and other reasons, we continuously advocate for a place or places where all homeless people can legally camp with toilet and trash facilities. This is the solution for all the problems listed as reasons for this new ordinance.

We welcome homeless people into spaces in Sonoma County. Homeless people are our friends and family members. We want them to feel this welcome and safe. The current level of toxicity that is being generated is very disturbing and this ordinance will only make that worst.

Thank you for your attention and, in advance, your “no” vote on the proposed ordinance.

Sincerely,

Adrienne

Adrienne Lauby  
Co-founder Homeless Action!





*Homeless Action!*  
*(707) 742-3733*

**www.HomelessAction.net**

August 7, 2023

Dear Santa Rosa City Council Members and Staff,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the new camping ordinance, Item 16.1 on your August 8 agenda. It includes an extreme number of places where homeless people will not be allowed to live including, within 25 feet of...

- a driveway
- loading dock
- building entrance or exit
- fire hydrant
- fire lane
- public transit

Where does this leave?

Please, take a minute and walk around your neighborhood, nearby business area. Tell us how many, and what are the dimensions, of places you find where a homeless person would be allowed to camp, sit, lay down, sleep or place personal items?

In addition to this list, there is another list of requirements for how exactly people must place their tent or sleeping bag if there are no openings at the shelter or elsewhere. It includes nothing “under a tree canopy or within vegetation that could aid in spreading a fire.”

Together, these lists make easy excuses to give homeless people citations and generally harass them. How much money in police time and processing will this cost?

We cannot begin to express how inhumane this ordinance is. Just imagine your own life, your own self, living outside in today’s heat. Imagine that you would not be allowed to put your tent up in the shade or near any bit of grass.

Imagine that you are given a list of places where you cannot sit or park but there is no list of where you can. (As you know, the shelters and other options almost always have waiting lists.)

In addition, please look at this meeting's Litigation Report, SCV-273655. You will see 100+ names of those who are targeted for "service of complaint for. . . Public Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Willful Misconduct, and Violation of Fish and Game Code§ 5650(a)(l)." These will primarily be homeless people.

We believe that the city should spend the money that would go to the SCV-273655 enforcement and the enforcement of this ordinance to support homeless people.

We realize that the City of Santa Rosa does invest in support of homeless people and that this investment has increased in the years since we began talking to you about it. We applaud you for the work you have done and the work you do in this area.

We also understand the fire danger. We live here.

We see the dry landscape and feel the wind that is so reminiscent of the Tubbs Fire. And we know that homeless people living outside often cook or build evening campfires because food and warmth are essential for survival. For this and other reasons, we continuously advocate for a place or places where all homeless people can legally camp with toilet and trash facilities. This is the solution for all the problems listed as reasons for this new ordinance.

We welcome homeless people into spaces in Sonoma County. Homeless people are our friends and family members. We want them to feel this welcome and safe. The current level of toxicity that is being generated is very disturbing and this ordinance will only make that worst.

Thank you for your attention and, in advance, your "no" vote on the proposed ordinance.

Sincerely,  
*Adrienne Lauby*  
Adrienne Lauby  
Co-founder Homeless Action!  
707-795-2890 home  
707-332-1894 cell

**From:** [Bolla, Rhonda](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] 230808 Item 16.1 City of Santa Rosa Council meeting.  
**Date:** Monday, August 7, 2023 4:12:34 PM

---

**From:** Gerry La Londe-Berg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 7, 2023 4:11 PM  
**To:** \_CityCouncilListPublic <citycouncil@srcity.org>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 230808 Item 16.1 City of Santa Rosa Council meeting.

Item 16.1 City of Santa Rosa Council meeting.

I have not been a resident of Santa Rosa for a while so you have not heard from me. Today, I want to bring up the past and ask you to send this ordinance back for upgrades.

Exactly 5 years ago, August 8, 2017, before the Tubbs Fire, the City of Santa Rosa adopted a similarly restrictive Ordinance. Apparently, it did not solve anything because here we are again in 2023.

On August 7, 2023 Ludmilla Bade told Homeless Action a message I hope the City of Santa Rosa can heed,

“The biggest thing is being welcome in a space. And ideally being safe there. All these things that are done to make people feel unwelcome are just like symbols of being unwelcome. The level of toxicity that's being generated is very disturbing. And, the simplicity of it is saying to people that you are welcome here.”

[From 2017 I wrote the following](#), it appears to still apply given the lack of detailed data that justifies the severity of these restrictions.

“The report cites a business survey of 80 businesses. No methodology or references are provided in the report. More importantly no data over time for the number of infractions is given as to the basis of the Collective recommendation or the Staff Report for the Council.”

**I have to say the exact same thing five (5) years hence:**

**Gerry La Londe-Berg testimony 08/08/17 [Over 3 minute version]**

“The City of Santa Rosa should not change its laws considering people who are homeless until it has done everything it can possibly do to mitigate the situation. Increasing penalties penalizes many people for no good reason. The law as



shelter or camping, and individuals who make shelter in these areas create health and safety risks for themselves and for persons encountering encampments;... [\[not in waterways as suggested\]](#)

“WHEREAS, the City should seek to accomplish the aforementioned objectives in a manner that preserves the dignity and safety of all residents and exhausts alternative models to promote compliance.”

**[this is a profound statement because it implies there are more and better things that could be done to preserve dignity and develop alternative models.]**

**[Section 1 – Recitals – The fact that sanctioned encampments would resolve the major issues while preserving dignity and demonstrating alternative positive models negates the validity of the underlying facts cited]**

“Camping” shall mean the conduct of one or more of the following activities on public or private property, when it reasonably appears, in light of all the circumstances, that a person is using space on public or private property as a place of temporary or permanent living accommodation:

1. Sleeping or making preparations to sleep (including the laying down of bedding for the purpose of sleeping);
2. The erection of any tent, structure, or other form of shelter;
3. The preparation or cooking of a meal;
4. Unattended storage of personal belongings (including but not limited to clothing, sleeping bags, bedrolls, blankets, sheets, luggage, backpacks, kitchen utensils, and cookware).” [pp 3-4]

**[Thus, sleeping in a park may be illegal, cooking anywhere is prohibited; being alive without a home in your home town is an illegal action.]**

[11.22.020 (B) sections ... by camping, sitting, lying, or sleeping, or by storing, using, maintaining, or placing personal property...

impedes pedestrian passage on any sidewalk or walkway;

within 25 feet of any driveway or loading dock;

within 25 feet of any building entrance or exit;

within 25 feet of any fire hydrant, designated fire lane, fire department connection, or fire protection equipment;

within any street, bike lane or other public right-of-way in a manner that hinders or obstructs the free passage, access or movement of any persons, bicycles or vehicles travelling or attempting to pass along the same right of way;

within 25 feet a public transit facility including transit hubs and bus shelters

Item 12 Page 5 No person shall erect a tent, structure, or other form of shelter for purposes of camping within 100 feet of a school.

---



[The City would be far **more fair and clear if they would list all public space where camping is not prohibited.**]

[Ironically the center of the City Hall parking lot seems to meet the criteria... or the front yard like when Occupy was there in Santa Rosa.]

[C5 is unenforceable because it applies to everyone as currently worded.]  
[pp5]

11.22.030 Private property camping is limited to 3 days

“Camping on private property shall be permitted only in a residentially zoned area, only where there exist sanitary sewers, running water, and cooking facilities inside a permanent building which is lawfully established and available to such person and only for periods of not more than 3 consecutive days, unless otherwise authorized by the City pursuant to the Community Homeless Assistance Program (CHAP).”

[Has the City published the CHAP guidelines which would apply to this section so the public can know what guidance is informative?]

[why 3 days? Homeless shelter is rarely available in 3 days. ]

“11-22.040 – Penalties for Violation. A. Any violation of this chapter is a misdemeanor and subject to prosecution in accordance with subsection 1-28.010 of this code. Every day any violation occurs or continues shall be deemed a separate offense. B. Violations described above are deemed and declared to be a public nuisance and may be subject to abatement in accordance with the City Code and Chapter 20-68 (Enforcement). C. Nothing in this ordinance shall preclude prosecution under both this ordinance and any other provision of law.”

[It seems that Civil and misdemeanor violations and foreseeable subsequent failure to appear will tend to compound the trauma of people with no home.]

### **Send the Ordinance back**

with a directive on the physical locations wherein people can sleep and camp

Direct staff to prioritize the elimination of camps near waterways.

Direct staff and committees to refine this ordinance using the following:

Read – [UCSF Bennioff homeless study](#) CSSPEH => California Statewide Study of People experiencing Homelessness.

Read - EDITOR K.C. MEADOWS of the Ukiah Daily Journal offers up this excellent observation about homelessness, and how pervasive it is. DOES THIS SOUND LIKE YOUR TOWN? [Attached below]

Direct your intention to be compassionate and effective. Asking for revisions at this point in time would be nd effective way to do that.

><><><><

**Staff report comments**

Executive summary fails to mention the 2017 update which was extensive.  
FISCAL IMPACT There is no immediate fiscal impact associated with the proposed Camping Ordinance.

[This seem disingenuous given there must be planned enforcement actions, such as in Item 9 Litigation of 8/8/23 agenda]

[It seems strange that this ordinance does not also cite the City's own [Homeless Action strategic plan](#)?]

Quote – support justice

Anscombe instructs us to focus on justice. What needs to be set right? What do we owe each other? The obligations of justice mean we have to respect human rights and to negotiate. Force is necessary only to rectify specific injustices and enable the negotiation of just settlements.

(He wrote about war, but force of law on someone without a home also should include justice.)

Respectfully submitted,

Gerry La Londe-Berg  
Petaluma and Richmond, California

[Redacted signature block]

><><><>< ><><><>< ><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><>

Related

**EDITOR K.C. MEADOWS of the Ukiah Daily Journal offers up this excellent observation about homelessness, and how pervasive it is. DOES THIS SOUND LIKE YOUR TOWN?**

We'll begin with a little exercise today, and we're calling it "Does this sound like your town?"

Read along and nod if any of this sounds familiar:

"Downtown businesses had long complained about people sleeping in their doorways at night.

Encampments within city limits sprouted and became sanitation hazards, and some homeowners reported finding people sleeping on their front porches who were unwilling to move on."

"A shocking 56 percent of (homeless) respondents reported using meth three or more times weekly."

"(The city) cleared its largest encampment of homeless people ... and the outcome of the clearing has

been seen repeated in other areas of the city, over and over again — some people take shelter that is offered, but many continue to scatter about to another place in the city.”

“Right now is ten times worse than 20 years ago. Twenty years ago (it was) much easier to handle the homeless, now it’s much much harder.”

“Beyond tent encampments, nearly half of those living without shelter in February’s count were sleeping in their vehicles.”

Nodding your head “yes” yet? Congratulations. You must live in any one of 200 or more towns in California.

For the third consecutive year, this newspaper has joined with nine sister publications around the north state for our “State of Homelessness” edition.

The idea is this: By publishing stories offering a bird’s-eye view of what’s happening on the homeless front elsewhere, maybe we’ll learn a little more about what’s happening locally — and even notice we’re probably ahead of the curve in some areas and behind it in a few others.

If there’s one thing that should be obvious by now, it’s this: No one city or town or county is ever going to “solve” homelessness. It’s a multi-layered, incredibly complex crisis that didn’t start because of any one town, and no one town is ever going to end it. Until there is a concentrated, and substantial, effort that covers factors as varied as mental health and housing and addiction and, yes, crime (just to name four) on a statewide and even national level, you are never going to see this problem “go away,” regardless of how badly you want to cling to some repeatedly disproven narratives:

“They’re all from somewhere else and they come here for the great benefits. If we kicked them out and made them go back to wherever they came from this wouldn’t be a problem. We need to stop enabling and the city needs to get serious about cracking down on the homeless.”

For every homeless person you see, your community probably has an equal number of people shouting this nonsense, blissfully ignorant of things like the law and restrictions on what cities are legally allowed to do. It’s stunning — especially considering the level of news coverage these issues have received.

One example: A statewide UCSF study showed 90 percent of unhomed Californians are from — wait for it — California. And 75 percent of them live in the same county where they became homeless.

In other words, while some homeless people go from town to town looking for a better deal, an overwhelming majority of them stay within 5 or 10 miles of where they originally became homeless.

We’re guessing you haven’t seen that figure quoted in your favorite local quality-of-life Facebook group lately.

Every year, we get a lot of feedback to this series. We always expect (and receive) some “There you go, being part of the problem again”-type comments — but we also get a growing number of “Thank you for this. I learned it’s not just happening locally and that it’s more of a complex issue than I believed” responses.

We can never adequately address problems until we first acknowledge what the problem actually is,

and learn to tell the difference between a fact and a narrative. For as much as our state spends on homelessness every year — nearly \$10 billion in the past three years alone — it should be obvious that we're not getting enough bang for our buck, and what we're doing isn't working.

Let's be smarter. That starts with recognizing the facts.

And for the record? Those first five paragraphs described the scene in Fort Bragg, here in Ukiah, Chico, Eureka and Santa Cruz, respectively, and were taken directly from the overview stories you can read today.

Bet you thought it was your town.

**From:** [Eileen Bill](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item #16.1  
**Date:** Monday, August 7, 2023 5:00:03 PM

---

Dear Santa Rosa City Council Mayor and Members,

This new camping ordinance (Item #16.1) lists many places where people can NOT camp or rest. Where are the places where people CAN camp? If you eliminated all of the practical places, do you expect the unhoused people to just disappear? These are people who, for the most part, are from this area and have resided here for many years. They have family and friends who for various reasons may not be able to accommodate their friends or relatives.

Another folly is to give a person who is in the “wrong” place a citation and expect this person who has no money to pay the fine and would be better off buying food. Later, if found again in the “wrong” place, that person risks being sent to prison or to have the fines increased. Is that the plan - to house everyone in a cell?

To say that no sweeps can be done if there are no shelter beds available and yet, knowing that shelter beds are kept empty to facilitate a sweep, this is contradictory and creates a falsehood. Either that or there are simply NO beds available for the unhoused. Why aren't we getting these people into housing?

So, instead of spending money on sweeps and police patrols, wouldn't it be better to provide services, food, mental support and rehab programs and get people into supportive and permanent housing? Instead of telling people where they can't go why not simply provide places where people can raise a tent in a community (with port-a-potties and trash services) and where they can safely sleep in their cars without being harassed. We can and must do better.

Please continue to work on better support for our unhoused neighbors.  
Thank you!

Eileen Bill

[REDACTED]  
Santa Rosa CA 95405

[REDACTED]