Manis, Dina

From: Denise Hill <faire@sonic.net>
Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2020 7:39 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 14.5 REPORT - COMMUNITY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
Attachments: Council Candidates Responses to Homeless Question - JAN 2020.docx; 600 Morgan Street 4pm 4.14.19_MP4 video.mp4

Mayor and City Council,

My husband and I wanted to provide the following input we hope you'll consider regarding the following areas of Agenda Item 14.5 (the CHAP Program):

AGENDA ACTION: REPORT

4. Conduct community outreach to seek public input on the CHAP expansion Staff conducted the following outreach related to the proposed CHAP expansion: a. Presentations to Community Advisory Board, Downtown Subcommittee, Santa Rosa Together, West End Neighborhood Association, Rotary Club of Santa Rosa East, and meeting with Homeless Action…

Per the staff recap attached to their report, the CHAP program started in 2016. Coincidentally, that's when our neighborhood started experiencing an uptick in encampments, petty theft, mentally ill and/or folks under the influence on our sidewalks, etc. While the population based on the annual Homeless Count appears to have stabilized more or less, the impact on our neighborhood has only increased. The encampments under Hwy. 101 have become virtually permanent, especially during winter months. January-July of 2019 were beyond anything a neighborhood should have to be subjected to (see attached video of the area across from the Homeless Service Center at 600 Morgan Street). After repeated calls and emails to city council and staff, the HEAP program was finally assigned to sweep the area. We don't believe it was coincidence, that the timing of the sweep was just prior to a major race event starting in the Courthouse Square area. Would there have been a sweep without this event? We'd like to think so, but it was never stated as something done for the neighborhoods. While it was a relief to have the encampments disbanded by the sweep, we received no communication from the Housing and Community Services staff after the sweep and when we questioned the plans for the 2019 winter months were told "Samuel Jones Hall" was it. The encampments returned as soon as the rain started in November and are still on 9th Street as we write this.

The lack of acknowledgement of what our neighborhood has had to experience over the last 5 years combined with the lack of communication from Housing and Community Services staff is incredibly disheartening. Case in point, Item #4 on their report doesn't even mention our neighborhood (the St. Rose Neighborhood) in their recap of community outreach for public input on the expansion of CHAP.

6**. Ensure alignment with the City's Housing First Strategy**
The City's Housing First Strategy directs that all homeless service resources and efforts be viewed and evaluated as part of a comprehensive community-wide program facilitating the transition of individuals and families experiencing homelessness into permanent housing…to achieve Functional Zero by following the Housing First model.

We are clearly not seeing a decrease in the street population under the Housing First Strategy. It is obvious that many on our streets are the "unsheltered", not the "homeless". They have not lost a home due to recently losing a job or the fires. They are addicted to drugs and/or mentally ill. The time it will take to find permanent housing for this segment of the population means we are literally looking at years, if not decades of encampments around our neighborhoods. As the saying goes, if you only have a hammer, everything looks like a nail. We would like to strongly urge the city to move

from relying on the Housing First Strategy as their only response and employ other contractors besides Catholic Charities to provide services for the unsheltered that urgently need drug and mental health assistance programs. Let's get them that assistance now instead of making them wait for permanent housing with these programs attached. We don't believe the city can achieve "Functional Zero" without doing this.

Lastly, attached is a recap of the responses of those applicants interviewed for the open city council seat when asked what they would do to address homelessness in our community. They had some very specific comments and suggestions that we hope the council will consider.

Denise Hill
Joe Lilienthal

Council Candidates Responses to Homeless Question

#2 - Saunders

- Remove homeless from downtown
- Assess for mental illness
- Needs to be accountability for services provided.

#3 – Ocana

- Other cities in county need to pull their weight
- Sanctioned encampments with social services

#4 - Flores

- His community feels the homeless issue is being pushed to Roseland.
- Residents fear using bicycle routes due to homeless on them.

#5 – Kennedy

- Homeless issue is negatively impacting neighborhoods.

#6 - Herman

- Should get more input from neighbors on future plans.
- Looks bad to tourists.
- Should be moved along for safety.
- Needs to be accountability for services provided.
- Provide housing vouchers
- Offer jobs to maintain parks and clean areas of the city.

#7 – DeWitt

- Work with the county to access and use government-owned land.
- Provide structure to services.
- Consider mobile homes as temporary housing.
- Consider short-term solutions, not just long-term.
- Humane law enforcement to address criminal element.
- House homeless veterans.
- Don’t tear down existing housing if it can be rehabbed for occupancy.

#8 - Weeks

- Other communities in the County need to be pressured into doing their fair share.
- Consider sanctioned encampments.

#10 – Ebright

- More outreach to homeless.
- Focus on mentally ill population.
- Temporary housing is better than no housing.
- Make homeless facilities welcoming.
- Get more gov’t funding.

#11 – Carlstrom

- Hearing from business owners that the homeless downtown are a deterrent.

#12 - Petker

- Mental health services and addiction recovery programs needed.
- More outreach by folks aware of services and shelters.

#13 - Wysocky

- Housing First is a long-term program. The city needs some more immediate programs.
- Permanent encampments may not be the answer, but there should be more shelter alternatives.
- The county needs to be “helped” to be the top mental health and homeless service provider.
- No one area should have to support the majority of facilities.
- Inclusionary units instead of in lieu fees to spread affordable units throughout the city.

#14 - Martin

- Compassion does not mean enabling.
- Camping in a non-sanctioned campground is not a right.
- Any sanctioned shelter has to have restrictions and rules.
- Foundations and business community should be able to help provide money to address the homeless issues.

#16 - Wandel

- More outreach is needed.

#17 – Dowd

- Solutions need to be provided to address those with addiction and mental health issues.
- Moving from one area to another doesn’t result address the root causes of why someone’s on the street.
- Facilities need to be spread across the city – not concentrated in one area.

#18 - Andrews

- Mental health services are needed.

#19 – Church

- LA legalized tiny homes as ADUs (not RVs) – can that be adopted in SR.
- Multiple small shelters (like Opportunity House) need to be spread out across the community.

Manis, Dina

From: x3sonoma3x <x3sonoma3x@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 12:14 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Opposition to CHAP Expansion

Dear Council Members-
Our family owns and operates the commercial building at **101 Brookwood in Santa Rosa**.

We would like to be on record with our adamant opposition to the expansion of the CHAP program.
In particular, the expanded definition of eligible properties clause. Our fear is that the neighboring lot at 100 2nd Street will continue to ad makeshift housing along the creek. The sympathetic owner is allowing homeless people to camp out on his property despite it's current code violations not being remiedated (case number CE20-0022). There are currently two RV trailers, two trucks, tarped tents etc. along the creek and other detritus. (See Attached Photo)
Our tenants, most of whom are female, have ALL made negative complaints to us as owners and have expressed their fear at night when exiting our building.

Please do not expand the CHAP program's eligibility at this time. More research needs to be done as to the long term effects of allowing this type of living in our community.

Jeff Smith
Owner
101 Brookwood Ave.

Manis, Dina

From: x3sonoma3x <x3sonoma3x@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2020 12:20 PM
To: _CityCouncilListPublic
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Opposition to CHAP Expansion (PHOTOS)

PHOTOS FROM 101 BROOKWOOD:

On Jan 27, 2020, at 12:14 PM, x3sonoma3x <x3sonoma3x@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Council Members-
Our family owns and operates the commercial building at **101 Brookwood in Santa Rosa**.

We would like to be on record with our adamant opposition to the expansion of the CHAP program.
In particular, the expanded definition of eligible properties clause. Our fear is that the neighboring lot at 100 2nd Street will continue to ad makeshift housing along the creek. The sympathetic owner is allowing homeless people to camp out on his property despite it's current code violations not being remiedated (case number CE20-0022). There are currently two RV trailers, two trucks, tarped tents etc. along the creek and other detritus. (See Attached Photo)
Our tenants, most of whom are female, have ALL made negative complaints to us as owners and have expressed their fear at night when exiting our building.

Please do not expand the CHAP program's eligibility at this time. More research needs to be done as to the long term effects of allowing this type of living in our community.

Jeff Smith
Owner
101 Brookwood Ave.