

Questions from PCT neighbors

These questions were shared with County Commissioner Jayapal's office around the time of the press conference announcing this new location (2/24/22). Since that time, the first Stakeholder meeting has been hosted, and responses to some questions have already been provided and discussed in that forum.

1. City and County should meet with housed and unhoused neighbors to hear and address concerns in a reasonable manner.

Agreed. Our program is based on input from those with lived experience at the A Home for Everyone task force, which set early guidelines and siting criteria. It also includes several staff with lived experience as people who have experienced houselessness. The SRV team has made plans to meet with those living outside at this location.

2. Wooden fence (like St Johns Village) this is to provide security for those living within the "safe village" because it is on a trail that has become an auto/truck route due to PBOT, PPB, Fire and Parks and METRO ineptitude.

All SRVs will be fenced, as is required by code.

3. Only access is Syracuse - a narrow dead-end road which creates a Fire and Police response concern and will create an access concern for Safe Village residents.

Site layout and entry/exit points have not been determined yet, but the SRV will be somewhere on the Portland Housing Bureau (PHB) property with access to PBOT right of way.

4. City will have to clean up the PCT and maintain it in a safe manner for the entire community.

The Safe Rest Village program is focused on providing safe, managed outdoor shelters for those experiencing houselessness. Our team recognizes that there are a host of other challenges in the immediate area, but the SRV program cannot address all of them. However, it is hoped that the Village and villagers together with the shelter operators and the community in general can make strides in addressing many of the challenges together.

5. City will have to enforce parking and camping laws to prevent nonresidents of a safe village and the housed neighbors from being overwhelmed. This might mean limiting vehicular access to Macrum, Oberlin and Princeton in a similar manner to the St Johns Village.

Decisions such as this have not been made at this time but can be addressed if / when they arise. The Safe Rest Village team only has jurisdiction over the

6. Relocating PPOP operations away from the PCT

Not sure what the question is here, but PPOP manages its own mission independent of the SRV program.

7. A Good Neighbor Agreement between UPNA and the Joint County-City Committee vendor. This would lead to some sort of advisory/governing committee to be a mechanism for resolving operating issues.

A Good Neighbor Agreement (GNA) between the shelter operators and the community is anticipated and will include roles and responsibilities for all parties, and clear lines of communication between each, to address and resolve issues as they arise.

8. A sunset time for the village so that it can be used for its intended purpose of providing affordable owner-occupied housing as promised by the City Council and Housing Bureau to the neighborhood at the time of transfer to the Housing Bureau from the Water Bureau.

Funding for the SRV project is provided by the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and runs through December 2024. The presence of the SRV will not slow down or negatively impact proposed future development by the Portland Housing Bureau.

9. City Council pledged it will take parks off the table for shelters. The PCT shelter is immediately adjacent to a walking/biking trail, an area for recreation. Is the PCT location siting in conflict with the intent of saving recreation spaces for all community members?

No. The area proposed for Safe Rest Village is not a recreational space, it is owned by the Portland Housing Bureau and is zoned residential. The City Council along with the Housing Bureau are united on the use of this property for this purpose. Use as an SRV for the planned time through 2024 will not slow down or negatively impact future PHB intentions for this land. The trail and its use will remain – and hopefully be improved by providing safe shelter for those who are currently living unsheltered in this location.

10. On the list of 70 inventory owned parcels the PCT property was one of a few that required security. Why would pursuing a siting location with known crime issues with frustrated neighbors

The Safe Rest Villages are specifically intended to provide shelter, services, and stability for those living on the streets, as a first step to moving off the streets into whatever is next for them. All the villages, by code, will be fenced for the safety and

stability of those within. There is a clear need for services in that area, and we are bringing services to where they are most needed.

11. If existing campers won't stay in the village and can't get recommended, then they will likely move to the nearby park or farther down the trail. How can you ensure the community doesn't face a larger burden of campers occupying even more of our recreation space?

The Villages are one option among many. They are not meant to, nor can they solve every possible outcome. Doing nothing is not an option. No doubt the presence of the village in this location (or any) will change the dynamic for those living unsheltered nearby. The SRV team, shelter operators, and others working in this space will work to address the changing needs as they become clear.

12. What happens to the existing campers?

We are working to mitigate impacts for the shelter. Our first step towards that was the addition of funds in this current fiscal year, and even more funds in the fall budget process that Commissioner Ryan helped lead for navigation team, clean up teams, and hygiene services through the Impact Reduction Program. Our goal is that we can address any camping around the Safe Rest Villages before it becomes an issue, with the support of these newly expanded services for those living on the streets.

Additionally, since the Villages will not provide any resources to those not residing in the Villages, and as they are referral only, there will not be incentives for people to camp close by. Unlike some other shelters, Safe Rest Villages are a program for people to stay while they access resources to help them move to the next step of their life. Many other shelter systems have beds for people to come for 1 night if needed. Safe Rest Villages are meant to provide an individual with their own space while the access services.

It is in the interest of those in the Villages, as well as those in the surrounding community, that there not be spillover camping near them. For those in the Villages, working to stabilize their lives with the resources and support inside the fence line, it's important that there not be triggers for them as they leave the villages when going to work, appointments, or wherever else their day takes them.

13. Who enforces the 150 foot buffer between the SRV and anti-SRV campers?

The 150-foot camping ban will be enforced by the [Impact Reduction Program](#). They are the ones in charge of addressing unsanctioned encampments around the City. If you have questions related to their program, you contact them directly at

reportpdx@portlandoregon.gov. You can also reach out to the Office of Management and Finance, as that is who they report to, or to the Mayor's Office.

14. How does the introduction of multiple SRV's change the city and county response and actions towards illegal, unsanctioned camps? i.e. will infraction enforcement be increased?

Safe Rest Villages bring available resources closer to the current community, in a far more accessible fashion. They are paired with a general increase in cleanup enforcement through the Mayor's Office. It also helps increase shelter capacity in our City while we continue to build enough affordable housing, all of which helps in the effort to end our houselessness crisis.

15. How does the cost burden of building and supporting these villages impact funds typically allocated to supporting non-sanctioned camps?

City Council approved spending of \$24.9 million in the first tranche of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) dollars to address houselessness—the bulk of which, \$16.02 million, is dedicated to Safe Rest Villages for use through 2024. Other ARPA funds are supporting other needs related to houselessness. These are federal grant dollars, which would otherwise not be spent in Portland. There are other funds from City, County, and Metro governments put towards other services and programs.

16. What additional enforcements for illegal parking along N. Carey and N. Oberlin can we expect?

I would ask that you reach out to the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) or Commissioner Hardesty's office for this answer, as they would be better equipped to answer it.

17. How will boundaries be established between the SRV and the neighborhood including Minerva?

We are working on a site design and are incredibly early in the process. However, all Villages will include a 6-foot fence, for the sake of privacy and safety for both neighbors and Villagers. This is all according to the code set for alternative, outdoor shelters.

18. Where will the access points be for the advertised army of support resources?

The access point is within the Village, for Villagers only. There will be a shelter operator onsite to help connect Villagers with resources appropriate for their needs,

to include case management, peer support, as well as mental and behavioral health services.

19. How does the PPOP dynamic fit?

PPOP is entirely independent. They do not have any funding from the City to do their work. As such, our ability to directly oversee their work is minimal. We only oversee nonprofits with which the City of Portland has a contract. If you have concerns about how they are operating, please reach out to them directly.

20. What are the plans for coordinating with other landowners (Portland Parks, The Railroad, PGE) in the area where tents now exist?

For the Safe Rest Village we work with our neighbors directly to address concerns and questions about the Safe Rest Village. Our team is excited to hear from these neighbors as we move forward and develop good working relationship. We are developing stakeholder groups for each site, to discuss questions and concerns, and develop ongoing relationships with partners and neighbors to address issues as they come up over the life cycle of the villages. We are just starting that work now, with the announcement of this site and others.

21. What happens to the goats? (Assumption is that they are staying since it took over a year to move them in and they still have an active lease).

The Portland Housing Bureau manages the contract with the group that cares for the goats, and together they will determine the next step for the goats. The Housing Bureau has expressed overwhelming support for the goats, and we will do whatever we can to help.

Regarding the Stakeholder Group:

22. If this is a monthly meeting, with stakeholders that are potentially in conflict (neighbors, PPOP, Mimi). Will productive conversations be possible?

This is intended to be an information sharing meeting, during which the SRV team and the shelter operators (once selected) will meet to discuss the plans and milestones of the project. We will work together to address issues of concern as they relate to the Villages, but cannot take on issues beyond that scope. Our hope is that they be productive conversations.

23. Also is this a sharing out session or a feedback session? If there are only 4 sessions, I question how much collaboration can occur, unless the expectation it that a lot of work happens on between sessions.

There has been an unfortunate misunderstanding about the goal and role of this meeting. It can be both sharing out session from the SRV team and the future shelter operators, as well as an opportunity to provide feedback. What it cannot be is a problem-solving group for issues beyond that scope – the SRVs themselves.