

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

Please explain: The Sounding Board's recommendation is to base the maximum number of spaces for an Outdoor Shelter on a formula of 1 site/unit for each 1000 sf of property. For example, a 10,000 sf lot could have a maximum of 10 campsites or units, while a one-acre site could have 44 campsites or units. Do you agree with this recommendation?

- What? you are going to create large homeless camps? you will just attract more homeless people!
- I'm afraid of what this will do to neighboring homes
- More people the better
- **Shelters will be too large to successfully blend with community**
- If the city want to build houses for the homeless, they need to work with the county and build campsites just outside the city limits. Provide portable restrooms, trash containers and transportation needs to these areas.
- **"As a basic formula it seems reasonable. There must be flexibility to make adjustments as sites become available and the workability becomes clear. Few plans work as originally envisioned and city should be open and quick to make needed adjustments.**
- Having dedicated staff at city and operational level would be important."
- I'll defer to the experts on safety for allocation of outdoor space.
- "I disapprove of any homeless shelters being built anywhere within the city limits.
- Again, I am strongly against any homeless shelters being built or considered by the city of Bend.
- **That seems proportionate to the space.**
- We should not allow anyone to live outside.
- We don't want these in our CITY!!!
- No shelters in RS, RL, or RM-10 zoning.
- **Need more information about the outdoor shelter plan. But it is a step toward a solution so that is good.**
- **The proposed formula does not appear to take in to consideration needed infrastructure (roads, paths, open space, toilet & shower facilities, laundry, and setbacks. This type of development should be held to the same standard as other existing development within the jurisdiction of the City. Further , the City should require buffers for noise, suppression systems, and sanitary facilities.**
- **"I think there needs to be a differentiation between more permanent structures and systems such as tents. Tiny home density should be allowed at a greater rate than temporary/transient (tent) density.**
- **I also would need to know what the screening process is for these shelters, and the manager/resident ratio. There should also be a higher standard of screening for shelter locations in residential areas as opposed to industrial areas. "**
- How does this help our city in any way?
- Reduces property values
- "No outdoor shelters. It is inhumane.
- I recently read in San Francisco there are 5 empty houses for every 1 houseless person. The article described the houseless people as Capitalist Refugees.
- Bend needs emergency housing PLUS services support.
- I am opposed to letting people camp within the Bend City limits. "
- We should not permit camping on public property within the city. Just the other day I saw a man urinating next to his tent by the highway when a toilet was a short walk away. Additionally, we recently saw a group of three shooting up at the Division at camp. At all costs these activities should not be allowed in public. Additionally the trash from houseless campers is atrocious. Once shelter beds are available all camps should be cleared.
- **This depends on where the outside camp is located. If it's in a residential district, then i strongly disagree**
- Too many people in a small area. Should be based on number of people not number of sites.
- "Based on the City's ""Houselessness in the City of Bend"" website, an Outdoor Shelter may consist of small structures OR tents. The latter scenario should not be permitted in any residential zone -- tents are not residential neighborhoods.
- Further, any Outdoor Shelter must be subject to the same degree of regulation, oversight and daily management as a Group Shelter or Multi-Room Shelter. As such, any and all zoning provisions pertaining to the establishment of Outdoor Shelters must clearly address on-site sanitation protocols and requirements for the shelter operator (e.g., on-site bathrooms, cooking facilities, fire suppression, etc.). Additionally, if the decision is made to permit Outdoor Shelters in residential zones, then such shelters again must be ""high barrier"" (not ""low barrier"") shelters to ensure the health, safety and well being of all. "
- **I agree especially with the idea that community space doesn't take away from unit numbers, and would encourage community space to be provided.**

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- I don't feel the definition of "campsite or unit" is well defined, but this sounds reasonable
- We need to make it illegal for homeless to live in Bend City limits, period. Let them camp outside the city limits only. Shelters only encourage the homeless population to stay in Bend.
- These are good ideas for TEMPORARY camps for those down on their luck or looking for work.
- **too crowded**
- I am against campsites except in an emergency, in which case pack them in as closely as you can. You can't heat a tent in winter efficiently or safely and they quickly become an eyesore to the community. Either build sheds or a shelter. Even a basic shed can be purchased cheaply from home depot, likely less than the cost of the number of tents donated over a fairly short period.
- A tent as shown in the Southern Oregon example looks like it could accommodate more than this recommendation. How many camping spots did the old KOA maintain? What is the current space allowed at OregonState campgrounds for the public?
- **Believe the larger campsite would be difficult to manage. 44 is a lot of campsites.**
- You've got a growing vagrant problem and you are intentionally trying to make it worse.
- City of Bend should not spend more tax payer dollars to house homeless. Instead, increase social workers pay and have them lead the conversations of eviction with police there as support.
- NO campsites. Move them out to BLM property that you manage with the federal government on land they don't use. The crime increases and lack of safety for mostly seniors in this area is disheartening. I no longer feel safe in our town.
- **I think "tiny house" type villages can be an excellent, cost effective way of housing people with dignity and safety.**
- If after some are implemented and we think we can bump up the number for slightly more, then we should revisit the number.
- **This is too dense; this density will lead to extensive abuse of the natural land and a waste management problem.**
- **Density if too high.** Typically the outdoor shelters/tents tend to have the people that have substance or mental health issues. Too many people ""on top of each other"" and there will be fighting and issues. Many houseless people feel this is too close and don't feel safe or want to be subject to mental health or substance abuse issues. 1000 feet doesn't allow for vehicle parking
- This survey assumes as if this is a fait accompli. I don't agree with this strategy. I am reluctant to provide details to my objections as I have already seen in the City Councilors response to bloggers concerns that they summarily dismiss concerns and provide specious and emotional arguments with no authority instead of providing citizens all both sides of the issues.
- That is far too many sites on one space unless the site is located outside of the city, away from homes and schools. If that's the case, I would support much larger facilities. These camp locations should have to be approved by the voters.
- I strongly support following the recommendations of the sounding board. Anything that could help with our housing and homelessness crisis.
- **Agree, but site location is key for success, and should be tested in areas that are not adjacent to schools, public parks, or common corridors, for safety of all.**
- I am against any outdoor shelters in the City of Bend
- Not near schools or residential areas. Find space on edges of UGB that have access to bus lines.
- No outdoor shelters. That's called camping.
- **That seems like adequate space but managing a site like that will be hard with staff shortages everywhere..**
- Depends on location, location, LOCATION!
- Not sure what would prevent someone from developing a seasonal campground, since tourists and visitors could be considered homeless. How would this match up with the zoning requirements for recreational campgrounds?
- Too much congestion which leads to violence and drug and alcohol abuse. Danger to surrounding community
- **Yep, that math checks out for standard usage.**
- This would create high-density and unsafe conditions for those living there as well as those providing support and help.
- Where will this be located? IM SURE NOT in more affluent neighborhoods.
- **CRAZY! Way too many campsites crowded into 1 acre.**
- You are making homelessness a permanent feature instead of spending that same money on things that help people get out of homelessness.
- Don't put any of these shelters in residential areas, they will destroy any area they are put in. If you have to, open up Juniper Ridge, or in open area on the southeast end of town.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- Seems like more would be possible, depending on the set up, but not sure I understand the actual data behind this number.
- Again, it depends where it is. at Juniper Ridge, sure. On a lot on the Westside, no.
- If you built it, they will come. . .
- This low density seems like a very poor use of land. And outdoor shelters are the most problematic - likely to be a visual eyesore and hard to contain noise issues. Prefer to not have any outdoor shelters.
- with continuing to appease the homeless more will be attracted to the area. homeless ness of most out these out of area people are not the responsibility of Central Oregon. they need to go back to where they came from, let's give them a bus ticket to let their communities best serve them.
- I disapprove of managed camps in residential areas
- **1000 sf is 32x32. That seems way too much space for a camper/tentsite. This is supposed to be temporary space. RV parks are much more dense. These facilities are not a homesite substitute, suitable for LT living.**
- Outdoor ""shelter"" like at Revere?
- Find some damn place out where they can't bother anyone but themselves, put up a circus tent and let them huddled together for warmth.
- "1. Camping is not a year round option. 2. That is high density camping. Any high density living situation brings safety, security and sanitation issues. Are the EXISTING communities going to be involved in the planning process? The people for whom their home or small family business is the single largest asset they have... will they have a say in what happens in their community? Will they have a say in something that will directly impact their greatest investment?"
- Tenting sites conjure up the image of what we've been seeing along the highway- trash, clutter, fire danger, sanitary issues. (I had an unpleasant encounter with a bag of feces in a business parking lot near an encampment) I would NOT want to see this become an acceptable option.
- Your plan is not the answer to this complicated issue.
- **That seems to be the proper density**
- This is a misuse of funding. Funding should be used for mental health treatment options to children. Our adolescent suicide rates in this community are far more appropriate to address. Homeless can find jobs and live in various locations. Children suffering from mental illness do not have such options to address their problems.
- The changes to City Code go against everything the City has implemented to manage land use and building codes for the last several decades. The City of Bend is partially responsible for high cost of housing in Bend, and before dealing with the issue in an extreme manner, the City should first fully evaluate their own building code requirements and development standards, and work to eliminate the costs and barriers to market-rate development. Why should there be two standards, one for developers, and one for non-profits/government subsidized?
- By looking at other examples of outdoor shelters around the country I don't believe this is a viable solution.
- Please don't invite all those that will distort the city
- awful !! stacked like cord wood
- See above.
- **Too much**
- Seems the limiting factor for campsites will be the availability of amenities such as restrooms and drinking water and trash collection and safe storage for personal belongings
- Will this work during a very cold, snowy winter???? Some people might not want to be enclosed in this type of setting. Just view the random "campsites" along Highway 97. People come and go at will. Again, ask the homeless. Would they actually live in this type of setting? Or would they feel trapped and enclosed.
- Again, if you build it, who manages it? I see this as a management disaster. Very difficult.
- Same as above!
- you people are idiots and don't represent the community.
- seems reasonable in comparison to campsites in the area
- I see how these camps look right now and it seems that it would be hard to control the sewage and trash. The drug use is rampant as well and for example I had the unfortunate situation where a homeless guy was skirting the lane and I almost ran him over...blind spot. I think they are so used to living on the street that they are actually creating hazards for drivers. A good example is how they stand on street corners and even IN the street with their signs often with their legs IN the street. The situation is out of control. Pass some laws to get it UNDER control.
- Too many people and no control over what happens outside the camps. you can't have these in neighborhoods and near schools.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- There should be an upper bound. I think other outdoor locations have seen success when the community is limited to 25 or so people. That way the residents can all know each other, and better self police their area. If there are too many people congregated in one area there is a higher likelihood of illegal activity occurring, and a degradation of the camp.
- Managed campsites are a terrible idea. How is providing a slightly cleaner, slightly more organized campsite a solution to the unmanaged camps the city allows now.
- Stop encouraging this lifestyle in our community.
- It's not enough information. Are these the sole eligibility requirements? It's short sighted to only base this on city code. Other contextual information should be required to make an informed decision. Like are there schools near by/ other vulnerable populations- children, elderly. Other higher risk scenarios, or higher likelihood of adverse impact to surrounding area- residential, infrastructure/ access.
- I like the simplicity of creating outdoor shelters, they need to be well managed and clean and people need to follow safety guidelines so neighbors can feel safe and comfortable too
- We should not be encouraging housing homeless people in Bend.
- I don't agree with enabling homelessness in Bend or any city. There are plenty of programs for assistance to avoid being on the street. Many of these people don't want assistance. Please open your eyes and tour the off ramps around Bend. The things I have seen and had to explain to my young children. Syringes, stolen bikes, piles and piles of garbage next to young males drugged out of their minds surfing their cell phones next to their empty booze bottles and drug paraphernalia with no care in the world. City council please get a clue. Learn from the state you moved from (most likely California) those policies and politics ruin states. Hence why you are here. Yet you brought the same ideas with you to ruin our state as well. "If you build it they will come". We're screwed, I believe it's too late.. you've done the damage and theirs no coming back.
- No camp sites but cottages are much more desirable. We don't have the climate for campsites. In the winter it is too cold and in the summer the fire danger is too high and excessive smoke and/or heat are not conducive to camping.
- **Seems reasonable.**
- Outdoor shelters and camping should be prohibited
- Outdoor shelters should not be allowed at all. That's called camping and we have campgrounds already in Central Oregon.
- Up to this point I have not seen any data that supports the sounding boards recommendations.
- Outdoor shelters don't work.
- Put campsites on the city limits and provide a public transportation bus to make a stop at the campsite 5-7 times a day. Also, provide security guards on site.
- This is a terribly written and not user friendly survey. There should be NO homeless facilities of any kind in a residential zone OR within proximity to a school / childcare facility
- Again, why are you asking respondents to comment on parking situations rather than the underlying zoning changes?
- Outdoor Shelters should be done near the County level near the Deschutes County Fairgrounds and NOT IN BEND.
- We have already seen what these campsites look like In The community. They are not simple campsites. They have grown over time into full blown collections of everything under the sun.
- No campsites! Zero!
- These people need help with their drug & alcohol abuse. They aren't looking for affordable HOMES!!!! They want affordable drugs and alcohol!! Open you eyes!!!! They are breaking the law EVERY day!!!
- **This seems awfully crowded. I would need more information as to how many sq ft per person would be allotted.**
- I disagree with the outdoor shelter concept and the ability for the city and county to manage it.
- Bend residents dont want more outdoor camps
- Why is Bend intent on promoting and expanding homelessness?
- Outdoor shelters should not be allowed.
- See previous comment.
- Not enough is outlined to move them out and on their own. Nothing outlines qualifications, screening process, etc.
- **That would give each camper 1,000 sq. ft. or allow for room between spots.**
- See my response above to providing any type of sheltering assistance. I'm opposed as it will degrade the quality of life in the Community at large as well as it does not incentive those living in such shelters to truly better themselves.
- The farther out of town you can place more folks. In town needs to be restricted because Bend is based on tourism.
- Too crowded. Leads to an unsafe and unsanitary environment.
- The board is just again opening Bend to all people who want camp out all summer long in Bend at hard working Bend residents expense. How is that fair?

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- **I believe the Sounding Board and staff have reviewed the relevant information and codes to make thoughtful recommendations as a starting point for these many proposals.**
- **That sounds like sufficient space to maintain order and cleanliness.**
- **That seems like over crowding and a way to try and hide all the homeless in specific zones.**
- Regardless of the density, I am strongly opposed to allowing outdoor shelters in all zones. I don't believe a campground, whether occupied by houseless persons or not, is a compatible use in the lower density residential zones.
- **Dense campsites would be fine in non-residential areas, but the number is too high if placed near low density homes.**
- Please do not put a camp near Bear Creek Elementary School and Bend High School. VERY BAD IDEA!!
- RUINATION OF OUTDOOR SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT...BEEN DONE BEFORE...THINK : ""SKID ROW""
- See my previous reasons. It's all the same.
- No campsites. Please do not enable this lifestyle. It will destroy our city, as we are already seeing.
- No more tax dollars to grow this problem
- Camp site are just trash piles look at what we have around town now.
- **44 campsites on 1 acre is way too many people/animals. Often times each campsite will have multiple folks and animals together. The ancillary services needed to support 44 campsites would be a lot (trash, restrooms etc).**
- I do not agree that we should provide outdoor camping at all. The cost outweighs the benefit by hundreds of thousands of dollars. If you're only providing 10 campsites, the government oversight and property management costs will be astronomical. These campgrounds will do nothing to curb the "chosen" homeless who want to live their way and not abide by rules.
- Encouraging encampments will only exacerbate our houseless challenges, we should focus on shelters and treatment facilities as step up options for those in need. By condoning encampments and barrier free options, we're promoting behaviors that endanger both housed and houseless.
- We don't need more of the homeless (yes homeless NOT unhoused) in Bend. There are plenty of jobs. When I was younger I had to have at least two roommates to afford an apartment. Based on the current wages and cost of an apartment in Bend there is NO reason most of these ""homeless"" people cannot be working and living in an apartment.
- Just will become another Hunnel rd. Mismanaged with trash and human waste, biohazard.
- I don't think these make sense for the climate of central Oregon
- STOP this insanity! Look at Portland, it was a beautiful jewel of a city and is now an absolute shit hole. Take care of those "houseless" who truly need it, send the rest packing. Walk or drive down 2nd and Franklin any morning and you will see that these "houseless" are just absolute junkies wandering around wasted. Take care of our city!
- **Trying to visualize this and my home is 1500 square feet so I would say you could fit more folks in an outdoor shelter comfortably.**
- I don't think Outdoor Shelters should be allowed in Residential Districts.
- **1,000 sq ft/shelter would seem about right.**
- You need to get the root of the problem here in Bend before you tout increasing availability across our town, many of those problems that the homeless population are experiencing are drugs and alcohol. Many are transients seeking a better life here, and that's due to our kindness being taken as weakness. We need more mental health funding if anything, get these people off the streets and REAL help.
- We should not have outdoor shelters in Bend.
- "Until the City can justify that the homeless we are working with are Bend residents I don't support any of these resolutions. The statistic cited in the recent Bend Editorial by City Council is that 26% of homeless residents were not from Central Oregon. That is 1 in 4. If we consider that it is in the best interest of the surveyee to respond that they are from Central Oregon and that Bend provides a majority of the services for homeless, it is likely that 1 in 3 (maybe 1 in 2) of those homeless in Bend are not from Bend.
- Further, the homeless need to show that they can be good residents in residential areas. If you look at what is and has taken place on Kansas Ave south of the library, the homeless have not demonstrated they can be good neighbors. There have been fights, unruly dogs, drunkenness, public urination and vandalism.
- I am completely in favor of helping those in need, but there also needs to be enforcement of current policies and I do not see that happening.
- Until I see enforcement of current policies, shelters and food kitchens taking an active role in policing the areas around where they serve, and the homeless behaving as responsible citizens I am not in favor of expanding these options into further communities."
- **Seems like they could shrink the elbow room to get more sites/sq. ft.**

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- WELCOME ALL TRANSIENTS AND HOMELESS PEOPLE! COME TO BEND, WHERE THE HOMES ARE INSANELY EXPENSIVE AND THE COST OF LIVING IS ABSURD, BUT HERE IS A NICE LITTLE PIECE OF FREE LAND FOR YOUR CAMPSITE...DID I MENTION IT'S FREE!?
- I am no fan of outdoor shelters and think it's a bit ridiculous to even consider. Get these people indoors and out of the outdoor camp-like spaces. This is not a solution. It's caving in to the existing problem of houseless sprawl.
- STOP making these camp sites so comfortable it draws more homeless.
- **I believe that 44 sites per acre would cause too much density and potential for problems in an outdoor shelter or camp.** If there isn't a set requirement for the supporting facilities/services being provided (bathrooms, kitchens, etc.) 44 people per acre could easily be too many. There are many instances where portable toilets would not be sufficient to support this many individuals in such a small space.
- See above comment.
- I think I agree, but the given information does not indicate what the density is of the example pictures provided. A plan-view set of examples would be helpful.
- The vast majority of our community does not want additional homeless infrastructure. If you build it, they will come. The experience of most West Coast major urban centers is demonstrative of this reality. Listen to the population that pays your salaries.
- I have my doubts that the city leaders are capable of managing these shelters
- "If the numbers in this question actually match the image shown, I agree. If it would leave it more crowded, then I don't.
- All property owners within the City performed due diligence on their property to determine what could be allowed. The sounding board's recommendations is a massive deviations from the rules. The suggestions is by no means a small scale test case, but rather is a large scale test case that can never be turned back. In addition, no information has been provided with regard to the operations of such camps and the expectations of their residents. These uses are completely incompatible with adjacent residential uses and should not be allowed in any residential zones.
- **This seems like adequate space for each unit while addressing the specific challenges of outdoor shelters. My question is whether there will be rules against personal items in the open spaces on the lot, or possibly providing communal lockers to store valuable items.**
- **I think for this type of shelter, with the cabin or tent being up to 300sq ft, setting them at 500sq ft min lots is fine.**
- **100 SQ.ft. gives plenty of space for people not separated by walls.**
- Stop allowing people to park derelict vehicles. How is this helping the houseless situation? Get people out of their vehicles and into very low income housing.
- I think this solution is the least viable, considering the extreme weather fluctuations in Bend. How will this work when we have a large snowfall? What will be the solution if we have sweltering heatwaves? I don't think "soft-structure" space is a good idea for the region.
- Although, the pictures that are provided make such a site look neat, tidy and accommodating that is NOT the reality. These types of settings always end up looking like more of a landfill, than a neat and tidy campground. They do NOTHING to encourage people to find permanent indoor housing, seek treatment for their addictions or attempt to better their situation in anyway shape or form.
- The less space allowed for junk and garbage the better.
- NO Campsites in neighborhoods why do you seek the destruction of Bend's neighborhoods and quality of life we once enjoyed? Council- just look at the garbage dump by Crux, 2nd street, Hunnell Road. Why is this what you want for the city of Bend and why do you want to attract more of it? The Council can end some pf the problem of the councilmembers and mayor took in homeless families into their own homes. NO Campsites in the City Limits.
- **44 campsites on one acre is too many, that many people crammed into that space is just asking for conflicts!**
- These camps should not be encouraged in the first place, but if they must, they should be consolidated in an area that will not result in a negative impact on the existing community of homes or businesses. If the city is going to promote this, they should be liable for any and all damages or losses incurred by the taxpayers who funded it. The best way to accomplish that accountability is to not spread resources, and create a "camping" area in a place that holds more than one "campsite" per 1,000SF which is the footprint of a decent sized home. Providing dedicated "camping sites" should not be located on the basis of what's most convenient for the homeless with disregard to the tax paying citizens of the city, even just their opinions of the matter. If taxpayers don't want it, that's just as valid as any other vote or decision such as whether to build a park, add a road, change a sidewalk, etc. The locations should be decided upon which has the absolute least impact, in an area away from potential harm to the community, and consolidated to most efficiently use taxpayer funded resources.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- this survey is not asking the right questions
- Why do we have to take care of people who can't take care of themselves!
- We do not want to allow camp sites. this will be allowing people that are less than trustworthy close to our homes. I understand that some of these people are truly struggling, but I'm also guessing that 10% of these people actually want help and not a hand out. the other 90% are people looking for a free space to sleep so they can wonder around town high and do nothing to help out society. No Camping allowed!!
- Do not use taxpayer money to accommodate the homeless. Enforce ""No Vagrancy"" laws and ""No Camping"" on public property. Do not move them in. Move them out.
- Tax payers should not be proving more shelter options
- This is not clear.
- as long as this is not in the city parks or residential areas, this seems like a fair amount in one camp. But it must be managed and no dumping of garbage everywhere.
- Why is the city in the business of assisting the homeless? I thought this responsibility was left to NGO's and not taxpayers. I vehemently disagree with this egregious use of taxpayer money.
- **Assuming it is managed and proper waste facilities are provided.** Also, there should be some requirements about drug or alcohol use. Definitely should not be low barrier.
- I think I am clear
- lets not turn bend into eugene or portland please don t screw up a good thing!!!
- On its face it sounds reasonable but I do not believe I have enough information about what might be considered normal in this situation to give you a firm up or down.
- I don't believe we should encourage camping at all.
- This is fine as long as no outdoor shelter is put in a residential neighborhood.
- Need way more information.
- We do NOT want Code changes like this! Stop changing Codes to do what the Council wants when it does not represent what the MAJORITY of voters want. This is NOT a solution. This just sweeps the problem into all areas of town. Step up and do the really hard work, which is funding for systemic solutions not this bandaaid on a gushing wound.
- provide semi permanent types of shelters, not tents and things like shown on the website that will be all destroyed after one month in the elements.
- What will the nightly fee be? As a tax paying citizen I am charged approximately \$25/night for camping in state and local campgrounds.
- You're going to gift the homeless 1000 sq ft to junk up like they do the sides of every road in this town? STOP. ENABLING. HOMELESS. PEOPLE.
- I will not support any recommendation that is provided without evidence supporting it as the optimal solution for the community.
- Too many sites to manage effectively
- It looks like there are too many sites to manage effectively.
- I'll be honest, I really don't understand the outdoor shelter idea. Isn't that what the homeless here are already doing? And will there be rules enforced about all the trash?
- Your pictures/diagrams show ideal clean, empty "shelters". In reality, "shelters" do not turn out that way. The more residents, the dirtier, messier, cluttered and unhealthy they become. The fewer residents the better!
- You are creating another Eugene. Stop the liberal supremacy.
- **While the ratio is OK, I believe you need to require a central staffed communal area per each 25 campsites. If it is not in the requirement it would not happen.**
- All this just invites more homeless into our community
- **Urban setting must maximize space.**
- See previous answers. Homelessness is the decline of our wonderful city, continuing to support those that do not wish to be contributing, tax paying, law abiding citizens is not a priority of discussion and should not be getting tax payer funding.
- No outdoor shelters.
- No more shelters. Homeless are very different than transient or nomads. We already provide services for the homeless, stop encouraging the madness! Stop!
- **44 campsites are ALOT on 1 acre.**
- **too dense**

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- The city council has forgotten it owes a duty only to its constituents, the tax paying citizens of Bend. Our concerns come first, and is inexcusable to ignore it for their own social engineering agenda. If the citizens say “no! We don’t want this in our communities and neighborhoods!” that should be the final word.
- **If each campsite houses 2-4 people those 44 units have anywhere from 80 to 180 people living on a one acre site. That is too congested, too burdensome on the surrounding neighborhoods, and might be unsafe.**
- I don't have a great understanding of how large an acre is in a city setting or what 44 campsites would look like in that setting.
- The location of any proposed site needs to be identified first. For example, the proposed site that has been proposed by the city that is adjacent to Bend High School is unacceptable because of the vulnerability of the many small, immature school students who walk through this area.
- not in residential neighborhoods!!!
- I’m not sure about the viability of this option. It is too cold here in the winter
- It is unclear how the City plans to guarantee the sites are clean, sanitary, and do not cause irreparable environmental and wildlife damage. Due to the lack of specificity and absence of guaranteed outcome. A group of citizens was overheard discussing their private group that is funding legal counsel to investigate this issue and hold city officials responsible for outcomes associated with the decisions. The individuals appear to be very wealthy, highly educated, and have remarked about derailing careers over similar matters elsewhere.
- "Hard to visualize this as your outdoor explanation is very confusing. There is a picture of tents but description mentions veterans village which i thought were tiny homes. Which is it? Tents are not permanent and should not be placed in single family neighborhoods.
- eException is circus tents with cots that could be more permanent. One for men, one for women and one for others. And put these in Brothers with a one way bus ticket."
- Bend does not have the climate to have outdoor camping shelters. It is too cold in the winter and high fire danger and smoke in the summer. Cottages are much more appropriate.
- These should not be densely populated.
- First of all, this is not a good use of property no matter what the zoning is. These types of ‘shelters’ rarely are used in good faith by occupants. Nearby business suffers an increase in property crime and citizens paid for property values decrease. Are we doing away with all zoning rules or only rules when they pertain to those experiencing “homelessness”?
- **cramming 10 RVs/tents on a standard city lot is much too high.**
- Do not agree with proposed shelters in residential neighborhoods.
- I do not want outdoor shelters being added here in Bend.
- Too many
- It really depends on the existing density of surrounding development.
- This should be double the number of spaces for each 1000 sq/ft. We are attempting to help people in need, not have them establish a foothold.
- What is most important is where the outdoor shelters will be permitted. With the risks of fire and with the need to maintain neighborhood zones, "where" becomes much more important. And from that the numbers will become more obvious.
- Also needs to consider space for sidewalks and paths and access and bike or vehicle parking that will result in more like 8
- To create camps encourages this kind of behavior and only generates more. a job requirement should be in place for any of these recommendations
- Campsites?
- It is unbelievable how the mayor and City Council has completely ignored the community these homeless camps will negatively impact. The community is not saying "no" to homeless shelters, but insisting they must not, cannot be near our children and schools.
- why would homeless wish to conform to your rules and bylaws on this type of site when they are choosing to be outside and enjoy their addictions or mental health issues... how does this aspect of homelessness get addressed.
- Bend is too cold to live outside
- Should be more lots allowed
- Doesn't seem like an efficient use of space and is potentially more costly to maintain (would the units be individually heated and plumbed for water and sewer?).
- Too many people in too small of an area.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- Higher density for these types of spaces. with the idea that this is temporary transition camping until someone can move to one of the indoor shelters. This should also be combined with a ordinance banning camping in the public right of way and disbanding permanent camping in our forests. This would be the option when removed from the above places.
- Observing the current sites on our state owned off ramps along the parkway each tent site comes with a multitude of out of the tent items, bikes, grocery carts, chairs, coolers etc. Are these items going to surround each tent? Will 1000 square feet accommodate all the owners items? Food for thought.
- Every effort should be made to get people into housing and not allow for this to become a permanent solution. With all of the jobs available in this town right now, and the support of the community for mental health, limiting the options and holding people accountable for their own future is key in providing a more robust community.
- It depends where its at. In a residential area, that would be way to high in my opinion. 5 shelters on a standard 50x100' lot. In an industrial or out of the way area it would be fine.
- We do not need to be providing camp site locations. We need to protect our properties, our children, and our community. We need to acknowledge most of these people do not want help and we are aiding to the problem
- **This would be enough for recreational camping. However, after seeing the current encampments on Revere and elsewhere, I think that 1000 sf would quickly fill with possessions.**
- How are you going to monitor it if they exceed this number of campsites.
- I agree with providing temporary outdoor housing. I do not agree with providing full housing for people who refuse to work. There are plenty of jobs available right now and I what I see is homeless people laying around ruining our public spaces. Why is this permitted? I can't camp anywhere or litter and defecate where I want? Clean it up and stop enabling. It's disgusting and unsafe. I'm a tax payer and I am about to stop recycling bottles and cans because Bottle Drop is surrounded by drug addicts and expletive-shouting homeless. I no longer feel safe running or biking alone in our national forests. It makes me angry as I drive around. It is a travesty. Keep them out of neighborhoods and far from schools - you're dreaming to think these proposed shelters in these areas will work out in a positive manner. Frankly, the homeless population is one of the top reasons we cite for leaving Bend after living here for over a decade and having a home here for longer than that.
- THIS ONLY INCREASES THE PROBLEM BY INVITING MORE HOMELESS IMMIGRATION INTO THE CITY
- "I think all of this is speculative, and it is going to depend on the surrounding neighborhood and lot in each case. I think general rules like those above are going to be hard. Uniformity within zones may not be appropriate. I think it is going to have to vary.
- Setting high maximums may have advantages to housing people, but it may not be suitable to have that many structures or tents in specific areas. There needs to be flexibility.
- That is why I started favoring lowering the max number of units. I fear the cramming of sites just because it is allowed."
- "What are the governing circumstances to this arrangement? Will there be bathrooms, garbage containers, etc? Who will maintain these, how and at whose cost?
- How many citizens are currently living out of their vehicles? will these be considered ""Outdoor Shelters?"
- For everything consider in these recommendations, the City needs to produce and share data driven information directly from the homeless community about their wishes. "
- "I do not want to see outdoor shelters in the City of Bend!!!
- Just as I think loitering and begging should be prohibited in our City!!!"
- That would be too crowded and not allow the residents sufficient room for privacy and seclusion. If we are designing camps, we need to keep in mind that we make them as humane as possible.
- **i would expect less density for open campsite. I live on 8/10's of an acre and imagining 40 sites on this spaces seems like a lot**
- This is gross. I see that the photos do not include pictures with any actual inhabitants? This is not appropriate for residential neighborhoods or even many other types of zones. Bend needs to stop trying to be a summertime magnet for the Portland and Seattle homeless.
- Same answer as Group Shelters.
- **I think the maximum number of site/unit per sf of property, but I believe the total size should be limited.** I believe in having many smaller group areas as that would disperse the homeless groups and be less offensive to neighbors.
- This results in a site in a 30' x 30' site. That is fine as long as they don't become a junk site like we currently see all over the City. They need to restrict the sites so that ALL of their belongings and possession's are inside the tents.
- I have lived here my entire life and I really don't know what the solution is but providing these housing facilities are only going to promote more moving here or encourage more. If someone really wanted help there are so many opportunities in

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

Bend but they are either too lazy to apply or abide by the rules or don't want to which means for most of these people this will not help only create more problems. They should not be allowed to live by children or families or schools and should have to abide by the laws that have always been in place. I know housing here is expensive I am not living it up by any means and own a small business that had to close multiple times this past year and a half along with bankruptcy because of it- but I don't complain just keep moving forward to create a better life.

- **This seems to be too many and to be an overload on the land.**
- sounds fine
- No way for people to keep warm in the winter
- **Density is too high.** What a mess in the neighborhood
- There are currently homeless campsites located all around Bend and these sites are an absolute disaster. I live near Hunnel Road, and if any of the council members have not driven down there recently I would advise them to. By allowing the homeless to take over public areas of Bend, it is creating a hazardous situation not only for businesses and neighbors, but this is not a safe or effective solution.
- We should not have outdoor shelters at all. This will attract houseless people who were not permanent residents of Bend and is unrealistic given winter weather. Plus we have no amenable locations for this anywhere in Bend.
- I strongly disagree with changing the code to allow homeless shelters all over the city. You are only encouraging an influx of more homeless folks. What a great place Bend!! Property values will diminish if a homeless area is adjacent to a neighborhood.
- "I agree with restrictions. I think there should be a buffer of the number of units depending on where the property situated .
- Don't allow these at all. They will become crime infested tent cities. They will end up as toxic zones that will cause environmental damage and cost millions to clean up.
- Poor survey so I can't answer because it doesn't reflect my position.
- Activist make horrible city leadership as demonstrated in Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles. other "progressive cities," and now Bend. This problem will only continue to increase under the current city "leadership." We will see our taxes increase, the hiring of a homeless Czar like they do in big cities, countless Non-Profits who will pay themselves handsomely, the hiring of more city employees, more low barrier camps will proliferate, and the cycle of homeless will only get worse under the current city leadership.
- "This survey is leading us to believe that the money has been spent and the decisions have been made.
- We want recovery, not handouts!!!"
- Depends on the design of the spaces.
- Without the inclusion of drug addiction/mental health services, 24/7 police surveillance, the assurance that the area will be kept free of second hand smoke, cigarette butts, needles, feces and other human waste, and loud noises to include screaming obscenities, I strongly oppose putting any kind of shelter within the city limits and in our communities. I urge you to work with Sounding Board to ensure the above issues are addressed and only then allow a small test model.
- "There should be NO outdoor shelters, allowed in RL or RS (single family) zoning. The overwhelming number of RS property owners DO NOT want shelters in this zone. There are no state legislative bills that allow shelters of any type in RS zoning. I guarantee you if the city moves ahead with allowing shelters of any type in RS zone there will be litigation. Is the city prepared for litigation? RM zoning is designated for multifamily dwellings that can blend in with RS & RL single family dwelling types. RH zoning is designated for high density multifamily and light commercial. If any zone would be compatible with a shelter, it would be the RH. HOWEVER, the shelter provider would be required to provide liability bonding that at a minimum provides \$50,000.00 coverage per each tent. CL zone would also work, BUT the shelter provider would need to provide, screen fencing, 24/7 patrolling to prevent laundering and liability bonding.
- **All examples provided do not take in account the tent occupants personal belongings.** Have you not seen the staggering amount of stuff, trash and garbage that accumulates in the homeless camps? What will stop the accumulation of occupants personal belongings and stuff? Many homeless people do have cars and prefer to live in a tent and access to free services. QUESTION, who will provide proof the tent occupant is looking for a stable work environment and to move into a permanent structure? At a minimum the shelter provider should provide and be liable for occupant search for stable work and permanent housing. Also, the shelter provider should provide concealed screen fencing, 27/7 security patrol to prevent laundering and most importantly the shelter provider is to provide liability bonding that at a minimum provides \$50,000.00 coverage per tent. MOST IMPORTANT, shelter provider is to provide a permanent toilet facility as per state building code NOT portable sanitation. In the winter portable sanitation freezes and no longer function. "
- 22 campsites outside my bedroom window? No thank you .. where are the people that should be knocking on my door asking me how it will impact MY life !!!!

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- sounds like a lot - these campsites are rather unruly quick - drive by any on/off ramp for 97
- There should not be a campsite in town for houseless people
- I think this is too conservative on the number of campsites.
- you are not addressing the core problem, you should look to the underlying situations of the population to determine actual needs.
- again, no camping or temporary shelters in RS zones.
- **Approval of an Outdoor shelter should fall within existing established parameters for a campground within the City Limits, and the Bend Development Code should be amended to allow any developer to construct a campground for anyone within the same parameters as being proposed for these Outdoor Shelters to serve the homeless.**
- Again, this allows for too many people in a fairly close proximity, which can easily lead to conflicts at the shelter site and the general area. Again, no mention of being able to have a pet or not.
- Any group housing should be high density. For example, the camp on 9th Street design that was given to the community is almost luxury - with fenced 'yards' and no shared walls for residents. This seems like it would encourage people to want to stay. If we are providing housing, it should be no frills and house as many people as possible, and be temporary.
- **Again, I think it makes sense to accommodate as many people per site as possible while taking into account important considerations like safety and health. 44 units per acre sounds reasonable without being too crowded.**
- There should be no campsites. You are putting a burden on residential owners. It is extremely unfair to house people in a neighborhood with mental illness, you need to have a proper facility. The people under the bridge or camping near highways, are not families experience houselessness, they are people with additions and mental illness. You are perpetuating the situation by creating any type of camping grounds.
- Should be no Outdoor Shelters. Stop enabling!
- For outdoor shelter areas I would like to see recommendations to facilitate a level of privacy for the residents (which will also benefit neighbors). This could be in the form of setbacks, fencing or vegetation.
- I think any discussion of requirements in the building code is jumping the gun. I want more community dialoge on the subject of homelessness, shelters, and affordable housing. I would like to see more work up front on these matters, i.e., identify types of homelessness (temporary, permanent, mental health issues, addiction issues) and what type of housing each needs (close to services, transitional, urban, rural, family, etc.); put forth the issue of shelters to a vote of the citizens of central oregon who will be most impacted; and identify ways to mitigate runaway housing costs which are likely to continue. I'd like to have more examples of housing successes and failures in communities who have been in the same situation as Bend.
- Give free housing to all Bend residents.
- I am opposed to the outdoor shelters being proposed and/or set up in any residential neighborhood. Outdoor shelter should be used as an emergency shelter for natural disasters. The proposed idea institutionalizes homelessness. Then the issue becomes the local government's issue to manage and budget for the long term without long-term resolutions. If someone cannot afford the current cost of living in this city or state, then find a community that best meets your needs. I had to do that to survive and didn't need government support to survive. I also went to work, school, had roommates to help with affordable housing. Why is the city even considering the proposed idea which institutionalizes the homeless living in tents. It sounds more like a proposal to attract more transients, where homelessness lacks a permanent residence.
- A complete resource for the houseless at Juniper Ridge. Built with resources and housing to help, guide and support the houseless. This is most respectival and human way to help. Displacing them around town will not give them the help they need.
- build it they will come
- Supporting campsites with taxpayer dollars is not a solution to the houseless problem. We need to focus on providing mental health and addiction services first. Futhermore, houseless individuals that break the law need to be penalized with jail time and mandatory rehabilitation programs. This will ultimately give them the tools needed (sobriety, access to resources, etc.) to get out of the cycle of homelessness.
- **44 campsites on a single acre is actually quite a bit!** This is going to destroy the land and we need more information on where this would go. There are serious concerns about fire safety and human waste/garbage for these sites.
- This planning department is out of control as is the city council. Changes need to be made either administratively or at the ballot box.
- Work.
- "In the photos, it seemed that there was more room available than the shelters covered.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- If there was the option to increase the number of shelters, when the homeless situation gets worse, then it makes more sense."
- That seems too high, unless you are going to tightly control the amount of storage of excess "stuff" that seems to pile up around these tents.
- Camping on public lands, outside of the forests in designated campsites, used to be called loitering. This should be illegal and not allowed.
- **I strongly agree - HOWEVER - rules on open space; landscape, parking, etc should apply.**
- I don't like the idea of a campsite.
- **"These sites can be much smaller. They need to be in nonresidential neighborhoods though.**
- A lot of the people in tents along the highway exits are transients or nomads. They just need small defined campsites in a fenced in area with toilets and dumpsters available to keep them and others safe. They can use their own tents etc.
- They should be away from neighborhoods."
- See above
- None should be allowed it is making bend a horrible place to live push them somewhere else. Quit providing services and they will leave. I saw someone pouring a gallon jug of urine all over the ground . A washing station totally destroyed. Build it for them and it will be destroyed.
- When is the Bend City Council going to represent those of us who voted you in? OMG was I stupid to think you would be a better Council. You know we call you the Brat Pack because you are young and think you have all the answers - and, of course, you do not!
- **Depending on the size of the units that could get over-crowded very quickly.**
- Use space without overcrowding
- I am not in favor of codifying going this type of housing. Only an emergency situation is OK to declare and allow this temporarily.
- **This is much too dense.**
- Put these camps in the Sounding Boards neighborhoods not in mine.
- More tents of shelters could fit on that size of lot.
- We do not want outdoor camps in town
- I would strongly agree if I had more information as to how the garbage/waste was going to be taken care of. Would the city be responsible for the cost of garbage service just like at a park? Would this facility be fenced as shown in a previous example ?
- See above answer
- No enabling the lazy
- That is a really large population of unhoused people. What kinds of regular social services would be paired with an outdoor shelter to ensure people can transition to more stable living conditions quickly?
- This seems dense for outdoor camping. Many Bend lots are only ~5,500sf and that would allow five tents. That many tents at a campground can be loud and impact neighbors. I'm fine with that density for permanent enclosed units.
- Winter's here are too cold to provide safe 'outdoor' shelters, other options should be explored.
- I'm from Bozeman MT. During the 90's while paying back student debt and trying to live, I couldn't afford to be there, so I left the state and went to Portland, Oregon. PDX in the 90's was a beautiful city. What is it like now? No one needs to live in Bend. I'd like a home in Park West in NYC but can't afford it. So I don't have it. I'll get on board with all these measures once Compass Park in NWX leads by example and hosts 220 Outdoor Shelters. Until then, let's hold...
- Adding a higher density of population to an existing community will add additional stress. Adding a high density of individuals that need an abundance of services will increase those stressors exponentially. Without further study on how many stressors can be added to each individual community before it negatively impacts that community it is unethical to house homeless in a functioning community. In trying to do good we must not harm others. House the homeless away from functioning communities and provide them the services they need to be reintroduced into a functioning society.
- every one of these turns into a dump. Look at ODOT land, Hunnell Rd, etc. More density, more trash. Any of these places should require "rent" payments. You can help clean the shelter for "funds" that allow you to stay there. Not reason there should be a free ride.
- **too many**
- **This seems pretty spread out - I feel like more units could be accommodated and folks would still be comfortable.**
- Not in city limits yes to county
- No shelters near family neighborhoods or schools.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- Again, you have not provided sufficient information to ascertain the impact.
- **This sounds reasonable although I strongly disagree with any homeless camps placed alongside residential areas within the city limits.**
- **For the safety of the shelter residents as well as the impact on neighboring communities, I'd suggest limiting the # of spaces regardless of the size of the site.**
- **I do think we need to try this model out on a smallish scale to start with to discover how it will actually work and what kind of density is best for residents and neighbors**
- Although there has to be consideration of the cost of operations and the service provided.
- Homeless camps should not be allowed within city limits.
- I do not support outdoor shelter in an area zoned residential.
- The spacing seems appropriate but the bigger question is where will you base this Outdoor Shelter?
- I am sorry, I am feeling very lost on this particular questionnaire. Again, I appreciate this concern for parking space, my priorities on this subject is knowing how these people will be 'managed' while still being cared for and being housed. My questions are way more basic. I don't know the percentages of mental health needs, addiction recovery, aid for children etc. Will there be restrictions applied and the plans toward recovery? And what for those refuse intervention? Will there be treatment available to these 'left overs'.
- I need more information. There will also need to be space for restroom facilities and other facilities (e.g. community room? social services space?). Could those facilities be adequately provided with that density of units?
- Agree BUT, overall total of any site must consider surrounding occupancies
- Given the fact that homeless folks require a good deal more services than the housed population to allow the maximum number of beds does a disservice to the community and the homeless. Scale the number of beds to the amount of services that are required; such as, mental health and substance abuse providers, security personnel, nursing staff, etc.
- What is this proposed number of campsites/acre based on?
- Not in favor of ""tent cities"" in our town.
- I think outdoor facilities is a disaster waiting to happen. Too hot/cold/smoky to work on an everyday basis, so things will always change. Plus too much opportunity for misbehavior and collection of junk. It will always spill outside the assigned area, and I don't foresee any appetite for control to be exercised over these areas. Will just turn into an outside drug marketplace and mental health free-for-all.
- Again, a response cannot be made until the location of the outdoor shelter is identified.
- **I think it's too dense. And where do they put their cars? The density should be no greater than 5 per 10000 square feet.**
- "I believe the humane thing to do is to create housing, proper shelters."
- There should be no camp sites. If you want to help build mental health facilities near police departments or fire stations, not near students/families even college students. I know someone who worked with the mentally ill, they go off their meds frequently and become a danger to others. People who are high are a danger to others especially women and children. Do you really want to increase the odds of that happening by spreading these people all over the city in every neighborhood. Managed facilities built to look nice with vetted folks would be okay in low numbers. Build more rehab centers near medical facilities.
- More information needed
- How might Bend justify allowing anyone to camp indefinitely on public lands for free, i.e., at taxpayer expense, without limitation when the state and federal government charges fees for camping on state and federal land?
- I strongly believe that the application of these changes and the impact of it must be equally distributed around the city-- east side to west side. The west side has been protected from the building of huge apartment complexes on the whole and when they're built, they have more parking and more amenities than those crammed in next to single family homes on the east side. Many of the neighborhoods on the east side are monolithic, without sufficient space for a child to play in the yard, few neighborhood parks, and even the simplest of attractive housing features such as trim and interesting painting on the homes. It's a huge divide from east to west.
- We are turning our beautiful town into slum areas all over - our property values will be affected and our personal safety is now at risk here. To allow this to continue is disgraceful. There may still be loitering and vagrancy laws on our books which are not enforced. This ""welcoming"" attitude attracts a very dangerous population. We have needle disposal in our public restrooms - it perpetuates this cycle of addicts and drug users. The percentage of people ""down on their luck"" vs. addiction is very low.
- **It's impossible to visualize this, but in general it seems like a reasonable density.**

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- **I am concerned with the recommendation to build the maximum number of campsites or units. I urge the council to move with caution and if you must build, build the minimum. You can always scale up if the shelters do not have a negative impact on the surrounding community. I would also urge that the city provide mental health and substance abuse counseling, along with security and mandatory noise and cleanliness regulations.**
- **44 seems like a lot for someone to manage given it is an outdoor shelter**
- I do not believe there will be enough man power to enforce these sites. How long will a person stay? How will you manage friends and others from congregating outside the site during the day? What will be enforced in terms of trash, loitering outside the shelter?
- **Let's create space for as many people as possible without overcrowding.**
- I want to see a comprehensive plan for where these outdoor shelters will be placed. I strongly disagree with their being in proximity to schools. I also think neighborhoods and their residents should have a giant seat at the table for planning when these types of outdoor camps are being proposed.
- Outdoor shelters should not be part of the solution. Homeless camps do nothing to help either those who are homeless and neighborhoods/communities where they exist. It is a lose/lose idea. Outdoor shelters are not housing. If your goal is to house those without homes, a tent camp is not a solution.
- **fewer campsites**
- It really depends on the makeup of the unhoused population living there. Are they more likely to generate 911 calls than the general population? If so, then a large congregation should be avoided.
- "this should be less. We should not be encouraging camping. This should be a transition to housing. We need to not confuse tolerance with compassion. Stays here need to also be limited.
- **Seems like a couple more units could be added since these are typically fairly small units. I suppose it depends on the size of the unit.**
- **44/acre seems a little dense. I would go down a bit. Maybe 35.**
- We should not provide areas for campsites. We should be helping these people relocate to cheaper areas of the country.
- I do not support any City authorized outdoor campsites for homeless inside of City limits.
- Outdoor Shelter developments should have to be located in a zone that allows for campsite developments, such as private or state camp ground parks. no exceptions for homeless shelter developments. These outdoor camps are the worst. Have you not driven around town and seen these trash heaps?! The outdoor shelter must be required to have indoor sanitary facilities (toilets, sinks, showers) per campground development codes and standards. The owner of the camp must provide for all utilities such as power, water, sewerage, and waste disposal. Trash can not be allowed to build up and become a hazard, either biological or fire. These camps around the city are a hazmat area and that is unacceptable to the decent tax paying residents of this community. You talk about the "safety and needs of houseless community members." Well what about the safety and needs of the rest of the residents of the City? You damn well better have that in mind first. Further, shelter owners should have to post bonds or insurance on a per bed basis to cover acts of vandalism, or destruction of property value to neighboring properties. The Owner of the Outdoor shelter would be held liable for all actions of the residents.
- **There should be far more area per tent. 2-3,000 per tent should be used.**
- Treat them well and we will end up like Seattle.
- There would need to be enough toilet and bathing facilities to service whatever amount of spaces is determined. I don't agree with increasing density of people without increasing toilet, bathing, and cooking facilities.
- "As long as these are not in residential neighborhoods.
- Would recommend open space to the east or the south of the city, with adequate buffer zones between schools and neighborhoods in the areas."
- Outdoor or hardship shelters are not a solution!! The problem should be solved with group or multi room shelters!!
- We don't feel that it is wise to take taxpayer money to set up additional living spaces for homeless from the standpoint that this doesn't really solve the underlying problem and over time where cities have made it convenient to accommodate homeless, the number of homeless merely increases every year, year after year. The basic need is to get these people into jobs and self-supporting and into affordable housing.
- **That sounds like very small spaces. Will all of the campsites be outfitted with the same type of camper or tent? Some may have four plus to a family, others may have only one person.**
- **1 site/unit for each 1,000 SF of property is ridiculous. For examples a 10,000 SF lot, should have a MINIMUM of 20' setback on ALL sides to any sort of living arrangement or structure. That would leave a 3,600 SF of usable space. At most, a maximum of 3 sites, preferably less on a 10,000 SF lot. UNLESS THERE IS ENFORCED REQUIREMENTS FOR**

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

SOBRIETY AND WORK THE CITY WILL FAIL MISERABLY AND DESTROY THE CITY LIKE MANY OTHER WEST COAST CITIES. ANYTHING LESS IS A FOOLISH UTOPIAN DREAM NOT GROUNDED IN REALITY. THE SIMPLE TRUTH IS A BUNCH OF ABUSING PEOPLE SURROUNDED BY OTHER ABUSING PEOPLE IS A RECIPE FOR ABUSING PEOPLE. DO NOT FARM HOMELESSNESS!!!!

- Outdoor shelters should not be allowed! the number of beds should be zero. Outdoor shelters cannot be maintained in an orderly, sanitary, aesthetic manner.
- Again, can you back up the recommendations with actual studies and data? Not all houseless people want to participate in organized shelters.
- There is not an option to click on Not Sure/Need More Information.
- The city should document their recommendation based on existing outdoor shelters that adequately function in a community.
- Not in any residential area
- One should be following the same requirements as those under the State's Tourist and Traveler rules. Even homeless people deserve to have some space between them and other folks.
- Outdoor shelters do not provide an adequate long term solution for the houseless situation.
- Campgrounds should not be allowed where current zoning does not allow it. If you wish to change zoning, do it through the proper channel. Do not create an exception for homeless people at the expense of neighboring property owners.
- They do not need to be here, do not provide them anything if they will give anything back or work for it.
- Too much
- If I become homeless in Bend due to no help with my housing situation due to slave wages in this town, I would move to where it is more affordable! Why are you helping to encourage people to stay here when homeless? If they are really down on their luck, they can move where there is more opportunity like I would.
- **Outdoor shelters should fall under existing zoning regulations**
- **There should be no more than 15 campsites/units on a site, otherwise it cannot be managed effectively.**
- Specific to a managed campground, more information is needed to better understand how they will be supported. 44 camps/acre seems high without more info and specifics regarding how an outdoor shelter camp will be actively managed.
- My view for all shelters is that they should be as dense as possible while providing basic necessities. If you make them too comfortable, there will not be incentive for people to work their way out of the shelter.
- Outdoor shelters should not even be an option. Either the homeless participate in a group/multi room shelter and agree to the services being provided, or they have no other option here. There will only be so many shelter beds available, and we cannot be expected as tax payers to 'house' every person who either "lives" here or comes here to use the services.
- Don't build it!
- No more camping.
- I dislike the outdoor shelter idea. Its amazing that the City is wanting to increase managed homeless sites when the existing "unofficial" locations are completely out of control and littered with refuse and waste. Instead of creating more bottomless gunding pits, manage the existing homeless locations BETTER
- "It should be considerably less. Perhaps, one-half that amount, especially if there are vehicles involved.
- NO HOMELESS CAMP NEAR OUR CHILDREN. Keep the homeless camps out of our neighborhoods and away from Bend High.
- **I would hope we could put as many people on a property as possible.**
- I'd like more information on what this would 'likely' look like and the likely number of residents. I wonder if the ancillary impacts can increase at a certain threshold of residents?
- **A one acre site with 44 spots would be hard to manage. It would be helpful if they could have a managed RV park for houseless people that could carry this density.**
- **you can fit more tents**
- Fundraise to provide transportation elsewhere (california/Portland)
- camping sites are really the entry portal into the system to get off the street. It doesn't always look pretty, although it should. The folks entering the system need the most help and support. Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Addiction issues, all require more support and less tension to help them decompress from the constant stress of living on the streets and making it work on their own. They need a bit of space to reduce tensions.
- **1 unit per 1000sf is way too low. We need to allow for more units on smaller properties.**
- If they cannot afford to be here, they should go somewhere else. I don't want my tax dollars to pay for this.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- You are not addressing the homeless issue by pawning off homeless people onto the general population to deal with the drugs, drinking and care of the homeless. The property owner is not trained in this area. Who will be held liable for bodily injury or property damage that will occur?
- I do not agree with the development of Outdoor Shelters within my community of Bend, Oregon. I believe these shelters will only draw more houseless individuals into our community and interfere with the lives of productive citizens.
- no more shelters enough is enough
- Stop stooping to your lowest level, think about how hard your family has worked...why should we expect less of others.
- Unless these outdoor shelters go in Troy Field or Discovery Park, we all know these are going to adversely affect neighborhoods without HOA's and CCR's. You will, in effect, create homeless ghettos in Bend that will destroy good neighborhoods.
- **44 campsites could easily equate to 200 people. That is too many to introduce into a community and could be difficult to manage.**
- **Provide a site mock up for a more visual understanding.**
- **Too compact, lack of personal space**
- **1 campsite/residential lot maximum.**
- Too many
- Would need to better understand what resources will be deployed to enforce this ratio/policy
- Outdoor shelters should have sobriety requirements. There's a big difference between people who are down on their luck and people who have addiction issues and choosing to live the homeless lifestyle. People need to be held accountable and not enabled. They need a helping hand up not to be enabled which keeps them down. These shelters should NOT be allowed in any zoning other than light industrial and commercial.
- Tents should not be allowed anywhere
- "Until you come up with a good way to assure the general public that the city will address and deal with any and all complains associated with this don't change the code.
- **I think the number is too high for residential districts, but appropriate for commercial zones.**
- **Makes good sense.**
- This should not be allowed in the city of Bend.
- Outdoor shelters are inappropriate in many zones and should not be allowed. The houseless situation is very complicated and opening up the entire city for houseless situations without the restriction of hardships as currently in the code is inappropriate. I am strongly against that. Also, if you look at the committee making these recommendations, it does not accurately reflect our community-only select segments of our community. This should be taken into consideration.
- No RV parking near residential areas or businesses.
- Shelter's should not be in residential zones. Shelters should be set up on State land outside city limits where those truly requiring govt. assistance will receive it via counselors that monitor the premises.
- Outdoor shelters are an eyesore and cause negative neighborhood feelings.
- If you insist on having them, be sure to distribute them fairly - including the West Side.
- This will turn whatever outdoor area designated into a visual eye sore for an otherwise pretty community.
- I urge the city to take a measured approach regarding sheltering the homeless. The city is well aware that homeless individuals struggle with mental health and/or addiction issues that lead to social and behavioral problems. It is immoral and unethical to place these individuals in our communities without proper levels of support. You cannot expect the general public to manage and cope with individuals that have dropped out of society. Thus I would expect the city to place as few individuals as possible and monitor results with the intent to do no harm or to allow for no inconvenience to the hard working individuals and families engaged in our society. Another option would be to place the homeless as far away from our communities as possible until they can demonstrate they can become a positive contributing member to society.
- Trashing our town
- No outdoor shelters. Why should people be allowed to live in tents on public property? We have to pay to camp on public campgrounds. Not healthy at all for residents of Bend. No Porta potties or trash bins. Just filth and waste.
- Much too dense. Don't destroy the Bend we all love
- Too many spaces per acre.
- the city shouldn't be encouraging the homeless by subsidizing their choices.
- Dont want any campers
- This needs to be in relation to service of help and public transportation or else this isn't helping.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- This is a terrible survey. "Do I agree with a bunch of recommendations" from group of people that did not even consider that the number of beds and parking spaces provided by tax dollars should possibly be zero. This plan will only make the homelessness problem worse. Make people comfortable in their homelessness and they will rarely, and probably never get out of it. Bend is becoming the next Portland, LA, or San Francisco. These plans of action sound compassionate, but after they have been shown to only exacerbate the problem time after time when will you wake up and realize it's not compassion. It's making you complicit in the very cause of the homelessness. I do not support any of this. I am certain you all won't care one bit, but in 3 years you'll see and remember these words "I told you so". Stop voting blue. Let's go Brandon and Let's go liberals.
- There should be no outdoor shelters.
- **Too dense; no explanation of managing these sites; should not be in single family residential zones.**
- Ban flagrancancy and address the drug issue surrounding the homeless
- You will ruin Bend. Plummet home values and drive good Citizens out of your town. Portland/Eugene 2.0.
- The City should not be allowing ANY homeless campsites. You are NOT solving the root issues and are encouraging lawlessness.
- Too dense. Lots of hygiene issues. Look at Portland for the dangers of this approach.
- We do not need to encourage more homeless to move to the area. The city does not do anything to control the excessive trash in our city accumulate by the homeless and none of these people actually want to live in your controlled homeless camp where they cannot horde tuns of garbage..... it is called a drug addiction, they do not want your help in regards to that and the city is simply wasting money thinking some group with a fancy name ""Sounding Board"" is going to solve anything.
- Stop encouraging drug use lifestyles when every employer is hiring
- Homeless need to be encouraged to find work and
- These type of shelters in a residential area are utterly inappropriate, regardless of the number of allowed users
- In the above scenario, does not account for common space/management buildings as seen in many of the examples for this type of accommodation. A common space/management building could gobble up the majority of space on a 10,000 sqft parcel where a full acre would better accommodate such a structure.
- This answer depends in the location of the shelter. Identify this first and then resend your survey
- **Need location first**
- There should be no shelters of any kind allowed in residential zones.
- I strongly disagree with the because we should not be building anymore shelters or changing zoning to allow anymore shelters. This will not solve the problem. It will simply increase the population of homeless in Central Oregon. "If you build it, they will come."
- Not seeing where there is the need for this amount of space.
- Outdoor shelter should not be an option. If people truly need safety and want to live a healthy life and find success and work, living in a camper is counterproductive. They are prone to molds and mildews, they are not secure, and they are not meant to be lived in. If a person is serious about changing their life, outdoor life should not be an option it will merely become a sanctioned life style they don't intend to move beyond.
- TOUGH CALL. 1,000 SQ. FT PER SITE IS NICE, AND DOESN'T OVERCROW , BUT THE MORE ROOM ON A SITE THE MORE ROOM FOR BAGGAGE, WHICH OFTEN TIMES LEANS TOWARDS JUNK/TRASH
- **I believe that is too many sites per acre**
- **Too dense. There's too much of a chance for problems to creep in when there are too many people living too closely together.**
- Too many
- The inability of the city to effectively manage the outdoor homeless crisis is evidence in the fruture of these outdoor shelters are not a viable solution to the homeless crisis in our community
- Camps are filthy and cause mental health issues. They are not helping anyone. Open more drug treatment facilities.
- There should be no outdoor campsites within the city limits. We literally live right next to millions of acres of State and National Forest where it's legal to camp for 2 weeks at a time. I propose we offer transportation from the city bus system at designated sites where the city limits meet these locations so homeless have free transportation into the city for work and necessities. This ensures homeless camps are not an eye sour and anuisam e to residents while also offering humane assistance.
- TENTS FALL DOWN

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- "This will only work if someone actively manages the area and ensures that the possessions of each individual are kept in their location and don't spill over. The exit ramps off Revere were a perfect example of unmanaged space. Those pieces of property are probably close to an acre in size and there was no way 44 campsites could have ever fit because each person's space continued to expand well beyond a 1,000 sf. What about their vehicles and space to drive maintenance vehicles through the site. There would not be any space with this plan for some many units for anything more than tiny walking paths on the property.
- Where can these campsites exist - only on public lands or in neighborhoods that have a random open lot?
- **If you don't have a community space at each outdoor shelter you are creating these ""solutions"" are doomed to fail. And at 44 or 43 units per acre (survey and outdoor shelter write-up don't match) you won't have space for a community facility. Locations have to be able to reduce the number of units to ensure community spaces are a guaranteed addition to these outdoor shelter locations. It needs to be a requirement.**
- You are looking for emergency - feel good - look at all the good things we are doing items rather than addressing the causes for the unhoused. These quick solutions should have been developed 5 years ago when Bend ""solved"" the downtown homeless issue by just moving people out of Drake Park. Build housing that everyone can afford is what is needed and the fact that wasn't started years ago is disgraceful - as this problem has been growing for years and years. Instead city council has happy allowed developers to line their pockets by only catering to the wealthy. We have a crisis but when all the resources go into band-aids we will never solve the real problem. There need to be guaranteed 2 year max end dates on most of these options without the ability to extend for any reason."
- **This amount of space seems reasonable for a managed camp environment, but it makes little to no sense to place a managed camp within Bend's UGB when that land should be developed with other housing types to rectify the overall housing shortage that's driven the homelessness problem in the first place.** Displaced families have only become displaced because traditionally affordable housing in Bend has been consumed by middle to upper-middle class buyers because the supply of their preferred housing is insufficient. We cannot solve the problem of homelessness by limiting traditional housing supply in any way.
- Somehow how we have to help these people out of camping in the city the garbage and clutter alone should tell you why
- All outdoor shelters should be at least 5 miles from any Bend neighborhood.
- Campsites should be less dense and should not be located in any residential areas. Everyone in Bend has seen the condition of scattered campsites and the debris that piles up. Campsites can't be allowed to facilitate this practice and should be less dense.
- This will be chaos. Violence, a drain on law enforcement and Bend Fire.
- Please do not allow Bend to look like Portland with tents and trash strewn all over the city.
- Exactly where will these campsites be located? Are they seasonal? Who pays for the land, ongoing management, clean-up, etc? Will they be cleaned and free from hazardous waste/materials? What are the expectations and requirements for living here?
- Only if it is one property like the old KOA. We do not want ten or more different locations for homeless. We already have them spread all over town. Stop trying to skip code restrictions so you can accommodate a few people and then you can say you are working on the problem. When really you are trying to push it out as far as you can so someone else will come fix the problem. Like the sewer line issues. They were pushed way back and the over pass for the RR on Reed Mkr. Pushed back and now it will cost millions more. Buy the KOA and make it the one and only managed camp. If they can't all fit then they move out of town.
- The temps fluctuate drastically year round. Why is long term camping a sustainable solution at this elevation, climate, or as a sustainable long term solution with the physical protection of the Unhoused to remain in sub par housing? Why are we only looking at Bed Space and Density and not addressing the mental health and drug addiction aspects of the people that will seek shelter?
- No outdoor shelters as they are an eyesore.
- Bend has a long history of being a place to come to. A main draw is having space around housing. We need to keep the not-jammed feeling that we so much love. Traffic has become a real problem. The more jammed we get the stressors go up and time wasted
- **44 campsites in one location??** Really? What are your goals for this City? Do you want to drive everyone to leave?
- **Density of persons in small space in residential areas is something I disagree with**
- I think it is premature to allow the City of Bend to rezone Bend for houselessness shelters until they can demonstrate that the rights of property owners are strongly supported. Words and not enough. Well run shelters outside the Bend neighborhoods need to be established before it is reasonable to even consider the plans suggested in these documents.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- I am offended that this survey is presented in a way that assumes the respondent is OK with ""updating the Bend Development Code to allow different types of shelter citywide"" and that only some details need to be worked out."
- No. This is an eye sore, and not a solution. Instead use funds to create services that move people out of this situation all together. Or better yet, support the non-profits that do this. This is not the city's job. The city's job is enforcement and infrastructure.
- No campsites in the city limits of Bend!!!! All those people do is defecate and collect garbage. If you want to go back to the look of European cities, bombed during WW2, just pursue this plan.
- Outdoor shelters should not be provided inside the city limits.
- **That is just too much.** I don't even think refugee camps have that kind of density.
- I do not agree with this proposal. This approach is unsustainable and will effectively act as an even greater magnet than the current approach of inaction... the result will be even more transients and houseless individuals that would otherwise move on if they weren't allowed to camp publicly or stay out the new Bend Houseless Tiny Home Resorts.
- Unless these sites are fully managed for sobriety and all other applicable laws then this is a waste of time and money.
- This is not what we want in our town.
- Again, there is no mention of barrier type. If this is for a low barrier shelter, this number is absolutely too high. For example, 44 campsites that are occupied by drug users, next to a school? No thank you. Your recommendations are too broad and vague and must factor shelter barrier into the equation + proximity to schools, parks, and other sensitive areas.
- **More sites equals more issues.** I don't believe tent shelters will work in this environment; not in the summer when it's hot or in the winter when it's cold. Even wood shelters in other environments are being built with heaters/air conditioners.
- I do not believe this should be determined by a formula. The city should determine the best count on units based on the surrounding area and community.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

Please explain: The Sounding Board's recommendation is for parking for Outdoor Shelters to be provided at a ratio of 0.5 spaces per each 16 units, with 0.33 parking space per unit for each additional unit above 16. Do you agree with this recommendation?

- **I disagree with parking minimums.**
- Free parking for people who don't work or provide any value to the community....Brilliant.
- I can see if you allow more parking, people coming and just parking and living in cars. Also the transients are a large group as you know and they have "networking" in place, they "visit" each others camps (they call it dirt world). I believe having too many visitors could potentially be a liability. Increased drug use, sales, etc.
- Again, I do not know their need for parking.
- See above comments.
- Less parking is better. See comments above re: parking.
- I strongly disapprove of ANY homeless shelters being built in the city limits.
- As stated, above I am strongly against any homeless shelters being built or considered by the city of Bend.
- We don't want these in our CITY!!!
- No shelters in RS, RL, or RM-10 zoning.
- None, no shelters at all.
- I believe the proposed density is too high for any zoning district, and I don't believe outdoor shelters should be allowed in residential or industrial zones, as it puts people too far from needed services and the use is incompatible with surrounding uses. Further the Bend Code does not allow camping in these zones, and should be modified as such. Based on existing encampments in the Public Right of Way around Bend, many of the vehicles are over-sized (RVs, busses, trailers, etc.) and parking in outdoors shelters should be designed and built to accommodate the true needs of the community.
- Again, where is the data to support this recommendation? Is it adequate? Does it take into account type of vehicle?
- How does this help our city in any way?
- If they have a vehicle they can live somewhere they can afford or find a job. There are vacancies all over town. Foisting these people on neighborhoods to get out of the obligation to deal with the problem is shameful.
- Outdoor shelters should not be allowed nor RV parking for more than 3 days in the city
- **What if 2, 3 or 4 occupants have a car they need to park? Where would they park it?**
- **Do you mean .5 spaces per EACH of the 16 units or .5 spaces for ALL 16 units? I would agree with the former but not the latter.**
Also I do believe each of these types of shelters should be distributed throughout the city in all neighborhoods, not concentrated in just the midtown or SE sections of the city. Locations should not be right near the schools, especially elementary schools. And all locations must be properly and effectively managed.
- Why have parking. They should not have a car over a place to live.
- **The referenced parking-to-bed ratio only is reasonable if you require that the Outdoor Shelter not permit houseless individuals with vehicles and/or manage occupancy of the Outdoor Shelter to ensure that there is no overflow parking off of the shelter site. If individuals with vehicles are expected to be serviced at the Outdoor Shelter, then a higher number of parking spaces must be provided to ensure no disruption to the existing neighborhoods and roadway network.**
- **Again, I'm not a big fan of using parking as a limiter. If not that much parking is available, I'd still encourage using a site.**
- We need to make it illegal for homeless to live in Bend City limits, period. Let them camp outside the city limits only. Shelters only encourage the homeless population to stay in Bend.
- not on city streets or residential areas
- **Not sure. Gas and maintenance on a car is expensive, but these outdoor shelters would likely be in lower density residential so parking would likely be cheap anyway.**
- **Again, hard to visualize what TYPE of vehicle will be allowed to park**
- If not enough parking, vehicles will be left on the streets
- City of Bend should not spend more tax payer dollars to house homeless. Instead, increase social workers pay and have them lead the conversations of eviction with police there as support. Your infrastructure is busting at the seams. Stop spending money to advertise the city, and use that money to help support the existing infrastructure

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

that is needing some love. We already pay insane property taxes. Do a better job of balancing the budget and quit raising taxes.

- Again, one only needs to read the news to figure out the problems businesses and residents are sharing with the increase in the criminal element and drug addicts you have invited here. Congratulations. You've turned Bend into Portland, which is uninhabitable. Please discount my property taxes to reflect the scourge you have brought upon us.
- **Parking should be increased in all situations to avoid pressure on adjacent areas.** Many cars are parked in neighborhoods such as near Revere Ave. It appears homeless have few cars, but, remote parking is very common indicating many more vehicles to homeless ratio.
- **Let's revisit once we have some in place to see if this formula is working. It may be we need less or more parking, but I'm guessing less.**
- **1:1 parking should be developed; a neighborhood will be highly impacted with this much on-street parking**
- Assumption that houseless people are on foot and many of them have vehicles. Assumption that Outdoor shelters are for those without anything. This may not be true. At least provide 1 full parking space per 16 but recommend 1 parking space per 8.
- This survey assumes as if this is a fait accompli. I don't agree with this strategy. I am reluctant to provide details to my objections as I have already seen in the City Councilors response to bloggers concerns that they summarily dismiss concerns and provide specious and emotional arguments with no authority instead of providing citizens all both sides of the issues.
- **I strongly support following the recommendations of the sounding board. Anything that could help with our housing and homelessness crisis.**
- I am against any outdoor shelters in the City of Bend
- They should have to follow the same rules as outlined by the city for short term rentals.
- **At least 0.5 space in all situations, hopefully more.**
- **Need to have more information on the demographics of the homeless population. Might be wiser to locate facilities that are serviced by local transit.**
- See above
- I'm a big fan of housing density!
- **again, this would be inadequate**
- Same as above.
- The resident's will park in any adjacent neighborhood - reducing the value of properties that the city gains property tax revenue from.
- Too many cars left on the streets.
- **This is too high- it will cause barriers to may potential sites to be developed.**
- Stop putting more cars on the street!!!
- If you built it, they will come. . .
- with continuing to appease the homeless more will be attracted to the area. homeless ness of most out these out of area people are not the responsibility of Central Oregon. they need to go back to where they came from, let's give them a bus ticket to let their communities best serve them.
- See answer above
- **So we require more parking for houseless individuals than than for a multifamily unit in Bend now? Don't require parking.**
- Wording is not clear.
- Why do you keep asking these stupid questions? Get rid of the bums.
- **Many homeless are living IN a vehicle. That vehicle will come with them. To estimate only 1 vehicle per 32 units is an absurd underestimation. And the additional vehicles will simply overflow onto surrounding streets.**
- **More parking is needed so that overflow vehicles do not crowd neighborhood streets. Neighbors will be more welcoming if they are not inconvenienced by off-property "clutter".**
- This is not the way to solve this issue.
- **Depends on available space**
- If we are concerned about parking we are clearly serving the wrong population. If homeless have the means to a vehicle and parking they are not in need as much as other populations. This is a misuse of tax funding.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- The changes to City Code go against everything the City has implemented to manage land use and building codes for the last several decades. The City of Bend is partially responsible for high cost of housing in Bend, and before dealing with the issue in an extreme manner, the City should first fully evaluate their own building code requirements and development standards, and work to eliminate the costs and barriers to market-rate development. Why should there be two standards, one for developers, and one for non-profits/government subsidized?
- See outdoor shelter explanation above
- I don't think this should happen at all
- my explanation is the same . . they allllllll have cars, what will you do with the unlucky person who doesn't get a parking spot ?? more trashed cars parked on Bends neighborhood streets
- This will NEVER happen - once again, look at Hunnel road - the word 'vehicle' seems very vague. There are home made RV's, jalopies put together with duct tape. You are ruining a once beautiful city. I think the houseless would be better served by a self sufficient camp out in the county.
- **Most houseless neighbors in Bend and other places are not in need of parking, and artificially limiting beds will prevent those most in need from finding housing. I'd honestly line to see parking requirements eliminated so that we can effectively provide shelter for ALL the houseless in our community.**
- you people are idiots and don't represent the community.
- again, do not know need for parking spaces in general for those seeking accommodations
- I for One do not want my tax dollars in the mix for this plan. A better plan for homeless influx and I might be on board. Further out on the ""edge "" of town might be feasible. Far less encouragement of homeless folks coming into Bend. More policing because like it or not jail is where folks get clean. Be realistic. Put them on the county land between the Redmond airport and the Deschutes fair grounds
- You need to explain this better. **This seems like a lot of parking. Where is the plan for this?**
- **How will they get to their services and jobs if they don't have a place to park a car?**
- **These developments should not have reduced parking requirements compared to motels, apartments and other intense, densely packed residential developments.** Existing neighborhoods don't need junk cars cluttering the public streets because the shelters have no parking.
- Please just stop encouraging this.
- See above comments on parking.
- **Seems reasonable, provided things can be kept clean and safe for all.**
- We should not be encouraging housing homeless people in Bend.
- I don't agree with enabling homelessness in Bend or any city. There are plenty of programs for assistance to avoid being on the street. Many of these people don't want assistance. Please open your eyes and tour the off ramps around Bend. The things I have seen and had to explain to my young children. Syringes, stolen bikes, piles and piles of garbage next to young males drugged out of their minds surfing their cell phones next to their empty booze bottles and drug paraphernalia with no care in the world. City council please get a clue. Learn from the state you moved from (most likely California) those policies and politics ruin states. Hence why you are here. Yet you brought the same ideas with you to ruin our state as well. "If you build it they will come". We're screwed, I believe it's too late.. you've done the damage and theirs no coming back.
- **Not enough parking.**
- **If it is an outdoor shelter, I assume many of the people sheltering there would have a car, so the Board's recommendation sounds grossly inadequate.**
- Outdoor shelters are not acceptable.
- Stop allowing camping in our city! You're turning Bend into Portland or Seattle.
- Show your data or reasonings and I might strongly agree
- Same as parking answer from above parking questions. Provide more than enough parking onsite so residents don't have an excuse to try and park elsewhere.
- People work hard and pay taxes to live in the places the buy or rent. We should not have camps being set up anywhere near residential areas. The safety of our kids being the number 1 reason.
- **We have essentially no public transportation here. Unfortunately, people need cars.**
- Parking and Homeless People are an oxymoron.
- Enforcement of current laws and codes would solve this problem!

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- Why the option to continue to explain our opinion on parking but not allowing this option for our reasoning regarding the above questions pertaining to ""more"" or ""less"" sites allowed in various zoning districts? The emphasis seems skewed.
- **What if there is substantial overflow?**
- That amount of parking will not be adequate.
- **Once again, not everyone has a vehicle.**
- **There is already a parking issue in Bend. Houseless folks will need a mode of transportation to get to their dr appointments, jobs, etc so restricting parking seems like it will lead to public nuisance**
- **Not enough parking. Leads to over-crowding of existing street parking, pushing tax paying residents out.**
- I disagree with the board on everything they are talking about. This is not how you deal with these people. The tax base of Bend is not big enough to do this. Make the State do it and do it in a place that has the mental illness treatment and job training available. Bend has none of those here. Stop giving away other peoples money that you have no right to do. These homeless are not from here and don't want to work or live like a normal society.
- **As mentioned I believe the Sounding Board and staff are making informed recommendations, I want to see more flexibility with parking if possible on a per site circumstance.**
- **That sounds like sufficient parking.**
- **Still seems like it is going to be massively overcrowding with this ratio. So for 44 people on an acre, would be 17 vehicles or so along with that?**
- Good to know I will no longer feel safe in this city. I can't even enter the local Bottle Drop without being verbally abused. Thanks for taking care of the local people who pay their taxes, stimulate the economy and are working to better themselves and surrounding areas
- They should be required to provide adequate parking, at a ratio the same as their neighbors. People living in open shelters aren't necessarily without vehicles.
I'm concerned that vehicles not accommodated on site will become storage units on our public streets, leading to abandoned vehicles, trash, and other issues on our streets. As with any other development, shelters shouldn't be allowed to spill over into public spaces that are used by all.
- **Again, should be based on the estimated number of vehicles. There should be enough off-street spaces to accommodate all the vehicles.**
- I understand that we have a major issue with the unhoused in Bend and I will be the first to tell you that I do not have all the answers. However, putting a managed camp in an established residential area (near two schools) is not a good solution. Especially since the model has not been tried in Bend. I have just returned from a trip to Austin, Texas where I toured the Community First! Village, a model that does in fact seem to be working. Has anyone explored that particular model?
- Why not put them in free accommodations in Brasada or Eagle Crest...??
- No support for any of these issues
- There should not be outdoor shelters (campsites specifically) in residential areas or along the parkway and on sides of streets. This is dangerous for the folks living there (crossing roads) and it is dangerous for housed neighbors. I am worried about the safety of our citizens and how walking/biking routes have already shifted to avoid going past campsites. There are dogs that bark and run, intoxicated "campers" and so much trash/garbage that is accumulated. The smells are rancid from human feces and urine.
- There should be no long term camping allowed. If I can't pull my trailer out on the street and camp more than two nights without breaking the law, no one else should. Laws should be compassionately applied to EVERYONE. There are a whole lot of people out there who are not homeless by anything but choice, drugs and an inability to follow the law. we need to enforce the law and stand behind our officers as they do so.
- Many of these houseless citizens are in need of mental health or substance treatment options. We should focus on those services in lieu of allowing flexibility of our city standards.
- **COB requires one parking space per apartment in Bend. You should require one parking space per bed.**
- See above
- STOP this insanity! Look at Portland, it was a beautiful jewel of a city and is now an absolute shit hole. Take care of those "houseless" who truly need it, send the rest packing. Walk or drive down 2nd and Franklin any morning and you will see that these "houseless" are just absolute junkies wandering around wasted. Take care of our city!
- Most of these folxs who live outdoors do not have cars but have bikes. I would focus on less spaces and more bike access

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- **Why is this so much less than the other shelter types (0.25 per bed)? Should be at least 1 space for every 4.**
- I have no data.
- It's just so tiring having to keep focusing on parking so much.
- Have you been to Hummel road?
- I do not understand this issue well enough to provide educated feedback.
- Although some houseless people have no vehicle, it seems like there needs to be more parking since some houseless folks have a larger vehicle (vans, RVs etc. I feel the footprint needs to be larger to accommodate trash bins, shower truck, medical RV etc.
- You'll not read this, but this is just embarrassing. Here is your 'participation award' It's now the American way. Something for nothing.
- **Increase from 0.5/0.33 to 0.75/0.5**
- I am against Outdoor Shelters as a solution.
- **Does any data or research (specific to Bend) support this code amendment? Assuming that houseless community members do not need spaces to park their cars is irresponsible; rather, we need to proceed confidentially, with evidence, that they do not have vehicles that require storage.**
- STOP normalizing homelessness...there are endless jobs for the homeless..../STOP your invitation to the homeless
- Seems insufficient
- **We already have enough parking problems in and around the City of Bend. By not requiring sufficient parking for the facility it is immediately setting up the potential for problems, regardless of where these sites could be located. Even if supporting staff is visiting or working at the site (non homeless/volunteers) wouldn't there be more than 1/2 car per 16 people? All it would take is for 2 volunteers/visitors to show up at the same time for a site of 30 units and not have enough parking. I don't think that assuming that most traffic into these sites would be non-car is a proper assumption to make in the model.**
- See above comment.
- It seems that many people using these facilities would have bicycles as their primary form of transportation. The facility would need a secure bicycle parking/storage facility.
- The vast majority of our community does not want additional homeless infrastructure. If you build it, they will come. The experience of most West Coast major urban centers is demonstrative of this reality. Listen to the population that pays your salaries.
- Again I have zero faith the city can successfully manage these camps
- There should be one parking space per unit. There could possibly be a working couple in one unit, each with their own car. Don't we want to encourage their success? The ratio suggested is too low.
- without the proper metrics we have no idea would a reasonable proposal would be. Parking for extended period of times is the right of way is illegal and should be strongly enforced. Inadequate parking could be people that are already struggling in a bad position should their car get towed. In addition, under parked uses will create conflicts with neighboring properties.
- **This seems backwards. You're recommending 0.33 to 0.5 for people who need outdoor shelter when this seems like a group that would not have a vehicle, whereas you are recommending 0.25 per room for more transitional multi-room units where people might be closer to getting back on their feet and have a vehicle to support employment. I think you need at most 0.25 for outdoor shelters.**
- Stop allowing people to live in cars. Get people inside into transitional housing.
- I don't think the outdoor shelter option is a good solution. What about all the people who live in their cars? Will they be parked inside the perimeter, and not move or drive? The areas you have proposed do not have viable parking solutions for the amount of vehicles.
- There are already more broken down vehicles/RV's than the city knows how, or cares to handle. Parking space should match the occupancy, And, ALL parking for and generated by these facilities must be contained on-site. Overflow onto public streets needs to be remedied immediately, before additional vehicles/RVs' begin to congregate and multiply
- The use of already existing facilities like the empty prison up in Madras would be a better move than allowing the homeless to ruin the city for the residents who pay for everything. If they wanted to live a good life they could figure out how to do that. I do understand if one is a drug addict that might be harder to do, but that is another issue I believe.
Another thing the City should absolutely do is get the people who have been shipped into Bend right back to where they came

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

from. This is a HUGE problem. I might like to live in Beverly Hills, but guess what, I can't afford it, so no everyone can live in Bend. It's not exactly a bargain to live here is it???

- I'm assuming these metrics have been based off of statistics and are reasonable. For me to have a concrete opinion I'd really want to know statistics related to those who would be utilizing the shelters, for instance how many vehicles are average, etc.
- Why do you seek the destruction of civil life, quality of life and livability of Bend? No Campsites, Homeless Drug Dens, Covid Camps in neighborhoods or the city boundaries. Go to Hunnell Road, the ODOT lot off of the parkway, by Crux, 2nd street, Brooks wood and see what the council has already done.
- Again...don't need to be promoting more street parking in Bend!!
- this survey is not asking the right questions
- **Again with consideration given to larger vehicles**
- Why do we have to take care of people who can't take care of themselves!
- no outdoor shelters so no need for parking
- Do not use taxpayer money to accommodate the homeless. Enforce ""No Vagrancy"" laws and ""No Camping"" on public property. Do not move them in. Move them out.
- This is not clear to me.
- You are assuming by this survey that we all agree. The questions are between what you want and what you hope, no place to say NO to this in the city area. Find land on the outskirts and make a bus stop there. NOT IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS!
- Again, why is the city involved in NGO work.
- I think i am clear
- **I think there should be more.**
- **Should be more parking spaces to avoid overflow in the surrounding neighborhood.**
- **Seems to REALLY guarantee an overflow parking situation!**
- I don't want to see more and more homeless help. We are encouraging this whole phenomenon.
- This is ridiculous. Lots of Bend homeless are living in their cars. These are the people that there really might be a good chance of getting back on their feet if they are exposed to services and people they trust on a regular basis. We should offer these outdoor shelters primarily to the car and van dwellers (who are currently in the forests, hunnell road, drake park) and transition them to this type of shelter. But, this will require a parking spot for each outdoor camp spot, no 1 for 33!!!!
- This survey is biased. Clearly the Planning Commission, Council, and Staff are, once again, going to pretend the community has input when it's obvious from how these questions have been presented that decisions have already been made. These are decisions Bendites do NOT want!
- alot of these residents have cars - where are they to go? on the streets, block the sidewalks?
- I do not support any recommendation that is provided without evidence supporting it as the optimal solution.
- Too concentrated again
- Too many people in one area.
- It seems like there needs to be ample parking for bicycles and not necessarily vehicles.
- **Again, if there are more vehicles than planned for, where do they end up? And, the vehicles I've witnessed have often times been full of personal belongings. Where do those items end up? More parking needs to be available than less.**
- Stop spending my tax dollars for your insanity projects.
- **Do not reduce the ratio to .33 - Additional required space for garbage truck pickup.**
- **more may be needed for campers, rvs, etc.**
- See previous answers.
- Stop this proposal. Listen to your voters.
- You need proper off street parking for any type of dwelling or you will jam the streets with cars everywhere. We lived by a beach town and it was impossible to park anywhere! Plus, with the snow we have, the dream of everybody biking or walking is a horrible idea and fails every time. Every time.
- again no where near enough parking! most A lot of homeless people do have cars.
- seems right
- Same challenge as mentioned above. Not having enough space for vehicles does not mean people don't own them and need a place for them.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- As previously stated, vulnerable population that depends on cars for storage and grounding. Not a good idea to reduce parking. They should have max parking to minimize disruption in their lives and minimize disruption to the surrounding businesses and neighborhoods.
- Again, I don't know enough to have an informed opinion. How many unhoused people that would live in outdoor shelters would have their own vehicles? If they have their own vehicles, would they be cars, trucks, or RVs? What would the expected occupancy rates be at a outdoor shelter and where would they be? How would these data compare to apartments or similar lodgings? How would parking rations affect the number of potential locations (assuming that we don't want to overly limit the number of locations or over-burden neighborhood parking)?
- not enough
- **Fewer.**
- **This is not near enough parking for service providers or residents.**
- Have any of these Sounding Board members actually toured Eugene, Portland, Salem or Seattle lately?
- This is ridiculous.
- Do NOT agree with proposed shelters
- Ah, need more parking than that.
- I do not want outdoor shelters being added here in Bend.
- **Substitute convenient access to transit for parking.**
- See previous comments.
- What are the demographics of the homeless? How many of them have cars? If there are cars, then we need to provide a place for them to be parked that won't interfere with the area surrounding the group home. Also need parking for the staff.
- If you can afford a vehicle then you can afford to move to a town that you can afford to make a living
- **Too low**
- It is unbelievable how the mayor and City Council has completely ignored the community these homeless camps will negatively impact. The community is not saying "no" to homeless shelters, but insisting they must not, cannot be near our children and schools.
- in my experience, many of the homeless wish to live this way. The city will not have the support of the people until they provide more information to the citizens. most of what we see is trash and filth and a city incapable of handling the problem. enabling bad behaviors creates more dependence. how come we don't see this problem when driving through lapine? why is bend the place where the homeless collect???
- Generally seems like a less efficient form of housing in this area, especially with cold weather. May sound harsh, but I also think there's a need to strike the right balance between temporary quarters and something that feels more like a long-term place to live (the outdoor shelter with buildings seems more viable for long-term living).
- **Not enough**
- see above explanation
- Every effort should be made to get people into housing and not allow for this to become a permanent solution. With all of the jobs available in this town right now, and the support of the community for mental health, limiting the options and holding people accountable for their own future is key in providing a more robust community.
- That amount of parking may not even be enough to accommodate the staff much less the RV's and cars of the residents.
- Who is going to monitor this?
- MORE UNSIGHTLY JUNK /VEHICLES .
- **What would happen to overflow? I don't know how many houseless have cars, so this is haed to decide without statistics.**
- For everything consider in these recommendations, the City needs to produce and share data driven information directly from the homeless community about their wishes.
For example, what proportion of homeless citizens have functioning automobiles? Is this plan including those currently living out of their vehicles?
- I do not approve of any Outdoor Shelters in the City of Bend!!!
- Is the goal to only allow those who cannot afford a car? That would not allow for a mixed community.
- Residential zoning areas are not the popular opinion for where to place shelter sites, but they should be prioritized to residential areas to provide an opportunity to those who are houseless to live as residents. By housing people in industrial or commercial areas, this may limit access to certain services such as schools for the children.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- not sure what this would look like
- I don't think any rational person thinks this is a good idea and I am seriously questioning how the selection of this ""Sounding Board"" occurred.
- I would need more information about the number of Homeless people that actually have cars and are lawfully allowed to use them. Obviously that number would dictate the number of spaces, not just a rubber stamp number.
- **Unrealistic to expect only 1 out of 8 occupants will have a vehicle.**
- **Again, why is there a need for parking. The less the better.**
- I have lived here my entire life and I really don't know what the solution is but providing these housing facilities are only going to promote more moving here or encourage more. If someone really wanted help there are so many opportunities in Bend but they are either too lazy to apply or abide by the rules or don't want to which means for most of these people this will not help only create more problems. They should not be allowed to live by children or families or schools and should have to abide by the laws that have always been in place. I know housing here is expensive I am not living it up by any means and own a small business that had to close multiple times this past year and a half along with bankruptcy because of it- but I don't complain just keep moving forward to create a better life.
- I think there are too many questions on parking and how much to have available.
Are you expecting the shelters to have RV's too?
Why not build a shelter out of Bend city limits? There is so much land outside the city that could be used. Why not start something like the Poor Farms they use to have? Most of the homeless know each other and if they lived together in a sustainable environment. You have each person contributing to the society and providing them with a sense of accomplishment and pride. Just providing handouts is not the answer.
People have to feel appreciated and if they work on a farm or a job to keep their community going then it should help give them a sense of purpose. But if just putting people into shelters and expect they can gain self motivation or confidence I don't see that working. Of course there will be those that mentally can function or the addicted. There has to be some help for them as well. But just to provide shelter and free things does not help the homeless or the City of Bend that they trash. It's such an eye sore and I cannot believe that letting people set up tents wherever they want is a community we want to live in.
- This assumes one car per 32 units witch is just not real.
- how do you park a car in a .5 parking space? Again, do not force homeless parking into surrounding neighborhoods.
- **require off street parking for all proposals at least at .5 per bed. Public ROW should not be used for parking for private development**
- I also want to add that the cost of living is very high in Bend, with limited housing opportunities for people who already live here. It is unfair to place homeless shelters within or near residential neighborhoods, devaluing property values and creating unsafe environments for residents. I live near Juniper Ridge, and until recently the desert out there was littered with trash and used needles. Please do not put the needs of the homeless population above the needs of residents who work hard and pay taxes. These decisions need to be equitable to everyone in Bend, and should not be slanted in favor of those who are not seeking help, not working and not contributing to our society. There need to be rules and regulations that go along with any of these shelters. These shelters also need to be spread out around town, most recommendations I've seen have focused on the east side, without any recommendations for camps or shelters on the west side.
- Outdoor shelters should not be instituted in any way. They are not safe in harsh weather and will be difficult to maintain
- Parking should be available at approved centers.
- Take a look at the debris that surrounds the encampments you already have. Do you think that will change if given a place sanctioned by the city? Who will be liable when their continued drug use and irresponsible behavior gets out of hand at a city sanctioned site? Ask the city of Santa Rosa police how many service calls they get per day to transient dwellings. Ask the ER how many ambulances are sent to encampments for drug overdoses, beatings, stabbings, rapes. Ask the fire department how many fires the transients have started. Is Bend prepared to handle a lawsuit like Petaluma is now faced with?
- Poor survey... it doesn't reflect my position so I can't answer.
- Activist make horrible city leadership as demonstrated in Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles. other "progressive cities," and now Bend. This problem will only continue to increase under the current city "leadership." We will see our taxes increase, the hiring of a homeless Czar like they do in big cities, countless Non-Profits who will pay themselves handsomely, the hiring of more city employees, more low barrier camps will proliferate, and the cycle of homeless will only get worse under the current city leadership.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- How about the committee and public that are generating this idea invite the houseless into their own homes... Problem solved at no cost
- provided street parking laws are enforced and any street parked vehicles are in good mechanical working order, ... no flat tire - broken-down vehicles
- Unsure about type of parking- (RV's, Trailers, etc.?)
- where would they park ??? Like there is room for more???
- people have cars - and often live in them if they are houseless
- There should not be units or parking
- Parking a vacant vehicle is a limitation and takes up land space that can be used to provide shelter.
- Not a fan of outdoor shelters
- you are not addressing the core problem, you should look to the underlying situations of the population to determine actual needs.
- Too few parking spaces means streets littered with all kinds of vehicles. That makes it dangerous to navigate these streets. We already have that problem in several areas of town.
- Density, parking requirements, and all requirements of the Bend Development Code should be followed when establishing a outdoor shelter site. If the Bend Development Code is too restrictive for this type of development, revise the Code so all developers can build on a level field, first.
- Insufficient parking allowance.
- We need to survey our homeless to see how many of them have cars. And, if parking is provided, proof of insurance should be required.
- I continue to stress that you should be able to put more people into spaces in order to create as much potential emergency housing as possible. BUT, the caveat is that you must then ENFORCE the actual law, which I believe states that if there are enough rooms and beds for people who are houseless in Bend, then they cannot set up their own tent housing on public property. To me that is the compassionate and realistic solution for all groups. There is a safe place to go for the houseless and shared public property does not become someones private space.
- I don't know that statistics on the average number of cars owned in the houseless population but I think it would depend on the location of the shelter and proximity to amenities/services.
- Again for the same reasons I have already stated. You all need to not put a band-aid on this mental illness pandemic but create a state of the art medical and rehabilitation facility. There should be no houseless camps allowed in Bend.
- Look at Hunnell Road
- Regarding the "more or less sites" in different districts questions, I would have picked "the same" if that were an option.
- Again why do you want to destroy Bend and make it a wasteland like Portland? Just equally enforce the laws on everyone not just the tax paying, law abiding citizens. That is reverse discrimination. You allow a free for all - lawless existence and only enforce laws and ordinances on the ones that pay your salary.
- I think any discussion of requirements in the building code is jumping the gun. I want more community dialogue on the subject of homelessness, shelters, and affordable housing. I would like to see more work up front on these matters, i.e., identify types of homelessness (temporary, permanent, mental health issues, addiction issues) and what type of housing each needs (close to services, transitional, urban, rural, family, etc.); put forth the issue of shelters to a vote of the citizens of central Oregon who will be most impacted; and identify ways to mitigate runaway housing costs which are likely to continue. I'd like to have more examples of housing successes and failures in communities who have been in the same situation as Bend.
- Let them park in Idaho.
- If every outdoor shelter is housing for multiple families and not single person shelters there is a chance that they could have two vehicles and there is already not enough parking for the amount of permanent or mobile units
- There shouldn't be any outdoor shelters. Why is the city even considering the proposed idea which institutionalizes the homeless living in tents. The proposal will only attract more transients, where homelessness lacks a permanent residence.
- The houseless needs guidance and the best solution is in an area built to help them. Juniper Ridge. Juniper Ridge should be developed like a campus with resources and housing. Not displace around town.
- build it they will come
- Just keep these Outdoor Shelters out of our Residential areas.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- As mentioned, this survey assumes we know what is zones as what across the city. We need visuals to better understand what is being asked. That said, I do highly disagree with allowing homeless shelters of any kind in residential areas. It simply is not safe for the homeowners in those areas.
- see above.
- Work!
- Again, you need to say where the other cars are going to park.
- I don't think that's enough parking. I guess we won't know until these sites are operational. The parking areas could initially be gravel, so if there's too much parking, the excess space could be converted to housing units.
- People will be parking on the public streets causing issues for neighbors. This should not be allowed.
- First I need to know where will these shelters be located. Then I can answer the question. Also, where indicated " more information is needed" , will more information ever be provided??? if so HOW AND WHEN???
- Will the survey be redesigned so I can comment on each question, not just the ones you choose? What is that so hard? this survey is extremely bias.
- Sites need to provide minimal basic services and be away from all residential areas.
- See above
- Sufficient parking needs to be provided based on demand....not some arbitrary number with excess cars spilling onto the streets
- This is NOT the answer. Why is this the big focus of the Council? You seem to not care about anything else. You put out surveys like this to give the illusion that you are listening to us voters - and then you turn around and do what you knew you were going to do in the first place. Such hubris!
- There should be other options for parking if this isn't enough
- See previous comments
- I am not in favor of codify going this type of housing. Only an emergency situation is OK to declare and allow this temporarily.
- 1 spot per unit
- More parking needed
- As I noted above I feel that many of the people being housed at these types of shelter do not own vehicles due to lack of funds and so this should be enough at this time and can be revisited if problems arise.
- **One spot per site. Again realism is required.**
- See above answer
- Make bums work
- show the data for Bend houseless population to support this
- **The current average for transient lodging (hotels) is 1/1:24. Let's go with that.**
- same reason as before about overflow.
- **not sure it's enough**
- No city!!! No driveways for camping of homeless in our neighborhoods!!'No zone changes!!
- Outdoor shelters only on city owned / managed property far away from family neighborhoods and schools.
- Same issues for parking as listed above.
- **Sounds reasonable.**
- same as above
- You are setting folks up for a problem if there is no place to park. I spend time in various areas of town, and many people living outdoor also have access to a car.
- What constitutes parking? Vehicle, RV? Can the capacity limits be sidestepped by this recommendation?
- Many houseless people have vehicles. There should be more space provided to allow them to park their vehicles. The ratio should be much higher - possibly 4 spaces for every 16 units.
- That volume of parking is inadequate unless the goal is merely to warehouse the homeless. If the goal is truly rehabilitation, these individuals will acquire transportation as they become more self-reliant. Outdoor shelters should be in less populated areas where transportation will be more critical.
- Again, what is this ratio based on and what is the solution if the maximum ratio is constantly exceeded.
- Not enough parking causing potential overflow onto city streets.
- Same issue as any other - cars = people living in them and conducting drug business out of them. Plus they won't be hauled out of there when they don't work. Speaking of, where would you tow them to? What happens then? Will just turn into a junkyard.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- Again, need to identify where and how many shelters are being considered.
- **Proposed parking is insufficient. Where does the overflow go?**
- **0.5 spaces per each 16 units is really confusing. It sounds like half a space per 16 units.**
- Please see comments above re: vehicles
- People should not be sleeping in cars just anywhere, they should be in facilities. You will be spreading trash and human waste everywhere. Not to mention damage to environment from broken down cars leaking antifreeze, etc. Create a homeless RV park outside of town that has waste services along with restrooms and showers. Should have on-site management/security.
- More information needed
- For reasons stated above, what justifies parking minimums for the homeless when Bend just practically eliminated them for new housing development?
- What data do you have to prove that:
 - A) These people will move into a shelter
 - B) These people have vehicles
- **as long as served by transit**
- Answer assumes a rational analysis to come up with the recommendation.
- Parking must adhere to current limits and neighborhood HOAs. Additionally all vehicles should be in working order and moved every 72 hours.
- Again, a HUGE issue with on street parking . Who can park outside the shelter if not staying there? I see another Hunnell Rd. because I don 't believe you will be able to enforce and patrol the area parking . Broken down vehicles. Friends and non shelter folks hanging around premises for days. Where is the money and people to enforce the regulations daily?
- **availability of parking at this type of shelter seems like it should be a greater than some of the short-term sites. That said the priority should be providing safe space for as many people as possible unencumbered by parking code designed for either standard commercial/industrial/residential areas**
- What does the data indicate is the need for parking?
- I strongly disagree with the premise of outdoor shelters as a solution.
- this should be similar to other shelters. Also, we should encourage less driving/parking
- It really depends on the population being served. Do they own vehicles?
- ugh
- Many residents may not have transportation at this point in their housing journey
- Need more spaces probably.
- I do not support authorizing outdoor camping within city limits.
- No outdoor shelter development should ever be allowed in a RL or RM zone. This is against the State of Oregon zoning laws and the City will be sued. Further, it is insane that the sounding board would even consider doing such a thing and should be ashamed of themselves. People do not move to Bend and invest in a home and a life here to wake up one morning and find that you have decided to place a homeless camp in their front yard. Think I'm exaggerating? Have you seen the news and what the City of Portland just did? They relocated homeless community members RV's from one street where it was inconvenient for the City to have them to another street and parked them right in front of peoples homes. Yeah, that just happened.
If an outdoor shelter is developed properly in the correct zone, it must comply with all zoning laws and restrictions and building codes, including the number of parking spaces. No exceptions for homeless shelters!
- Supplementing addiction will unravel our community.
- As long as parking is not on-street, but parking lot is provided.
- Outdoor or hardship shelters are not a solution!! The problem should be solved with group or multi room shelters!!
- We don't feel that it is wise to take taxpayer money to set up additional living spaces for homeless from the standpoint that this doesn't really solve the underlying problem and over time where cities have made it convenient to accommodate homeless, the number of homeless merely increases every year, year after year. The basic need is to get these people into jobs and self-supporting and into affordable housing.
- I do not quite understand this. If there are more units, more parking spaces? I guess it depends on where they are, how big they are and how many people per unit.
- Parking requirement should be the same as anywhere else and NOT reduced for homeless sites, otherwise IT WILL be abused.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- There should not be outdoor shelters. Therefore, there should be zero parking places allotted.
- Back up the recommendations with studies and data. Seems like the sounding board is throwing darts in the dark.
- There is not an option to click on Not Sure/Need More Information.
- **The city should have a parking study prepared to document a parking ratio that works and is based on conditions at existing shelters. Do not base the parking ratio on anything less than current documented information.**
- If you mean campers that would not be ok
- Explained in earlier questions.
- you shouldn't have more than 10 units
- **Decreasing required available parking per bed would likely result in occupants to park vehicles offsite within proximity of the shelter.**
- Normal standards should apply. Whatever a. Amp ground requires in a campground approved zone.
- All you are doing is devaluing our property and opening up our property for more to vandalized and theft. Unless the city is willing to pay for increase in crime and property values going down....DO NOT DO THIS!
- Not enough by a long shot. I guess the vision isn't campers, trucks, and trailers parked up and down any streets with a 97703 zip code or in northwest crossing. The "eclectic" east side and mid-town is the vision. They don't mind. And, it'll keep the homeless out of downtown and Galveston.
- Zero, zero, zero, zero is the answer. You have a car? Leave town!
- more parking is needed
- **I rely on the existing providers to know what the ratio needs to be.**
- **While not having data to inform how many houseless residents have automobiles, having only 1 parking space for every 8 units/camp spaces doesn't seem adequate. To avoid any potential overflow parking issues, I feel this recommendation should be re-evaluated and/or re-validated.**
- Again, I don't feel this is enough. More people may have vehicles.
- do not agree that outdoor shelter should even be an option.
- Don't build it at all
- I dislike the outdoor shelter idea completely. The city cant even manage the outdoor homeless locatiins as they currently stand. What evidence do we have that supports their ability to manage more? Its amazing that the City is wanting to increase managed homeless sites when the existing "unofficial" lications are completely out of control and littered with refuse and waste. Instead of creating more bottomless gunding pits, manage the existing homeless locations BETTER
- I think you worded your above question different than the text; to be correct it should read "... to be provided at a ratio of 0.5 parking spaces per unit for the first 16 units or campsites, with a ratio of 0.33 parking spaces per unit or campsite for each additional."
Should just stay at the ratio of 0.5 parking spaces for all applications and amounts.
Outdoor Shelters should not be allowed in any residential zone areas.
There needs to be a daily enforcement checks and insured continual compliance, as these facilities quickly spin out of compliance and into unwanted behaviors. Strong consideration should be given to on-site management, or expect continual community relations issues.
Limits on stay periods are essential and need to be enforced. A one month maximum stay would be significant.
- If the location of the shelter is near adequate street parking then this seems like it would work.
- **Reasonable**
- how many of those in need have a vehicle?
- Fundraise to provide transportation elsewhere (california/Portland)
- **this seems like a more reasonable number. Still in addition to the car parking you need sheltered bike parking and bike skills training. Crashes, injuries, and fatalities among this population of Bend residents is very high. Bike skills mentoring, pedestrian safety training, etc.** A mentor to show them these things, to enable them to feel like they deserve to be safe and live is going to be helpful. Their cavalier attitude about safety could be stemming from their self-hate, self-doubt, self-esteem.
- If they cannot afford to be here, they should go somewhere else. I don't want my tax dollars to pay for this.
- See above answer.
- I think I need more information - how many houseless come with vehicles? Would these campsites allow RVs? What about big RVs? Do they take up 2 spaces? Would this be walk-in with just spaces needed for camp managers?

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- I do not agree with the development of Outdoor Shelters, nor the development of parking structures/lots to serve them. I believe these shelters will only draw more houseless individuals into our community and interfere with the lives of productive citizens.
- What do you think your prized tourists will do when confronted by this mess? I think they WON'T come...and it'll serve you right!
- I would support live-in mental health and drug addiction facilities in industrial zones. Allowing homeless facilities in residential areas and public facilities zones will create nothing but problems.
- Will there be "dead car" limits, mechanics on call, DMV oversight?
- Not sure of neighborhood impact.
- **Not nearly enough parking**
- **Not enough - overflow into businesses and neighborhoods will create more negativity around the issue of homelessness. Don't we want a cohesive and unified community?**
- It's unlikely that anyone on the Sounding Board will be impacted by these facilities in any way. So, visualizing the impact to a neighborhood of 15 out of 16 houseless service recipients parking in front of someone's house was probably difficult for them.
- Not enough parking
- Again since this will be a new project and you do need to start somewhere, hopefully there will be a review of all items mentioned at a later date and adjusted accordingly.
- What data is available that made The Sounding Board arrive at parking space recommendations?
- More parking units
- The parking isn't the issue. People living in the outdoor shelters need to be held responsible for their belongings and keeping things clean and clutter free. If they can't keep it clean then they should be kicked out. We all have responsibilities in this world and homeless people are no different. People need to learn to respect their property as a step to respecting themselves and wanting more for their lives.
If these shelters are going to be monitored then take that time to offer help to those with mental health and addiction issues. These shelters shouldn't be a way to enable people, they should be a way to help people get back on their feet or maybe on their feet for the first time. Don't waste the opportunity to have a captive audience that you can help. The shelters are NOT going to fix the homeless problem. It's just a bandaid. Addiction and mental health problems NEED to be addressed.
- Really, get a clue.
- Are these parking spaces in addition to tent spaces? Can the outdoor shelter be an RV? This number sounds low, so again, it should be based on the number of that typically have a vehicle.
- These shelters should not be allowed in the city of Bend.
- If you look at the committee making these recommendations, it does not accurately reflect our community-only select segments of our community. This should be taken into consideration.
- Shelter's should not be in residential zones. Shelters should be set up on State land outside city limits where those truly requiring govt. assistance will receive it via counselors that monitor the premises.
- Parking should be limited based on the number of registered and fully operating vehicles for people who have valid driver's licenses and have passed a drug/alcohol test within a 24 hour period.
- Trashing our town
- No outdoor shelters
- **One space per unit at a minimum**
- **Not enough parking provided.**
- provide more parking so their vehicles don't overflow to the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Find somewhere out of city limits for any campsites.
- **This doesn't seem high enough, show me how you arrived at this number. The parking needs to be located where people can get help and have minimum barriers to get help.**
- **The parking should be enough for all the vehicles associated with the shelter so there is not overflow into non-shelter parking**
- This is a terrible survey. "Do I agree with a bunch of recommendations" from group of people that did not even consider that the number of beds and parking spaces provided by tax dollars should possibly be zero. This plan will only make the homelessness problem worse. Make people comfortable in their homelessness and they will rarely, and probably never get out of it. Bend is becoming the next Portland, LA, or San Francisco. These plans of action

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

sound compassionate, but after they have been shown to only exacerbate the problem time after time when will you wake up and realize it's not compassion. It's making you complicit in the very cause of the homelessness. I do not support any of this. I am certain you all won't care one bit, but in 3 years you'll see and remember these words "I told you so". Stop voting blue. Let's go Brandon and Let's go liberals.

- NONE. This survey is a joke. NONE...that is my vote.
- The City should not be allowing outdoor shelters.
- Will negatively impact neighbors
- Stop encouraging drug abuse
- The types of individuals staying in these locations will likely have vehicles.
- It is unclear whether this requirement is in addition to or included in the max number per acre. If for instance 8 places are required for an outdoor shelter with 16 RVs, then the site will be crammed. If the spaces are in addition to the one unit/1000 ft requirement, then it may be adequate.
- Why are the answer options so limited in the preceding questions? Less, More, not sure/need more information how about, how about "keep current requirements"? The more or less answers presumes that such shelters should be allowed in those zones.
- No shelters in residential zoned areas. We have made an investment in our residences and are tax payers who want to continue with our current cc&r's r's and HOA and city zoning rules. Having Shelters in residential areas affects our quality of life and lowers our property values. I suggest you identify areas where a camp can be set up and fenced in for everyone's protection and well being. If the homeless do not want to stay in a designated camp that is their choice, but it does not release them from the laws we currently have against squatting or loitering. All the citizens need to be protected, not just the homeless which for many is a lifestyle choice.
- Where will, they be located??
- There should be no shelters allowed in residential zones.
- I strongly disagree with the parking ratio because we should not be building anymore shelters or changing zoning to allow anymore shelters. This will not solve the problem. It will simply increase the population of homeless in Central Oregon. "If you build it, they will come."
- While some level of parking required, seems a bit high. That extra space for parking could be quickly consumed by individual homeless camps & tents
- See above
- **This is not enough parking and the result will be property and vehicles overflowing into adjacent areas and negatively affecting the quality of life and driving for others.**
- ONCE AGAIN, INADEQUATE PARKING FORCES PARKING IN THE STREETS OR NEIGHBORING NEIGHBORHOODS...
- Need more data
- Bend has historically underestimated the parking needs. Earlier, I mentioned the neighborhoods around Revere, but if you look at the campsites along China Hat road, you will see multiple cars per campsite.
- Vehicles should be allowed on a case-by-case basis. Many times the vehicles involved are barely running, behind on registration, and typically unsafe for the roads thereby creating a hazard for others. Don't enable the bad trying to do good. If people needs a ride somewhere, have a shelter bus/transport available.
- Hunnel road is a disaster and there is no credible support for the city council and city of Bends ability to manage the homeless population. The statement from city council that most homeless population come from within our current residence is misinformation. People are drawn here from out side the area.
- Make the homeless, a real word, work for their space in the shelters.
- TINY HOUSES are a better answer
- **Many of the unhoused have vehicles. Stop trying to pretend that they don't. We need to plan for the reality. You must have 0.5 spaces a minimum all the time and in some locations plan for 0.75 to 1 spaces per bed.**
Tiny houses in residential areas might be okay, but tents are not. Community service building have to be a requirement. All of these locations need to be actively managed. Tents on public land can work, but again, you need restrooms, a community service building and the space needs to be managed.
More information needs to be provided on how these outdoor shelter spaces will work in the different zones to be able to effectively answer these questions.
If these locations are opened up then there cannot be any random unhoused communities popping up else where in the city or on public lands. You either live in the designated areas or you move on to another community - no exceptions. Otherwise the problem will just continue to grow and expand.

Appendix C: Shelter Code Survey Unedited Comments, Outdoor Shelters

- **A good number of people that will fill outdoor shelters will have a vehicle - because for many that is currently serving as their shelter. Planning for anything less than 0.5 parking spaces per unit (no matter how large the camp gets) is setting a camp up for neighbor conflict by pushing the overflow parking needs onto your tax paying residents. It's also completely unfair to expect a homeless person to rely on our unreliable and insufficient public transportation or a bicycle/walking (which becomes completely useless during the winter when our roads become ice-skating rinks and our sidewalks remain unshoveled and impassible (because Bend City government has proven it can't even enforce existing code).**
- Again you guys never account for people form of transportation for there's a shopping cart for a car all they're gonna do is fill up the space with garbage
- Where will all the vehicles used by Homeless people go? Don't make our streets dumping grounds for these vehicles and the debris piles that follow. The number of units should be the result of a fair and open review process by the commercial property owners affected since their property values will be impacted. The City appears to be prioritizing the rights of homeless people over its own residents who are taxpayers, employers, employees and support local businesses every day. Bend is a small City and no models used in larger cities should be applied here.
- Please provide data that shows the need for 0.25 parking spaces per bed. Will the shelter require ID, insurance and registration? If not, then what is the plan for unregistered, unlicensed, uninsured residents and their vehicles? Who is responsible for inoperable or abandoned vehicles?
- See above answers
- i disagree with all of this. I applaud you all for trying to find fixes. So many locals i have spoken with, All living here for 40 plus years(i was born and raised here 46 years ago) All of us agree that an easy fix is use the KOA next to cooley rd. There is so much money in this town. If they can find a way to build a walking bridge over the parkway than you can use some of that money buy that land and boom one huge managed camp. Out of neighborhoods, schools and close to resources for them. It's a win win. Find a way. Then no one else is put out, like neighbors or ODOT or sheriff . Fence it and manage it. They are all parked on hunnel rd anyway.
- **This is not realistic. Please provide evidence that the people you wish to help have 0.33 cars**
- See above
- Won't be nearly enough! Please do not over-burden those of us who have enjoyed living and driving in Bend.
- Again, parking is an issue all over Bend, high density creates neighborhood issues for parking and blight
- I think it is premature to allow the City of Bend to rezone Bend for houselessness shelters until they can demonstrate that the rights of property owners are strongly supported. Words and not enough. Well run shelters outside the Bend neighborhoods need to be established before it is reasonable to even consider the plans suggested in these documents. I am offended that this survey is presented in a way that assumes the respondent is OK with "updating the Bend Development Code to allow different types of shelter citywide" and that only some details need to be worked out.
- This is a terrible idea. Cars are a part of the American identity whether you like it or not. Not planning for parking just increases congestion.
- outdoor shelters should not be an option in this plan.
- I think this is a matter of obscuring whether or not the whole city should be turned into a homeless camp, by asking how many parking spaces should be allowed at a particular type of shelter location. Any shelter location is going to need adequate parking. Asking people who don't know those metrics, when the real question is "Do you think these shelters should be allowed at all?", is just insulting. I would counter this question with my own: When someone is camped out by the side of the Parkway, how many parking spots in downtown are affected? Why don't we just let people camp in parking spots in downtown Bend, then ask people if .5 parking spots is enough for 16 tents!
- **Many homeless that are likely to be in a temporary status, i.e. "getting back on their feet" still have a vehicle and in many cases have multiple vehicles (family). Not providing adequate parking will result in overflow into surrounding properties.**
- Dont encourage houseless people to come due to resources. Take care of mental health and encourage others to move along or take part in society and help by working , respecting laws, our land and city. They need to want change. Why want it if you're giving them everything they need, but not helping them be productive.
- I don't have the data to know if the people occupying these shelter types typically have vehicles. Again, if you want community support, the impact from these shelters needs to be low. An overflow of parking is not going to make community members happy and supportive so make sure there are enough parking spots.