

## INTRODUCTION

The goals of this report are to, a) determine the extent that City of Seattle temporary, permitted encampments are an effective homelessness response strategy and, b) identify successes and areas of improvement for the permitted encampment model. The majority of the data and financial findings in this report reflect the experiences and results of the Ballard, Interbay and Othello permitted encampments between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016.

### Background

The City of Seattle is the first in the country to offer public land and funding to support permitted encampments. As of today, the City of Seattle (the City) invests in six permitted homeless encampment programs<sup>1</sup>. Based on the most recent HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) data, from September 2015 through May 2017, 759 people have been served through those programs and, 121 people have transitioned into a safe, permanent place to live. These temporary, permitted encampments contribute to the City's efforts to address homelessness.

---

"Permitted encampments are not a permanent solution to the crisis of homelessness we are experiencing in Seattle," said Murray. "These encampments will provide a safer community environment than sleeping under a highway overpass or on a park bench. Residents will have improved access to services and we hope to open the door to permanent housing as quickly as we can."

*Mayor Murray, June 29, 2015*

---

In 2016, the City adopted a strategic plan known as the *Pathways Home* plan as a framework of actions to address homelessness. The person-centered plan includes key data-driven policies and actions that will transform the current system into one that more fully addresses the complex needs of people experiencing homelessness. While the priority actions within Pathways Home are underway, permitted encampment programs that include access to services and case management provide immediate options for people without shelter.

### Key Findings

- The City permitted encampments have **met and exceeded the contracted performance measures**.
- The model is successfully **servicing people who have been living outside** in greenbelts, on the streets, in cars and in hazardous situations.
- Overall, **communities have responded positively** and welcomed the residents of the permitted encampments into their neighborhood.
- The encampment **self-managed governance structure** offers residents a way to positively contribute to day-to-day operations and community engagement efforts while building individual confidence and leadership skills.
- The success of the first two years of the permitted encampment **validates the value of adding case management and services** to the self-managed encampments.
- More research is needed to provide insight into any **detrimental racial equity practices or program barriers** that may exist at the permitted encampments for Black/African American, American Indian or Alaska Native and Hispanic Latino people experiencing homelessness.
- It would be beneficial to evaluate the potential changes needed for the **level of case management, staffing and supportive services offered** as the make-up of the permitted encampment shifts to serve more people who have been living without shelter for long periods of time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Identified as: Ballard, Interbay, Othello, Georgetown, Myers Way and Licton Springs

## THE MODEL

### Background

In late 2014 Mayor Murray convened an Emergency Task Force on Unsheltered Homelessness to identify a set of immediate, short-term action steps to address the growing number of people experiencing homelessness. The task force was made up of leaders from the housing/ homelessness services sector, funders, neighborhood and business districts, faith community, and advocates. Over a two-month period, the task force developed a set of proposals for the Mayor's consideration. One of those proposals was for the City of Seattle to permit organized legal encampments to be sited on public land or privately owned, non-religious property.

The Mayor accepted that recommendation and, in early 2015 the full City Council unanimously adopted an ordinance related to land use and zoning to permit transitional encampments as an interim use on City-owned or private property. A related joint Director's Rule was adopted by the City's Human Services Department (HSD) and Department of Planning and Development (DPD) to establish compatible requirements for community outreach, encampment operations standards, and coordination with the permit process for new transitional encampments on any selected site meeting the requirements of the ordinance.<sup>2</sup>

The ordinance includes restrictions around the number of persons to be served at each site and limits the permitted use for one year, with the possibility of permit renewal for an additional year. Further, the joint Director's Rule directs the permitted encampment operational standards. These include budgeting and fundraising, site management, maintenance and security protocols, required resident supports, and public health and safety goals. The joint Director's Rule also outlines community outreach standards and requires the creation of Community Advisory Councils (CAC) to provide neighborhood and business input on proposed encampment operations. The CAC's also identify methods for handling complaints or concerns relating to the encampment site or its residents.

The program regulations and guidelines for the operation of the sites are further outlined in the Project Service Agreement, which is executed by agency and HSD authorized representatives. Program oversight is maintained by HSD through a monthly *Contractor Invoice Form* and *Monthly Status Report* that document progress towards the contracted performance commitments and line-item reimbursement. Additionally, HSD staff meet regularly with the staff, in person and often on site, to assess the program progress and work collaboratively on addressing issues.

### Leveraging Expertise of Local Operators and Service Providers

A qualification review process was used by HSD to select the operators of the encampment sites. The organizations selected to partner in the permitted encampments bring to the program decades of experience in supporting unsheltered and low-income people. Longtime and nationally recognized tent city operator SHARE (Seattle Housing and Resource Effort) was selected to manage the Interbay encampment and established operator Nickelsville was selected to manage the Ballard site. In March of 2016, Nickelsville began operating the third permitted encampment, named Othello. The Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) was invited to act as fiscal agent for the two organizations and to provide the case management services for the residents at the three encampments.

---

<sup>2</sup> Council Bill No. 118310, Ordinance No. 124747, DPD Director's Rule 20-2015, HSD Director's Rule 01-2015

**KEY FINDINGS****Elimination of the 90-day Relocation Requirement**

In the past encampments, or tent cities, were only permitted to stay in one location for a 90-day period. The disruptive nature of the 90-day limit placed a burden on the encampment community. The encampment leaders were constantly searching for the next host congregation. Each 90-day move meant many residents had to abandon progress made with a service provider or agency to begin with one that was closer to the new location. The City's permitted encampments are now allowed to stay in place for a one-year period with a second-year option based on successful operation. This longer-term siting means residents can make greater progress towards their stability goals and build stronger relationships with the surrounding community.

**Bringing together the Self-Managed Model with Case Management Services**

What makes the Ballard, Interbay and Othello permitted encampments different from other non-sanctioned or unpermitted encampments are the incorporation of structured case management services into the self-management model. The model was without historical experience or comparisons, which meant much of the operating norms and expectations were created simultaneously with the physical setting up of the sites. More than one person interviewed described the experience using an analogy like, "We were building the airplane in the air."

The encampment self-managed governance structure offers residents a way to positively contribute to day-to-day operations and community engagement efforts while building individual confidence and leadership skills. The residents support and encourage each other, which adds to the increased sense of well-being that contributes to positive outcomes. Residents tell stories about how they help each other out and, how they celebrate successes and milestones.

---

"The people in the encampment are very proud of what they have accomplished in creating the encampment. One man said at the low barrier encampment that this place was the last chance for many people."  
*Healthcare for the Homeless staff reflection*

---

Although each of the organizations uses slightly different methods, the core tenets are similar. The primary elements of the governance model are:

- Democratic decision-making with every member having an equal vote. Paid staff does not have a vote in camp decisions.
- All residents contribute to the day-to-day operation of the encampment. This includes contributing to camp security, participating in neighborhood service activities and other operational duties.
- Residents hold each other accountable for individual actions. A grievance procedure is used to resolve conflicts.
- Residents can be barred from camp for serious violation of the rules. Barred individuals are asked to leave the camp property. Re-entry can be petitioned depending on the severity of the offense.

The Low Income Housing Institute who has more than 20 years of experience identifying and developing affordable housing programs provides the permitted encampment case management. The agency also holds demonstrated expertise in providing person-centered, service enriched programming to a wide range of low-income and homeless populations. LIHI is also responsible for the administrative, financial

and data collection activities that contribute to the success of the programs. The permitted encampment service-enriched, case management model includes:

- Entry into King County's Coordinated Entry for All (CEA) program
- Referrals to diversion programs and local shelters when appropriate
- Coordination with local affordable and homeless housing providers including rapid rehousing programs
- Connection to legal services to clear up outstanding issues that create barriers to housing and employment
- Employee training and educational referrals
- Help covering transportation costs for job searches, education and accessing resources
- Family reunification and homeless diversion assistance
- Childcare subsidies for working parents and coordination with McKinney Vento Act transportation for school aged-children
- Refugee and immigration services including interpretation resources
- Referral to King County Veterans Program and other VA resources
- Domestic violence services and advocacy
- Access to healthcare, mental health and substance abuse programs through the Healthcare for the Homeless mobile medical van and other programs that enrich the experiences of the camp residents

Even with the inevitable challenges faced by most startup programs that pioneer new ideas, one of the biggest outcomes of the first two years is the validation of the compatibility of the self-management and case management models. Although stakeholders consistently mentioned the lack of clarity in roles and poor communication as the biggest challenge they face, each expressed commitment to finding solutions and improving processes.

---

The "A" family has been at Othello since it opened and have become sober, employed and regained custody of their infant son. They are saving money and waiting for housing. Their goal is to "restart their lives".

---

Three additional permitted encampments were opened in 2017 (Myers Way, Georgetown and Licton Springs). The City of Seattle and its partners are committed to continuous learning and flexible program development as they pioneer new methods of employing person-centered responses to homelessness and poverty. This includes periodic evaluation and program adjustments based on data and real-time learnings which were utilized in the deployment of the 2017 sites. Therefore, the new sites benefited from the experiences and learnings observed in this report.

## People Served

The three permitted encampments are programmatically designed to serve single men, single women, couples and adults with children who are part of a family unit. Unaccompanied children under the age of 18 are not served at the encampments. Operational procedures are in place to quickly and safely refer any unaccompanied children to the appropriate agency.

During 2016<sup>3</sup>, 403 adults over the age of 18 and 64 children as part of a family were served at the permitted encampments. These individuals equaled 323 households, with 37 of those containing children. Of the total population, 60% were male and 39% female. The other 1% includes two individuals who identify as transgender, one who selected 'doesn't identify as male, female or transgender' and two who declined to share their gender identity.

---

"My stay at Tent City5 allowed me to stabilize and recover from a horrible situation. The social immersion, responsibilities and opportunities that the camp and SHARE provided helped me to regain my footing and functionality. I'm now working for SHARE and have stable shared housing."

---

A total of 25 (5%) of encampment individuals were between the ages of 18 and 24 and, 13 (3%) were over the age of 62. There were 23 children who were under the age of 5 and, 41 who were school-aged (aged 5-17). Of the individuals served 27% are chronically homeless<sup>4</sup> and 5% are veterans.

The race and ethnicity of the individuals served are described in the table below. One of the primary findings of this evaluation and, recommendations for future study is the high percentage of White individuals (57%) served at the encampment as compared to the City funded Single Adult Enhanced Emergency Shelters (43%). The low representation of Black/African American, American Indian or Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian people as compared to other programs should be researched to identify any racial disparities and make programmatic changes that lead to racial equity.

Race	Total	
White	265	57%
Black/African American	88	19%
Asian	5	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	30	6%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	7	1%
Multiple Races	46	10%
Refused/ Not Collected	26	6%

Ethnicity	Total	
Non-Hispanic / Non-Latino	399	85.5%
Hispanic/ Latino	33	7%
Refused/ Not Collected	35	7.5%

Of the 403 adults served during 2016, 93 (23%) reported a history of domestic violence (DV) in their lives. Fifteen of those who reported were part of a family with children. Additionally, 31 (33%) of those who reported experiencing DV in their lives said they were fleeing a DV situation at that time.

<sup>3</sup> Collected in Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), see Methodology for details. Data characterized as people or individuals includes both adults and children.

<sup>4</sup> To be considered chronically homeless, an individual or head of household must meet the definition of "homeless individual with a disability" from the McKinney-Vento Act, as amended by the HEARTH Act and have been living in a place not meant for human habitation, in an emergency shelter, or in a safe haven for the last 12 months continuously or on at least four occasions in the last three years where those occasions cumulatively total at least 12 months.

## Permitted Encampment Evaluation

July 7, 2017

The table below describes the physical and mental conditions reported by the individuals staying at the encampment at program entry. Mental health and physical disabilities are the conditions that were most cited during intake. During interviews with staff and residents, one of the most mentioned areas of success was the Healthcare for the Homeless Mobile Medical Van where people are receiving treatment for physical conditions that would be untreated without that service.

<b>Physical and Mental Conditions</b>	<b>Total Reported</b>
Mental Health Problem	177
Physical Disability	134
Chronic Health Condition	110
Developmental Disability	63
Drug Abuse	25
Alcohol Abuse	20
Both Alcohol and Drug Abuse	10
HIV/AIDS	2

Almost half (45%) of the adults report they have no income when they enter the permitted encampment. Additionally, 36% report other income from sources like the Veteran's Administration (VA), governmental programs such as TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) and SSI/SSDI (Supplemental Security Income) and, 12% of the adults reported earned income or a combination of earned and other income.

<b>Number of Adults By Income Category</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Adults with Only Earned Income*	44	11%
Adults with Only Other Income	145	36%
Adults with Both Earned and Other Income	4	1%
Adults with No Income	182	45%
Adults Refused/Not collected	28	7%

\*i.e. employment

### Performance Measures

The three temporary encampments located in the City’s Interbay, Ballard and Othello neighborhoods, met the 2016 contracted performance commitments. Those combined performance commitments were: (a) 125 unduplicated homeless individuals/families meet their emergency or immediate shelter needs and, (b) 45 homeless individuals or families enter transitional or permanent housing.

- **The encampments are helping individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness meet their emergency or immediate shelter needs.** In 2016<sup>5</sup>, 467 people or, 323 households were served at the Interbay, Ballard and Othello encampments. More than half (55%) of the adults served slept the night before in a place not fit for human habitation.
- **Homeless individuals or families are entering transitional or permanent housing.** Of those who exited the encampments during 2016, 85 (26%) moved into a permanent place to live and 41 (13%) entered a transitional housing program.

### System Comparison

The following section describes how the permitted encampment performance for adults compares to City funded Single Adult Enhanced Shelter programs that similarly provide 24/7 access, storage, services and case management.

<b>Last Place Slept (Adults)</b>	<b>Encampments</b>		<b>Enhanced Shelter</b>	
Place Not Meant for Human Habitation	222	55%	407	29.5%
Shelter / Safe Haven	82	20%	666	48%
Staying with Friends/Family	41	10%	70	5%
Hotel/Motel	15	4%	22	2%
Transitional Housing	13	3%	20	1.5%
Institutional Setting	8	2%	88	6%
Permanent Housing For Formerly Homeless Persons	0	0%	3	0%
Rental or Owned	7	2%	21	2%
Refused / Not Collected	15	4%	84	6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>403</b>		<b>1381</b>	

<b>Length of Stay</b>	<b>Encampments</b>		<b>Enhanced Shelter</b>	
	Left During 2016	Still There 12/31/16	Left During 2016	Still There 12/31/16
Average	88	123	61	104
Median	69	71	15	60

<sup>5</sup> 12 months of data for Interbay and Ballard, 9 months of data for Othello

## Permitted Encampment Evaluation

July 7, 2017

Exit Destination	Encampments		Enhanced Shelter	
	Total Exit		Total Exit	
Permanent Housing	85	26%	207	18%
Place Not Fit for Human Habitation	43	13%	53	5%
Transitional Housing	41	13%	87	8%
Shelter / Safe Haven	17	5%	175	15%
Institution	7	2%	30	3%
Other Temporary Situation	5	2%	75	7%
Deceased	0	0%	3	0%
Missing/ Refused	129	39%	504	44%
Total exited	327		1134	

### Cost Summary

It is challenging to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the permitted encampments because there are no historical comparisons or standards with which to compare. This report summarizes the total cost of the program for 2016 and offers a baseline for future evaluation.

During 2016, the City of Seattle contributed \$559,600 of a total program budget of \$755,500 for the operations and case management costs for the Ballard, Interbay and Othello permitted encampments. The cost per person exited from the program during the year is \$2,310 and the City of Seattle's investment is \$1,711 per person exited. The total program cost per individual who exited the program to permanent housing in 2016 is \$8,888 or, \$6,584 of the City of Seattle Investment.

### Tents on Platforms Compared to Tiny Structures Performance

The three permitted encampments are comprised of sleeping areas that are both tent and wooden structures (also called tiny houses or tiny structures). The following table describes the configuration of sleeping areas for each of the three sites being evaluated in this report. The capacity of each site was gradually built up during 2016 and this configuration reflects the final capacity of the permitted encampment sites as of December 31, 2016.

	Othello	Interbay	Ballard
Tents on Platforms	12	40	12
Tiny Structures	28	0	5

Although there are other factors that could contribute to the results, some preliminary observations can be made between the permitted encampment sites. For example, the data shows a slight difference in the length of stay and exits to housing between Othello (mostly tiny structures), Interbay (all tents on platforms), and Ballard (mixture of tents and tiny structures). The Othello site also has the highest percentage of people moving into permanent and transitional housing. The data shows Othello has a significantly lower rate of exits to a place not meant for human habitation compared to the other sites. Future study is recommended to evaluate the reasons for these differences and identify the most effective way to incorporate the results into future permitted encampment models.

Permitted Encampment Evaluation  
July 7, 2017

Length of Stay	Othello 70% Tiny Structures		Interbay All Tents		Ballard 70% Tents	
	Left During 2016	Still There 12/31/16	Left During 2016	Still There 12/31/16	Left During 2016	Still There 12/31/16
Average	88	88	84	116	88	165
Median	78	64	63	62	68	112

Exit Destination	Othello 70% Tiny Structures		Interbay All Tents		Ballard 70% Tents	
	Total		Total		Total	
Permanent Housing	47	31%	26	20%	14	22%
Place Not Fit for Human Habitation	10	7%	26	20%	10	16%
Transitional Housing	36	24%	3	2%	2	3%
Shelter / Safe Haven	6	4%	9	7%	2	3%
Institution	1	1%	3	2%	3	5%
Other Temporary Situation	2	1%	4	3%	2	3%
Missing/ Refused	48	32%	60	46%	30	48%

### Impact on the Neighborhood and Community

During interviews with partner agency staff, the Ballard and Interbay Community Advisory Committee members (CAC) and permitted encampment residents, one of the most frequently mentioned positive outcomes is the increased neighborhood resident engagement and support. This includes physical donations, enjoyable community interactions and other positive experiences. One of the Interbay CAC members described how the siting of the encampment has brought together the Queen Anne and Magnolia faith communities to more effectively work together to address homelessness and poverty in their neighborhoods.

Each of the encampments has seen increased visits from interested community members and others who want to observe the operations. This has resulted in opportunities for relationship building and, in some cases, increased community understanding of homelessness. One person said, “The camps are considered a place to go to learn about homelessness and get involved.”

The permitted encampments are committed to being good neighbors. One way they demonstrate that commitment is through neighborhood cleanup efforts (i.e. Litter Busting), and neighborhood safety walks.

There is no consistent method being used at the sites to capture data around the amount of community interactions, which could include donations, meal preparation and serving, fundraising and volunteer programs (including setting up the encampment and building donated tiny structures). It is recommended that the partner agencies develop a common tool that can capture the types and levels of community support at each site. The quantitative data can be combined with qualitative data collection around the perception and attitudes about the permitted encampments and homelessness in

general leading to a greater understanding of the impact of the permitted encampments on the community.

In the meantime, several indicators illustrate the change in the quantity and type of community responses to the permitted encampments in their neighborhood. For example, there was a significant decrease in the number of phone calls, email messages and in-person meetings during the re-permitting of the three permitted encampments. Although no data was collected during the 2015 public notification process for all three of the encampments, the intensity of negative neighborhood reaction to the siting of the permitted encampments was evident. In comparison, when the public comments for the 2016 re-permitting were analyzed, the number of positive remarks about the neighborhood experiences outweighed those that contained negative responses.

### **Police Activity, Crime and Safety**

The permitted encampment sites operate under a set of rules, codes of conduct and policies that each resident receives as part of the intake process. Although the language varies between Nickelsville and SHARE, the intent is to provide safety and security to the individuals who reside in the encampment and to the surrounding neighborhood. Camp security is a critical part of the successful operation of the permitted encampments. External complaints are handled through permitted encampment procedures that are designed for fast and efficient response. Generally, the permitted encampment staff are the first contacted when a problem is identified.

The permitted encampments have 24-hour security shifts, with each adult resident participating. Security duties include monitoring the environment for dangerous situations and working with camp leadership to identify and address any resident action that is contrary to the established rules of the camp. If a resident is determined to be in violation of the rules, he/she is barred from the premises. Depending on the severity of the situation, the Seattle Police Department (SPD) is contacted. The SPD responds as appropriate and works with the permitted encampment operators to resolve any situation.

The SPD has been collecting data that reflects changes in police activity and crime in the neighborhoods around the permitted encampments. The SPD assessment includes crime data and computer-aided dispatch (CAD) proactive and dispatched/reactive events for each of the six permitted encampment locations and the surrounding radius (See Appendix 3). It is important to note that the events recorded do not all result in a general offense. In addition, the recorded events include officer checks on premises that occur during daily operational activities.

The City's Human Services Department will continue to work with the SPD Data-Driven team to assess police activity and crime in the permitted encampment neighborhoods. In addition, there is some evidence of increased numbers of people who come to the neighborhood in search of a safe place to stay and this could contribute to some negative public perception of the encampments. Further study is recommended to evaluate the level and impact of the foot traffic on the neighborhood.

## WHAT CHALLENGES EXIST?

### Communication

Communication is an integral part of any new program, especially one that was created within a short time frame with no previous experience or model to use as a guide. As noted above, the City permitted encampments were a response to the growing crisis of homelessness. There was little time for extensive planning sessions and, much of the decision-making was done in real-time. This resulted in disconnected communication channels and, in some instances, miscommunication around policy and procedures. While it was the most mentioned challenge, almost every person interviewed described some changes that were put in place to improve the communication channels. There was also a clear commitment from all parties to find ways to improve, especially around clarity on roles, expectations and procedures.

### Data Collection Challenges & Limitations

Data collection challenges were identified that, with creative approaches could be reduced or eliminated. These include:

- **Short-stays:** While the permitted encampments operate on a 24-hour timetable, the case managers hold scheduled office hours. Campers who stay for short periods may not have interacted with a case manager and therefore, not be captured in the HMIS data set. There should be a mechanism for collecting basic information about these individuals including reasons for leaving before connecting with case manager.
- **Staffing turnover:** During periods of staffing changes and turnover, camp residents reported challenges receiving consistent access to case managers. This could also limit the quantity and quality of data collected.
- **Data collection:** As with any new program start, the process for data collection included multiple iterations. While every effort was made to utilize HMIS, the data set may contain gaps from early program start up challenges.

### Services / Operations

- **Staff training:** The permitted encampment model serves people who have spent many years living outside in hazardous conditions. The City's Navigation Team, comprised of outreach workers and SPD officers who are trained to work with this population, rely on the permitted encampments as an option to offer to people with high barriers to housing. This means the staff and case managers at the permitted encampments need access to training on trauma-informed care and other trainings that will help them give the most effective services possible.
- **Caseload levels:** The case managers at the permitted encampments work with each resident to create a housing plan. With high caseloads, it is sometimes difficult to make progress with people who have multiple barriers to obtaining housing or other issues. The case manager to client ratio should be evaluated and adjusted as needed.
- **Budget analysis:** During interviews, the operators consistently mentioned the restrictions they face with the program resources available. It was recommended there be a review of the budget allocations and determination if adjustments could be made to increase or redistribute the funds available for administrative activities and case management costs.

## CONCLUSION & FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

The City permitted encampments have met and exceeded the contracted performance measures. The model is successfully serving people who have been living outside in greenbelts, on the streets, in cars and in hazardous situations. The neighboring communities have responded positively, and crime does not increase significantly when a permitted encampment moves in.

The challenges identified in the previous section should be researched further and plans made to address them in the next operating year. Additionally, research and attention is recommended in the following areas:

- Although the percentage of permitted encampment **missing responses** (*Client Doesn't Know/ Client Refused, Data Not Collected*) are within the range of the single adult enhanced programs, efforts should be made to research the reasons people exit the program without providing destination information. This research could point to program gaps, service barriers or, racial bias.
- More research is needed to provide insight into any **detrimental racial equity practices or program barriers** that may exist at the permitted encampments for Black/African American, American Indian or Alaska Native and Hispanic Latino people experiencing homelessness.
- A low percentage of residents at the permitted encampments are between the ages of 18-24. Research should be done to determine if there are any barriers to **Youth and Young Adult** use of the permitted encampments.
- Inquiry should be made into the services offered to residents with a history of, or who are fleeing **domestic violence** to ensure connection to City of Seattle funded DV legal assistance and mobile flexible advocacy programs.
- There should be deeper research into the reasons for the **differences between tiny structures and tent** results.
- It would be beneficial to evaluate the potential changes needed for the **level of case management, staffing and supportive services offered** as the make-up of the permitted encampment shifts to serve more people who have been living without shelter for long periods of time.
- There would be a benefit to a study around the presumption that there is an **increase in "foot traffic"** in a neighborhood because of the camp and its potential impact.
- A public perception survey and data collection tool should be developed to capture **levels of community support and perception** by neighborhood.

## Appendix

### Appendix 1: About the Partners

The permitted encampments are designed to offer a safe place where people without shelter can access health and addiction services, find housing and participate in activities that encourage independent living skills, increase income, and promote health and well-being. Each of the partners plays a critical role in reaching the goals of the permitted encampment programs.

Organization descriptions as stated by the partners:

**SHARE:** SHARE and WHEEL are partnered organizations of homeless and formerly homeless men and women dedicated to surviving and solving homelessness, primarily through self-help, self-managed solutions. SHARE (Seattle Housing and Resource Effort) is co-ed and a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation. WHEEL (Women’s Housing Equality and Enhancement League) is made up solely of women.

SHARE/WHEEL is committed to providing survival, safety, dignity, empowerment, and leadership development to homeless people in need of shelter. Our shelters, our encampments, and our organization are run by participants themselves. SHARE participants determine the policies, rules and operating principles of SHARE and, take responsibility for the day-to-day (and night-to-night) work of running the encampments and shelters.

This commitment assures that our sites are safe, comfortable, and welcoming to all. Our self-managed model welcomes diversity in all aspects as long as participants adhere to our strict Code of Conduct.<sup>6</sup>

**Nickelsville:** The Nickelsville Othello Site is a self-managed encampment with a diverse population of homeless men, women, families and pets living in tents and simple wooden structures that is expected to start in March 2016.

Empowerment and dignity are promoted through self-management. The day-to-day operations of the camp are in the hands of leadership elected at camp meetings. Although Nickelsville has staff, they do not live on-site, and can’t vote or make motions at meetings.

Nickelsville is a 501(c)3 organization with a goal of educating the public and homeless people, particularly those living in encampments, about the causes of homelessness and with a broader goal of working to solve homelessness. Nickelsville has been in operation since September 22, 2008 providing safe shelter to thousands of homeless people.<sup>7</sup>

**Low Income Housing Institute:** Founded in 1991, LIHI has grown to be one of the most productive affordable housing developers in the Northwest. LIHI owns and/or manages over 1,700 housing units at 50 sites in six counties throughout the Puget Sound region.

LIHI provides a variety of supportive services to help residents maintain their housing and develop self-sufficiency. Our efforts include providing residents with case management, life skills training, technology access and training, financial literacy training and savings programs, and access to employment, healthcare, and educational programs.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>From the Tent City 5 Interbay Management Plan

<sup>7</sup> From the Othello Site Management Plan

<sup>8</sup> From the Low Income Housing Institute Service Management Plan- Encampments

## **Appendix 2: Methodology**

This report contains analysis and findings based on data collected at the Ballard and Interbay encampment sites from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016 and, from the Othello site from March 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 (contracted period). Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) case managers adhered to King County HMIS Standard Operating Procedures and interview protocol, which include obtaining a “client’s informed written consent” to participate in HMIS. Before any HMIS information was collected, camp residents were informed that access to services would not be tied to participation.

The HUD Annual Performance Report (APR) was the primary data source for this report. The report findings are measured at the individual rate. Head of household measurements were not used due to the complicated structure of the encampment households. Use of head of household race, ethnicity, disability, residency and exit data may not describe the true composition of the encampment residents. (Example: a 2-person family could have the female adult sleeping at an emergency shelter with the male adult sleeping in a place not fit for human habitation the night before entering the encampment.)

### **Qualitative Information**

This report is supplemented by information collected during interviews with key stakeholders within the city of Seattle. Additionally, informational interviews were conducted with people from the following organizations/ programs:

- Community Advisory Committees (Ballard, Interbay)
- Nickelsville, SHARE staff, camp leadership and residents
- Low Income Housing Institute (case managers, fundraising, data management, volunteer coordination and other staff)
- Seattle-King County Public Health (Healthcare for the Homeless, Solid Waste/Rodent/Zoonotic Disease Program)

Appendix 3: Police Activity and Crime In and Around Encampment Reporting Areas

## CRIME IN AND AROUND ENCAMPMENT REPORTING AREAS



### Crimes for Exact Encampment Addresses

\*There were no incidents in 2015 at the listed addresses\*

Location (group)	Jan 1- May 31st		Year over Year Diff	
	2016	2017	2016	2017
1000 S Myrtle St		4		4
1419 22nd Ave	4	2	-2	
2826 NW Market	10	4	-6	
3234 17 Ave W	5	3	-2	
7544 MLK Wy S	3		-3	
8620 Nesbit Ave N		3		3
9701 Myers Wy S		2		2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>-4</b>	

### Crimes for Encampment Reporting Areas

Encampment	Jan 1- May 31st			Year over Year Diff		
	2015	2016	2017	2015	2016	2017
1000 S Myrtle St	6	4	19	-2		15
1419 22nd Ave	5	10	5	5		-5
2826 Market St	1	5	4	4		-1
3234 17th Ave W	11	17	12	6		-5
7544 MLK Wy S	9	12	8	3		-4
8620 Nesbit Ave N	4	11	9	7		-2
9701 S Myers Wy	11	11	12	0		1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>23</b>		<b>-1</b>

\*Addresses in which encampments were located were based upon the address as recorded in the SPD record management system.\*

\*\*Totals from Reporting Areas were calculated based upon the number of incidents within the reporting area that contained the encampment.\*\*

\*\*\*Crime counts are based on the primary offense within a single incident, and do not represent the number of victims, or associated offenses within an incident. Crime data is dynamic and will change based on reporting and investigative updates.\*\*\*



### Crimes for Surrounding Encampment Reporting Areas

Surrounding RAs	Jan 1- May 31st			Year over Year Diff		
	2015	2016	2017	2015	2016	2017
Myrtle (Surrounding)	14	17	44		3	27
1419 22nd Ave	39	33	36		-6	3
Market (Surrounding)	18	56	34		38	-22
17th Ave W (surrounding)	36	27	21		-9	-6
MLK (Surrounding)	82	63	54		-19	-9
Nesbit (Surrounding)	116	129	138		13	9
Myers (Surrounding)	97	126	97		29	-29
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>424</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>-27</b>

\*Totals from surrounding areas were selected by summing the number of incidents taking place within a one unit radius.\*

\*\*Crime counts are based on the primary offense within a single incident, and do not represent the number of victims, or associated offenses within an incident. Crime data is dynamic and will change based on reporting and investigative updates.\*\*

# CAD ACTIVITY IN AND AROUND ENCAMPMENT REPORTING AREAS



## Proactive and Reactive Events by Surrounding Encampment Reporting Areas

(January 1st- May 31st)

Surrounding Areas	Call Type	2015	2016	2017	Grand Total
Myrtle (surrounding)	Proactive	39	50	38	127
	Reactive	87	104	81	272
22nd Ave (surrounding)	Proactive	99	79	30	208
	Reactive	309	291	107	707
Market (surrounding)	Proactive	44	117	55	216
	Reactive	264	334	88	686
3234 17th Ave W (surrounding)	Proactive	49	80	34	163
	Reactive	206	197	78	481
MLK (surrounding)	Proactive	101	76	24	201
	Reactive	319	317	112	748
Nesbit (surrounding)	Proactive	285	397	257	939
	Reactive	1,043	1,005	399	2,447
Myers (surrounding)	Proactive	316	366	268	950
	Reactive	571	552	241	1,364

\*Totals from surrounding areas were selected by summing the number of incidents taking place within a one unit radius.\*



## Proactive and Reactive Events by Exact Encampment Address

(January 1st- May 31st)

Exact Address	Call Type	2015	2016	2017	Grand Total
1000 S Myrtle St	Proactive			3	3
	Reactive	3	2	10	15
1419 22nd Ave	Proactive	6	1	3	10
	Reactive		7	1	8
2826 NW Market St	Proactive	3			3
	Reactive	3	21	11	35
3234 17th Ave W	Proactive		4	2	6
	Reactive	1	48	18	67
7544 MLK Wy S	Proactive		4		4
	Reactive		17	7	24
8620 Nesbit Ave N	Proactive			2	2
	Reactive			10	10
9701 Myers Wy S	Proactive			2	2
	Reactive			8	8

## Proactive and Reactive Events by Encampment RA

(January 1st- May 31st)

Encampments	Call Type	2015	2016	2017	Grand Total
1000 S Myrtle	Proactive	7	3	13	23
	Reactive	9	8	15	32
1419 22nd Ave	Proactive	9	17	3	29
	Reactive	54	58	20	132
2826 Market St	Proactive	2	11	4	17
	Reactive	39	57	19	115
3234 17th Ave W	Proactive	24	33	9	66
	Reactive	90	163	67	320
7544 MLK Wy S	Proactive	34	25	23	82
	Reactive	108	97	43	248
8620 Nesbit Ave N	Proactive	49	51	15	115
	Reactive	124	70	31	225
9701 Myers Wy S	Proactive	15	11	8	34
	Reactive	84	87	42	213

\*Addresses in which encampments were located were based upon the address as recorded in the computer-aided-dispatch system.\*

\*\*Totals from Reporting Areas were calculated based upon the number of incidents within the reporting area that contained the encampment.\*\*