

# Blue Ribbon Panel Report

The Impact on Neighborhoods  
of  
High-Risk/High Needs Facilities  
in  
Tacoma, WA

(And Recommendations on What to Do About It)

Final Draft

Present to the Tacoma City Council

November 8, 2005

# Table of Contents

## Executive Summary

- I. Early Learning
- II. Approach to Recommendations
- III. Overview of Recommendations

## Report

- I. Background
- II. Key Findings
  - a. Factors Influencing the problem
  - b. Factors Influencing solutions
- III. The Role Government/the City
- IV. Recommendations
  - a. Recommendations to offer citizens clear, direct and immediate ways to resolve issues in areas of high-risk/high-need concentration
  - b. Recommendations to reduce problems in the future, or reduce their probability
- V. Addendum 1: The Process We Used
- VI. Addendum 2: Findings And Recommendations  
Addressing Specific Issues Raised In The  
Council Resolution
- VII. Addendum 3: List of Members
- VIII. Addendum 4: List of Presenters and Guests

## Executive Summary

This report from a panel of citizen volunteers representing organizations selected by the Council is in response to and at the request of the Tacoma City Council.

The Council asked the Panel members to “***study issues and make recommendations for a community model for affecting change***” in the manner in which services are located and services are provided to high-risk/high-needs individuals in our neighborhoods.

The Resolution expressed concern about appropriate standards of care, quality assurance ( program accountability), and community relations requirements for those providing service (including potential operating agreements, licensing, and dispute resolution processes).

### **EARLY LEARNING**

Panel members in early sessions of study concluded, consistent with the Council’s thinking, that there are neighborhoods in Tacoma with “more than their fair share” of facilities and homes serving high-risk/high-needs individuals. The Panel also agreed with the Council supposition that this concentration has a negative impact on those neighborhoods. We also agreed that certain changes were likely to make a positive difference.

Early in the process, it became clear to Panel members that the scope of our work would need to be driven by the consensus understanding of the “real” problems “on the ground” in the neighborhoods if our work was to have any value in the long term. The many representatives of neighborhood groups on the Panel were vocal and articulate and persistent in insisting that we deal with reality.

As a result of the above, the Panel learned that the many interactive variables at play encompassed far more than traditional non-profit human service providers and the people they serve. Given the above fact, the Panel decided it was important to study the other important variables, and to make recommendations addressing them, if the Council's overall goal to "affect change" was to be realized.

The Panel also concluded, based on the sheer volume of services being provided and the many unique kinds of services in question, that we could not be, nor should we be, suggesting standards for agency best practices, or trying to set staffing levels for different programs. That task was clearly far beyond our expertise. However, we agreed those issues were and are important, and have suggested ways that true "experts" in those fields might play an important ongoing role in helping to set standards for various programs.

### **APPROACH TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

Consistent with the above, in general we have attempted to recommend "what to do" based on our understanding of street reality, and not so much "how to do it." In some cases we do make suggestions or give examples for clarity. There is absolutely no way our panel of volunteer citizens with varying backgrounds could possibly act as experts in all the different areas needing review.

Our assumption is that "how to do" the things suggested will require substantial staff research, including in some cases legal review, coalition-building, training, budget review and development, and perhaps contracting. So, we anticipate that while a few of the recommendations may be able to be implemented immediately, it is more likely that we are looking at an evolving process over one or two years for a number of the recommendations.

In the report that follows, you will read

- key findings related to neighborhood impact upon which the Panel agreed;
- recommendations made, with some explanatory examples, based on the above findings,
- a section devoted to identifying which findings and recommendations address the specific questions raised in the Resolution.
- a section outlining the process we used for discovery/learning/consensus building; and,
- a list of participants.

## **OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Our recommendations follow. The full report outlines these recommendations in more detail.

- 1. Develop a thorough inventory of facilities providing service to high-risk/high needs individuals (including homes owned by landlords with a history of renting to high-risk populations, faith-based programs, non-profit programs, non-conforming-use properties, and others).**
- 2. Require a Memo of Understanding (MOU) be completed, in cooperation with the neighborhood, by those providing program services or renting multiple properties in areas with high concentrations of high-risk/high needs individuals. Require group housing facilities that provide services anywhere in the city to also complete a MOU.**
- 3. Place a higher priority on well-trained and community-connected Community Liaison (Tacoma City Police) Officers (CLOs) in areas of high-risk/high needs concentration.**

- 4. Place a higher priority on directing resources to enforce existing regulations that apply to housing and other facilities in areas of high-risk/high needs concentration; create an aggressive structure for billing service calls and fining violators; and, establish a licensing/permitting process for all group facilities in areas of high-risk/high-need concentration.**
  
- 5. Limit the use of the so-called “grandfather clause” for allowing non-conforming use of property in areas of high-risk/high-needs concentration.**
  
- 6. Develop a clear and consistent City-wide grievance procedure including: 1) a commonly understood “input point” at the neighborhood level; 2) an appeal point above the neighborhood level; and, 3) a clear “final decision” point.**
  
- 7. Develop a City-wide high-risk/high-need placement coordination process with all appropriate local, state, and federal programs.**

Members of the Panel have a high level of confidence that if these steps are taken, the sense of safety and security in our neighborhoods, and the sense of government responsiveness to community concerns, will improve. Again, please see the report for a more in-depth discussion of these issues.

Blue Ribbon Panel  
On  
High Risk/High Needs Facilities  
Final Draft

**Background:**

On May 17, 2005, the Tacoma City Council passed an Ordinance which established an immediate moratorium on further permits for new or expansion of Group Homes, Group Residential Facilities, Lodging Houses, Emergency and Transitional Housing, and for high-risk/high-needs residents for a period of 180 days.

The moratorium was established because of growing community concern about how and where high-risk, high-needs individuals were being placed, and the perceived impact on neighborhoods if too many facilities are located in an area. This is especially true if citizens have been unsuccessful in obtaining the kind of cooperation they would like from facilities managers. Things such as identifying acceptable standards of care, assuring quality programs, eliminating or quickly correcting on-the-street behaviors, and improving communication standards and grievance procedures during disputes were raised by the Council as issues of concern that needed clarity.

As part of the effort to study these and related issues, the Ordinance formed a panel of Tacoma citizens to review the issues in depth and make recommendations to the City Council. What follows is the report from that panel of citizens.

Our general mission, the Panel agreed, was to:

Make recommendations to the City Council that the will:

- offer impacted neighborhood citizens clear, direct, and immediate ways to resolve issues related to those providing services of any kind to individuals displaying inappropriate public behaviors; and,
- avoid such problems in the future, or reduce their probability; and, as a result,
- improve the sense of safety and security in neighborhoods impacted by high risk/high needs behaviors.

### **KEY FINDINGS**

The Panel discovery process is explained in more detail in a later section. These Key Findings, and the discussion around them, led the panel to the Recommendations noted in the Executive Summary and are explained in more detail in the next section.

### **FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PROBLEM:**

1. Many high-risk/high-needs people live in neighborhoods where rents are more affordable; many programs and services locate in these areas for the same reason, in addition to the need to be close to the people they serve.

Too, it is a market reality that few residents in these areas have the financial muscle to marshal a successful legal challenge to placement of facilities in their neighborhoods.

Furthermore, successful and accessible programs require proximity to bus lines, governmental services, and other companion services that clients require.

But the Panel found that even good providers, who adhere to all best practices and consider the community around them, can have a negative neighborhood impact if too many are located within close proximity; there does appear to be a “tipping point,” after which problems become chronic.

The above factors suggest the following:

- programs and housing, if they are to be successful, will require additional financial assistance to disperse to higher cost areas;
  - dispersal of service programs without also dispersing their clients will likely make programs unsuccessful and leave more people un-served and more likely to be troublesome;
  - if dispersal is neither possible, legal, or even desirable, then the City’s focus should be on ensuring that services, organizations, and entrepreneurs operating in any neighborhood are competent and responsive to neighborhood concerns.
2. Facilities and programs independently operated and excluded from the moratorium play a large role in the problem of “too many high-risk, high-needs people” in close proximity within a neighborhood. These include, for example, landlords with multiple properties, independently negotiated release plans between felons and the Department of Corrections, faith-based “informal” programs, and services provided on property approved for non-conforming uses. The focus on formal and licensed programs is misplaced to the degree that the above are excluded from equal review. This is an issue with many interrelated parts.
  3. Part of the reason for the proliferation of “informal” service programs and entrepreneurial landlords may be a market reaction to underserved populations. In other words, because

Facilities and programs independently operated and excluded from the moratorium play a large role in the problem of “too many high-risk, high-needs people” in close proximity within a neighborhood.

professionally run non-profit organizations lack capacity and funding, lower-cost (and less well-run) options have appeared in the marketplace.

4. “High-risk” behaviors are not exclusive to high-needs individuals. In fact, many institutions and landlord entrepreneurs engage in “high risk” behaviors, some without realizing it, that jeopardize neighborhoods.

These include:

- Facilities or services inadequate for the population being served.
- Lack of a business plan, formal training, best practices, or long-term budget plan to serve those in need (“defacto” informal services or group facilities).
- No process to measure results of service.
- Lack of responsiveness to legitimate community concerns.
- Lack of accountability for tenants or clients; failure to screen tenants or conduct background checks; disregard for landlord/tenant laws
- Inadequate parking for services/clients, resulting in constant overflow into the neighborhood
- Inadequate maintenance of facilities/structures
- Failure to include or consider the surrounding neighborhoods in placement decisions regarding high-risk/high-needs individuals.

*For the above reasons, Panel members found it important to focus not just on program facilities or named groups of “high-risk, high-needs people,” but on the behaviors of all of the players in the mix.*

5. While high-risk behaviors do occur by landlords, program managers, and others as noted in number 3 above, the resulting behaviors of seen on the street are those that result in intimidation, embarrassment, and even fear in neighborhoods. They include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Public drunkenness or unlawful use of controlled substances

- Aggressive loitering/panhandling or publicly threatening behaviors
- Public nudity and/or urination
- Criminal activity such as buying/selling controlled substances, vandalism, theft, burglary, assault, prostitution or the solicitation of prostitution.

*Who are the people displaying these behaviors? They include the mentally ill, recently released felons on parole, those attempting to recover from alcoholism and/or drug addiction, the homeless or very low income people seeking food, shelter, and money, young people with multiple juvenile violations, and even, on occasion, seniors suffering dementia. Not all members of these “groups” display inappropriate behaviors, of course. But a few from each group do display such behaviors, and when services are in a concentrated geographical area, the negative public behaviors can become chronic in those neighborhoods.*

*Additionally, many of these “groups” are classes of people protected by federal laws (including the Federal Fair Housing Act) that can not be discriminated against in access to housing. Therefore, it is important that recommendations address high-risk behaviors, which can be regulated, rather than individual characteristics or demographics.*

6. Some tools currently available to the City are not being put to consistent use due to lack of staffing, or perhaps fear of a lawsuit. Such tools include the Chronic Nuisance Act. Some tools currently available to the City have well-known loopholes that have not been addressed, such as a landlord’s ability to continue to (mis)use a building as long as they continue to pay or appeal fines. Citizens are understandably frustrated by the City’s failure to consistently use existing mechanisms to address their concerns or to correct flawed mechanisms.

7. While the City has purchased several problem properties, the City itself has let many of them fall into further disrepair and is not maintaining its own properties. This, of course, appears to citizens as self-defeating.

<p>Some tools currently available to the City have well-known loopholes that have not been addressed ...</p>
--

8. Allowing non-conforming use of properties in areas of HR/HN concentration is a particular problem. These areas are typically older neighborhoods, and have far more properties that qualify for non-conforming use. Residential areas now surround many of these properties, and the ability to put the property to a non-conforming use is an additional burden to areas of HR/HN concentrations, particularly if things like group homes spring up in these properties.

#### **FACTORS INFLUENCING SOLUTIONS:**

1. The Panel agrees a number of assets are available to help resolve many of the issues, including: competent and concerned City staff; highly-regarded Community Liaison Officers (commissioned police officers, part of the Tacoma Police Department); active Neighborhood Councils; the Community Council; concerned and competent leadership in most local non-profit organizations operating in the affected areas; new and potentially creative Internet/On-line options; existing City laws, and, best practices from other areas dealing with similar issues.
2. In addressing the above issues, Panel members think it important to reward good behaviors, and not create barriers for persons and programs that are doing well. It is common to regulate (and overburden) the many to obtain responsiveness from the few; the Panel wishes to avoid over-regulation of well-run facilities and programs.
3. Currently the complaint process is scattered, occurs isolated in program/facility "silos," loses track of consistent problems, and contains no commonly understood grievance or arbitration process when disputes arise.

4. Being a person of low or limited income does not automatically qualify one as being high-risk/high need. Neither do all high-needs individuals engage in activities that are a risk to neighborhoods. Consistent with the above statements, affordable housing units, especially those that have qualified through Crime Free Housing programs and use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, are rarely part of the problem the Panel has been asked to address. In fact, if more housing followed these principles, a number of related problems would be mitigated.
5. While occasional problems with formal human services organizations (often non-profit providers) and the people they serve do occur, they are often quickly resolved. In fact, of all service providers in the neighborhoods in question, formal programs are usually the most responsive. However, when not quickly resolved, the lack of a Memo of Understanding (MOU) between the organization and local citizens, or the lack of a clear, consistent grievance process to resolve such issues in a timely manner, helps to aggravate and prolong issues and to discourage and anger citizens.
6. There is some concern that solving a problem in an area with concentrated services to high-risk/high-needs people may simply shift the problem elsewhere in the city. That is likely true, based on the City's experience with the Alcohol Impact areas. This suggests that some of the recommendations will need to be applied City-wide, perhaps with slight modifications to avoid over-burdening the many programs that are doing well.

*While shifting some of the services/issues to other areas is not necessarily desirable, the Panel remains concerned about the "chronic" problems occurring in areas that have reached a "tipping point" of too many high-risk/high-needs people and services. If shifting services/issues results in less chronic problems in high-risk/high-needs areas without resulting in*

*equally chronic problems elsewhere, perhaps that is part of an acceptable and reasonable “fair share” solution.*

7. Neighborhood citizens from other cultures and/or with English as a second language often have more difficulty and concerns about using government/police assistance, due to different (often negative) experiences in their former cultures. This can result in issues receiving fewer complaints from these areas, even though the neighborhood issues may be as severe, or more severe, than in other areas. Consequently, it is important to build in system sensitivities to this issue.
  
8. The term “Good Neighbor Agreement,” having been the center of a number of disputes in the past, now has a lot of negative baggage attached to it, despite all the good intentions surrounding the title. The recommendations suggest an alternative to create common understandings about how neighbors, programs, program managers, and landlords can work and live together in harmony.
  
9. It now appears Western State no longer releases many more persons into Pierce County than they take from Pierce County. Statistics from the Department of Corrections are less clear. Regardless, local “release coordination” at the community level, to mitigate impact on specific neighborhoods, would be helpful.

The term “Good Neighbor Agreement,” now has a lot of negative baggage attached to it ...

## THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT/THE CITY

There was common agreement that sacrificing neighborhoods is not an appropriate outcome of providing service to high-risk/high-needs populations; healthy neighborhoods are a vital City asset. They need to be safe and enjoyable places to live, work, and shop for all residents.

In a democracy, government is defined as citizens coming together for the common good, so an active role on the part of the City Government, on behalf of its citizens and neighborhoods, is encouraged, expected, and, by definition, a responsibility. Negative behaviors, in particular in areas of high-risk/high concentration, should be more aggressively challenged by the City.

The recommendations which follow outline a number of areas in which the City will need to take the lead.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Sense of the general Panel discussion:

*Overall, the Panel felt that the City must find a way to put “teeth” into its effort to mitigate the impact of concentrated high-risk/high-needs populations, services, and facilities in neighborhoods.*

*Panel members are aware that a concept identified as “overlay zones” is being considered by the Planning Commission, to identify areas of HR/HN concentration and perhaps design regulations specific to services in those targeted areas. Generally, Panel members agree this is important, and many of our recommendations do suggest enhanced efforts in areas of high-risk/high-need concentration.*

*As a way to facilitate an ongoing and updated inventory of facilities, Panel members believe the idea of a small one-time “location permit” should be considered for all new and existing service providers, formal or informal, including landlords with multiple properties within the targeted areas.*

### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO OFFER CITIZENS CLEAR, DIRECT, AND IMMEDIATE WAYS TO RESOLVE ISSUES IN AREAS OF HIGH-RISK/HIGH-NEED CONCENTRATION:**

1. Require a mandatory Memo of Understanding (see below for suggested items in the MOU) for all formal or informal HR/HN services, new and existing. This should include landlords with multiple properties within areas of HR/HN concentration, and all existing and new programs serving high-risk/high needs individuals. For good programs, this should be relatively pain-free, and many already have such agreements.

*Neighborhood citizens may initiate the MOU effort, and the process itself should be mutually developed (therefore taking on a customized look in different neighborhoods). While a name change from “Good Neighbor Agreement” for this document may seem Orwellian, in this case the Panel has concluded that such a change would be beneficial to facilitate progress and cooperation.*

*For landlords or other service providers experiencing consistent service calls to their properties in areas of HR/HN concentrations, the MOU requirement should become mandatory in whatever neighborhoods they decide to operate; the MOU requirement might be tied to a business license process. No MOU, no business license.*

A good Memo of Understanding should:

- ❖ Be customized to a specific program, landlord, or entity; localized/customized to the neighborhood;
- ❖ Be initiated by local citizens or the user of the property
- ❖ Be positive and cooperative in tone
- ❖ Be completed before occupancy whenever possible
- ❖ Clarify issues of confidentiality regarding those being served
- ❖ Encourage reasonableness on the part of neighbors and the entity
- ❖ Explain expected staffing levels and funding needs, if any, and how they are to be met
- ❖ Explain what program standards or best practices have been reviewed and incorporated into service, and how and by whom outcomes are measured
- ❖ Clarify expectations of residents' care and behavior consistent with mission of facility
- ❖ Discuss issues such as upkeep of the property, parking, tenant behaviors, house rules, hours of operation, and curfews, if any
- ❖ Contain a brief explanation of an ongoing plan to communicate with neighbors
- ❖ Identify expected action to be taken by neighbors and by facility owners/managers if problems arise
- ❖ Be posted, distributed, or otherwise communicated to the surrounding neighbors
- ❖ Be negotiated on behalf of neighbors by the Neighborhood Council, Safe Streets, or some other representative organization deemed acceptable by surrounding neighbors
- ❖ Identify the process for arbitration and grievance, perhaps a standard clause once such a process has been developed for City-wide use.

2. Establish a clear and consistent City-wide Grievance Procedure. The required MOU should help resolve issues locally. The Grievance Procedure should be the vehicle to use if this local process breaks down or is otherwise ineffective.

- The Grievance Process should include a common complaint input point at the local level (Neighborhood Councils?) and a consistent grievance follow-through process at levels above the neighborhoods, with a clear “final decision” point (such as the Dispute Resolution Center or another qualified entity).
- Complaints to Neighborhood Councils, Community Liaison Officers, Community Council, Safe Streets, Hill top Action Coalition, Tacoma Cares, 9-1-1, relevant Code Enforcement Officer reports, and neighbor complaints to specific program areas, should all also go to a central point for tracking.
- Complaints from areas with large populations of residents from other cultures and languages should be given particular priority, regardless of volume, as many from other cultures are often reluctant or fearful of reporting to the police or government. A few complaints or even a single complaint from these areas may indicate a severe problem.
- Community education on complaint processes and tools available to address concerns, while available through Tacoma Cares, needs further emphasis.

3. Make well-trained and community-connected Community Liaison Officers (commissioned officers of the Tacoma Police Department) an especially high priority in areas of HR/HN concentration.

- Well trained and community-connected Community Liaison Officers are vital to improved quality of life for residents living in HR/HN areas. The Community responds well to those CLOs who are well-trained and used appropriately.
- Conversely, citizens are frustrated by those few CLOs who use or are required to use CLO time for paperwork or other responsibilities which takes them out of neighborhood view.
- Many citizens fear confrontation with perceived uncooperative landlords, ineffective programs, and the resulting behaviors of people on the street. The availability of the CLO gives them an alternative contact who can address issues with the unspoken power of the uniform and badge. CLOs enhance the citizen perception of neighborhood safety, government responsiveness, and improves citizens overall perception of quality of life.
- Experienced CLOs familiar with a neighborhood, its residents and its issues, and having the confidence of its citizens, take *substantial* time to develop; CLOs new to a neighborhood require substantial time to develop citizen trust and achieve the highest level of effectiveness. Turnover among CLOs should take this issue into consideration.
- Because their mission is so directly tied to a specific neighborhood, some form of neighborhood input into the CLO evaluation process seems appropriate.

Make well-trained and community-connected Community Liaison Officers an especially high priority in areas of HR/HN concentration.

## RECOMMENDATIONS TO REDUCE PROBLEMS IN THE FUTURE, OR REDUCE THEIR PROBABILITY

1. The City should: put priority on maintaining its own properties in areas of HR/HN concentrations; close loopholes in existing laws relating to property use; use existing zoning, licensing, and other laws more aggressively in areas of HR/HN concentration; and, establish enhanced fees and license requirements within areas of HR/HN concentration.

- Increase fees substantially for calls to properties or for infraction of zoning or other requirements;
- Develop shorter timelines for corrective action and potential property take-over within the zone.
- Maintain higher fee structures for entrepreneurs who are consistent problems within areas of high-risk/high-need concentration, and who relocate; higher fees and shorter corrective timelines follow them to the new location, whether or not in areas of HR/HN concentration.
- Give response priority to areas of HR/HN concentration; we have allowed a chronic situation to develop, and now we must follow-through to begin fixing it.
- Search for and implement ways to create incentives for those complying and cooperating and providing excellent service.
- Establish permitting/licensing/notification processes for all types of groups homes in areas of HR/HN concentration.
- Require that programs or group services go through a peer review process of Program Standards Review if this is not part of their current funding requirements. This might occur through some combination of the existing city-wide Community Council and the local Tacoma/Pierce County Human Services Coalition (or some other appropriate group or collaborative). This review would include an assessment of “best practices,” intended outcomes,

evaluation processes, and long-term budget requirements. Again, for most well-run programs, this should be a relatively pain-free process, as they already take the identified steps as a matter of course.

2. Develop High-Risk/High Need Placement Coordination with all appropriate local, state, and federal programs through a community placement clearing house (for example, rather than “release plans” including a housing location negotiated only by state Department of Correction officials and the offender, the City, perhaps through staffing at Safe Streets or through the Community Council, would also be engaged and could require placement outside of the HR/HN Impact Zone). Appropriate consideration for confidentiality and protected groups should be incorporated.
  
3. Require landlords (and their families and business partners) with over a certain amount of properties within areas of HR/HN concentration to participate in the Crime Free Housing program; require them to ask about criminal background.

Create incentives for landlords who go through the Crime Free Housing program and implement Crime Prevention principles..

*Landlords with multiple (more than 3?) service calls to their accumulated properties, or with evictions (more than 1?) stemming from criminal activity during the past year, should be subject to MOU requirements, Crime Free Housing requirements, additional licensing and fee requirements, etc.*

*Create incentives for other landlords who go through the Crime Free Housing program and implement Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.*

4. Limit the use of the so-called “grandfather clause” that allows non-conforming use of property in areas of HR/HN concentration.

## **ADDENDUM #1**

### **The Process We Used**

The Council appointed specific individuals to the panel, representing a broad range of neighborhood, community, and human services interests. The panel met every other week from mid-July through September, then met weekly throughout October.

All meetings were open to the public. Public comments were encouraged. Staff input was also accepted. If a selected representative was unable to attend, an alternate was often sent representing the same organization and, like other public participants, their input was solicited.

Meetings were handled as “learning events.” Various organizations closely related to the matters at hand were asked to make presentations, and a dialogue was encouraged. Minutes were kept, and key points of discussion were saved. Occasionally the panel broke into smaller groups (also open to the public) to discuss issues related to a “learning area.” The groups then came back with reports. Those reports were presented and compared and contrasted to determine common themes and areas of consensus within that subject area. City staff assisting the panel also was occasionally asked to compile information from other cities dealing with the same issue.

We intentionally held off on making any recommendations until hearing from all sources in all learning areas, as we felt the issue (location of and service to high-risk, high-needs population) was a complex one with interacting dynamics. We did not want to “jump to conclusions” about recommendations without understanding the entire picture as best we could.

Finally, we revisited our learning points, clarifying and coming to consensus as much as possible with the knowledge at hand. We agreed on certain key issues to be included in this report.

One person wrote the draft report, with all drafts going back to all members and staff supporting the Panel for their comments, clarifications and recommendations for additions and deletions or changes. A draft was also sent to the Council for their input regarding issues needing clarity, and to the city’s Community Liaison Officers for their review and input (since they work daily with the community in the affected neighborhood areas). Common themes from the drafting input were incorporated into the report when the Panel agreed such input was vital. Three drafts were reviewed by the Panel before the report to the Council was finalized.

## **ADDENDUM #2**

### **Findings And Recommendations Addressing Specific Issues Raised In The Council Resolution**

The Council Resolution asked the Panel to specifically address questions related to the standards of care, quality assurance, and community relations. Below is a listing of the findings and recommendations (page number, numbered and/or lettered statement as it appears in the body of the document), as it relates to each question:

#### **Standards of Care:**

*See Executive Summary, page I, last paragraph*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 2, second-to-last paragraph, last bullet point*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 3, Number 3.*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing Solutions, page 5, Number 2, Number 3, Number 5.*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), Memo of Understanding, page 9, bullet points 7, 8, 9, 10.*

*See Recommendations (to reduce problems in the future), The City Should:, page 12-13, bullet point 7.*

#### **Quality Assurance (Accountability):**

*See Executive Summary, page I, last two paragraphs*

*See Executive Summary, Approaches to Recommendations, page II, first two paragraphs*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 2, Number 1, paragraphs four and five*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 3, Numbers 3, 4*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing Solutions, page 5, Number 2, 3, 5*

*See The Role of Government/The City, page 7, second paragraph, last line*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), page 8, 9, Memo of Understanding*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), page 10, City-wide Grievance Procedure*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), page 11, CLO Officers*

*See Recommendations (to reduce problems in the future), page 12, The City Should:*

**Community Relations:**

*See Background, page 1, second paragraph*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 2, Number 1, fourth paragraph; also, Number 2, final paragraph, same page*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 3, Number 4, 5*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Problem, page 4, Numbers 5, 6, 7*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Solution, page 5, Numbers 1, 3, 4, 5*

*See Key Findings, Factors Influencing the Solution, page 6, Numbers 7, 8, 9*

*See The Role of Government/The City, page 7, second paragraph, last line*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), page 8-9, Memo of Understanding*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), page 10, Grievance Procedure.*

*See Recommendations (to offer immediate ways to resolve issues), page 11, CLOs*

*See Recommendations (to reduce problems in the future), page 12, The City Should:*

*See Recommendations (to reduce problems in the future), page 13, Numbers 2, 3, 4*

### ADDENDUM #3

#### List of Members

#### REPRESENTATIVE

#### ORGANIZATION

Michael Mirra Walter Zisette, alternate	Affordable Housing Consortium
David Alger	Associated Ministries
Kevin Bovenkamp Anne Fiala, replacement Bob Pearson, alternate	Department of Corrections
Rose Lincoln Kristen Corning, alternate	Greater Tacoma Community Foundation
Jeanie Peterson James Collins, replacement	Hilltop Action Coalition
Pastor Lee Madison (St. Johns) Reverend James Payne, alternate	Ministerial Alliance
Darin Dressler	Neighborhood Council – District 1
Corinne Dixon Ralph Tomberg, alternate	Neighborhood Council – District 2
Phillip Brooke, Vice Chairman Jeanie Peterson, alternate	Neighborhood Council – District 3
Edwina Magrum Kathleen Paulson, alternate	Neighborhood Council – District 4
Darlene Picon Shana Johnny, replacement	Neighborhood Council – District 5
Robin Anderson Bobbie Jo Tarnecki, replacement	Pierce County Coalition for the Homeless
Tom Hilyard David Shirer, replacement	Pierce County Community Services
Robin Lester Gina Bruekleman, replacement	Pierce County Human Services Coalition
Paul Ellis Marty Campbell, alternate	Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber of Commerce
Rick Allen, Chairman	United Way of Pierce County

## ADDENDUM #4

### List of Presenters and Guests: (Alphabetical)

#### **PRESENTER**

Eileen Bisson, Chief

Stephen Green

Priscilla Lisicich, President

Bob Pearson

Andy Phillips

Alan Roberts, Lieutenant

#### **ORGANIZATION**

Pierce County Jail

P.C. Human Services, Regional Support  
Network

Safe Streets

Department of Corrections

Washington State Hospital

Tacoma Police Department

#### **GUESTS**

Troy Christensen

Micheal Clubb

Lisa Cook

Amanda Evans

Lisa Gordon

Jerry Guthrie

Sou Chee Hill

Lauren Karlin

Donald Lachman

Ed Mahon

Patty Moore

Rose Stidham

#### **ORGANIZATION**

PC Homeless Coalition

Community Corner, CCS/HAC

PC Homeless Coalition/Faith Homes

Continuum of Care

Nativity House

Peanut Butter & Jelly Ministries

Tacoma Catholic Worker

Lachman & Laing Consultants

Street Pulse/Nativity House

Street Pulse

PC Homeless Coalition