

Regular Council Meeting

RECEIVED

September 12, 2024

2024 SEP 11 AM 11:57

FRESNO CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF FRESNO
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE



Public Comment Packet

ITEM(S)

2-U (ID 24-1216)

***BILL B-29 - (Intro'd August 29, 2024) (For Adoption) - Adding Chapter 10, Article 24 To The Fresno Municipal Code, Authorizing Local Businesses To Enforce Private Property Rights Against Trespassers At Privately Owned Locations Open To The Public (Subject to Mayor's Veto)

Contents of Supplement: Public comment emails

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.

From:

Subject:

FW: public commnt 2-U

Date:

Wednesday, September 11, 2024 9:58:51 AM

From: Brandi Nuse-Villegas

Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2024 8:47 AM

To: Clerk

Subject: public commnt 2-U

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

In response to this ordinance, I assert that we need sustainable and more effective solutions to the complex issues brought forth, and there is a crucial foundation to addressing these concerns of businesses that we don't yet have in Fresno and that have been effectively implemented in other communities that would not be unfamiliar to you because the community has asked for them.

In addition to continuation identification of needed multifaceted support for local businesses that we want to thrive,, We need resources for de-escalation, crisis response, and conflict resolution to these issues as part of building resilient independent and thriving neighborhoods, using community resources that are best equipped to deal with these as well as other issues.

It is far more cost effective, beneficial, and transformative than criminalization efforts. For instance,there is CAHOOTS; there is also the Heart model in Hayward that the city implemented, and Mental Health First in Oakland as well as "The People's House"which provides holistic services. These are showing results.

Fresno Pacific University has a center based on restorative justice approaches, because there is data that shows that addressing issues this way is effective. We have resources and those with plans to draw from and find community based solutions that would work for our community and having those with lived experience at the table in these plan would be key to that success.

Having trained mediators, mental health professionals, those versed in conflict resolution and de-escalation who know how to work with the population, to respond to problems and incidents would not only address the matters at hand, but serve in relationship building that lead into aiding in getting services and more long term solutions for the individuals. We need to not be reactive, which not only would provide a temporary response, but may make the issues worse, as the FMCOC noted that criminalization further hinders efforts to get out of homelessness and into permanent situations. It is assumptive that those who would be affected don't want help. For the community, this means that the issue and needs behind it would not be addressed long term, just as the actions of HART has not decreased homelessness, in part due to how they have operated.

I am concerned about possible misabuse of this ordinance or use in ways than what the sponsors stated, and that concern is in part founded of the lack of accountability HART and it's common practices that are in violation of codes, including our own to give notice, store belongings, and 4th amendment rights by forcibly and coercively taking people's possessions, however vital, with no services offered. Practices that have actively impeded

people from getting out of homelessness, because they are taking IDs, paperwork, phones, as well as items that people need to turn their focus to replace, like food, medication, blankets, pet supplies, and so forth.

Even before the ordinance, people with nowhere to go have faced losing their belongings on public land this way, thus compelling them to move to other areas, including going on business property. They have nowhere to go.

As the sponsors felt the need to couch the narrative in the city as having “There’s plenty of help available in the city if people will take it,” I must respond that our experts who know well what is available, such as those with the FMCOC, have publicly stated that we DON’T have enough services, from shelters to treatment.

Thus, to the sponsors’ inference that those still out there are refusing to get services, and not taking accountability; not only this is not accurate, and a disservice to problem solving efforts, but also slanders those who ARE trying to navigate the system and do what they can to help themselves out of their situation, and are even timing back out from shelters. This includes those the city have stated, in proclamations and policies, that they want to protect, such as many domestic violence survivors who are made more vulnerable, elderly and disabled, families, and other constituents who have experienced whose voice should be heard to strategize effective solutions.

To Maxwell’s statement that Fresno is ‘hotbed for affordable housing,’ “while we are getting more desperately needed affordable housing: The city of Fresno’s housing element progress report for 2023 shows that as of now, we are 4,500 units short in extremely low and very low income housing alone, as determined by the California HCD, 9,000 short between extremely low and moderate income housing. Even with the progress that has been made, we are still severely short and the state has required that the city have a plan to meet these numbers in their Housing element.

Karbassi himself said in a news piece for ADUs regarding housing that “It’s definitely a supply problem. This will help with that, but we need more.”

There is rarely housing available for the unhoused and it needs to be noted that among affordable housing built, these units are not guaranteed to be available to those unhoused, as we also have housing needs among those at risk and others with low income who are housed.

If we don’t have housing, there is no stable place for those who seek and go into services. Again, Housing First needs to be pursued for services to be most effective. We have people going into treatment programs and graduating without housing to go into. We have people in the shelters being exited back onto the streets, regardless of how far they are in getting housing ready.

Focusing back on this ordinance though, we need to pursue comprehensive, well-tested community based conflict resolution and de-escalation approaches, increased investment of services, address safety and public well-being concerns transformatively and sustainably, as well as continued conversation of the needs of businesses.