

Encampment Monitoring Report

May 2017- September 2017

**Prepared by the Seattle Office for Civil Rights
October 26, 2017**



Seattle
Office for Civil Rights

BACKGROUND

Since 2008, the City of Seattle has adhered to a set of rules for removing unauthorized encampments lived in by people who are homeless. The Multi-Departmental Administrative Rules (MDAR 08-01), outlined a series of steps the City would take relating to notice, storage, and outreach prior to removing an unauthorized encampment. Beginning in August 2016 and lasting until the end of December, the Mayor's Office asked the Seattle Office for Civil Rights (OCR) to monitor all unauthorized encampment removals to ensure that the City followed MDAR 08-01.

In late 2016, Mayor Edward Murray's Office formed a task force to make recommendations on changes to the MDAR. New draft rules were published on January 31, 2017 and public comment was solicited. As a result, the new Multi-Departmental Administrative Rules (MDAR 17-01) went into effect on April 3, 2017. An additional rule, Finance and Administrative Services Encampment Removal Rule (FAS 17-01) was promulgated to provide guidance to City departments on how and when the City would remove unauthorized encampments. The new MDAR 17-01 directs all City departments to follow the FAS 17-01 Encampment Removal Rule when removing an encampment.

Additional changes to the way encampment removals are conducted was the creation of the City's Navigation Team and the use of the Emergency Operations Center as a central location for interdepartmental coordination. The Navigation Team is comprised of Seattle Police officers and REACH outreach workers contracted by the City to provide connections to services. An outreach coordinator on staff with the Finance and Administrative Services Department, is the point person for mental health issues and responsible for tracking outreach contacts and services provided. Field Coordinators, also on staff with Finance and Administrative Services, provide on the ground coordination ahead of and on the day of removals. A program manager with Finance and Administrative Services and an SPD lieutenant are responsible for overall team and scheduling coordination.

On April 25, 2017, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) signed a new Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Finance and Administrative Services and the Human Services Department to provide high-level oversight to ensure the City is following MDAR 17-01 and FAS 17-01. The MOA states, "The Seattle Office for Civil Rights will provide high-level oversight to ensure the City is following the Multi-Departmental Administrative Rules (MDAR 17-01), the Finance and Administrative Rule (FAS 17-01) and other adopted policies pertaining to removing unauthorized encampments as they may change from time to time." OCR conducts its assessment through two monitors who observe whether and how protocol is adhered to at a site. This includes reviewing notice postings, observing outreach with residents and observing storage processes. Under the current MOA, if the required elements of the MDAR or FAS rule are not met, OCR has the authority to halt the cleanup and removal efforts. Unlike the 2016 MOA, where OCR monitors were required to be at every removal of an unauthorized encampment, the 2017 MOA calls for random site visits and high-level oversight. The MOA stipulates OCR will review monthly operational reports and encampment removal data, conduct interviews with encampment cleanup personnel, outreach staff, and residents, and issue semi-annual reports on our observations, findings and recommendations.

This report is the first of two OCR will publish for 2017. This first report is intended to highlight initial observations to date. A final report will follow up on these observations, include any additional areas of inquiry and our recommendations.

METHODOLOGY

The report is based on observations made by visiting 16 encampment sites including 9 removals of encampments between May 12, 2017 and September 26, 2017. We aimed to visit sites that represented a breadth of types, including encampments with large numbers of people residing as well as smaller encampments, diversity in location throughout the city, sites deemed emphasis areas¹, and sites where only outreach was taking place ahead of a removal. During these visits, monitors spoke with residents and City staff. In addition, we reviewed daily site journals of encampment removals created by the Navigation Team and data on outreach collected by REACH. Appendix A provides a list of encampment sites visited and a summary of monitor's field notes.

SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE

OCR monitored 12 encampment sites between May and September of 2017 and found that the removals complied with the new rules governing encampment removals. To date in 2017, OCR has not had to halt a removal. Monitors noted increased coordination and stated that compliance is likely due to the interdepartmental configuration of the Navigation Team, the hiring of Field Coordinators, and the use of the Navigation Team's site journals to document that staff are following protocol.

AREAS OF CONCERN

Our monitor's observations on the ground as well as conversations with City staff and outreach workers led to the identification of a few areas of concern related to the FAS and MDAR rules that would benefit from additional exploration. These are as follows:

Issue #1. Storage retrieval options not always deemed effective.

Monitors observed adherence to the rules relating to storage, and heard from REACH staff that on many occasions FAS went to great lengths to store items. However, monitors also reported learning about potential unintended consequences regarding the ability of individuals to retrieve their belongings following a removal from an encampment. At one location people living in the encampment reported to monitors that the new option of having items that had been placed in storage during a removal, delivered to them upon request, was not an option that worked. They stated this was the case because not every person has a phone to call for their items and those with phones have a limited number of minutes per month needed to maintain services. They also stated that some people living in encampments have felt afraid to inform City staff of their new location after removal for fear that the new location will be targeted for removal in the future. We understand that FAS will be applying a Racial

¹ FAS Rule 17-01 defines an emphasis area as: "an identifiable area where the City has removed an encampment and has designated an encampment-prohibited area by installing signage as provided for in Section 13." The City in some cases installs fencing around these areas and the FAS rule states that once an area has been designated as such, and residents provided storage and notified, the area will be visited once a day by the City. The rule states that after this time, "Individuals camping in an Emphasis Area and their encampment-associated personal property may be removed as an obstruction." Personal property encountered under an obstruction must comply with procedures described in Section 4 of FAS Rule 17-01.

Equity Toolkit analysis to the encampment monitoring process. Ensuring that those living in encampments have an opportunity to talk about the challenges and benefits of different procedures related to storage, may assist in refining the rules to be most effective.

Issue #2. Under the City’s current response to encampments, people are leaving a location quickly and at times without appropriate shelter options.

Monitors noted that compared to 2016, encampment removals are now conducted with numerous staff, creating a strong City and police presence. At many removals visited, most of those who had been living there had departed before the day of the removal, with those remaining often being the elderly and others who are particularly vulnerable and who couldn’t leave as quickly without appropriate shelter. One resident at Spokane and Airport Way reported on July 11, 2017 that having to pack up all their belongings to move to another location can be very difficult and time consuming, particularly for those with disabilities. In another instance, a pregnant woman and her partner who was camping under the Aurora Bridge when a removal occurred on 8/11/17 had housing starting on 8/15/17 and needed assistance for the next four nights. There was dialogue about putting them in a motel so they could stay together until their housing option was available. The woman reported to the OCR monitor that she was told she would have to prove her pregnancy. FAS informed us that the woman was four months pregnant and that because the staff that worked with her could not visibly tell she was pregnant, required some assurance the shelter option of the motel was needed.

OCR reviewed the data collected by REACH on their outreach activities related to encampment removals. Since January of this year, 613 residents declined the offered shelter options, and another 375 residents were ineligible. Combined, the data shows that approximately 79% of residents over this period either declined or were ineligible for the offered shelter alternatives. Reasons for the declines included not wanting to be separated from the group or from a loved one, access to nearby services at their current location, a previous negative experience in a shelter, and having a condition that made it harder to stay in a shelter, such as PTSD. Reasons for ineligibility included having a criminal history, being barred due to a past incident, a lack of identification, owning a pet, or having issues with substance abuse. At one location on May 4, 2017, REACH reported: *“One person was interested in going to the Tiny Houses, but does not have ID and cannot get cleared by the Nav officers because of criminal charges and warrants. The available encampment bars most of the people who are drinking or using here.”*

The City has implemented numerous alternative housing options in 2017. Our monitoring has occurred while some of these options were already made available and while others were just opening. The new 100-bed Compass Center operated by Compass Housing and located at the First Presbyterian Church on First Hill became operational on August 30, 2017. On July 12 of this year, the Navigation Center opened in the Pearl Warren Building. The Navigation Center holds space for 75 people and is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The goal of the Navigation Center is to bring adults living outdoors into the Center and work to transition them to stable housing within 30 days. People can stay up to 60 days with a case by case decision made on requests for longer stays. The Navigation Center and Compass Center provide daily vacancy availability to the Navigation Team for real-time referrals. In addition to the Navigation and Compass Centers, the City also established six authorized encampments for unsheltered people: Ballard – Nickelsville, Camp Second Chance – Myers Way, Georgetown Village, Interbay – Tent City 5, Licton Springs Village, and Othello Village. These authorized encampments were created for unsheltered people with significant barriers to transitioning into shelter. While these efforts are major steps towards addressing the specific needs of those who are unhoused and living outdoors, the spaces

are either completely full or with very limited space left. A gap currently exists in the availability of appropriate shelter options for people living in encampments.

People living in encampments also relayed difficulties in accessing services being offered. Some of the reasons given were because they are undocumented immigrants, transgender, non-English speaking, not Christian, or that some services require sobriety. Some individuals relayed experiencing theft or violence at shelters. Other concerns were that some shelter options are far from services they receive and others reported concerns regarding incidents of bedbug outbreaks at some shelters.

While referrals to shelter are being made, it is unclear whether an institutional mechanism exists to ensure that those being removed from an encampment are moving towards housing stability. In 2016, as the City prepared to undergo the development of new rules pertaining to the removal of unsanctioned encampments, it issued the *Bridging the Gap to Pathways Home* report. The report described the efforts that would occur during the interim period when the City's new Pathways Home approach to address homelessness was being developed. The report stated that its efforts, including the development of new rules pertaining to the removal of encampments, would be guided by the principles defined by the Taskforce on the Cleanup of Unsanctioned Encampments. Two of these principles included:

2. When it is necessary to disband an encampment, all occupants will be offered a safe and appropriate shelter option.

3. Low-barrier (person-centered), housing-focused shelter must be expanded, as well as permanent housing options (buildings and rent assistance), to meet the threshold of offering "safe and appropriate" housing or shelter for all.

The final rule that was adopted pertaining to alternative shelter, FAS 17-01 requires the availability and offering of alternative locations or housing for homeless residents prior to removing an encampment. FAS 17-01 (7.1) states in part that *"the alternatives shall be available to the encampment occupant starting on the date an encampment removal notice is posted and shall continue to be available until the encampment removal is completed. The City shall maintain, or cause to be maintained, a daily list of alternatives, which list shall be shared with FAS and outreach staff."* The administrative rule as written, does not require that the shelter is low-barrier and appropriate for the many of the individuals who are unhoused and living outdoors. Monitors have heard from people living in encampments and REACH workers alike, that a common problem with the alternative housing and shelter options is that those options were often not suited for, and therefore inaccessible to, a given population. On 5/12/17 at the I-90 and Dearborn location (an outreach-only visit) and on 5/23/17 at Dean and Poplar, monitors noted that some individuals did not accept services because they were primarily shelters that had barriers for a person with substance abuse disorders.

Whether it's a person dealing with substance abuse, couples preferring to remain together, people with pets, people with criminal histories, or people barred from shelter for behavior stemming from mental or behavioral health reasons, low-barrier shelters are an option that many will accept. Outreach workers noted that once the Navigation Center and other low-barrier options opened, a greater number of people living in encampments were accepting shelter. As the low-barrier shelter spaces fill up, OCR will continue to monitor whether people are able to successfully move from an encampment into appropriate shelter. It is our understanding from REACH that they currently have access to only few and on some days no, low-barrier or appropriate options to refer a person to. While the City is not under

a stated obligation to provide appropriate shelter options for people with barriers to traditional shelters, having these options makes a tremendous difference in moving people from living outdoors into safer conditions. Without an adequate supply of appropriate housing options, we may simply be moving people from one outdoor encampment to another.

Issue #3. Designation of an encampment as a priority for removal has at times appeared opaque and can lead to human service concerns not being given appropriate weight.

FAS 17-01 Section 5.1 describes prioritization of encampment sites for removal. The rule explains that encampment sites shall be prioritized for removal after an inspection of the location, and provides a list of eight factors to consider when prioritizing: (1) objective hazards such as moving vehicles and steep slopes; (2) criminal activity beyond illegal substance abuse; (3) quantities of garbage, debris, or waste; other active health hazards to occupants or the surrounding neighborhood; (5) difficulty in extending emergency services to the site; (6) imminent work scheduled at the site for which the encampment will pose an obstruction; (7) damage to the natural environment of environmentally critical areas; and (8) the proximity of homeless individuals to uses of special concern including schools or facilities for the elderly.

While the rule states that encampment sites must be inspected and prioritized according to a list of factors, it does not explain how that prioritization process should be conducted, how to weigh the various factors, or who makes the final decision. Staff from Finance and Administrative Services indicated that in practice the program manager and other managers responsible for oversight of the Navigation Team make the decision. The determination is made on the set of factors outlined in the rule and they base their determination on information from Field Coordinators, information from police, the Fire department or other City personnel who may encounter a situation, or from the public who contact the City via the Customer Service Bureau.

Staff from REACH shared that it has not always been clear why one site has been deemed a priority over another when a site appears relatively clean and the removal may cause greater harm to residents living there. In one instance, REACH relayed that they had repeatedly raised concerns regarding the danger of an encampment situated above Interstate 5. They knew the individuals living there were experiencing substance abuse disorders and the location was such that the individuals living there could easily fall and hurt themselves and potentially others. They were told the site was on WSDOT property and that the City was unable to prioritize it. After many attempts to stress their concerns, the site is now on the schedule to be removed in October. This is an example where transparency regarding site prioritization can lead to ensuring human service and safety concerns are given strong consideration. FAS has responded to OCR that the site was not scheduled earlier because reaching the location would require the closure of the express lanes, the use of ropes to climb into the area, and fall protection training for staff. Nonetheless, transparency in site prioritization and communication would have ensured the team was aware of why other sites were moved ahead on the list and ensured team members who were raising human service concerns felt their concerns were heard and understood. OCR will continue to track how sites are prioritized and whether there are mechanisms to ensure greater transparency and understanding of the process.

Issue #4. The structure of the Navigation Team could allow for greater institutional accountability to ensure those who are unhoused and living outdoors are on a pathway to stable housing. A question remains whether the City's response to addressing homeless encampments should be led by the department responsible for the City's finance and real estate services or rather by the City's department responsible for addressing homelessness.

The Navigation Team is comprised of the Seattle Police Department, staff from the Finance and Administrative Services Department and outreach case managers from REACH who are contracted by the City. While REACH staff participate under a contract administered by the Human Services Department (HSD), HSD is not institutionally a part of the Navigation Team and the team is managed at a high level by the Department of Finance and Administrative Services. The absence of HSD as a leader of the Navigation Team and the City's response to encampments, has led to the following identified issues:

1. HSD's expertise working with vulnerable populations is not at the table.

Privacy concerns. FAS management relayed to OCR that REACH no longer provides the Navigation Team with outreach reports taken in the field. FAS stated that while REACH used to provide these notes, the practice stopped when REACH staff found their outreach reports had been posted to the City of Seattle's website. The outreach reports contained identifying information of residents, their locations and where they would be going to next. According to FAS, some but not all, of the information had been redacted. This breach in confidential data, when discovered by REACH, was removed immediately. When we inquired with REACH about it, they stated the issue highlighted the problem with having the Navigation Team housed within FAS. They stated that HSD is an expert at dealing with sensitive data. In response to this incident FAS provided training to staff on how to handle confidential data and REACH has gone back to providing weekly outreach reports to the City. However, REACH has said it will no longer provide the City with access to any identifying information of individuals.

Case Management. Removals are at times scheduled for Saturdays, days when REACH staff are not available. We have been told that on Saturday removals, SPD provides outreach. Monitors reported that a notable response improvement from 2017 included the change from precinct-based officers responding to a site to utilizing trained community police. Monitors reported observing the officers engage with the residents in a respectful manner and aid the residents where they were able. At the same time, use of police officers in place of trained social workers also brings with it a set of issues that should be explored. The use of a uniformed police officer to do outreach, even if trained to work with vulnerable populations, can cause a lack of trust, particularly to those with prior criminal justice involvement or with communities who have been disproportionately impacted by the criminal-legal system. The Human Service Department is well-situated to explore these questions and ensure the City's response to encampments includes appropriate case management support.

2. There is a need for a greater connection between the daily work of the Navigation Team and the City's targeted efforts to address homelessness.

The Navigation Team coordinates with HSD staff, ensuring outreach workers are aware of beds open at shelters and other services for those facing removal of an encampment. At

the same time, a sustained approach is needed and will benefit from ensuring the department responsible for long-range planning on how to address homelessness is also involved on the ground in the daily work of the Navigation Team. This would allow for a direct pipeline allowing the department to share its expertise while connecting the City's response to encampments with the City's overall plans to address homelessness.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF SITE VISITS

Date	Location	Summary of Notes
5/12/2017	I-90 and Dearborn – under overpass	Outreach only not removal. Staff provided ID services, shelter, and housing assessments. According to REACH staff, a lot of people experiencing substance abuse issues at this site. One resident stated he’s been moved 4 times now but refused tiny house due to lack of shower/laundry services. One resident stated alternative placements are being offered, but not appropriate since not close to services and hard to get to. Also stated some residents not interested in treatment, shelter. Another resident proposed that homeless residents be hired to work at Navigation Center on opening.
5/23/2017	Dean and Poplar	Large number of residents had left before removal. About 33+ people present. More residents accepting shelter/housing. Tiny houses seem to be especially popular. Some housing options rejected due to being clean-only. Very large staff presence. All Nav Teams present, SPU, SDOT, Parks and Cascadia all present for clean-up, approximately 8-10 dump trucks standing by. Large police presence. At least 6-8 SPD vehicles present.
6/9/2017	1500 9 th Ave	It did not appear that a removal had occurred at this site. No updates received regarding the site prior to arrival there. Informed by REACH after that the sole camper had left, removal had been cancelled.
6/22/2017	Under I-5 at E Shelby and E Gwinn	No removal took place. The updated Operations schedule for the week showed it had last been updated June 19. However, the Nav Team schedule for June 12-30, updated on June 16, showed a different schedule for June 22 than the more updated Operations schedule. Informed afterward that the more recent schedule was incorrect.
7/12/17	Dearborn from 9 th to 10 th , under I-5	No residents present. REACH reported that most residents just leave now when the crews arrive to begin a removal. Some referrals made to new Navigation Center. REACH reported concern about subjectivity of process and authority in designating obstructions and hazards. Also reported difficult to work with residents, provide services when a resident agrees to services, but is then told they must leave. Creates situations where REACH loses track of residents who already accepted help but didn’t take alternative housing, and have to track them down again.
7/21/17	Spokane and Airport Way to 1 st	Not a removal. Monitor arrived at 8:45am, no outreach workers or SPD present. Monitor stayed on-site until approximately 10:15am, but never encountered outreach. The area was very clean. Spoke with two residents. 1 Latino male, and 1 white female. Male thinks the city should designate a large area, set up plots for homeless residents. Also thinks more project/tiny houses needed, running water and other services provided. Female stated she’d been there about 5 weeks, hadn’t moved.

		<p>before. Feels most residents in that area stay there because they're like family. She said a major problem w/ removals is that it breaks up the family, forces people to split up. Also said they keep area very clean, doesn't understand why City won't let them stay there. Thinks that if the City plans to continue w/ cleanups, should provide volunteers to help residents move. Can be very difficult, time consuming, especially for disabled.</p>
7/31/17	S Jackson St (800- 900 block - along I-5)	<p>No residents present upon arrival. Residents had left night before or early morning. REACH had been present earlier, had already left due to lack of residents.</p>
8/10/17	Harborview Emphasis Area	<p>Approx. 4 residents at the site. Spoke with a white male resident, age approx. 30-35. Had accepted services, was going to Nav Center. Resident understood why City wants to clean, doesn't understand why City can't clean while leaving people in place. Expressed that trash receptacles and portable toilets would be very helpful. Trash disposal is often far away from camping locations, difficult to reach to dispose of garbage.</p> <p>REACH reported they felt it was falling on them when residents refused services, still needed to move. Also reported not enough appropriate housing. Reported that residents not cycling out of tiny houses, at least partly due to not enough available permanent housing, resulting in tent overflow which homeless residents have been rejecting. REACH doesn't feel it is leading to permanent housing.</p> <p>REACH also reported they don't have a lot of authority to advocate for not removing a specific site, and that residents end up circulating around, not leading to effective housing solutions. They stated that sites slated for removal seem driven by public and business complaints, rather than cleaning up hazardous areas or helping most vulnerable people, and that not enough weight was being given to residents' situations.</p>
8/11/17	Troll Bridge (Winslow Ave N & Bridge Way N)	<p>Residents included 3 women and 2 males: included: 1 multi-racial couple/female pregnant, 1 older male, 1 elder woman and one middle aged woman. The monitor reported that the navigation team was hesitant to speak with them. One Navigation team member mentioned that a call had come down to do this encampment removal the day before (8/10/17) because there was a community event happening on Saturday (8/12/17). This removal was not on the original Navigation Team calendar. OCR received the site journal the morning of 8/11/17 and the site was included in the updated calendar that went out the afternoon of 8/11/17.</p>

		<p>A pregnant woman and her partner had housing starting on Tuesday (8/15/17) and needed assistance for the next four nights. There was dialogue about putting them in a motel so they could stay together until their housing option was available, if they could prove her pregnancy.</p> <p>Bio Management NW, a newly contracted clean-up crew, reported that most of the crew did not have stainless steel boots and were feeling unsafe due to the large number of syringes at the site.</p>
8/25/17	Ballard Commons Park (5701 22 nd Ave NW)	<p>Outreach-only event. Scheduled for removal 8/28/17. The Site Journal indicated site characteristics (part of what goes into determination of priority) to be a park and a rented location, garbage, open alcohol and property damage. The monitor reported the site appeared clean (limited trash & no needles observed), close to services, the Ballard Clinic is nearby and the church next to the park does provide services to those without housing and in need. All three resident couples were on waitlists for housing. There were limited to no shelter options for couples at this time.</p> <p>REACH reported they had a hard time visiting sites multiple times prior to removals due to the constantly changing Removal Calendar. Also makes it extremely difficult to develop relationships and trust with residents when the removal calendar and therefore the outreach efforts consistently change.</p> <p>REACH is often told last minute or after the fact when the schedule changes. The communication regarding calendar changes and new priority sites is poor. REACH also reported a large concern that priority sites are being determined on a complaint based system. Both REACH and residents stated the 60-day exit protocol for the Navigation Center was unrealistic, as there are both institutional barriers and ill-informed perceptions that make this timeline impossible for many. Many programs (getting an ID, food stamps, housing vouchers, etc.) take time to process and the idea that residents can call for services assumes they a) have a telephone and b) have unlimited minutes if they do have a phone.</p>
8/29/17	4048 Pasadena NE	<p>There was only one tent and resident observed. The area set for removal for tomorrow was rather large (from NE 40th St to NE 42st St on both sides of Pasadena PI NE). There was some trash close to NE 42nd St but more than 75% of the area designated for removal was very clean.</p>

		It is unclear why this location would be high on the removal list. FAS later indicated (email received 8/30) that this removal was changed to a litter pick-up. WSDOT was to be repairing fences at the site (see below).
8/30/17	42 nd and Pasadena Place NE	Arrived at the site approx. 8:45am. Upon arriving the monitor received an email from FAS indicating that the removal had been cancelled and converted to a litter pick-up. There were no structures present and no residents. The site was divided into two main areas, one on the hillside under I-5 on the west side of Pasadena, and a hidden area on the east side of Pasadena. The Field Coordinator indicated he would put whatever materials he could into storage.
9/6/17	I-5 SB Exit at James St	The date on the notice did not match the Site Journal submitted to OCR or the calendar provided to OCR. Monitor spoke with WSDOT staff who were onsite to do electrical work separate from the removal. The two sites scheduled for removal today (according to the Navigation calendar provided) had no one there from the Navigation team. Monitor went to both sites twice over the course of an hour and twenty minutes to see if the start time had been adjusted. The posting for the James St site had yesterday's date on it and according to residents, the City came yesterday to do the removal.
9/11/17	Western and Bell	2 females and 2 males (vacated before arrival). REACH had been to the site multiple times and ¾ of residents accepted shelter. All residents had vacated or were packing when removal began. REACH had visited multiple times and were able to transport people to shelters.
9/26/17	316 Florentia St	All residents had vacated before today's removal and it became a litter pick-up only. At most, two tents were reported. The site was in woods behind a funeral home on the SW side of the Fremont Bridge. The site had a large amount of debris/trash and some needles.

9/27/2017	40th and Pasadena Place NE	<p>There were two residents present, both white males. Both were in the process of packing up and leaving. REACH stated most of the other residents had all left. REACH was going to transport to shelter at Nav Center or Gossett Place. REACH stated they have been very busy lately with encampment cleanups and outreach. Stated that as more shelter/housing options have become available, have been more appropriate and more residents are accepting. REACH stated the situation began to improve once the Nav Center opened. Confirmed items would be stored. Confirmed most residents had left, remaining were leaving to go to shelter. The Monitor witnessed Field Coordinator working with REACH and residents to store belongings, get residents to shelter.</p>
-----------	----------------------------	--