

Roberts, Karin

From: angela jernejcic <ajernejcic@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 6:27 PM
To: EBCC; Stannert, Kyle
Subject: Ajernejcic_BellevueLUCAstatement_111319.pdf
Attachments: Ajernejcic_BellevueLUCAstatement_111319.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Hi there,

My name Angela Jernejcic; i'm at Wednesday night's EBCC meeting. currently signed in to speak 2nd on the Tent Encampment LUCA, but need to leave at 7:30pm due to a prior engagement in Seattle. I'm emailing my statement for the record just in case I don't get the chance to actually speak before leaving. It's quite a full house here!

FYI, I also tried emailing this PDF to the TentEncampmentLUCA@bellevuewa.gov several times but it was rejected every time. Not sure what I'm doing wrong...

Manythanks for reading and for your consideration, Angela Jernejcic

Opening statement:

I've lived in my Bellevue residence since 2013. I've attended several city council meetings regarding the Tent encampments (specifically regarding camps at TBT), as well as participated in a city-sponsored months-long attempt at meditation between TBT and the immediate neighborhood. Nothing actionable came out of that effort.

I feel like the City of Bellevue is kowtowing to TBT + the religious orgs because the city very much wants to avoid a new lawsuit with TBT + the religious orgs. Some of the religious orgs have access to resources neighbors / neighborhoods do not, such as funds to hire lawyers, or lawyers in the congregation handling the matter pro bono. It is difficult for concerned neighbors + communities to mount a serious defense or even effectively engage in legitimate discourse against such resources. Our only recourse are the three minutes each person is allowed to speak at the various city + public hearings, as well as emailing our comments + thoughts to the city online. 3 minutes at a city council meeting is hardly enough time to make a substantive argument on such a complex issue.

Undoubtedly, much money has been spent on planning for Bellevue's growth. It seems like the city has tunnel vision on bringing those to fruition at any cost - even if it means ignoring the concerns of its current citizens. These city council meetings do not feel like a starting point for a serious, on-going, meaningful dialogue between citizens and city council regarding the encampments. The public speaking during the city council meetings feel like something the city council must sit and listen to before they continue to go about whatever plans the city already has in the works.

OVERALL CONCERNS:

1. **Public meetings + notifications need to happen WELL BEFORE the city allows a permit to be issued.** Community notifications should be placed in an area-relevant publication (example: local newspapers and the blue sheets of city plans the city mails out from time to time). We don't live in Seattle proper, and likely find little value in reading the ST. Therefore, a meeting notice in the Seattle Times won't sufficiently raise awareness in an outlying neighborhood such as Bellevue. An announcement in our weekly local paper or via mail would be much more effective... but perhaps the city wishes for a low turnout for these events.
 - a. Public meetings allow the host to hear their communities' concerns BEFORE the encampment moves in, allowing the host to be proactive in constructing the framework policies that the city requires.
 - b. The meetings should be considered an opportunity for the potential host to disseminate info not only about the camp timing + policies, but about how the host plans to handle any community concerns / problems that arise while the

- c. encampment is present (if they affect the neighborhood). The host should relay specific info at this meeting - such as name of point person at Host org and their contact info, when to expect a response that your complaint has been acknowledged, how it will be followed up, and hopefully how it will be resolved.

2. New proposed length of stay is a proposed 120 days; up 30 days from the current 90 day allowable stay. **IF that's the case, then the 365-day countdown until the next stay should NOT begin on the first day of the camp's stay, as the Church Council would prefer.** IF the City of Bellevue is conceding to the Church councils to allow a longer stay, then a concession should be made in the community's favor: the 365 day countdown between current stay and next stay should start on the LAST day of the camp.

3. I've read the 20.30U.131 Time limits section, which address merely the top line of my following concerns. **No where is it detailed what specific recourse neighbors have if something goes awry in the encampment / neighborhood, and the host fails to make a good-faith attempt to remedy the situation.** What violations, events, or series of events are cause for permit revocation? Should there be a "three-strikes-and-you're out" for hosts? Meaning, if the host fails multiple times to sufficiently acknowledge or attempt to remedy a problem, that is one strike against the host. These "strikes" or adverse events would need to be tracked and entered into the official city record with the corresponding host's permit.

4. Similar to above point, **each host should be required to present to the meeting attendees the specific procedures detailing how an escalation of events would be handled (along with host parties' relevant names and contact information).** This way, if something should occur at the encampment, neighbors and encampment residents are aware of what to expect in regards to investigation/due process and that an effort is being made to resolve the situation.

5. **What outside source verifies the hosts' + camps' Code Of Conduct meets city standards** - and that the Code of Conduct is indeed being enforced? During the last encampment stay @ TBT there was an OD resulting in a death. Illegal drugs were involved. Obviously against the code of conduct. How can we the public be sure the policies are being enforced?

6. **Results of sex offender / warrant checks should be shared with the local PD to address and verify that the checks have indeed been done.** This way, it ensures the

11.13.19 // comments for the EBCC public hearing on the City of Bellevue LUCA resolution
checks are completed and that actionable items can be handled BEFORE the encampment moves in.

Page 3

7. Ideally, hosts would hold mandatory monthly meetings open to the neighborhood for the duration of the camps' stay. The meetings would provide a community forum for neighbors to raise concerns - if any / necessary. These meetings would go a long way towards engendering goodwill within the neighborhood, and reassure neighbors that the Host + camps are listening, instead of allowing resentments and problems to build up, fester, and explode.

8. Post-stay public meetings held by the host should be mandatory. These meetings would encourage on-going dialogue of what procedures worked and what didn't work during the encampment's stay. People on all sides could share their "Lessons Learned" for future stays of encampments within neighborhoods. Again, these meetings should be announced in appropriate local forums - not the Seattle Times. Mailing letters to residents within the 600-ft range of the encampment should be required.

9. Issuing a permit valid for 5 years without any interim review of the camp / hosts is far too lengthy of a time. 2-3 years seems more appropriate. Neighborhoods are dynamic entities, evolving faster than ever due the large amount of growth in the Seattle area. Each communities' needs + concerns evolve as the community changes. This must be taken into consideration. Also, management of the host orgs or encampments can change over the course of a year or two — or every year. These issues need to be considered when looking at longer time frames. A new permit application should be absolutely required if there is a management change at either the host org OR the encampment.