Public comment on Sammamish Draft Ordinance No. 02014 and background issues and documents

From Karen Morris 15788 NE 4th St. Bellevue WA 98008

Received by Code Compliance

I attempted to meet with your planning department in February, but was not successful. I did a short public comment at the City Council meeting on June 3. I finally met with Carl de Simas a couple of weeks ago and left a couple of documents with him. We agreed I should probably write comment to put them in context and provide more information.

First of all, I come from a unique perspective compared to the others I have heard or read. I have experienced 4 TC4 stays in close proximity to my own house, and a 5th a short distance away. This allows me to speak from direct knowledge on how such encampments are experienced by the neighbors. And you can believe me when I say that it is a far different experience for us than it is for the church members and helpers. They would have you believe that is because we don’t think or behave correctly. They visit, experience the short term image and go home. We live the reality 24-7. It is not the same thing. And with all due respect, it is not their place to critique how we think or act. We are not their congregants. They may choose to act on “faith” and trust. We can choose to be more pragmatic.

From the beginning, as with you, they told us a story about their operations that was frankly just too good to be believable, especially since they had developed no data of any kind to back it up. 10 years later they still have no real data, and they have a lot of excuses for why. But it makes no sense, since keeping such data would help them get things they want, and create the opportunity for more effective funding. After years of observation and data collecting of my own I have come to the conclusion that they keep no data because it would not back up their story if they did. The churches and their advocates choose to accept their claims and procedures on faith and trust them completely, even when they have broken that trust. But you are not churches or advocates, you are government officials, who have a responsibility to make prudent decisions based on logic and as much factual information and data as you can get. You have the heavy responsibility of the protection of the public health, safety and welfare of all concerned, community members and encampment members alike. It is a difficult job, and I wish you well with it.

I have gone through the draft ordinance and find it to be quite good in general. There are a few items I would like to comment on or suggest some changes to:

First, Section 4 (1) Since the whole basis for allowing these host to be permitted in this use is interpretation of their rights to religious expression, it follows that an organization or entity without such a right to religious expression would not have the same basis, and would have to follow the same zoning regulations as the rest of us.

Section 4 (2) Duration and frequency I understand you are being pressured to extend this to 4 months, and a claim is being made that this should be done to somehow facilitate things for TC4. They are also implying this would be some sort of compromise. But you have already
compromised, since other Temporary permits, including the first one you issued are for 60 days maximum. You need to balance their convenience with the inconvenience to the surrounding community. 90 days is a better balance, and has been working for other jurisdictions. I can tell you from experience that some locations will be pressured to host when surrounding schools are not in session, and 4 months would make that impossible. Also, an encampment “contains” a site until the last day of its stay, so the 18 month interval should be calculated from that.

4 (4) It is good to require the neighborhood meeting to take place before the application, as this will give the neighbors the chance to have substantive input. However, since management security measures is undoubtedly the most important thing for them to have input into, that should not be finalized before their meeting takes place, or there should be another meeting or formalized way for them to have substantive input before that plan is set in stone.

It is also imperative that the warrant and sex offender checks section remain the same and not be weakened or modified. That is because it is the only way you can verify that the commitments they have made the community will actually be kept. It is not only logical, it is the way it has turned out over the last 10 years. You have some documentation of this from the recent stay in your city, and attached to this is very specific documentation from a stay in my neighborhood which is the best window into this issue that has ever been opened. (See attachment “Sampling of Crimes Committed By TC4 Residents While Living in TC4). This document came from running the names provided on Affidavits in a court case through King County Court Records, and then getting the indicated police reports from surrounding cities. 51 residents out of 97 provided affidavits, and of those 51, 10 or 20% had committed 15 crimes while living in TC4. And 3 of the 10 had active outstanding warrants at the time, but were still resident in TC4. Clearly their procedures and processes had not yielded the results that they had and continue to promise. Their procedures are so purposely opaque it is not easy to track this, but I have seen other more recent cases of residents being discovered to have warrants or to have committed crimes while in TC4. So have Sammamish officials. They have had 10 years to demonstrate that they can stop these things from happening with their procedures and “knowledge of their community” and they have not been able to do so. It is time they do what is necessary to keep their own commitments It is not treating them differently than the rest of us. There are many instances in our ordinary everyday lives where we are required to turn over the kind of information that would allow anyone who wished to run such checks on us. I have seen full background checks to volunteer at a school or with elderly or disabled people. And I certainly can’t buy or rent a place without giving up enough information to allow checks to be run. And a lot of jobs require such information. I even have to provide ID to write checks sometimes, or pick up packages. If we expect them to transition to a more regular life, this is something they will need to get ready to deal with. As for the implication that a sex offender check is tantamount to “barging into a neighbor’s home and demanding to investigate them”, that is simply hyperbole. I only need my neighbors address to check the public record and see if anyone on the list is there. But actually, I don’t even need to do that, since the one time someone on the list moved into my general area, I was mailed a notification, complete with picture. As for their concern about anyone seeing their list of residents, I find that ironic, since when one of these permits is applied for, a list of neighbors and addresses in the notification
area is created and turned over to the applicant. It also goes onto the public record for anyone who wishes to see.

Since it is the sponsor who can and is getting the permit, it is imperative that the sponsor be responsible for verifying that the warrant checks occur, the log is being properly kept & verifiable forms of identification are being provided. You were right to include that. It isn’t mentioned, but perhaps should be that someone from the city may need to see the log occasionally to verify code compliance on some items such as occupancy numbers etc...

While on the subject of the Sponsors responsibility as the permit holder, I would like to point out that the State Law only addresses insurance in terms of holding the city harmless. It does not say that liability insurance for the sponsor cannot be required. That is a requirement in Bellevue, and is only prudent.

The fencing requirement is not specific enough. It needs to be not only sight obscuring, but also a barrier to entry at other points than the security tent entrance. This is because their whole security plan is based on limited point of entrance and egress. I have seen sites where the “fence” is nothing more than ill supported tarps or construction netting, allowing anyone to go in or out and bring things in or out at points not within sight of the security. I have pictures of this I can show you if you would like.

4 (16) Code of Conduct. First of all, Sponsors & Managers ensuring enforcement is the operative part here. If you would like, I could provide you with dozens of police reports over a decade demonstrating a lack of effective enforcement. Without it, a Code is just a wish list. So you will have to be very diligent about verifying this. My only other comment about this is that one very important item is missing from the code. And that is that No Crime Should Be Permitted. They have often claimed this verbally, so it should be here. Not all crimes that harm people are physically violent. Property crimes for instance. When they claim no neighbor has ever been harmed, they are certainly not including this. How about the felony forgery at the top of the included chart? That woman in her 80’s was certainly harmed, and yet a 7-9 year resident of TC4 stood up at our neighborhood meeting in April making the claim of “never any harm”. Since he was mentioned in the report and definitely aware of that crime, I find that disingenuous.

Now I would like to address some of the other claims and comments. First of all, the many claims and interpretations of Elizabeth Maupin, Karen Studders et al about their interpretation of the State Law on this issue that passed in 2010. I got involved by going to public hearings commenting and sending in information on it in 2009. I showed Carl the packet I prepared for the Senators on the Committee who modified it. I also went back and forth in emails with the legal legislative aide who wrote the drafts of the final wording in 2010. I was responsible for the rationale to change wording which would have been unconstitutional because it would have required other citizens to subsidize the churches religious expression. This law is not quite the new cudgel that they would like it to be. It is essentially duplicative of existing protections such as RLUIPA and the state constitution. Even Bill Kirlin Hackett said so, both in a quote in the paper at the time, and in comments he made to the Senate Committee. The Representatives of the Washington Associations of Cities and Counties agreed, and that was their testimony. It
does not “throw out” ordinances written before that as they claim. Elizabeth is right about them being “haunted” by the Bellevue Consent Decree. That is because it affirmed that cities would not be violating RLUIPA or the federal or state constitution by putting in place regulations to protect the public health and safety. I refer you to Section 3.1 of that document, which you already have I have been told. Also, notice that both SHARE and The Church Council of Greater Seattle are signatories to that decree.

Elizabeth among others, tries to excuse and explain away the rather serious incidents that happened during their first stay in your city. But those excuses and stories don’t hold water against the police reports available (which I have copies of). The Police Captain who looked them over for Bellevue said as much. And there is a pattern of drug incidents going back for years in various SHARE run entities. She also attempts to minimize the Mercer Island experience, but I am far more familiar with that than she, again I have the reports, and she is wrong. Where is her mention of the 3 T4 residents with active outstanding warrants that moved to Mercer Island from Bellevue before that chart became public? The Mercer Island Police arrested two of them, and the other was warned off and wasn’t apprehended. That, by the way, is also a pattern. If you look at the other document I provided Carl, the Memorandum from the Bellevue Police that covered the first 3 stays there, you will see that in just about 50% of the cases of a person with a warrant showing up, the police were not able to get there before they melted into the surrounding community. So do whatever you can with procedures and vigilance to make sure the turn aways and evicted residents leave your neighborhoods. In some cases, such as the one of William Joseph Madden in Redmond, they find another spot to camp in the immediate neighborhood. 5 days after he was evicted he was burglarizing nearby homes. In a report from the Shoreline police, a Sex Offender ejected from TC3 took up residence in a nearby ravine. There is also a pattern of crimes being committed in neighborhoods where TC4 has been by residents of TC4 at other sites, who return to previous sites and get into trouble. Steven Arnold was high and causing a disturbance and threatening people at the Kirkland Teen Center while resident at TC4 in my neighborhood. He had previously stayed at Kirkland Congregational with TC4, which is near the Teen Center.

As for the Letter from TC4 themselves, it appears they think they should be allowed to do whatever they see fit, since they are convinced their perceived needs trump any balancing owed to anyone else’s needs. Once again they insist those who want more balance are “fearful, biased and ignorant”. I can assure you my neighbors and I are none of those things, and I don’t hear much of that from your citizens either. Pragmatism and logic isn’t fear. Learning from history to inform future decisions isn’t biased or ignorant. I would say the stereotyping that is going on here is much more apparent from their direction. Not very collaborative.

As for some of the comments from people connected to involved churches, they need to be more open to the fact that theirs is not the only acceptable viewpoint on things. Their beliefs and desires are theirs, and they have no inherent right to impose them on others, or to let them impact others negatively. They don’t seem open to seeing those impacts or minimizing them with common sense actions. Perhaps they should try extending their neighbors some of the same consideration and empowerment they reserve for others. I see numerous comments displaying a lack of knowledge about what actually occurred (there were no problems at
MQP!). Others just accept stories or anecdotes that fit with their mindset instead of seeking all available information. I realize they are experiencing cognitive dissonance, but it won’t help to deny unpleasant realities. Ideas such as making the warrant and sex offender checks “voluntary” are naïve. And the only way a “designated Camp Advisory” would help is if that person was outside of the SHARE orbit, and had real authority. It would have to be someone the neighbors would recognize as neutral. SHARE has many of the same issues at other places they manage and control. I do see some hope in the fact that Rich Shively among others, does seem to realize that they really should agree to do some of the stuff like the warrant checks they are so opposed to. I think if they are willing to use their influence and the power of their hospitality they can make that happen. They would be doing them a favor by leading them to true collaboration and balancing.

Finally I would like to address the rather incredible argument posited by Charles Kahler about “relative” substantial burden. As I understand it, he is actually arguing that the citizens of Sammamish deserve less protection of their health and safety if a church with insufficient resources would like to host. If their staff is too small to carry out the duties of sponsor, or take on the responsibility for their own permit conditions, and they haven’t members or collaborators with sufficient commitment to help, then they are expecting other citizens to be burdened to support their religious expression. This is not constitutionally permissible. For a government to allow this is to engage in the establishment of religion, and that is not a valid use of government power. Nor would it be wise to forgo an ordinance and leave the rest of your citizens out of the process.

There is much more I and others could relate about what has and has not happened in these encampments and their surrounding neighborhoods. But this has gotten long enough already, and I want you to read it!! I can see that your city officials have put time and effort into this, on short notice, and your citizens are certainly engaged and communicating, judging by the petition results and all the comments. I think that logic and factual data can speak for itself, and I sincerely hope it will. I am available to give more data to anyone who would like to see it. I have lots more!
Date: January 23, 2006
To: Communications Specialists
From: Operations Manager Jean Best
Re: TC4 (BELLEVUE) WARRANT CHECKS

I know the fact that we are still doing warrant checks for TC4 while it is located in Bellevue is frustrating, and seems to defy the usual jurisdictional roles. I want to assure you that I have taken the steps available to me to try to change this responsibility to Bellevue PD, and that they are willing (eager, even) to accept it, but there are other considerations in play. The County Exec (or his staff) made a promise to the entity that created and supports the tent city that—regardless of jurisdiction—the Sheriff's Office would do the warrant checks. This is a promise we are still expected to support, and one that I have been unable to change. Therefore, we are obliged to continue doing these.

Bellevue PD has discovered that when we run a name that has a warrant associated with it, and we transfer the call to their dispatch center that this “longer than usual time on the phone” seems to cue the bad guy to high-tail it out of there. We have been asked to change our procedure somewhat, in order to lessen this likelihood. Effective immediately, when you have run a name for a TC4 staffer and the name has an associated warrant, just say what you usually do to the caller. Then, immediately upon disconnecting, please call Eastside Communications and let the operator know that you ran a name for TC4, got a hit and offer the subject's information. I have received a suggestion that we might incorporate using AC and Metro as possible alternatives to transferring the TC4 staffer to secondary when there is a long wait; this is acceptable if the transfer will not interrupt the work normally in progress at either of those radios. The other tack I am trying is to get word to the TC4 staff not to hang up and call back, as that does not get them assistance faster.

Thank you all for your patience and continued professionalism.

From: Fenton, Robin Robin.Fenton@kingcounty.gov
To: Ed Holmes ed.holmes@mercer.gov.org
Cc:
Subject: Tent City
Date: 7/22/2006 1:27:31 PM
Attachments: TENT CITY_001.doc; TC4 warrant checks update.doc

I found a memo to an employee complaining about this wherein I stated that the Executive’s Office has made the deal with ShareWheel. Sorry I pinpointed your office as the dealmakers!

<<TC4 warrant checks update.doc>>
JeanBest: Operations Manager
King County Sheriff's Office 9-1-1
206-296-7500
206-205-7969 = fax
EXHIBIT 37

MEMORANDUM

Bellevue Police Department

Date: May 11, 2006
To: Chief James Montgomery
From: Captain Denny Bronson
Subj: Tent City 4 Activity Summary

Temple B'nai Torah Site

Nov 18, 2005
Found Property Report 05B-13270
A driver's license was found in the desk at the TC4 reception area and BPD was called. The officer contacted the owner and determined their wallet had been stolen in Seattle between the dates of 9/25/2005 and 10/05/2005. It was unknown when or how the license ended up in the desk at TC4. Written report taken and license mailed back to owner.

Nov 18, 2005
Warrant Arrest 05B-13071
A subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered he had an outstanding Auburn misdemeanor warrant. Subject was arrested without incident and turned over to an Auburn PD Officer.

Nov 23, 2005
Warrant Subject No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.

Nov 26, 2005
Warrant Subject No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.

Dec 5, 2005
Warrant Subject No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.

Dec 8, 2005
Warrant Subject No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.

Dec 8, 2005
Warrant Arrest 05B-13965
A subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered he had an outstanding no bail Dept. of Corrections warrant for Escape. BPD was called and subject was arrested without incident. According to the subject, the warrant was supposed to have been quashed that day. DOC later sent a teletype requesting that the subject be released from custody (apparently because the warrant had been quashed). Subject was given a courtesy transport back to TC4.

* These all say arrested without incident, but what about the incident? Numerous neighbors observed by the cul-de-sac? Numerous cop cars + cops

EXHIBIT 37
Dec 30, 2005

Resident of TC4 called to report items were missing from his tent. He had been working in Seattle for the previous two days and returned to find the items were missing. Value of loss was $143.

Jan 1, 2006
Pound Property Report 06-0034
A neighbor of TC4 living on 157 Ave NE called BPD to report they found a blue bag containing prescription medication and vitamins. The neighbor thought it may belong to a TC4 resident. The officer checked the name on the prescriptions with the staff at TC4. The name did match a resident of TC4, however, the resident had not been seen for the past 2-3 days. The officer left a business card for when the resident returned to TC4 and booked the found property into evidence for safekeeping.

Jan 2, 2006
Subject Contact FIR
Two TC4 residents were contacted in the 14200 block of Lake Hills Blvd. They were "talking loudly under a stairway". No warrants or other charges.

Jan 6, 2006
Verbal Disturbance: No report
Union 76 Station in Crossroads
Union 76 employee called 911 to report he had a verbal disturbance with 2 transients over buying cigarettes. It was determined the male subject lived at TC4. Subjects left prior to officer arrival. No crime occurred.

Jan 6, 2006
FBI Request: No report
FBI made a request that we check TC4 for a subject they were looking for as they had received a tip that the subject was a TC4 resident. Subject was wanted for Unlawful Flight to avoid prosecution - Lewd and Lascivious Assault upon a Child and Probation Violation. Due to the nature of the crime reportedly committed by the subject, I requested Officers to immediately respond to TC4 to determine if the wanted subject was there. Officers went to the site and determined a subject with the same name had been staying in TC4, but had left 3 weeks previously. Upon checking the identification information on the TC4 resident, it was determined they were not the same subject being sought by the FBI (different dob, Social Security number, physical description, and birth place). FBI was re-contacted and provided that follow-up information.

Jan 7, 2006
Warrant Subject: No report
TC4 staff called to report that it was believed a current resident had an outstanding felony warrant under a different name. Various names provided were checked through the system and no warrants were discovered.

Jan 9, 2006
Warrant Subject: No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was contacted in the neighborhood. Subject had no extraditable warrant out of Tacoma for $750. No arrest.

Jan 9, 2006
Warrant Arrest 06-0356
Subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered that he had an outstanding Seattle misdemeanor warrant. BPD was called and the subject arrested without incident.

Jan 10, 2006
Warrant Subject: No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.

Jan 15, 2006
Warrant Arrest 06-0608
Subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered that he had an outstanding Seattle misdemeanor warrant. BPD was called and the subject arrested without incident.
Jan 16, 2006
Shoplift Arrest 06-0617
TC4 resident was detained and subsequently arrested for shoplifting $7.92 worth of merchandise from the Crossroad's QFC. Subject was re-processed from the QFC.

Jan 17, 2006
Subject Contact FIR
TC4 resident was contacted at the Circle K (156 NE and NE 8) after he was discovered sleeping in the restroom. Subject was extremely intoxicated and left without incident.

Jan 18, 2006
Mal Mischief Report 06-0700
Citizen living near TC4 reported unknown person smeared something like a baked fruit on top of their mailbox. Citizen believed the incident was caused by TC4 resident. No witnesses or evidence to substantiate that claim. No damage, just time loss for cleaning up the mess.

Jan 23, 2006
Theft 1 / Burglary 2 Arrest 06-0922 and 06-0930
TC4 resident was arrested for committing theft and burglary at Party City in Crossroads Mall. Loss was valued at $1550. It was also determined that the same subject committed a burglary at Pier 1 Imports (also located in Crossroad's Mall) taking property valued at $305. Search warrant was served on his tent and some stolen items were recovered. Prior to the suspect's arrest, a member of the Executive Committee at TC4 had told him that we were looking for him. This was brought up with the Temple Staff and other Executive Committee members, who properly addressed the concern.

Feb 5, 2006
Warrant Arrest 06-1490
This is not consistent with what we were told at the B'nai Torah Meeting on 3-18-2008 when we brought this incident up.

St. Luke's Lutheran Church Site

Feb 20, 2006
Suspicious Circumstances FIR
QA vehicle in the lot at TC4. No crime

Feb 25, 2006
Subject Contact FIR
TC4 called to report subject was trying to check in and misdemeanor warrant was discovered. BPD officers arrived and determined it was not the same subject that had the warrant. No arrest.

March 6, 2006
Area Check No report
TC4 resident called to report a questionable vehicle parked in the Church parking lot. Vehicle was checked – no crime.

March 6, 2006
Harassment 06-2782
TC4 resident apparently threatened one of the Executive Committee members when he was barred from the encampment for 3 days for violating Camp rules. Subject was subsequently permanently barred from the encampment.

March 11, 2006
Subject Contact No action taken
Officer called out at TC4 on a contact. Cleared with no action taken.

March 12, 2006
Warrant Subject No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.
March 12, 2006
Subject Contact  FIR
Two TC4 residents were contacted at the South Bellevue Park and Ride. One of the subjects is a convicted felon with a non-extraditable warrant. No reasonable explanation for being at the park & ride.

March 14, 2006
Infraction BI 696222
TC4 resident was issued an infraction notice for having an open beer in public. The officer's attention was initially drawn to the subject as it appeared he was urinating next to the public sidewalk in the 500 block of 148th Ave NE.

March 15, 2006
Warrant Arrest 06-3137
Subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered that he had an outstanding Renton misdemeanor warrant. BPD was called and the subject arrested without incident.

March 16, 2006
Subject Contact  No action taken
Officer called out at TC4 on a contact. Cleared with no action taken.

March 19, 2006
Warrant Subject  No report
TC4 called to advise a subject was there with an outstanding warrant. Subject left prior to officer arrival and was not located.

March 23, 2006
Follow-up Info 06-2782
TC4 staff called with follow-up info regarding Harassment case. Suspect had apparently called with additional threats made to TC4 staff.

March 29, 2006
Assistance Call
Subject called from Bellevue Square with no place to stay. Was given a courtesy ride to TC4 and checked in.

March 31, 2006
Subject Contact  FIR
TC4 resident was contacted at the Transit Center after being in a verbal altercation with another subject. Neither wanted to pursue criminal charges. TC4 resident was intoxicated.

April 2, 2006
Warrant Subject  No arrest
Subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered that he had an outstanding warrant for their arrest. BPD responded, but the warrants could not be confirmed by the other agency.

April 2, 2006
Paper Service  No Case
Temporary Anti-harassment order was served on TC4 resident without incident.

April 8, 2006
Unwanted Subject  No report
TC4 staff called as they had barred a resident from the encampment who was refusing to leave. Subject did leave prior to officer arrival.

April 14, 2006
Suspicious Circumstances  FIR
Subject was sleeping at the bus stop. Believed to be TC4 resident. No crime committed.

April 15, 2006
Warrant Arrest 06-4479
Subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered that he had an outstanding warrant for their arrest. BPD was called and the subject arrested without incident.
April 20, 2006
Subject Contact: FIR
Vehicle and driver contacted by officer in parking lot. No case report.

April 20, 2006
Violation of Order / Warrants  No arrest or Case report
A male and female tried to check in at TC4. Warrant check revealed that both were respondents to orders prohibiting contact with each other and outstanding warrants. Both subjects left prior to police arrival and could not be located by the responding officers.

April 26, 2006
Assault: FIR
TC4 resident apparently shoved another resident. Officer responded and resolved incident with no arrest. FIR only.

May 3, 2006
Verbal Disturbance 06-5200
TC4 resident had been drinking and was yelling at/threatening other residents. Subject trespassed from the encampment at the request of TC4 Executive Committee members – no arrest.

May 8, 2006
Warrant Arrest: 06-5406
Subject was attempting to check in at TC4 and as a result of the records check, it was discovered that he had an outstanding Kirkland warrant for their arrest. BPD was called and the subject arrested without incident.
Karen Morris
15788 NE. 4th St.
Bellevue, Wa. 98008
425-957-0367 cell 425-503-1025
moe@msn.com

12-29-05

To: Bellevue Police Public Information

Pursuant to Washington State law on public information I am requesting all public information concerning any calls to police or police activity or reports at or within a one-half mile radius of the current Tent City 4 location on Temple B'nai Torah property at 15727 NE. 4th St., Bellevue. Please include the warrant arrests made on November 18th 2005, and December 8th, 2005, along with all others. Also, please provide all public information concerning sex offender/s related to the above referenced property, including the December 12th 2005 sex offender case.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter, as I would like the information before next weeks Tuesday City Council meeting.

Did not receive any info on calls listed on 5-11-2006 report as being a call about a warrant where No arrest, No report, subject not located should have as per above

Karen Morris
will pick up when ready

70 cases
111 pages @ 154

1-16-06

EXHIBIT 37
Comment on file #09-122033-LZ or TC4 permit application

moe@msn.com
Thu 9/03/09 7:55 PM
tpratt@bellevuewa.gov

My name is Karen Morris and I reside at 15788 N.E. 4th St Bellevue. I am across the street from a location where TC4 has been twice, and in the close neighborhood of another previous location. Along with other of my neighbors, I expressed concerns about the security of this encampment in the past. We never felt those concerns were adequately addressed, and problems arose because of that. We started researching this issue and gathering public records and other documentation. It took us a long time and a lot of work, but we have been able to document that the issues we raised as past and potential problems were in fact problems at our site and other sites since. We have gathered many police and court records showing some very clear patterns. We had raised the concern that those who were turned away for having warrants would not be contacted by the Bellevue police in time unless the Bellevue police themselves did the warrant checks. We were assured this would not be a problem. In fact, it was a problem and fully 50% of them at the first 2 Bellevue sites were gone before the police could get there. We also discovered that people did get in and/or were living there even with active warrants. And even more problematic are cases of people committing crimes while resident in TC4 and still residing there afterwards through many locations while the police came out to investigate and arrest, they went to court, jail etc... And I was shocked to discover that a city employee who assured us at a later meeting that "there had been no problems" actually knew that there had been. I would urge city officials to start being more diligent about this issue, and be open with the citizens who are affected by it. And I would reiterate the necessity for the Bellevue police to do the checks and deal promptly with any problems. Also, checks need to be done on all residents not just new ones, as history shows some may have committed crimes while living in a previous TC4 location, after their initial check. As to their "Code of Conduct" there is plenty of evidence in the reports we have gathered that it is not any assurance that the things it prohibit don't happen. And the fencing will be inadequate for the security requirement of one point of entrance and egress unless it is better than it is at most sites. We have also seen a very recent video on the NY times site which seems to show a child was in residence at the St Jude's site, another thing that is not supposed to happen. Finally, I have had the unfortunate experience of witnessing many instances of TC people and supporters say things in meetings which I knew and could document were not true. At some point the city is going to have to stop accepting anecdotal information from those with a history of saying what it takes to get what they want, whether true or not. The city needs to look at the data we have been able to collect, help us collect more, and collect more itself and act on it. This is the only way to adequately address the very real public safety issues here. I would be happy to meet with city officials and show them our documentation.

moe@msn.com