

FAQs: How the City of Palm Springs is addressing Homelessness

Q. Why does homelessness seem to be worsening?

A. Homelessness is worsening nationwide. The pandemic, along with specific relocation programs administered by the County of Riverside, have compounded the problem locally.

Q. Is the city doing anything to address these issues?

A. Yes. The City is working with multiple partners, has secured state funds, is working to hire staff dedicated to homeless issues and is working to re-envision local services to steer away from services that enable homelessness and toward "housing-first" programs with wrap-around supportive services proven to be more effective at lifting people out of homelessness.

Q. Why can't the City arrest or get rid of homeless people causing problems in our community?

A. Firstly, this is a humanitarian issue worsening nation-wide. Unhoused residents often struggle with significant mental health and addiction issues. Services should not enable bad behavior but should utilize a blend of housing opportunities and comprehensive health and social services to lift people out of homelessness. Secondly, the current criminal justice system is not equipped to handle many of the issues surrounding homelessness. With that in mind, the City is working diligently to address these issues by partnering with the County and a host of other local agencies like Martha's Village & Kitchen to increase and maximize services for homeless individuals that will provide successful permanent outcomes and minimize the negative impacts to our community.

Q. What can the City do about homeless camps?

A. Court rulings, including <u>Martin v Boise</u>, have held that cities may not arrest or punish people for sleeping on public property unless there is shelter for every person who needs it. While the City and County of Riverside are working to provide such shelter, there is currently not enough available in Palm Springs.

Q. How is the City spending the \$10 million grant it received from the State of California to address homelessness?

A. Palm Springs lobbied hard to be one of the only cities our size in the state to receive special funds to address housing and homelessness. The City has committed land and \$7 million -- \$4 million comes from the state grant -- to develop two affordable housing projects, <u>Aloe Palm Canyon</u> and Vista Sunrise II. The two projects provide a total of more than 50 units for individuals experiencing homelessness and leverage \$60 million in state and federal funding. The City is looking to spend the additional \$6 million from the grant developing more permanent and transitional housing with wrap-around services for those in need.

Q. Why is the City ending the conditional use permit with Well in the Desert?

A. This is not a discontinuation of service. The City plans to extend and enhance the services for homeless individuals at the Palm Springs Boxing Club by partnering with Martha's Village & Kitchen to develop a new daytime homeless drop-in center. The City exhausted attempts to negotiate improved services with Well in the Desert, and a new contract with a new provider creates an opportunity to improve outcomes and minimize negative impacts.



Q. What else has the City done to address homelessness?

A. The City has developed a strong partnership with the County of Riverside and stepped up with more than \$12 million to find solutions that include:

- Partnering with the County for a new 24/7 seasonal shelter with homeless services at the United Methodist Church, operated by Martha's Village & Kitchen.
- Funding the Well in the Desert drop-in center for unsheltered individuals and a daytime homeless access center at the Palm Springs Boxing Club.
- Partnering with the County of Riverside for Project RoomKey, which has permanently housed 87 Palm Springs residents.
- Funding two Homeless/Mental Health Crisis teams on the ground in Palm Springs.
- Funding homeless wrap-around services in partnership with Martha's Village & Kitchen.
- Partnering with CVAG to implement the regional CV Housing First and CV200 programs, which have successfully transitioned homeless individuals to permanent housing over the past several years.
- Partnering with the County of Riverside to provide summer cooling centers for Palm Springs residents.
- Partnering with the County and United/Lift to provide rental assistance for eligible low-income Palm Springs residents in need.
- Creating an internal position to help address homeless issues.
- Recently hiring a housing and homeless services consultant to further evaluate and recommend practices to improve outcomes and reduce negative impacts.
- In addition, the City is actively partnering with the County of Riverside on potential plans to develop a new onestop Navigation Center and Shelter for homeless individuals.

Q. What should I do if I observe a homeless encampment?

A. The City encourages residents to use the myPalmSprings app to report homeless encampments. The app can be downloaded in the Apple store or Google Play.

Q. Why doesn't the City pass a law outlawing panhandling?

A. Numerous court cases have determined that panhandling is protected by the first amendment. Ordinances against general panhandling in many cities have been struck down and cities held financially liable for damages.

Q. How else can I help?

A. Consider supporting one of the many partner organizations dedicated to improving outcomes for our unsheltered residents.



- Main page Contents Current events Random article About Wikipedia Contact us Donate
- Contribute
- Help Learn to edit Community portal Recent changes Upload file
- Tools
- What links here Related changes Special pages Permanent link Page information Cite this page Wikidata item

Print/export

Download as PDF Printable version

Languages

Add links

Article Talk

Read

Edit

View history

Martin v. Boise

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Martin v. Boise (full case name *Robert Martin, Lawrence Lee Smith, Robert Anderson, Janet F. Bell, Pamela S. Hawkes, and Basil E. Humphrey v. City of Boise*) was a 2018 decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in response to a 2009 lawsuit by six homeless plaintiffs against the city of Boise, Idaho regarding the city's anticamping ordinance.^[1] The ruling held that cities cannot enforce anti-camping ordinances if they do not have enough homeless shelter beds available for their homeless population.^{[2][3]} The decision was based on the Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment.

In 2019, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear an appeal of the case, leaving the precedent intact in the nine Western states under the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit (Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington).^{[3][4]}

History [edit]

In 2009, after a local homeless shelter in Boise

closed, six individuals were cited for violations of a city ordinance that makes it illegal to sleep on public property. One of those individuals, Robert Martin, along with the others, represented by Howard Belodoff, filed a lawsuit challenging the constituitionality of an ordinance that punishes someone for sleeping outside when they have nowhere else to go.^[1]

In 2021, the city settled the lawsuit by agreeing to spend \$1.3 million for additional shelter spaces, \$435,000 for the plaintiffs' attorneys fees, and agreed to amend ordinances on public sleeping as well as to train their police not to arrest individuals or issue citations when there is no shelter space available. Persons who are offered appropriate available shelter space, but refuse to go could still be cited, under the settlement.^[5]

Current interpretation [edit]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_v.	Boise[7/12/2021	2.40.53 PM1
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wartin v.	D0130 //12/2021	2.40.331 [11]

Martin v. Boise		
COURT OF THE A		
Court	United States Court of	
Full case name	Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Robert Martin, Lawrence Lee Smith, Robert Anderson, Janet F. Bell, Pamela S. Hawkes, and Basil E. Humphrey v. City of Boise	
Decided	September 14, 2018	
Court membership		
Judge(s) sitting	Marsha S. Berzon, Paul J. Watford, and John B. Owens	
Case opinions		
Decision by	Marsha S. Berzon	
Concur/dissent John B. Owens		

The ruling leaves undecided the issue of whether it is legal to set limits on *which* public properties and during what hours camping or sleeping can be prohibited; the city of Sacramento, for example, allows sleeping on the City Hall grounds at night but not during the day, and this arrangement is not explicitly banned by the ruling.^[6]

References [edit]

- ^ *a b* Dougherty, Conor (2019-12-03). "How Far Can Cities Go to Police the Homeless? Boise Tests the Limit - A decade-old legal fight shapes a mayoral race and offers the Supreme Court a chance to weigh in". *The New York Times*.
- A Greenstone, Scott (6 September 2019). "How a federal court ruling on Boise's homeless camping ban has rippled across the West" . Idaho Statesman. Retrieved 11 April 2021.
- 3. ^ a ^b Smith, Erika (2019-12-16). "Supreme Court decision on homeless case is a blow to cities wanting more policing powers" . Los Angeles Times. "The high court declined to hear a landmark case on homelessness, letting stand a ruling that amounts to a broad curb on police powers in nine Western states, including California, to stop people from sleeping on public property if no other shelter is available."
- 4. ^A Sisson, Patrick (5 April 2019). "Homeless people gain 'de facto right' to sleep on sidewalks through federal court". *Curbed*. Retrieved 11 April 2021.
- 5. **^** Harding, Hayley (2021-02-08). "Boise will settle controversial homeless camping lawsuit, change city code" . *Los Angeles Times*.
- 6. ^ Clift, Theresa; Yoon-Hendricks, Alexandra (2019-12-17). "U.S. Supreme Court won't hear Boise homeless ruling. Here's what it means for Sacramento" . The Sacramento Bee. ""Some would argue it's very broad and would be difficult for a local county or jurisdiction to balance the needs of homeless residents and other residents," county counsel Lisa Travis said. One way to achieve that balance might be to approve a new policy outlining the specific locations and times of day a homeless person could sleep on public property. The Boise decision does not explicitly ban making these kinds of restrictions. For example, the city of Sacramento allows homeless to sit or sleep on the ground outside City Hall at night, but not during the day."

This case law article is a stub. You can help Wikipedia by expanding it.

Categories: Case law stubs | United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit cases | Homelessness in the United States

This page was last edited on 29 June 2021, at 22:02 (UTC).

Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy. Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.

Privacy policy About Wikipedia Disclaimers Contact Wikipedia Mobile view Developers Statistics

Powered by MediaWiki

WIKIMEDIA

Cookie statement