

What are your thoughts on limiting the number of campers at an individual site?

Good idea. With large groups, comes large amounts of trash, crime, sanitation concerns, etc.

limit as much as possible

I think it should be based on square footage and availability of water and sanitary facilities like bathrooms and garbage service

Yes

1 or 2 per site

The less people, the less sanitary concern.

Yes. It should be limited to families or small groups

I think we should keep overnight camping to a minimum and away from residential neighborhoods.

Yes

Should be limited to zero

0 would be great!

All camping should be limited, to many negatives such as litter, drug use, theft and other things happen when large groups get together

Please limit to 3 people

Good idea, don't want homeless communities in Springfield

Only 1 at a time.

Disagree

There needs to be a limit

10

I don't care how many are camping at the same site as long as they don't throw trash, needles and human waste everywhere, and they don't commit crimes.

Horrible idea on streets. Find a vacant lot and give them rules.

Agree

Yes

Very important. Large congregations of people camping seem to create consistent waste, noise, and long-term occupancy plus are concerning safety wise.

Important

I think limits might prohibit the ability to provide sanitation stations, but I also like the idea of limiting homeless encampments from reaching large sizes (and thus bringing dangerous circumstances).

Camps should be limited. Large camps in Eugene have caused issues, sanitary problems, and over safety issues.

More people means more trash, more waste, more drugs , more problems

Yes

Keep it to a quantity so sanitation, trash, and safety are managed.

Absolutely! It gets out of control quickly, eugene is a prime example of what NOT to allow. Time should be limited to 12 hrs only and with a 24 to 36hr spacing time for the entire space

I do not want any camping on public land and I absolutely do not want large tent cities. Yes- limit number of "campers"

Freedom to gather should be protected, so no limit.

Don't allow it

Agree but not feasibly enforceable

Agree

Please limit

Limit unless the site allows

We should not allow a homeless "community"

If you invite one you might as well invite them all. They'll come by droves.

I think it should be something to enforce.

I think there should be a limit to the number of campers at an individual site

I approve of limits

Agree

No limits

Neutral

Very strong

The number of campers should be very small. We don't want vast "tent cities" in Springfield!

Yes 20x20 should home no more than 2 adult and 2 children under the age of 18

Good idea. Keep families with kids together. Have family sites only.

Yes! Limits should be made

I'm mainly concerned about garbage and drama between campers

Limit to 1 person or family (must be related)

I strongly agree with limiting the number of campers. We were hiking in the hills behind our neighborhood and found a small community of people who had set up camp there.

No camping should be allowed on public land within city limits

yes there should be a limit.

That should be taken into consideration.

Unenforceable and problematic

No camping

Definitely should limit number of campers

Any large sites should be away from residential and commercial areas. Small locations should be away from schools and parks.

Should be limited. With large congregations usually comes problems

I think the area of impact and sanitation considerations should control over the number of people.

Yes

Well, my thoughts are bathroom, sanitation, safety, illness breakout, with a highly congested area. I support a limit

Please do.

Yes, it should be limited

Definitely needs to be limited. It's much harder to relocate an entire group.

Yes, there should be a limit

Yes. Big groups big mess and more trouble. Ex: Eugene previous temp sites there should be limit

The larger the group of campers, the likelihood of challenges both in public safety as well as the ability to request moving on from the location as there will be potential push back and refusal.

It would depend on the site

They should be, the more there the more trash and environmental impact occurs.

It's important. For sure no more than 8. Unless a designated area near typical services. And limited amounts of "low barrier" sites

Agree

Yes

Yes otherwise it will end up like the Washington/Jefferson Park in Eugene

There should be a limit of how many people are permitted per site. Public safety and environmental impacts are greater with more people.

We should NOT ALLOW public camping. It should be allowed only on sanctioned and serviced lots by non profits. The public rights of ways are not camp grounds.

Agree

Absolutly

I feel that there needs to be more places for them to get help and back on their own

Only if couples or families related

I think that unless its a family(married couple, dating and/or have kids) there should only be 2.

Agree

There should not be any camping allowed on public property

Unless it's a fenced specific homeless area no more then 1
too many campers will be hard to manage and more potential for permanent camps to set up.

There should be a limit. When camps get too large, they get out of control, create safety concerns and make a big mess.

I don't think camping within the city limits should be tolerated at all. Get these people consistent help or get them out of town.

No campers on public land period

Definitely limit the numbers

Agree

Absolutely limit

6

I don't support this.

Don't show camping, leave to Eugene

Less crowding = less litter, fighting, etc.

It could hopefully lessen the amount of transient congestion in specific areas, but unsure how this will be regulated

Yes

I would imagine a family should stick together. If not a negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods, size of group to comfortably fit available site

No

There should be NO camping at all. But limit 1 person per tent.

Don't want more than 3 people per site

Depends on location and proximity to people and places.

I don't want camping in town

Having designated sites to host groups of campers is better than having them dispersed throughout the community.

Shouldn't be allowed at all.

I agree, the more people the more problems

Yes.

I hate that we are allowing any. No more than 2

Ok if reasonable. Ex. 20'x20' 4-6 people max

Should not be large groups

Limited number would be ideal, but more importantly where will camping be allowed. Can actual campsites be made so one can not choose any location of their choosing

Yes, there should be a limit

Once they come they won't leave. Not enough time or people to enforce rules.

They should be limited to zero and monitored for compliance

If allowed, which it should not be, the camping should be for one person with a 24 hour time limit. There are enough beds, shelters in our area to accommodate homelessness. We should not allow camping at all.

yes it should be limited

If the number of campers at an individual site is limited, it decreases the chance of amount of garbage and waste left behind. It also decreases the chance of the camp getting unmanageable.

Yes. They should absolutely be limited

Yes

I am against allowing camping in city limits on public property- it is a slippery slope. We already deal with through traffic at my place of work. Including feces on the sidewalk

Enforcement on all of these issues will be the biggest problem. You can write whatever you want down, but who's really going to enforce them? What will the punishment be?

I think limiting the number of campers is a good idea but might be difficult to enforce.

Yes we shouldn't have any camping specially not large camps they become unsafe and disgusting

2

Depends on sanitary and environmental conditions and where it is located. Are we talking public land? And if so does that mean sidewalks?

i saw the effects of camping on the washington jefferson park in eugene. it basically became a toxic waste area

From seeing what's happened in Eugene, the now people in a single location the more there is a concern for safety and sanitation.

There should not be a limit for families.

This is bullshit. I'm tired of feeling unsafe with my children walking into the grocery store. Do better Springfield!

You have to.

I don't think we should even have this as an option.

Couple or family but no more than 2 individuals

Makes sense. More than 20 and you get a messy camp

Yes

Limiting the number of people per campsite is close to impossible. Duration and cleanliness should be more of a priority

Yes 1

Larger groups are a safety concern for me

To the extent that limiting number of campers at an individual site will allow for effective enforcement, services, and preservation of environmental, public health, and public safety, it may be important and helpful. However, it only takes one individual to cause a fire, a public health hazard - food and fecal matter, used needles, plastics, metals, other trash - or other kind of safety concern – real or perceived - by the general public. Is the number the determinate or is the ability/resources available to manage, service, and enforce sites what determines the number of campers allowed on individual sites?

No, because friend and family connections are important for people to have. They should be able to stay together, that's also important for their safety too.

There should be no sites to camp at.

Whatever works best for any and alls safety!

yes, limits

Take a good look at Portland. Keep Camping off Public lands near businesses or residences.

NO CAMPING IN THE CITY.

Yes. The number of campers on one site should be kept to best practices. My understanding is that if groups get too large it creates a range of issues including sanitary and environmental impacts.

I think it's probably wise

There should be a limit.

It must be limited.

Depends on nuisance level

Seems reasonable to have some limits

Yes

There can be both safety and threat in allowing groups of campers. I'm not sure what research has been done to answer this question.

should be a low number to make sure there is not a huge impact on the site- just look at Washington park and how they destroyed the soil

Please limit; larger groups create more of an impact (more garbage, needles, human waste, community eye sore). One camp/ tent/rv

Good idea, keep it manageable

I feel that the number of campers should be limited to the capacity of the tent being used.

Yes

Better than no limit

I do not think public camping of any kind should be allowed in Springfield.

Send them to Eugene. Let's keep Springfield clean.

This would help and likely easier to manage

NO CAMPERS AT ALL

Not allowed

A balance needs to be found to allow both housed and unhoused neighbors to feel safe. For the unhoused they may feel that there is safety in numbers while the housed may be intimidated by large campsites. I tend to believe a few large campsites is probably preferable because that make it easier to provide trash collection, bathrooms, and other services

Definitely limit to immediate family, otherwise no more than 2 individuals.

I don't think it matters. I have seen one tent with lots of garbage.

Limiting the number of campers per site must be matched with sufficient sites to meet the need.

Highly agree

It depends upon the size of the site.

It depends on the other issues

It's not the quantity in one place, it's the frequency in the unhoused population camping of clear drug use and mental illness that is dangerous (shelters usually require you not to be drunk or on drugs)

Absolutely should be limited and enforced

Zero should be the limit

Agree

See below

Needs to have limit in regards to how much the area can handle

So long as there are enough sites available limiting campers is a viable option. However the more sites the more sanitation needs.

I think the number of campers should not be limited.

That is a good idea to ensure that the campers have sufficient personal space and the area is not overwhelmed (e.g. keeps grass from being destroyed with high traffic).

Depends on the site.

depends on size and location at the site

Immediate families should be allowed to stay together.

Neutral

Agree if on public land

One per site

It depends on what the site can handle without spilling out onto other non camping areas.

Disagree

Would it be more feasible to have a limited number of camping sites for more people, to keep support service resources from running all over the city?

Depending on site accommodations it should limit occupants

Who will enforce? Is it only at night? What about visitors?

I don't support camping in city limits

There should be no camping in the city limits.

Good idea if it's actually enforced

There should be no camping allowed whatsoever in Springfield

For one, stop calling them campers. They're addicts with mental health issues, period. And the answer is 1.

Less campers in one site might keep the site from turning into a tent city. The smaller the "tent community" might make it easier to manage. Easier for the authorities to enforce the codes and rules.

No camping in the city limits unless in a campground, must follow campground rules , running , register vehicles of a certain age should only be allowed.

It shouldn't be allowed in city limits regardless of campsite size.

20

There should not be any campers

This cannot be a long-term solution. We all have rights to short-term access to public spaces.

Not sure how we would regulate it. I guess either immediate family or 2 campers if unrelated

Yes, limits are good

Not limited. No Homless Camping in Springfield.

Depends on site but large groups tend to create problems

I agree the number should 0 campers allowed

no comment

I'm not a fan of camping at all. I have seen the impact in Portland and Eugene and it is atrocious what has happened there.

Please consult local providers who have experience with this type of work to based decisions.

Limit to 2 adults

Limits are good. Limit camping in public to the greatest extent possible.

You should not focus on limitations to services. Business see how big their consumer base is and then make these considerations.

There should be limits on number of campers

Yes - smaller numbers easier to be compliant and less likely to disturb neighbors or cause issues with surrounding community. It means more sites to manage for whomever, but fewer complaints are likely.

important to mitigate impact

let people stay where they will

I don't think Camping should be allowed on any public property. Springfield should take a stand to keep our City clean and say no to it.

Agree but what if you have more campers than space ?

It depends-if you're planning on hosting everyone in the same location, that's ok. Otherwise I think the number of campers should be limited.

the bigger the camp and the more people camping the worse it is

There should be a limit

Agree with this. If you allow too many it will become an encampment

I strongly agree that the number of campers should be limited per site.

Camping should be consolidated into specified areas where sanitation can be assured, behavior can be monitored, and laws can be enforced. If this isn't possible, then disperse them as much as possible.

As a taxpayer, I believe that the more campers per campsite, the more likely there will be issues, such as drug use, violence and other illegal activity, such as theft. The fewer the better

This must be the case and enforced!

No campers period

Make it one person

I am against camps on public property unless the campers obey all the city laws.

I think it should be limited. If I were to reserve a camp site at a state park there are limits on how many people are allowed when I am paying to be there.

Should not happen

yes

My only concern is splitting up families if they are looking for a place to sleep. But, if there's a way to limit the number of unique groups I think it would be an effective way to manage camping sites getting too large.

Yes a limit needs to be set

People have reasons that they reside in groups (safety, support, disability, etc.). This should be taken into account. Also, with respect to campsize, there are many barriers to staying in a tiny grid.

There should be NO group camping period! It encourages illegal behavior, theft, drug use, assault etc.

In favor

I think there shouldbt be ANY overnight camping in the city limits

No more than 20.

4

They can pay to camp at a campground like law-abiding citizens do.

Problem is, who and how will these rules ACTUALLY be enforced?!?

I think that only stands to create more animosity between campers and police

There should not be a limit

Just another way for the city to overpolice the unhoused without actually helping them.

I don't think the number of campers should be limited. People camp together for a feeling of safety and community. These individuals want to feel a part of.

I think if the City of Springfield wants to limit the number of campers at an individual site they need to think about how many camps they are willing to have. In addition, if they are going to limit, I think it's important to have some regulations for circumstances and guidance in accessing social services.

We already do that, and it's not working

I agree we should not have large groups in one spot it makes trash and environmental issues

I feel that it would be ok to limit the number of campers at one site, as long as there are other sites and resources available to remaining folks.

N/A

That can be difficult because houseless people have families, either people who are directly related to them or people who they have formed relationships with, so I would say limiting the number of campers at an individual site should take that into consideration.

I think that the number of campers at an individual site should not be limited. Having a higher number of campers at a site could encourage a sense of community and safety.

This is the wrong framing: there are so many unhoused people that the focus needs to be on how to provide enough safe places to sleep, not limiting numbers. Yes, large camps can get more chaotic and dangerous, but they can also be places of self-organized community-building and empowerment.

I agree with this

I would prefer there not be a limit

I think there should be no limit on how many folks can camp. Folks find community with other unhoused people and camping in bigger groups provides more safety and ability to safeguard their belongings.

This isnt a house

As many as can safely be at that location. Criminalizing being unhoused is not the way to solve the issue

Not a good thing no

Don't allow camping

Disagree, there should not be a set limit as different spaces may be able to accommodate more people.

Depending on the size of the site, I believe that there should be some limits mainly for safety and security reasons of the members living at the site.

Should only be allowed in designated areas where facilities are available to include garbage disposal and restrooms.

Depends on the site and its designated use. If a suitable safe sleep site can be arranged then multiple persons should be allowed a space to sleep in safety. But public space to congregate without any accountability as to how they live or treat the space and others I'm not in favor of.

The smaller the group the less garbage to clean up.

This would ensure great public safety

I do not believe camping in public areas should be allowed.

Strongly agree

Good for public safety

Zero campers allowed

0

I think that's a gray area

Yes limit the amount

I think there needs to be an occupancy limit to ensure that everyone not just the homeless have a right to occupy the space

No. Large families experiencing homelessness could be excluded.

Very important. I have seen the fallout of building homeless "communities"

As needed

Yes

Prefer no camping

1

I'd love to see one large area designated for ALL campers and provide buses to them for work essential needs. I do not agree in any way with letting people camp on just any public property.

No

Probably a good idea...I've no idea's on how to arrive at a number...

Hard to inforce

Na

There shouldn't be camping. Period

It will not work. Look at Eugene.

The number of campers allowed should reflect the space and amenities capacity of that area.

Should be limited to 4

There should be none

Absolutely, too many people in one place it trouble start snowballing

No more than 1 to 2 people at an Individual site.

Agree

It is a must!

Yes must be a limit

Yes. Limit number otherwise it becomes too out of control.

Yes

0

Yes

The more people that are at a site, in my opinion, the greater the chance of problems

They should be limited. The more people the more problems you will have.

Yes should be zero

There absolutely should be a limit based on the space available.

There should be a limit of 2 unless all campers are legally related

It shouldn't be allowed at all.

It might be easier to manage or help provide services if limited camping is allowed.

Don't allow all

I do want this anywhere. Size doesn't matter.

I don't believe there should be sites in Springfield

There shouldn't be allowed any campers in public areas. They can go to the mission or other services

This would be difficult to maintain without direct supervision (staff).

Yes the less the better

Impractical if it's a family unit. Perhaps that should be in the Gudelia e. No multi-family campsites? That could also be problematic if people have established a co-op to maintain their own/family safety.

It would reduce congregation of homeless campers in city parks... making parks safer for public use.

I don't have a problem with the camping, its the waste that is the biggest concern. They tend to be very dirty sites.

There should be a limit to the number of campers. As possible limit of 2?

Unless an alternative in the community is given, this should not be restricted

What would enforcement look like? Would they be criminalized? Would enforcement work or just end up costing us more money?

The worst part of any of the camps that folks who experience homelessness seem to leave, or have are large gatherings, drugs / drug paraphernalia / environmentally hazardous substances/ garbage in the general vicinity, and the nature of the people in general.

-0-

How would this be enforced

Limits are necessary to ensure sanitary facilities are adequate and that noise levels remain reasonable.

Yes, they should be limited

I feel there should be no camping at all

Camping should not be allowed

I just think camping is and always has been illegal. Look at the mess in Eugene. I have always loved Springfield for not allowing camping. I think there should be 0 campers at any site.

I think there should be limits in place to assure health and safety based on the size and number of individual sites

Zero

Definitely a small number so we don't have a tent city

I think camps should be small, no more than 4 people (unless it's a family)

Right now Springfield works, most of Eugene does NOT! Limit to as little as possible, please.

One

Limitation is a must.

There should be NO camping allowed except in designated camping park areas

Yes

If it's a family or a couple, allow them to remain together. Small groups are also good for safety reasons

Agree. Generally from what I've seen, the more homeless that camp together creates a bigger mess and "tent city" type area.

Two per camp

Yes limit the number

No more than 2 adults

Yes, please. No more than 4 to 6 units together.

Are they a family? Single? Families should be able to stay together. Couples should be able to stay together. Groups of friends should have their own space.

A limit at an individual campsite should limit it to two people and a pet.

They should be sheltered. This is not camping. This is enabling the drug abuse and mental illnesses. More Hospitals, More complexes for low/no income.

Depends on the site

There's a balance - many small sites vs fewer larger sites. I would support larger sites in appropriate locations with considerations above - rather than have campsites spread "everywhere".

One camper is too many.

Limiting the number of campers is acceptable. It can limit the impact on the area and the potential for conflict among campers.

My thoughts are that no campers should be allowed to camp near entrances, exits of businesses, on sidewalks or anywhere they would impede on normal business traffic and use. we need limits based on capacity re: safety and sanitation

There should be a limit, with the possibility of exceptions for large family groups.

I think it needs to be reasonable to ensure safety amongst those camping (consider families, youth, etc).

I think that focusing on restricting the symptom of the housing issue is a waste of time and effort my thoughts is allow 0 people!

That would be restricting community

I would be more interested in seeing policies that address the growing number of campers without access to stable, affordable housing

you should not bother these people unless you have a house or apartment for them to stay in and not limit

No issues with this. From what I've observed in Lane County, unhoused people don't usually congregate. I don't believe there needs to be a limit on number of campers at an individual site.

Strongly agree

I don't want homeless allowed to camp or live in Springfield.

I agree. Large group tent sites are breeding grounds for drugs and crime and make me feel unsafe in those areas.

None

Campsites should only be in the south hills of Eugene

Yes, but realistically how would that be enforced?

It will reduce huge tent camps that create an unsafe location that will need to be heavily cleaned assuming there is heavy drug use

I don't think we should have camping at all. But if we have to it needs to be small groups.

I absolutely agree that there should be a limit, or it will turn into tent city. There could be children exposed to drugs, and other behaviors that could come up.

0

strongly support

I think that even if they are limited and cited for exceeding that limitation it will not matter.

People have compassion for each other and will allow friends a place to stay even if it is in a tent already crowded.

no public camping should be allowed at all no matter what

it should be an emergency one person per night basis. With a check in to monitor people, especially if they are registered sex offenders or have previously stayed there.

I would strongly agree with limiting it to a certain number. If you don't have that limit them, it just becomes a big tent city with a huge mess.

Yes, limit campers. The more people in close proximity the less sanitary the site becomes, the more trash is left behind and more people will see it as being a welcoming place to hang out and be unproductive.

It should be limited to 4 or less.

Springfield needs to provide safe sleeping / camping sites for people dealing with homelessness. Like the mission or Safe Sleep in Eugene.

I do not think that this is realistic. As it could not be enforced.

Agreed, slippery slopes tend to be taken advantage of.

The biggest issue is not so much they are camping, it is the length of time, and the disgusting mess that always seems to be left behind when they leave, so how is limiting the numbers of campers at an individual site going to make a difference?

neutral

Some families are large so a restriction should not force a family to separate.

Keeping the site number low allows for easier maintenance of the space and limits behaviors that occur in larger groups.

It depends on the site. I feel there should be more designated camping or safe places created for our growing number of homelessness. Most of us are just a paycheck away from being there too and with prices of everything going up, it's not getting easier!

There needs to be an area dedicated for tent /camping cities

Depends on the site and how large.

I believe it should be on an individual basis. Not concerned with a single person or small family spending a night somewhere. It is highly concerning when a group of tents start popping up.

reasonable

I think unhoused people should be able to camp without limits in terms of hours or numbers. I do not think they should be restricted to 24 hours, size of campsite, or how many people can camp there. Unhoused people are our neighbors and deserve dignity and respect. Until housing is a universal right that everyone can access I do not have an issue with unhoused people camping in any public spaces. Human life matters more than aesthetics.

Families should be able to stay together

strongly agree with regards to number of campers to ratio of sanitary and environmental capacity

Yes

there should definitely be a limit and they should be required to clean up after themselves as well as do community service

Yes, should be limited

We shouldn't allow any camping in Springfield city limits.

limit if possible but how attainable or possible is it to check/know the number of campers

Essential for safety.

Disagree - safety/resources increase when there is more help available.

There is safety in numbers. Group camps help establish community.

I think that by creating smaller communities you have a chance to create a more positive public opinion and are less likely to have the public view it with a "slum" or "shanty town" mentality.

Also, smaller groupings are easier to manage, can create a stronger sense of community, and can even become part of a neighborhood.

Adequate restroom facilities and garbage cans

When limitations are placed then campsites spread out across the city. If one area can be designated then bathrooms and garbage cans can be provided.

Agree

The camping provisions should be as inclusive as possible. Do not limit the number of campers, size, location, or duration.

As long as enough sites are available that the most vulnerable members of our community are afforded the basic necessity of a place to sleep and exist, limiting numbers of individuals

dependant on the size of the site feels reasonable.

You should not limit the number of campers

limit number of campers

It's a good idea. I've seen overcrowding, which leads to littering, unsanitary conditions.

Equal to availability of bathroom facilities and garbage disposal, away from schools,
From my experiences size doesn't matter. I've seen camps with 5-10 run horribly and some with

20+ run smoother than some businesses do.

strongly agree

provide more community resources, limits who is coming in and out of site.

Not fair to those that being houseless is out of their control

We should absolutely limit the number of campers at unimproved camping sites.

If limiting the number of campers at a site is necessary for public safety and sanitation, I would support it.

Absolutely they need to be of smaller amount

No camping.

There should not be a camping allowance.

2

All in favor

How will this be enforced? I like it, but who will be monitoring?

Yes! Please Limit

Family units should stay together but larger groups mean more noise and trash.

If need be, fine, with some flexibility.

Campers need to be outside city limits

0

I feel it shouldn't be allowed at all

Might be reasonable for sanitation but could be disruptive to community amongst the homeless.

Definitely. Limited to immediate family.

Helps cut down on population and makes it more manageable for clean up

As many as safe

I don't feel I have enough knowledge to make an informed opinion on this matter.

It should be based on available public restrooms and public trash can availability

No more than 2 per site

There needs to be a balance. They should be located in every park as we need public places for recreation.

It would depend on families with young children. It wouldn't be safe for them to be separated.

A safe limit for any given campsite size seems reasonable

I think the number should be relatively low for each site

Yes limits too many people create public safety issues

Totally need to limit the number, but I just can't conceive of how and who this will be enforced.

I oppose limitations on numbers of campers.

It's probably a reasonable idea to prevent a tent city from popping up, but I'd hope there are resources and plans to prevent splitting up families and making sure people have a safe other place they can get to.

That would depend on size. Who will monitor this?

Neutral

No camping within the City. But putting a count is beneficial. Also proof of family members.

Yes

What is the safe and sanitary size for the space and access to necessities? Who is going to manage these numbers?

There should be a limit on the number of campers.

Yes it should be 0

I think it's a good idea

I agree there should be a limit

DON'T ALLOW THEM AT ALL! THEY WILL RUIN THE CITY LIKE THEY DID TO EUGENE!!
THIS IS ALL A HORRIBLE IDEA!

If it started with one, others will follow

Yes

Makes sense depending on the site size

We should not allow homeless camping in our public areas

I think we shouldn't have anyone camping like we currently do

I think it would depend on the site. It needs to be safe, so the number should be set per site.

0

Should be limited

Yes

There shouldn't be a limit. Where else are they suppose to go? Community matters.

Agree

As long as they have access to dispose of trash I don't have a limit. Maybe 25

Unnecessary

Negative. It doesn't make sense.

Should just be famlies together or individuals no groups

Completely agree with limits.

NONE

It should be extremely limited. 1-2

How about zero campers or camping

Not sure

NO CAMPING IN SPRINGFIELD

Should be determined by available bathrooms

Whatever number can be reasonably accommodated with respect to sanitation & safety.

Depends on the individuals willingness to maintain clean and safe areas.

If city assistance or services are being offered onsite, then capacity should be considered. Otherwise, I believe it will self-govern as long as police leave them be. Similar to homeless communities during the great depression

This makes sense - prevent whole villages from forming where they shouldn't be.

There should not be homeless camping allowed period...I didn't vote for squatters to have rights...

a denser area of possibly poor hygiene and/or unsafe. Make bathrooms accessible and limit size

No camping at all!!!! In city limits!!!!

As many limitations as possible. We don't want to become Eugene

That would help especially if it was out of control. It would be easier to control

To minimize issues for law enforcement a maximum number of people seems reasonable yet I am unclear how it would be decided who needed to vacate in the case of excess campers

Strongly agree -there should be limits.

Yes there should be restrictions

I believe the number of campers at an individual site should be limited in order to prevent the buildup of human waste and trash and to prevent excessive noise, foot traffic, and the likelihood of illicit drug use/sales.

I think that is wise as the more people that tend to gather the more garbage and issues arise

If there is a limit then you won't have unlimited homeless people everywhere in Eugene.

no camping allowed anywhere in the City of Springfield

Not really an issue

If size is limited won't that necessarily limit the number?

As long as there are multiple sites.

Should be limited to a max of two persons

number is less important than where and how

Yes to limiting number of campers, excluding children

Eugene is the poster child for how a once cool and beautiful city has been overrun and destroyed by drug use and the criminal homeless. Look at the dumpster fire (literally) that was Washington Street Park when they opened a " homeless camp " there. It completely destroyed the neighborhood and businesses and residents fled. NO MORE THAN TWO ADULTS should be allowed to camp for a maximum of 24 hours.

No camping. Period

Ok

It must not be too limiting. If there is a limit, it should allow for multiple family units.

No campers, period. Send them to Eugene.

Seems to me that larger the crowds, as evidenced in Eugene, creates more public safety issues for the unhoused and residents alike. Verbal, physical and sexual assaults are the norm in the larger camps. The environmental impact on these areas is also great.

More people seem to bring more conflict but it is better to have them contained in fewer areas than spread all over town

Sad that Springfield is being forced to have homeless camps. The fewer individuals the better. If the area can be kept clean and free of garbage, then more people can be allowed.

25-50

Good idea if we have enough sites to accommodate the number of campers needing to camp. limit according to sanitation and resources

I think that limiting the number of campers at an individual camp site would be a reasonable approach.

Why are we even discussing this. Our city doesn't presently have a huge camping problem primarily because the police enforce existing statutes. Thank God we don't look like Eugene.

How about not bending to public pressure and keeping our existing code as is? If it isn't broken, don't fix it.

Ambivalent

There should be no campers at any sites. Camping is prohibited in the city and it should stay that way.

The less the better

There should be no camping. So the limit should be 0 person

Should be zero campers

We don't need more drugs or criminals in Springfield

There should be no camping of any kind within the Springfield city limits. The impacts of the unhoused camping is seen in Eugene and is completely unacceptable. I rarely go into Eugene due to this.

2

Yes

Absolutely

one to site

Great idea

Seems unconstitutional

Yes

Campers are not a community.

No. Families need to exist together and people keeping eachother warm need to exist together. End of story.

I believe the number allowed should be zero, we should have zero tolerance for the sake of the community at whole.

no more than 2. If someone is camping with a family including children that is child abuse and the police should be called.

Be 1 per site

yes

Strongly agree!!!

There should absolutely be zero public camping for house less in Springfield

Keep them in Eugene..

0

I purchased a house downtown a year ago due to homeless camping in Eugene where I have live for 50 years in Coburg Road Area

No more than 5

A reasonable amount of people is good.

2

Absolutely must be done.

there should be a reasonable limit to the number of individuals per sitethere should be a reasonable limit to the number of individuals per site

Strongly Agree, the less the better

Agree. Camps turn into drug use sites.

Don't want our city to look like our neighboring city

They should not be allowed to camp at all

Have you not seen what this is doing to neighborhoods? Crime, crime and more crime!

It depends on the size of the site. More people = more drugs, more people with mental health issues, more problems.

It should be zero....camping on public property should not be allowed

I feel the more people in an area creates potential to crime and other unlawful activities.

It would depend on the size of the site, and the sanitation facilities available.

Should be a family unit or couples.

Keep them out of residential neighborhoods.

As a tax payer, I would prefer NO "campers"

Don't allow campers PERIOD!!

Horrible

Strongly agree

Don't let them camp at all

Agree

Good luck. If these people cared about what we think, we wouldn't have to be answering these questions. Once you allow camping, the homeless will run rampant. Damn any rules.

Max 1

Yes. I find this troubling. The tent campers need to stay in Eugene. Don't allow it here

I don't think people should be camping on property that we will have to pay to clean up.

It will not be enforced and will quickly be problematic.

I'm very concerned about safety

more than one family creates problems

Yes, limit number.

I'd prefer no camping in public areas, but if it's allowed, as few as possible.

Camping should be limited to both number of people and vehicles allowed. No motor homes and cars!

Less the better

Neutral

Camp sites limited to community service groups like churches that can monitor activities.

Agree

Unclear if this means number of campsites or persons per tent/camp?

Agree

Yes limit it to zero

Yes!

Yes, they should be limited

yes

No camping

Seems like it would be difficult to enforce

I am in favor of this. Smaller groups are easier to manage.

0

2 adults max

We don't need another Jefferson park.come on Springfield...

Limit dependant upon location size

Yes

Agree

There would also need to be a limit to site proximity, size and considerations to what type of shelter is being used.

It should be limited. Crime and garbage increases with more people and should be limited.

No idea, seems specific to park capacity/size?

The more camps in one location increases the outcome of more trash, more domestic situations, and more human traffic (including drug use and sales)

0

Most definitely should be limited

yes. limit the number.

The homeless need each other to survive. Perhaps a clause regarding camps becoming bicycle chop shops and hoarding other junk items, etc.

Agree

There should be a designated area outside the residential, park and business areas.

I am against allowing campers in springfield oregon

You should limit campsites all together

There is often safety in numbers.i personally prefer to camp with alone with my dog...if i had a family,id want to be allowed to keep my family intact

Yes, there should be a limit 2

We should limit the number of campers and not let communities form, only making trash and sanitary conditions worse.

Less campers less problems

Strongly agree

Agree but how would it be enforced?

The fewer the better. Just remember the city park in Eugene and all the damage it received, and it's still closed.l

I consider a limit to 100 campers.

camping should not be allowed

Agree. No camping!

They should

Camping is camping. This is if you were camping out in a state park you would have space in between your campers

Yes!

I don't think we should allow for campers anywhere.

There should be no camping in any cities or private property without the consent of the owner

Camping should be keep to camp sites only with restrooms and trash removal available

Just no campers

Absolutely, because this is where problems start

If camping must be allowed then a limit must be in place.

2

No camping at all. Unless in campgrounds

Yes limit

Necessary

It's always a mess where they camp. Human waste and litter

If camping is allowed, then there must be a limit.

Not necessary. One messy destructive "camper" can cause more harm than 10 responsible "campers"

The smaller the better. Look at the large camps in Eugene. They are a disaster. And the cost to rehab the area is high.

I agree unless they are a family

No camping

As few as possible

No more than 2

Only there family

Have sites where people can live in their vehicles if that is their option. Quit towing and making it worse

Yes

the fewer the better

DEFINITELY limit numbers

We shouldn't be allowing campers at all. But there should be a limit

If a more central location was provided with bathrooms and safety measures that seems like the best scenario.

No camping should be allowed on public grounds, this is an invitation to the destruction of our beautiful city.

the rule will not be followed

Should have limits

There should be a limit. Depends on size of the site and the available facilities.

The greater the number the more trash and unhealthy sanitary conditions much like we already see in Eugene and Portland.

A single family or a couple

Good idea. I had a large homeless camp by my work and within months it was a small unsanitary ,crime ridden fire hazard. Fire dept / police were out numerous times.

I do not want ANY homeless camps in our city,

Should not be allowed

Absolutely limit the number so we don't end up with a "community" like Washington Jefferson park

Don't allow

Agreed

Do not agree for anyone to "camp" in Springfield

Should be limited absolutely

I think accommodating a single family unit should be allowed, but not large camps of unassociated individuals.

You should allow all individuals with campers to have a safe space to camp without worrying about being kicked out or no where to go.

The site should be limited to single families.

0 number of campers

Strongly agree

The higher the number of people, the easier for things to get out of control. (trash, human waste, etc)

Agree

If there are more than two people at one site, they should be family, ie kids involved

1

I believe that it is important to limit the number of campers per site, and the fewer the better.

I work in Eugene and most of the homeless are on drugs and can become very violent. We had a homeless man come in with a knife and threaten a female worker just the other day let alone the trash they leave behind. We need to get them off the streets and rehabbed. Allowing them to camp just encourages this behavior. I work in Eugene and it has turned into a disgusting trash heap.

It would depend on the size and site amenities

No camping on private or public property unless it's a designated

The number of campers per camp site should be limited.

it depends on the location. If its a large designated area, organized, more could use the location. likr 7th and Ast. large paved easier to manage and clean. also a central place to offer services and the bus line.

Limited

This is awful... Eugene is an absolute mess because of this, I think we should fight this tooth and nail and deny camping in city limits.

I think limiting the number of campers duration and limited hours per site is imperative to limiting environmental and sanitation and visual impacts. Additionally smaller sites should be easier for police and other emergency responders.

Not concerned as long as the limited number is zero.

Good idea

There should be a limit of the # of campers on an individual site.

Agree

Yes

0

Yes limit

I don't see the need for a set limit.

1 max for individual campsite or 10 max for a multi-campsite location

Yes

That would be hard to determine. I have 6 kids. If we were to become homeless again and the campsite said only 4 people, where would we go?

I prefer authorized camp sites like Community Supported Shelters does

Not sure

More campers using less tents could make less space.

I hope it does not prevent groups of people from coming together to maintain clean, safe camps.

1 camper is hard enough to monitor anymore than that you are going to have issues

I think as long as it's reasonable.

Yes

It's completely dependent on the size of the site and what facilities are available. Port-a-potties should be supplied at all sites

We should not allow large groups. Simply it will become like Washington Jefferson Park in Eugene. (Still fenced off and unaccessible because the park was ruined)

They can go to Eugene

Should be 0

Yes

Agree

I think it's not fair. We have no control over the number of homeless people. We are safer in groups! The larger the better! The more people, the safer we are!

Yes the more homeless the more crime and drugs that will be at the location

Zero "camping" in town. If there is no connection to the city, job or family and they don't want to become a product member of society....leave.

My concern is how will this be regulated

should be limited

Limiting the number of campers hopefully keep the mess they will leave behind to a minimum.

0

The single most important factor is to absolutely prohibit camping in residential neighborhoods! IF homeless camping MUST be allowed, the number of campers should be limited unless it's a purpose-built site that can accommodate the number.

Agree

0

Should not have camping in public areas.

0

I think if you have to allow the campsites limiting the number of campers per site is a great idea that way it doesn't become a social party zone

Limit to one

Shouldn't be allowed but if it has to then make it as limited as possible

Absolutely agree. Do not want similar issues to Eugene with large number of people at one site.

Specific sites need to be provided to keep campers out of residential areas and bike/walking paths where residents live, so the number of campers will be determined by what each site can accommodate. I share concerns that businesses have with downtown camping in commercial areas, but even business owners and their employees need to be able to come home from work and not have to worry about the crime, trash, and unsanitary conditions, which ALWAYS accompany homeless camps, existing in their yards and recreation paths! And the motorhomes also need a designated place to park away from residents' homes!

A campsite in a state or federal or private campground is limited to the number of people that are allowed to camp in it. Therefore I believe that those guidelines should be used for public property.

I think 2 at maximum, but NOT AT ALL in areas listed above

Zero

I don't think there should be more than 5 campsites at any location

It's should be minimal to zero. These are not campers, they are squatters. The city of Eugene and Portland are destroyed due to allowing this to happen and then get out of control. You can limit it to whatever #, but it will overflow along with the trash, drugs, etc.

Yes limit it. If someone has multiple family members such as children at a camp this is child abuse

How about no campers?

Not sure

Yes

I honestly don't care. As long as they don't disrupt business, litter and residents.

I disagree completely with any number of campers. But seen as though as though this is being forced on residents then one camper.

No camping should be allowed in residential areas or public parks/spaces.

I agree even considering event celebrations i.e. how many during the day and how many overnight if overnight camping is allowed.

Policy should focus on eliminating the incentives drawing the homeless to Springfield.

I tend to agree, but it depends upon the circumstances.

They should not be allowed to camp just anywhere, no matter the number of individuals

Yes number of campers is extremely important it could become issue ridden without an unforced limit.

I agree there should be a limitation.

I am not in favor of opening our parks for camping. We have designated campsites for camping. This is ridiculous. Will take away from families and children using our parks.

No camping

Yes, site should be small.

None!!! No public camping unless in designated park campsite.

Don't want them near any residential areas. I pay too much taxes to allow this

Limit it to zero.

No camping at all!

This would help as not to take over a site.

No camping!

Should be limited

Absolutely, but how can that be enforced? Huge camps run out of control in Eugene already.

No, that's terrible for families.... how about rent caps so people can afford a home?

Absolutely no to drug use. Should be limited unless designated. Must maintain clean area, no build up of trash and remain sanitary

None, when they leave, taxpayers money used for the cleaning

This is discriminatory. Unhoused people also deserve community and safety.

I don't think there should be any campers on public property, period.

I do not agree with camping at all - there should be shelters in place for people unhoused to stay and be safe and clean

I don't think the city should allow this at all, look at Eugene and Portland they are dumpster fires

Limit to 2

Its going to be hard to limit this if there is a family unit trying to stay together

Limits should be imposed

depends on how many trash cans and bathrooms there are.

They aren't going to follow the rules either way

I think it is important to prevent huge camping cities that end up dangerous and destructive as has been in the case in Eugene. Small areas are safer and easier to manage.

Yes, there should be capacity designated at each site.

Limit should be 4. Any more than that then sanitation and safety become a major problem.

There should be NO camping in the city of Springfield period!!! Find a place outside of the City and designate a place and the campers can build and maintain it.

TRUE

I don't think there should be any camping on tax payer's land.

It's ok if there is sanitation and where they are has been determined a site to camp...just like if I went camping.

Limits should be tied to the sanitary facilities available and closeness to safety officer patrols.1

I agree with that. There should be a small number. There need not be cities of campers in Springfield

None

Immediate family members only

There definitely need to be limitations given site size, sanitation services available, adequate space for # of people, supervision, etc

Homeless people are very dangerous. Mental illness and drug use combined. Plus, homeless people carry knives and have other weapons stashed close to their campsite like rocks and sticks. Several days ago I found a sharpened spear on a side trail by the Mill Race Path near Swansons plywood mill.

I think that would help cut down on large groups gathering for extended periods of time.

Number isn't an issue as long as they pose no risk to surrounding area.
seems impossible to enforce

necessary

Limit to zero

More restrictions the better. The point is to prevent the issues that Portland and Eugene have.

Agree

I would trust proposals that worked elsewhere. I don't know what a limit would mean for someone who may camp with others to assure their own safety while on the street.

The number needs to be manageable for responsible parties

Safety and sanitation

Please provide a Buck and trash can. Those two items will give campers an opportunity to maintain the area and their self respect while they wait for PSH or other options

As long as there is support for sanitation and other services, the number is less important.

This seems reasonable. I would like to know more about what has worked in other cities.

Yes

there is more safety if there are more rather than less at a given site, it is also easier to provide sanitary services

Numbers need to be limited.

It should be unlimited.

none

Absolutely

They should go camp in Eugene

Concerned about over crowding and potential safety issues

Yes

Strongly Agree with limiting

No

depends on capacity

Campers can stay in Eugene. Keep Springfield clean.

I think this is a good idea, but who would enforce it?

It would hopefully keep large camps from happening which are harder to manage.

It should be very limited

Yes

If you were limiting the size, you would need to eliminate the number of campers in a site.

Don't

Community is important, even to unhoused people. But too many make the site unmanageable logistically.

This sounds like it would be too difficult to enforce unless officers are looking into people's tents/RVs. I think it makes more sense to limit the number of tents or the square footage.

This is an issue of compliance with in the campers, but with our homeless issues growing as of family evictions ~ with working families w/children ~ it should not be acceptable for these hard working families

Good idea!

Campers should stay outside the city limits.

I understand safety with numbers, but not with the shit bags of society.

Agree

1 or 2. Keep it SMALL

No campers unless it's maintained by the government

No campers allowed, the better

0

I think it should as limited as possible and they should have to be a certain distance apart

I think there should be limits that would still allow for a family with children to camp

Agree

No camping should be allowed

Sites should be managed to prevent overuse and damage.

I believe that would be a good idea. With numbers, Comes trouble and drugs

Yes

They must be limited to the very minimum, the more campers, the more the problems.

Yes

Yes

I agree

Don't let them be there. These people ruin the area with their feces and filth. Eugene has plenty of locations for them to stay

Yes, 0! End of story

I am completely against campsites because of the extensive cost, damage and safety issues that have risen from them. It's not limiting that will stop them. It's WHO is going to enforce the

limitations? And who is going to pay for this? There should never be a plan to maintain homelessness, but if you keep that as an option very little change will come.

Campsites should be limited to members of a single family unit, verifiable with identification

I dont think there should be a limit

Very important for sanitation and safety

Limits should be in place

Don't allow campers in Springfield. Have you seen Eugene!

I don't think any true rules will stop them, especially after watching Eugene lose control.

Agree

How are you going to regulate?

Most of the time people don't like camping to close to each other anyways

I don't want homeless campers on neighborhood streets

The bigger the campsite, the more problems will occur.

Refuse them all

I think it's a good idea and if they are camping together they might st be immediate family.

I think this should be as strict as allowed by law.

No.

Limit

support

If the campers are located within a designated area such as huts, temporary housing or everyone's village, I think that the housing environment should determine how many campers should be at an individual site. If we are speaking about camping on public property, there should be a limited number of individual campers or family units at one site.

Limit 2 to 3 people no related

How would this even be enforced! It's encouraging that the city is acknowledging that this is a problem and trying to fix it, but I question if this new bill will be adhered to by the "campers".

There should be no camping in on public land unless designated for camping.

I don't think the homeless should be allowed to camp on public property. There are enough services to not need to allow camping

Large camps create noise and potential for fights

The larger number of individuals in one area statistically lead to higher crime, decreased sanitation, decreased property values for surrounding areas, decreased ability to enjoy public open spaces and recreation/parks.

I don't support allowing camping at all. There are shelters available for those who choose to follow rules.

Agree

They should get a job and get off the drugs

I don't want to become a Seattle so camping!!

Limiting is good.

yes, setting number of campers to land space to avoid over crowding.

I think the number should be limited. I have seen first hand, the chaos and violence in excessive amounts of people at individual campsites. Criminal activity, drug distribution, and sales, prostitution, fights, etc.

My thought is once you allow ANY of it they will all start showing up here in larger and larger numbers. Look what's going on in Eugene! This is not a homeless issue it's a drug issue! Lived here all my life and suddenly there's a homeless crisis like never before in our history who just all happen to be drug addicts too? Tax paying citizens have to accommodate poor choices and pretend it's just a bunch of down on their luck Chuck's? Let's look for ways to deal with the drug crisis and not turning our once beautiful city and state into a cesspool of a sea of tents, tarps, litter and human excrement it has become over the last several years. I have been proud to live in Springfield and not Eugene because of the way Eugene has embraced this problem and now I have to worry about my own community going down the drain the same way. Not happy about it...

I think it should go hand in hand with current limitations on how many individuals can live in a home as that campsite is their home.

good idea

Absolutely unless in an approved campground like a national forest.

Depends on how well organized it is

It depends on the setting/safety.

Just look at every site they start it get out of control in no time

None

Zero camping

I am not sure if there are negatives to limiting campers. It seems like limiting groups sizes of individuals might put homeless people at risk for their safety.

Yes!!!

Do not let tent cities pop up

Over crowding seems to be an issue whether in a camping area or other places where there are crowds

There should be a limit

no homeless camps

4 or 5

Springfield has density code requirements for privately owned property so the same justification used for these codes should be applied to City of Springfield owned properties

I don't agree with allowing public camping. I've personally seen the negative impact it has had on larger cities

No camping allowed

Agree

None would be best, the federal courts and state of Oregon have no right to overrule municipal sovereignty.

I think this is an important factor in sanitation and environmental impacts if we are talking about unmanaged sites. Managed sites can have increased capacity and increased safety & sanitation.

I LIKE THIS IDEA

yes

More concerned about the mess and taxpayer safety than number of campers

Limiting the # of campers per site won't limit the # of campers in general

Yes. Limit to about a dozen individuals per camping site.

You are fooling yourselves if you think homeless campers are going to follow rules. Why do i have to pay to park or camp and that set of folks do not? i think a large site out of commercial or recreational area would be best to discourage camping and rings of thieves, in our residential and very important recreational areas.

I agree. Any steps taken to discourage transients to loiter and gather instead of seeking services needs to be taken seriously.

No campers what so ever !!!!!

Yes. Do it.

I think limiting the number of campers at each site will alleviate the stress on the campers, the people managing the site, and make it easier to keep up with maintenance of site.

As strict a limit as allowed by law.

Should be a limit depending on the site.

Neutral. I can see why campers may need to be limited, but really have no opinion either way.

The campers often form groups in order to support each other and pool resources, or for safety, as well as for other (sometimes bad) reasons. I don't know how big their groups get, usually I see maybe five maximum, but it would probably make those who are not camping feel safer to be in smaller groups. That being said, they have homes to go to.

Yes you should limit the number

Makes sense, but if it is a houseless family, they shouldn't fear being seperated.

I'm against any camping period

Yes if the limit is zero. No camping should be permitted.

It seems necessary.

That's a great idea, but I doubt it will be easy to control

No camping, go back to Eugene. That's why we don't live there.

No opinion

Just find a designated location out of the way of public and put this location close to police station so that they who stay there behave. Also follow the 24hr ordinance.

One camper leaves his trash all over the place multiple campers with tinted into a dump site my taxes should not pay for someone to be waited on like this

Limiting the numbers of campers on an individual site will help keep issues manageable.

Yes. needs to happen 1+

8

Yes with exceptions for family members

I think this is a helpful boundary, as long as campers have resources nearby, as limiting group size cuts back on ability of a group to share resources amongst themselves.

Number of campers should certainly be considered. The more campers the greater the impact.

It should be limited

No camping at all. These people often pay no taxes for the maintenance of said locations

The ideal number would be zero.