

Regular Council Meeting

December 18, 2025

FRESNO CITY COUNCIL



Public Comment Packet

ITEM(S)

2-C (ID 25-1700)

Actions pertaining to the amendment of various ordinances:

1. ***BILL B-56 (Introduced December 4, 2025) (For Adoption) - Amending Chapter 9 Article 31 Section 9-3104 of the Fresno Municipal Code, relating unlawful possession and abandonment of carts (Subject to Mayor's Veto)

[TITLE TRUNCATED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL PACKET COVER PAGE]

Contents of Supplement: Public Comment Received

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.

2025 DEC 17 P 2:10
CITY OF FRESNO
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

RECEIVED

From:

Subject:

Date:

[BULK] New eComment for City Council on 2025-12-18 9:00 AM - Regular Meeting
Wednesday, December 17, 2025 8:25:30 AM

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

[City of Fresno](#)

New eComment for City Council on 2025-12-18 9:00 AM - Regular Meeting

Cynthia Piombino submitted a new eComment.

Meeting: City Council on 2025-12-18 9:00 AM - Regular Meeting

Item: 2.-C. ID 25-1700 Actions pertaining to the amendment of various ordinances: 1. ***BILL B-56 (Introduced December 4, 2025) (For Adoption) - Amending Chapter 9 Article 31 Section 9-3104 of the Fresno Municipal Code, relating unlawful possession and abandonment of carts (Subject to Mayor's Veto) 2. ***BILL B-57 (Introduced December 4, 2025) (For Adoption) - Amending Chapter 9 Article 25 Section 9-2507 of the Fresno Municipal Code relating to exposure of minors to tobacco products (Subject to Mayor's Veto) 3. ***BILL B-58 (Introduced December 4, 2025) (For Adoption) - Amending Sections 10-2101 of the Fresno Municipal Code relating to the prohibition of camping in public places (Subject to Mayor's Veto) 4. ***BILL B-59 (Introduced December 4, 2025) (For Adoption) -Adding Chapter 9, Article 37 of the Fresno Municipal Code, Relating to unauthorized possession and use of a City, an Authorized Cart/Bin Collection Agent, or Authorized Roll-Off Collector owned trash containers (Subject to Mayor's Veto) 5. ***BILL B-60 (Introduced December 4, 2025) (For Adoption) - Adding Chapter 9, Article 38 of the Fresno Municipal Code, Relating to criminal prosecution of wage theft (Subject to Mayor's Veto)

eComment: These amendments are unconstitutional and they do nothing to help solve the problem that we have here. It is a well-known fact that we are very far behind a decade at least in building affordable housing. Let's not shift this to criminalize our homeless and dehumanize them. This would give more power to the h a r t team to terrorize our homeless and put them deeper into debt with fines. There's nowhere there for them to go please do not pass this please open up safe camps in every district until we get this housing built and these shelters in order

[View and Analyze eComments](#)

This email was sent from <https://fresno.granicusideas.com>.

[Unsubscribe](#) from future mailings

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: Public comment, 2C: No Camp Ban
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 10:40:57 AM

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Dear Fresno City Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed No Camping Ordinance aimed at banning homeless individuals from camping within our city. This ordinance not only fails to address the root causes of homelessness, but it also risks exacerbating an already critical situation.

Fresno is currently facing a significant housing crisis, with insufficient affordable housing options for our most vulnerable residents. Enforcing a ban on camping will not provide solutions; instead, it will lead to criminalizing homelessness and increase arrests, which is not only inhumane but also burdens our already strained public resources.

Rather than focusing on punitive measures, we should prioritize initiatives that offer tangible support, such as expanding affordable housing, providing mental health services, and increasing access to job training programs. Let us work together to create a compassionate and effective response to homelessness that reflects the values of our community.

I urge the council to reconsider this ordinance and focus on sustainable solutions that promote dignity and wellness for all residents of Fresno.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue

Amanda Gann

Fresno Resident

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: Clerk
Subject: Public comment, 2-C, No Camp Ordinance
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 12:13:50 PM

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Council,

I ask that you reject the bill proposing the amendments to the no camping ordinance on 2-B.

I ask what had the ordinance accomplished. It is not accomplishing “pushing people into housing, both because people have already been seeking services and because there is still want of permanent housing, Even those who accepted being taken to substance abuse treatment often were just taken to be put on a list and were then back on the street. Our community members cannot accomplish *not* being on public property until they are in housing.

City council, these are your constituents. You represent those who are among the most vulnerable. Those who have not had the safety net of a community that could help them at their most vulnerable to not lose their housing due to a myriad of different crises that should also be addressed. This fall, I spoke with a gentleman asking about shelters whose wife is in recovery care for health issues, who said they lost their house due to medical debt and, as she is still in a care facility, he didn’t have the heart to tell her that they no longer had a home.

An elderly man who I gave a ride to the warming center this past year told me he lost his housing while he was in the hospital for an extended amount of time.

Many people have fled domestic violence.

The highest rising demographic is those who are elderly and disabled on a fixed income who cannot afford their housing. Many have become unhoused because they are disabled and the process to get benefits is difficult and often includes initial rejections. One of the women who spoke up against HART in the past years is now finally housed, having become unsheltered after leaving domestic abuse, after over ten years, and stays at the shelter, because WestCare

helped her finally get her disability and find a place for her (she was in the county at the time). Another woman in a similar situation finally got housing after ten years. Note that while officials celebrate and take credit for housing people, that the process can take a long time. In the meantime those waiting, including these women, are on public property out of lack of other options, while city officials claim that they and others are “refusing services.”

There is a young man in his twenties whose grandmother had him leave the house when he turned 18 and has been without housing since then, which is reflective of many of our youth, including foster youth who age out. I’m glad we are doing job programs to help youth who are unhoused, but that doesn’t negate the fact that we have a limit on all resources and have those who were unhoused before they were available and trying to get help, but should not face penalization for trying to exist.

There are those who needed and completed drug treatment programs, only to have nowhere to go and be called “Those who refused services.”

There are so many other causes and challenges to why people are where they are. We need to address these, instead of penalizing them for being the only places they can be.

Our housing element shows that we are many thousands of units short on housing from very low to median, and those with very low income have the most obstacles, including that fact that they are competing with other low income marginalized demographics for limited housing when it becomes available, and in addition to any other challenges, like mobility, consistent access to the internet, etc, the HART throws away all documents they need to obtain housing.

UCSF has done a study that shows that lack of housing is the main reason for homelessness. We know we have a challenge getting affordable housing, so the city also needs to be honest and transparent that our community members, your constituents are in a difficult fight to get into housing and back on their feet.

Our own FMCOC and service providers can tell you of the challenges of finding housing and that people ARE seeking services.

Many of our folks have jobs, which are difficult to maintain with HART throwing away things needed for employment. One of them was a woman who was a CNA and asked about housing. I helped her get replacement scrubs that

were taken by HART and lost contact when HART went through.

All of these people would be considered in violation of the ordinance and face arrest. You by passing this ordinance are stating that they deserve to be arrested and fined.

And thus, it is not addressing concerns of the community

It IS accomplishing allowing the city to violate the rights of our unhoused. The ordinance as it is has been used to arrest people who were just standing, not creating an impediment, who were visiting people. I have heard someone say they were resting because they were tired and they were threatened with arrest, But also, people who are resting, who need a place to pause, who need, by very human need to sleep, are being arrested for this. For living. The city is also violating the right to property as people's belongings are taken.

Note that the ACLU points to various court ruling regarding due process order not being vague and that injunctions regarding nuisance must show certain parameters, and "It goes without saying that human beings do not constitute nuisances in themselves," (Id. at pp. 153-54.) but the City's amendments risk just that.

The "Standing and loitering" amendment regarding those impeding pedestrian traffic is subjective and, based on HART's practices, could and likely will be used even when no one is actually being impeded. Though this amendment isn't in the code, HART has already arrested people who were simply standing who could have moved.

As I've mentioned before, some have been arrested for "camping" waiting for the recycling center to be open. A woman who was living at a shelter was arrested visiting her uncle who was unhoused, which also threatened her place in the shelter. I know of elderly men standing with their walkers who were arrested.

The inclusion of bedding and shelter supplies in the description of "camping," further shows the cruelty and lack of sense for our community. We just experienced a storm that threatens the health of those unsheltered and are moving into winter weather that results in deaths of those who are not fortified and protected from the cold. People need to have something to protect themselves and including this as a prohibition would further show that the city is not prioritizing the safety and well being of some of their most vulnerable

residents.

We have already lost a couple due to the cold weather. The HART team regularly throws away blankets and other sheltering needed to literally survive.

We are pushing for punitive actions when we are aware that HART and the FPD mistreat and violate the rights of those they identify as unhoused.

In addition, HART is leaving pets behind during these arrests and many of us have had contact with those who faced this tragedy. A woman recently told me this week that she has seen so many dogs that HART leaves behind when they arrest people that she wants to start a rescue program.

These ordinance Counter productive to the goals of decreasing homelessness and addressing as well as addressing other members of the community concerns

It creates another impediment of those who are already facing challenges to permanent housing. It disrupts the housing process, threatens jobs,. Arrest records add impediments to housing.

What does it help in the process of finding housing to add an arrest to someone's record?

And that means it actually sets the city back in the goal to decrease homelessness

Yes, there needs to be solutions and a missing component that the city needs to prioritize is to center those with lived experience at the table, work towards making that happen and together assess and work towards sustainable, dignifying solutions. Those who have experience with being unsheltered in Fresno and navigating the system need to be at the center of policy, planning, and evaluation.

And we need to hold our HART team and others accountable to ensure that the city is respecting the rights and humanity of all of your constituents, and that includes those who are unhoused.

These ordinances do not help Fresno.

Remember again that these are your constituents. Your community members.