

I reject your whole plan, as it amounts to shipping the poor off to labor camps, as the Russians did with undesirables sent to Siberia. Poor should be housed in each city: we cannot create segregated cities, only for the rich. The main cause of homelessness is lack of affordable housing.

No, the main cause of homelessness is [drug addiction](#) and mental illness. If housing fixed everything, we'd not end up with stats like [this](#) and [this](#) and [27% losing their housing again.](#)

Much of the cause for high housing costs lies in [rent control](#) and govt fees & unnecessary bldg. codes. Housing c/b built less expensively by changing laws.

Even if we accept your premise and say that homelessness was caused by lack of affordable housing, how do you propose that we solve this, realistically, given the slow pace of housing construction, and the fact that most of the nations' homeless are in the cities where they can least afford to live? And that many have **zero income**? What is "affordable housing" for someone with zero income? The number of homeless in LA is 60k, and only [300 to 2000 units of new housing are built each year in LA.](#)

If people want to live on the sidewalk instead of in shelters, that should be their right.

You [can't solve a crisis with long term solutions.](#) When housing is prioritized over shelters, you then force people to stay on the sidewalk for years while more housing is built. This is literally killing people, while also causing exacerbation of slum conditions. How long would you say it's acceptable to keep people living in tents on the sidewalk until thousands of new units of housing are built, AND there are funds to give this to people w/ zero income?

We just have to build a LOT more housing.

If people want to [defectate in the Safeway aisle](#) instead of in a restroom, should that be their right too? Is it also okay to just lie on the street w/ your ass & more exposed and [crap while you sleep?](#) The point being, that there is no "right" to live on the streets: the fact that people have engaged in illegal activity for a while now, does not make this illegal activity a "right."

Martin vs Boise says people have a right to camp on the street.

That is incorrect. Martin v Boise only says that people have a right to **sleep** (not **camp** 24/7) in public places if there is **not shelter space for them.** Once govt creates shelter for them, it can prohibit them sleeping in public. It can always prohibit camping 24/7, eg see [Berkeley City law](#) which prohibits homeless setting up tents except for sleeping hours 10pm to 7am.

This law shows that even "liberal" cities can get "smart" about abating nuisance on their streets.

Oakland is smart too: in exchange for neighbor support for shelters, plan is to [ban all street camping](#) in areas where shelters are built.