

**City of Lawrence, Kansas  
COMMUNITY COMMISSION ON HOMELESSNESS  
October 13, 2009 Minutes (Lawrence City Commission Room)**

**Members present:** Jeanette Collier, Hubbard Collinsworth, Wes Dalberg, Katherine Dinsdale, Charlotte Knoche, Shirley Martin-Smith, Mike Monroe, Robert Mosely, Shannon Murphy

**Members absent:** Loring Henderson

**Staff present:** Danelle Dresslar, Margene Swarts

**Public present:** Sara Taliaferro, Diane Etzel-Wise, Heather Hoy, Saunny Scott, David Tucker, Carla Helm, Simon Messmer, John Miller, Loring Henderson

Chair Dinsdale called the meeting to order at 8:35 am. She informed the Commission that Sandra Winn-Tutwiler had resigned from the CCH due to scheduling conflicts on Tuesday mornings.

**ITEM NO. 1 Introductions**

The members of the CCH introduced themselves.

**ITEM NO. 2 Approval of the Agenda and the September 15, 2009 Minutes**

Martin-Smith submitted a correction on Item 3, page 1 of the September 15, 2009 minutes. The sentence should read "Martin-Smith stated that she had sent a rough draft of the notes from the subcommittee regarding updating the Housing Vision."

Dinsdale suggested moving items 4 and 5 of the agenda ahead of item 3.

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motion by Knoche, seconded by Monroe to approve the amended Agenda and to approve the September 15, 2009 Minutes with correction.

Motion passed unanimously.

**ITEM NO. 4 Discussion of amendment of the Housing Vision with regard to the number of clients estimated for emergency shelter component.**

Dinsdale noted that there has been a request to update the number of clients estimated for the Emergency Shelter (ES) component of the Housing Vision from 75 individuals to 125 individuals, including 25 family members.

David Tucker, PATH outreach worker, said that in the quarterly report submitted to the CCH it shows that the hours have doubled for the outreach team and 170 additional individuals have been identified as homeless.

Loring Henderson, Lawrence Community Shelter, explained that he wished that the community did not have 125 people who needed the ES component of the Vision, but this is a good estimation based on the number that the shelter had served last winter, the number at the

shelter currently, and the number that the outreach team is serving. In the draft plan that LCS submitted to the Planning office, there is space for five families in the new shelter as well as a central living space. These are the numbers that seem real based on what they are seeing at LCS as well as conversations he has had with Jeanette Collier, ECKAN, regarding the families she is serving.

Martin-Smith said that if this number is in need of updating in the Housing Vision, how does this change the number under Temporary Housing? She asked Henderson if the number of 125 under the ES component was based on what we see to day with the current economic conditions or will the community continue to see 125 as the need in the future. As a member of the CCH, she would like to see the Temporary Housing component really working for people.

Henderson said that this is based on the current numbers that they are seeing. Temporary housing in the community is a concern because Family Promise is full and has a waiting list. There is not enough room there to handle the need. The E Housing Connector is getting established and it focuses mostly on families and the least problematic of the individuals. The Temporary Housing component stays with the same focus. It is the goal for everyone to get people out of the emergency shelter. The point of having programs is that the facility can really help people get out and move on. The number of 125 was based on discussions with the Planning Department. They indicated that LCS needed to submit a number that was going to deal with the situation and that they cannot keep changing it. Henderson said that some of the numbers used are based on conversations with Collier. He said that the current situation may be largely due to the economy and it may not be long term, however the overall numbers are in this ballpark.

Collier added that they need a number that, if needed, can utilize the only emergency shelter that Lawrence will have. Family Promise is full, and E-Housing is not immediate housing. People need somewhere to go during the interim. She indicated that her office has opened up 60 new cases in the last two weeks and they are all families that are facing eviction. If ECKAN did not have the stimulus funds to work with to help those families then they would be homeless. There is also a population of clients that do not qualify for E-Housing. They need somewhere to go.

Knoche said that LCDHA has taken 100 transitional housing applications as well.

Dinsdale said that they need to have trust in the providers and this number seems correct based on those conversations.

Collinsworth asked how many organizations are involved in emergency temporary housing in the community.

Henderson said two for true emergency shelter, LCS and Family Promise.

Swarts added that LDCHA and Family Promise administer temporary housing programs and other agencies can take advantage of these services.

Collinsworth asked Knoche what number of units is needed for emergency temporary housing. According to the current Housing Vision the number is 100.

Knoche deferred to Heather Hoy, LCDHA E-Housing Connector, who indicated she could fill her waiting list if she had an additional 25 units. These 25 units could contain eight one or two bedroom units and the rest could be three to four bedroom units. There are now 30 landlords in Lawrence who are either on the list serve or currently housing a family.

## **ACTION TAKEN**

Motion by Collier, seconded by Mosely to increase the number of clients served by the Emergency Shelter component of the Housing Vision from 75 to 125.

Motion passed 8-1.

### **ITEM NO. 5 Consider LCS application for the new shelter with regard to meeting CCH established Emergency Shelter Facility Considerations. Direct staff to convey support of application regarding meeting the Emergency Shelter Facility Considerations, if appropriate.**

Swarts referred to the draft copy of the memo to the CCH that staff prepared that accompanied the agenda. If the CCH chooses, staff can forward a memo to the Planning Commission and then ultimately to the City Commission showing support for the SUP application. Staff looked at the Emergency Shelter Facility Considerations that the CCH established and then looked at the proposal from LCS as well as previous minutes from CCH meetings. Staff determined whether or not the proposal met any, some, or all of the criteria. It appears to staff that the application does meet all three of the considerations set forth by the CCH. The memo states the established criteria and how the SUP application submitted by LCS meets those considerations.

Martin-Smith said she had no questions or comments regarding the staff memo or review. She agrees that the application submitted by LCS is a match to the considerations set forth by the CCH. She has questions regarding the Management Plan.

Dinsdale agreed that she had no questions or comments regarding the staff memo.

Collinsworth said that he had some concerns about the bus stop in relation to the location of the new shelter site. He said that the memo lists that the proposed shelter site is on a bus stop. The nearest bus stop that he knows of is at 23<sup>rd</sup> and Harper and the bus will not stop in front of the shelter without KDOT approval because it is in a non-stop location. He is concerned with what is defined as walking distance.

Henderson explained that the bus stop is 3/10 of a mile from the proposed site, which is considered walking distance. The school district will not run busses within two miles from the schools, so that may be a baseline for walking distance. The site is also walking distance to 19<sup>th</sup> and Haskell where there are services. LCS currently spends a lot of time getting people to and from places during the day.

Tucker asked how far the current shelter location is from the nearest bus stop.

Henderson said it is a block and a half currently. He is talking to Transit representatives about the possibility of placing a stop in front of the shelter, but it is a process. The jail has been trying for a while to obtain a stop in front of thief facility as well. As the area surrounding the proposed site develops the need will become greater for increased bus stops.

Dinsdale said as there seem to be no more comments regarding the memo of support the discussion can now move toward the Management Plan.

Henderson reiterated that LCS appreciates all comments and guidance from the CCH.

Martin-Smith told Henderson that the entire commission wants LCS to be successful in this application and in front of all the Commissions it will have to face. She has a concern with the section regarding the Rules of Conduct for guests, which is Item four in the Management Plan. Martin-Smith says when she looks at the definition of the Emergency Shelter component in the Housing Vision she feels that this is the public's expectation of the shelter. It is a short term solution to move people off the streets. She said when she reads the number of days that someone will be allowed to stay at the shelter over a 12 month period it seems like a long time for someone to be coming and going from the shelter. There is a plan in place for some people and not for others to get out of the shelter. Not everyone will be successful in getting housed, she understands that, but she would like to see this length of stay tightened up to show that there are real expectations of those who utilize the shelter.

Martin-Smith also asked Henderson about Item six in the Management Plan which is in regard to the "Communications plan that establishes how the shelter will regularly communicate with neighbors and police." She asked Henderson if LCS could take advantage of their website to promote communications with the neighborhood in terms of good neighbor policies. The public should know what is going on at the shelter, including what is going on with the jobs component. He should strongly consider taking advantage of this website to do this. If there has been a challenge with an issue the public should know what is going on and the website is an excellent way to do this. If the public knows they can go to a certain location online to find the answers to their questions that will help quite a bit.

Martin-Smith added that with the last paragraph on Item six of the Management Plan she is concerned that Henderson and LCS are carrying the burden of expectation from the public that they will personally make sure that these types of things do not happen.

Dinsdale agreed and said that promising that the shelter will deny services to those who are caught loitering and camping on private property in the shelter neighborhood is effective, but she is concerned with how they will truly be able to enforce this.

Martin-Smith said she did not want to see Henderson or LCS constantly bombarded with dissatisfaction from the public and the neighborhood.

Sara Taliaferro, CCC Chair, added that when the agenda gets to the CCC report this is something that can be discussed in terms of where the CCC can assist the shelter and Henderson. Her thought would be that she would not counsel the Management Plan not to address this issue, but there needs to be clear definitions and clear parameters. It is a good will gesture to include it but she agrees that it needs to be workable.

Don Huggins, President of the LCS Board of Directors, said he realized that this component can cut both ways when you begin to police activities off site. If the shelter does nothing, the perception is that you are doing nothing. He concurs that in the present location the neighbors are so close that they could see loitering as it was happening. He agreed that there did need to be parameters set.

Knoche suggested wording specifying "verified incidents" or "documented incidents" could be helpful in this section of the management plan. The guidelines will give them something to fall back on.

Collinsworth said that there was a document in the past that dealt with safety. He asked Henderson if there was a safety plan for the proposed site.

Henderson said that the safety plan in the Management Plan is aimed at situational safety. There will be a documented fire safety plan as well and it will be set up for the new address.

Dinsdale wanted to echo the concern Martin-Smith raised on Item four and the length of time one could stay at the shelter. The goal of the Housing Vision is to move guests in and out of the shelter. The wording as it is in the management plan does leave it open that someone could move out for a week and then return for another 120 days. When this comes before the public people are going to want insurance that the goal is still to move people out of the shelter and into housing.

Henderson said that LCS will be setting up a plan for those staying at the shelter as soon as they can. The public should know that from day one shelter guests are being case managed.

Martin-Smith said that in the Rights and Responsibilities section, the conditions of stay are documented. That is what the shelter component of the Housing Vision is all about. She suggested to Henderson blending the two descriptions and restating that in the Management Plan case management will be a key component.

Dalberg asked if the 120 days were for a calendar year or a rolling 12 month period. The Salvation Army headquarters had the same policy, and then it was ultimately determined that it could not work based on a calendar year. They determined it would be from the first time a guest stayed at the shelter until 12 months from then.

Henderson agreed that it is a rolling 12 month period.

Dalberg said that The Salvation Army's headquarters comment about 120 day stays was that if someone was not willing to cooperate from day one why would you keep them in the program? The guest should start the program on day one, and as long as they continued to work the program they could stay there.

Henderson agreed, but said that people arrive in the shelter at all stages, including those who arrive in very bad shape. Some are not able to agree to anything on day one. They can take intake information in increments as well. The name and intake form can be documented on the

first day, but you cannot always get all the information in one day. The LCS goal for intake is within 48 hours.

Dalberg added that there are always those clients who have no intention of working with the program, but will do what they need to do to stay at the shelter.

Henderson said that in the proposed new shelter location there will also be a separation of drinking guests from non-drinking guests. There will be a space for men and a space for women, and a common room for those dealing with drinking, addiction issues, or mental health issues.

Martin-Smith asked about onsite medical care.

Henderson said LCS is still in agreement with the Baker School of Nursing and there will be an onsite clinic that will have several beds for those who have the flu or other illness.

Henderson added that there have been changes to the site plan since the first draft. There was a basement added for storm cellar and mechanical uses, and families were moved from the front to the back of the building. Henderson said in a month LCS goes before the Planning Commission, so the CCH will have one more meeting before that occurs, and he will share any further amendments to the site plan at that meeting.

Hoy asked Henderson about the specifications that the shelter can house up to 25% of guests who are not residents of Lawrence or Douglas County. Her concern is that there may be possible problems with case management and discharge of these clients because they do not have established local residency, which may hinder their options for transitional housing. There are steps that the case managers can take to help those clients obtain residency.

Henderson said that the case managers spend a lot of time to help those clients obtain residency if it is in their case management plan to remain in Lawrence or Douglas County. He is aware that if the person is not a resident of Douglas County that the LDCHA cannot place them in transitional housing.

Martin-Smith asked Henderson if LCS has a family staying there that are not considered Douglas County residents, and they decide that they want to become residents, will LCS will help them to do that?

Henderson said that they would work with the families to do that, and at the same time if they work in case management with someone and it is a better plan for them to go back to their home location they can help them do that as well.

Murphy said the Douglas County residency aspect is a good point to add to the Management Plan. She said that they work with this at the jail as well with reentry. It is important that in the Management Plan there is a method to assist and case manage those who are not initially Douglas County residents because that is a situation that will arise.

Dinsdale asked to clarify that the Management Plan can still be tweaked by LCS, and that the motion the CCH would make would be to support this SUP application for the site.

Swarts agreed and said that the Management Plan can be amended by LCS. The CCH can also amend the memo conveying their support for the site as well.

Martin-Smith asked if the suggestions of the CCH all had to do with the Management Plan.

Dinsdale said it did, and clarified the recommendations were for the 120 day time limit for guests, the Douglas County residency issue, and the effect on Henderson and LCS regarding policing the area.

Taliaferro advised that recommending work on the language of the Management Plan may be enough for Henderson to go on. All points that were brought up are areas of concern that it would be valuable answers for the community to have access to.

Dinsdale thanked LCS for the work that they do and reiterated that the CCH is very excited about the site and moving this project forward. It is very important that this body fully support this activity. She said she supported directing staff to convey CCH support for the application, while recommending work on clarification of language on bus stop, residency, loitering policy, and 120 day requirements.

Knoche agreed that the CCH needs to be very verbal about why they are supporting the application.

Swarts pointed out on the second page of the memo there are specific examples that correspond to the considerations that meet the criteria.

Martin-Smith said it was also important to note in the memo that the City Commission unanimously adopted the Housing Vision in June of 2007.

Knoche agreed that she supported staff forwarding a memo of support on behalf of the CCH for the LCS application.

Dalberg said that he felt that the CCH was trying to go beyond what they said was the minimum criteria and considerations for a shelter site. His concern is that the CCH is trying to micromanage the shelter's operations. The Management Plan is Henderson's plan. He feels that they have gone beyond the considerations.

Martin-Smith agreed with Dalberg that Henderson should have full control of his Management Plan, but at the same time the CCH needs to hold true to what they have been charged with and what they believe.

Knoche said that the CCH is only reviewing the Management Plan and this is not the group saying that Henderson has to do anything. The CCH is utilizing their experience and knowledge of the community to support Henderson's efforts and give advice on the application.

Dalberg asked if the Planning Commission would try to dictate the Management Plan like this.

Swarts said it was within their power to do so.

Dalberg reiterated that LCS was a private non-profit agency and that he did not want to see government dictate how Henderson runs his agency. He feels it should not be the position of the CCH to say how the shelter operates.

Martin-Smith said that the criteria and considerations were written in a very bland form. She said when the CCH is asked to look at the Management Plan that is what they should do. This discussion is to help Henderson and LCS get through the Planning Commission as well as the City Commission.

Dalberg agreed that they were recommendations to help, but he wants to make sure that the CCH is not tying Henderson's hands.

Murphy said that she felt the CCH was just helping with considerations and recommendations as opposed to dictating how Henderson should run his program. The CCH should have a voice to this plan.

Martin-Smith said she agreed with Dalberg that Henderson should be able to dictate how his program is run, however it is the obligation of the CCH to help the application get through the Planning Commission.

Swartz said that there can be language in the memo that there were recommendations for tweaking the Management Plan.

Murphy agreed and said that it can state that there was a recommendation from the CCH for language clarification in the Management Plan. The CCH knows what Henderson is trying to accomplish with the 120 day stay policy, but the public might not understand that and it needs to be effectively conveyed to them. The recommendations given to Henderson were more clarification and definition oriented. The CCH understands the intention, but the public needs to understand it as well.

Martin-Smith agreed and added that this shows there is a process and the application is supported on its merits.

Henderson clarified that the CCH is conveying support for the SUP application and in addition recommending some changes to the Management Plan to be better defined to the public. He added that the recommendations have been very helpful.

Taliaferro agreed and said that this ties in concerns that the public, as well as the Planning Commission and the City Commission, will raise as the application process moves forward. If these things are defined in writing that helps to clear up questions.

## **ACTION TAKEN**

Motion by Dinsdale, seconded by Murphy to direct staff to write a memo acknowledging that the CCH has reviewed the SUP application submitted by LCS for the new proposed shelter location, and that the CCH determined that the site meets the criteria that they have previously

set for a shelter site. The CCH asks that LCS take into consideration recommendations to language in the Management Plan as a guideline for amending wording in regards to the bus stop, residency, loitering policy, and 120 day requirements.

Motion passed unanimously.

### **ITEM NO. 3 CDD Staff Updates.**

Henderson entered the meeting as a voting member at 9:45 a.m.

Swarts spoke to the CCH Resolution and said that she and Martin-Smith have met and have reviewed this document. In December there are four terms expiring on the current Commission. Dalberg is eligible for reappointment, and Dinsdale, Henderson, and Martin-Smith are not eligible for reappointment. The Mayor has acknowledged that those terms are expiring and noted that this is a very important time in the CCH with the current issues related to the shelter relocation. The Mayor asked staff to suggest how the body can get through this time with the terms expiring in December.

Swarts said that she talked to Dinsdale, Henderson and Martin-Smith and that they are all three willing to extend their terms of service six months. Along with the reappointment of Dalberg, this will provide stability to the group through these issues that they are working through at the present time. After the six months, the CCH can have the opportunity to determine what the future holds for the Commission. The intention of staff, upon agreement of the CCH, would be to ask the Mayor to extend the terms and subsequently receive a report from the CCH in the spring to determine the future direction of the Commission.

Collier said she agreed with that because it would be very difficult to get new members up to speed in such a short amount of time.

Knoche said that when she was appointed she had the ability to attend several meetings beforehand to get up to speed and that was very helpful for both her and the CCH.

Swarts agreed that it was a good idea to do that. The plan was to have appointees identified by this time and to begin to get them up to speed but that did not happen. This is the plan that seems the strongest to provide stability to the group at this time.

Knoche said she supported that idea and that continuity was important for keeping things on track.

The CCH agreed unanimously to direct staff to forward the recommendation to the Mayor in support of extending the terms of Dinsdale, Henderson, and Martin-Smith for six months, as well as reappointing Dalberg to the CCH.

Swarts said the HPRP award has been received by the City of Lawrence in partnership with the LDCHA and that there is staff training on October 22. Staff anticipates that funding will be

available November 1. There will be more information released after staff attends the training. All questions regarding the funding administration should be directed to the LDCHA.

On the topic of the utilization of the HMIS system, Swarts reiterated that the City has no ability, other than the HPRP and ESG recipients, to require any agencies to use HMIS. The Balance of State Continuum of Care can have that requirement of their funded agencies, but the City does not have that requirement. At this point in time, HMIS does not seem like a system that the City or providers can depend on for numbers. These figures will still need to come from outreach and the Homeless Count.

Murphy asked if there will be a vacancy announcement for Tutwiler's position on the CCH.

Swarts suggested that it stay vacant for now and the CCH can revisit it in the spring.

Collier asked Swarts about the residency requirements in the CCH Resolution. Since Collier lives outside of the county but is a service provider for the county can the requirements be revisited as well?

Swarts said that is something that will be looked at in the spring as well.

## **ACTION TAKEN**

Motion by Martin-Smith, seconded by Collinsworth to extend the meeting until 10:15 a.m.

Motion passed unanimously.

## **ITEM NO. 6 Receive update from the CCC.**

Taliaferro handed out documents that illustrated three recommendations that the CCC is making to the CCH, including a draft proposal for the CCH Conflict Resolution Protocols/Guidelines. The first document is one that is contingent on LCS and their desire to work with the CCC regarding neighborhood discussions.

Martin-Smith noted that the document is very timely. If the neighborhood discussions are handled well and communicated well this could enhance the application and answer questions that will come up before the Planning Commission.

Dinsdale asked if there needs to be a quick approval for this document given the timeline that the CCH is working with.

Taliaferro suggested that the CCH review the document and give recommendations to the CCC if appropriate. There was another CCH meeting before the LCS application goes before the Planning Commission so there is still time to review the document.

Collier said the document is helpful, but it may be too technical for the public. She asked Taliaferro if there can be any examples added to the document to better explain the intention.

Taliaferro said that one of the cautions for giving examples is that it may appear as if you are already making a suggestion for a line of thinking. In connection, the facilitation team clarified informally what they might need to consider so the CCC stays in the right regarding liability issues. The CCC is not a City agent, so it is important not to present themselves as one, or give anyone the idea that the CCC is working on behalf of the City. Anyone who is involved in a facilitated meeting has to do so on a volunteer basis. An individual cannot be forced to be there and participate. There are no one-on-one meetings with people. Everything is done in a group meeting setting. Everything is documented and all the participants are able to review what was said.

Collier asked Taliaferro if the City Commission or the Planning Commission was aware of how the CCC functions, and if they do not, it is important that they know that.

Knoche suggested adding the CCC as a resource and let the City Commission and the Planning Commission know their role and that they have come forward and offered assistance with neighborhood communications.

Collier asked Taliaferro if any agency that deals with homeless issues can utilize the service of the CCC.

Taliaferro said yes.

Henderson added that any issue that has two sides can be aided by the CCC.

Taliaferro explained that the document she disbursed outlines flexible guidelines. There are two situations where facilitation is appropriate, and one situation where mediation would be recommended. The CCC is trained in facilitation. They are not able to mediate. There would need to be a contracted mediator to handle those situations where mediation is necessary.

Dinsdale said that the CCH would read the document and come back in November with approval if appropriate.

Swarts reminded the CCH that the next meeting will take place before LCS goes before the Planning Commission. Anything the CCH wants to pass along can be part of that agenda packet. This would include anything agreed upon at the next meeting.

Taliaferro said that the CCC has worked with the LCS to contact neighbors of the current proposed site. There has been no indication thus far of voluntary participation from the neighbors. At this point they are still exploring all the facts and exploring the notion of the shelter being in their neighborhood as opposed to somewhere else.

Henderson said that LCS has to hold a public meeting before the application goes before the Planning Commission. The CCC can be involved in this if necessary. The question is that of voluntary participation. There will be a presentation by the architect at these meetings. LCS and the CCC are working with the architect to see if this can be a situation of voluntary participation

with the understanding that there will be a presentation and an understanding of the topic at hand.

Dinsdale asked if Henderson could make the choice to let the CCC run the meeting.

Taliaferro said that they must talk to the architect first and then the neighbors.

Mosely asked if this meeting might be grounds for a mediator due to the potential of heated conversation.

Taliaferro said that they would set up ground rules for those involved in the meeting. If during the course of the meeting it comes so heated that people are not able to work within the ground rules then the CCC facilitator would stop the meeting.

Knoche recommended having a facilitator at the meeting. There will be no split focus and Henderson and LCS would be able to fully focus on the meeting content.

**ITEM NO. 7 Receive Report on Homeless Outreach Workers.**

Knoche said that she did not have a chance to prepare the reports for the Commission but that she would have them ready for the November meeting.

Collier asked the Bert Nash outreach team why the reports that they submit are still not reporting children by their ages. She has met with school social workers and they are interested in coordinated services for the community but they need these specific numbers to accomplish that.

Tucker asked what age ranges she needed.

Collier said that she needed the ages of all the children being reported. There is nothing that shows a breakdown of ages within the 0-12 and 13-17 age range categories. The data needs to be determined so the Lawrence School District can apply for their grant.

**ITEM NO. 8 Discussion of Drop in Center on the Downtown area.**

Because of time, Dinsdale tabled this discussion until the November meeting.

**ITEM NO. 9 Public Comment.**

There was no additional public comment.

**ITEM NO. 10 Miscellaneous/Calendar.**

Henderson said in addition to the SUP application for the proposed new shelter site, LCS also submitted a SUP request to extend the SUP on the current building on Kentucky Street. The current SUP is up in April. The hardest thing to do at this time is speculate when the shelter might be able to move. Henderson said he hopes to know more in January.

Martin-Smith left the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

Simon Messmer, Director of Housing to Homes with the Mental Health America of the Heartland, introduced himself and said he was submitting an application with the Balance of State CoC for permanent supportive housing in Lawrence. His application is due at the end of October. He indicated that he would email his proposal to members of the CCH.

Tucker asked about the staff memo conveying the support of the CCH for the LCS SUP application. He was concerned about the Planning Commission and the City Commission seeing the recommendations that the CCH made to Henderson.

Swarts explained that the memo would list the criteria set forth by the CCH and how the proposed shelter site meets those criteria. It would document that there were recommendations made.

Tucker said he had hoped for a fully supportive letter for the shelter.

Swarts agreed and said that it was very important for the public to realize that the proposed new shelter site will be a different situation than the current shelter at 10<sup>th</sup> and Kentucky. This understanding was the reason that the CCH developed these considerations and criteria. These are the components that the new proposed shelter site must encompass to be successful. The current location will not just be picked up and relocated to a new area. There needs to be outreach efforts to let the community know what this new shelter will entail. It will not function as a holding facility for homeless, but it will offer a place to sleep, a place to learn, and a place to get help.

Tucker said he appreciated the comments and the recommendations are good for Henderson to think about, but his concern is listing specific things that the CCH has discussed such as recommending how long someone can stay there. Tucker said he felt like this was something that the CCH should not dictate in the memo to the Planning Commission and City Commission.

Knoche said that the memo will convey that the CCH has looked at this SUP and by the established considerations it meets the criteria for a successful shelter site.

Henderson noted that Tucker's concern is listed in the recommendations that were made to the Management Plan.

Swarts said that the Planning Commission will want to know that the CCH has looked at this and considered this and understands what the application says.

Knoche added that the process is what is important. There are several years at stake here. The CCH has brought those into the process that have the most experience in this arena.

Collier told the CCH she would not be in attendance for the November Meeting.

**ITEM NO. 11 Adjourn.**

**ACTION TAKEN**

Motion by Dinsdale, seconded by Monroe to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Motion passed unanimously.

**Attendance Record**

Members	01/09	02/09	03/09	04/09	05/09	06/09	Jun PR	07/09	July PR	08/11/09**	08/18/09	09/15	10/09	11/09	12/09
Jeanette Collier	+	+	+	+	E		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Hubbard Collinsworth	+	+	+	+	E	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		
Wes Dalberg	+	+	+	E	+	E	E	+	+		+	+	+		
Katherine Dinsdale	+	+	E	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	E	+		
Loring Henderson	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Charlotte Knoche	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	E	E	E	E	+		
Shirley Martin-Smith	+	E	E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Mike Monroe	+	+	+	+		E		+	E				+		
Robert Mosely	+	+			+						+		+		
Shannon Murphy	+	+	E	E	+	+	+	+	+	E	+	+	+		
Sandy Winn-Tutwiler			*E	+	+		E	+						***	

\* designates first meeting after appointment.

\*\* no meeting; lack of quorum

\*\*\*resigned prior to meeting