

**City of Lawrence, Kansas
COMMUNITY COMMISSION ON HOMELESSNESS
December 8, 2009 Minutes (Lawrence City Commission Room)**

Members present: Jeanette Collier, Hubbard Collinsworth, Katherine Dinsdale, Loring Henderson, Mike Monroe, Shannon Murphy, Robert Mosely

Members absent: Wes Dalberg, Charlotte Knoche, Shirley Martin-Smith

Staff present: Danelle Dresslar, Margene Swarts

Public present: Brad Cook, Steve Cowan, Jennifer Davis, Hilda Enoch, Heather Hoy, Saunny Scott, Sara Taliaferro, David Tucker

Chair Dinsdale called the meeting to order at 8:30 am.

ITEM NO. 1 Introductions

The members of the CCH introduced themselves.

ITEM NO. 2 Approval of the Agenda and the November 10, 2009 Minutes

Collinsworth noted that David Tucker's name was listed twice on the "Public Present" section of the November 10, 2009 minutes.

ACTION TAKEN

Motion by Collinsworth, seconded by Mosely to approve the Agenda and to approve the November 10, 2009 minutes with the noted correction.

Motion passed unanimously.

ITEM NO. 3 LCS Management Plan Update

Henderson said that when the Management Plan was originally written, it had several pieces very similar to the pieces that make up the Management Plan at their current location including a good neighbor agreement, rights and responsibilities, and consequences for actions and behaviors. These components were utilized to put together the Management Plan. Henderson said that it seemed to be the most transparent option to show people what is done at the shelter when situations arise. He said that he has found that management plans are sometimes a more broad statement of operations and the guiding principles of an organization. What Lawrence Community Shelter wants to work with the neighborhood on is the fact that this Management Plan really cannot be etched in stone and unchangeable. Henderson views this plan as a working document, incorporating LCS, the City Staff, and neighbors input and suggestions. He would like to see a committee of stakeholders including residential and business neighbors that can oversee the Management Plan and amendments and changes as they arise.

Henderson said that he and Taliaferro have been working with the CCC to follow up on guidance from the Planning Commission and to continue to work with the neighbors to the proposed shelter site. There has not been a meeting yet with the neighbors. The CCC has

been contacting residential neighbors and LCS has been in contact with the business neighbors to the proposed location. Henderson said that LCS has a meeting tomorrow with the business neighbors who are immediately next to the proposed shelter location as well as the landlord of 10 Marketplace. Some of the changes to the Management Plan that have been discussed with the business neighbors includes more clarity on the transportation aspect of the plan, as well as clarification that LCS will not release clients out of the shelter at night into the neighborhood. The neighbors have been asked for their input for the management plan. LCS has a meeting on Friday with City Staff on the Management Plan draft update, and the final is due to the City by December 23, 2009.

Collinsworth asked Henderson if he will provide copies to the CCH.

Henderson said that there will not be draft copies as it will be changing throughout the development, but there will be copies of the final plan provided to the CCH.

Dinsdale asked if there has been an outline created for changes to the Management Plan.

Henderson said that he received notes from Sheila Stogsdill, Assistant Director of Planning, that were taken during the Planning Commission meeting. These notes have been reviewed by LCS as well as Pat Slimmer, who is representing the business neighbors, and both parties have agreed that the list is the outline that they will follow in developing the Management Plan. Michelle Mueller, the architect on the project, and Sara Taliaferro of the CCC also have notes from public meetings that they will take into account.

Dinsdale asked Henderson about the timeline going forward for the Management Plan.

Henderson said that everything in the process has been moved to January. They have the SUP for the proposed new site as well as the SUP for the current location.

ITEM NO. 4 Shelter Relocation Timeline Update

Henderson explained that when the Planning Commission postponed the SUP consideration until January it caused LCS to miss their deadline for the purchase of the property, which was December 4. The purchase was conditional on zoning approval, which did not happen. When it became apparent that the Planning Commission would not make a determination prior to the December 4 deadline, LCS wrote a letter to the seller to explore opportunities to extend that date. The seller responded last week with additional conditions on the purchase. Henderson said that right now LCS is proceeding with the discussions. Nothing will happen on the purchase prior to the hearings, and the LCS board is meeting regarding the new conditions of purchase. Henderson said that essentially everything was delayed two months, and the capital campaign has also been delayed. Henderson assured the CCH that they are moving forward and there will definitely be a shelter location.

Dinsdale asked if the steering committee and the LCS board are still supporting the relocation.

Henderson said that there is still support from two co-chairs of the steering committee and they have been very vocal with their support.

Henderson suggested that the CCH advance the agenda at this time to **ITEM NO. 6** **Emergency Overflow Shelter Update** and he would provide that update.

ITEM NO. 6 **Emergency Overflow Shelter Update**

Henderson said that there is now an overflow plan set up as part of a combined effort of LCS, The Salvation Army, and several local churches including Plymouth Congregational and the Methodist Church. The overflow plan takes effect when the temperature is below 30 degrees. The overflow shelter will rotate churches and locations. Henderson noted that they had not encountered an overflow situation until the previous evening. The additional people were fed at LCS, then transported to the offsite location, and returned in the morning to LCS for breakfast. This is the plan for overflow shelter situations going forward.

Dinsdale asked Henderson how many individuals were considered overflow clients last evening.

Henderson said that they only had five individuals last evening that were over the capacity of the shelter. Those people were transported to the offsite location with bedding and mats last evening and then brought back to LCS this morning.

ITEM NO. 5 **HPRP Update/E-Housing Discussion of Case Management**

Heather Hoy, LDCHA, told the CCH that HPRP began serving clients in mid-November, and so far 28 people have applied for the program. Hoy said that of the 28 that have applied 18 have been determined eligible for assistance. There have been seven individuals go through the Housing Stabilization Course that is a requirement of obtaining the HPRP funding. To date, HPRP is paying rent for seven families. With the Rapid Re-housing portion of the funding, three people have been put through the class and are receiving assistance, and there are several other eligible participants that are taking the stabilization class next week. Hoy stressed to the CCH that it is important to remember that this is a housing stabilization program and that it is not designed for the chronically homeless. This is the regulation from the Federal Government. The HMIS system is utilized for determining eligibility, and the information for the client is entered, and the system will determine if the individual qualifies for assistance. Hoy said there have been some cases where ineligibility has been determined and they have not been able to help the person. There are two LDCHA case managers working with the program on the housing case management component, and LDCHA is working with other agencies as well. The client needs to maintain case management through the other agencies as well to create a wrap around effort. LDCHA provides the housing piece of the case management.

Hoy said on the E-Housing Connection, there are 26 people on the list, and of those 18 are housed and 8 others are looking for homes. If a family is determined to be ineligible for HPRP then they are being routed to E-Housing instead. LDCHA is using HOME funds for security deposits, and the rental assistance component is coming from outside funding from the City. The case management for E-Housing is coming through LDCHA and Bert Nash. ECKAN still has some clients in the program but they are not accepting new clients for the E-Housing Connection.

Murphy asked Hoy what criteria is making people ineligible for HPRP funding.

Hoy said that there are many questions on the HMIS form including questions about the client's history and current situations with childcare, income, health, education, transportation availability, housing, and length of time homeless, among others. The system looks at the barriers to stabilization and scores the information accordingly. The system then kicks out a score and the score determines if they are eligible or not. The less barriers to housing they have the better the score. HMIS ultimately decides who is eligible.

Dinsdale asked Hoy if she could determine where the biggest hole in the Housing Vision exists in terms of what she has seen with the E-Housing Connection and HPRP.

Hoy said that the biggest gap she sees is in housing for larger families. Finding affordable housing for these larger families that have so many barriers to obtaining housing is a problem. LDCHA has been doing a lot of referrals to LCS for those that cannot be helped through the LDCHA programs, and LDCHA has been doing a lot of work trying to make people feel comfortable about the shelter. Hoy said that yesterday they worked with a family of six who is not eligible for the LDCHA programs or Family Promise, so they referred them to the shelter.

Dinsdale asked if these families would be eligible for Permanent Supportive Housing.

Swarts said that as a general rule, Permanent Supportive Housing is reserved for the individual who is chronically homeless, which would indicate that they are unaccompanied.

Collinsworth asked Hoy how many families they are working with right now.

Hoy said that there are five larger families that they are trying to house currently.

Collinsworth asked if it was a problem that has been creeping up on us, or is it a problem that has arisen within the last few months.

Collier said that the families have been around a long time. Most of these families are long time residents of Douglas County, and now they have so many housing barriers that they have a hard time accessing services from anyone.

Swarts asked Hoy about the family of six and why they were not eligible for Family Promise.

Hoy said that this family did not follow the rules and guidelines at Family Promise so they are ineligible for housing through their program as a result.

Dinsdale asked if the current design for case management was sufficient.

Steve Cowen, LDCHA, said that with their program the case management is sufficient. They are working to keep their case load small as it is very intense work in a short period of time. They are working closely with Bert Nash as well.

David Tucker, Bert Nash, said that the Homeless Outreach Team is exploring different options to handle the case management load. They are looking at ways to make it more effective because there is a shorter timeframe that they are able to work with the individual because of their entire case load.

Hoy said that the HPRP case management requirement is three months and the transitional housing program requirement is two years.

Collinsworth asked if the CCH can have copies of the guidelines to all the programs that everyone is using so they can be informed if a citizen asks them specific questions about housing programs in the community.

Hoy said that she can provide that to the Commission.

Collier added that with the stimulus funding that ECKAN received they opened 150 new cases in two months, and they were all evictions. They will be working with the clients for 90 days. They are not restricted by a timeframe or services that they can provide. Because of the influx of new cases ECKAN had to change their program guidelines.

Murphy said that the Correctional Facility is also looking at case management for those who are released. There may be those who are not able to qualify for other case management because of their situation. They are exploring the idea of a 90 day follow up case management plan for those who go through reentry.

Collier said that there is also another agency that has contacted ECKAN to provide additional case management in the community.

Mosely asked what other options do the larger families have when they do not qualify for anything.

Dinsdale said that they have the shelter as an alternative.

Henderson added that they have places for families available.

Hoy said that there was one family on E-Housing that was very comfortable and happy at the shelter. This family is happy to talk about their experiences at the shelter.

Collier said it was a problem of the continuation of generational poverty. They cannot afford to rent and even if they are able to rent they are constantly in a state of eviction.

Collinsworth asked Henderson if a family of four comes into the shelter does this result in four less beds for use at the shelter.

Henderson said that families do get priority, and they do have to stay under the occupancy limit. Families will get in first, and with the current weather situation there is now an overflow plan so there will not be anyone left on the street.

ITEM NO. 7 Public Comment.

Sara Taliaferro, CCC, said that they are attempting to communicate with the neighbors near the new shelter location. She has attempted to contact two neighbors so far, and one did not want to have a face-to-face meeting or a phone conversation, so that individual requested they

correspond by mail. The second person is the spokesperson for the residential neighbors, and has been very difficult to reach. Taliaferro said that when she was able to contact her, the individual did not have time to talk to her. Taliaferro said that they are keeping a list and are poised to have a meeting where everyone is present and can have a dialog.

Dinsdale asked if there was anything that the CCH could do.

Taliaferro said she is not certain that they can help out at this time; it is a case of trying to have the neighbors agree to meet to discuss the proposed site and the Management Plan component.

Taliaferro commented on the panhandling issue, telling the CCH that she has attended three meetings as a citizen regarding the proposed ban on panhandling. Taliaferro said that it is her understanding that the topic will be on the City Commission agenda for the December 15 meeting. The meetings that she has attended have been citizens concerned with the ban on panhandling and have some compassionate alternatives that they would like to explore instead. The citizens want to meet with City Manager and City staff to have discussions on the alternatives.

Dinsdale asked if they had a specific alternative in mind.

Taliaferro said that they have some ideas.

Dinsdale asked if Taliaferro would be attending the City Commission meeting regarding the panhandling ban.

Taliaferro said that she would attend as a citizen. She has spoken with the group of concerned citizens and has offered facilitation if they would like to look at that option. The Coalition for Homeless Concerns does not want to come out with support on either side until they see what will happen with the City Commission in their discussions. The Coalition for Homeless Concerns does acknowledge that until a decision is made or an alternative is found this discussion will continue to come up in the community.

There was no additional public comment.

ITEM NO. 8 Miscellaneous/Calendar.

Swarts said that the next meeting is January 12, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. in the City Commission meeting room.

ITEM NO. 8 Adjourn.

ACTION TAKEN

Motion by Collinsworth, seconded by Mosely to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 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		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	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	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	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