IFC Neighbor Plan
Additional Information for the Public Record

June 11th, 2012
## History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| May 2008   | Backroom Deal Announced                        | No public siting process  
No publicly vetted criteria                                              |
| Summer 2010| Shelter Subcommittee                            | No public input integrated into plan. 
No Fair Share required.                                                 |
| October 2010| 1,201 Signature Petition                       | Presented to Council                                                  |
| Spring 2011| SUP Hearings                                    | None of the neighbor stipulations/conditions were incorporated in SUP  |
| May 2011   | Neighbor Plan Resolution (for “communication plan”) | Planning Dept drafted resolution with IFC input and no neighbor input. |
| March 2012 | Neighbor Plan Meeting End                       | Not voted on by committee. Not published until done deal.             |
## $2.2M Taxpayer Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC HFA Support Housing Dev</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal EDI</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chapel Hill HOME</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chapel Hill CDBG</td>
<td>$322,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased Land</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Contribution**

To date – new 2013 allocation likely to be $400,000

**Overall Shelter Project Costs***

$5,200,000

---

*With land value

---

Findings 1, 3, 4
Neighbors didn’t ask for this plan

It was created to provide Political Cover and dubbed the “Good Neighbor Plan”

The Shelter Ordinance / Guideline decision intended to make up for removing the 25 bed shelter limit was permanently deferred to clear the way for this project
## Neighbors Attended Many Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept SUP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Removal of 25 Bed Max</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation – Neighbors &amp; IFC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC BOT Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Subcommittee</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board – Shelter Guidelines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – Shelter Guidelines (no action)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP Information Session</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Rec – SUP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board – SUP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC’s Controlled Issue Gleaning Mtgs – Falsely billed as “Community Discussions”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP Hearings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor Plan Meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>27 Meetings</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighbors Repeatedly asked Council To

- Acknowledge Saturation of At Risk Facilities
- Require Fair Share by Ordinance
  - Assure Homestead Area that we have done our part & no more at-risk
- Remove Emergency Shelter Component
  (Transitional Only – just as IFC & Kleinschmidt “sold” it)
  - Or at least a forcing timeline to move Emergency Shelter
- Require government photo ID (2 adj preschools)
- Disallow Intoxicated & High Men
- Require Public Process for Future Projects
  - For Public Land –OR– Significant Public Funding
Here’s what neighbors got

... (NONE OF THOSE)
IFC withheld drafts from public until
- Two weeks AFTER the final was approved by IFC board
- AFTER the final was submitted to Council
  - (Thus, public has not seen/commented on any drafts)

Final Draft was
- Not seen by committee until after submitted
- Not voted on by committee
Process Issues

- Remained a stacked deck even after Council intervention
  - No merchants from Shoppes at Homestead were invited
  - No small business owners invited
  - Most neighbors were handpicked

- Open Meeting Issues
  - Did not follow NC Open Meeting Law
  - Attendees not allowed to record
  - Attendees spent 1 hour per meeting to review/correct notes
  - Controversy remains over what was said
Process Issues

- Neighbors Concerns Were Ignored
  - Without neighbor input, the plan would have been substantially the same

- This plan could have been done in 2–3 meetings
  - If IFC had included neighbor requests from SUP
  - If IFC had provided latest drafts at each meeting
  - If IFC had invited neighbors with concerns
  - If IFC had followed open meeting laws
For The Record

- Andy was hired by IFC to facilitate the meetings themselves.
- IFC did not hire Andy to edit the document. IFC was the sole editor of the document.
- Andy took notes during the meetings and these notes were edited by members and proposed to the group.
  - On several occasions, there were disagreements between the notes and participant recollections.
- No one was allowed to record the meetings. When the vote for recording was taken, the individual votes of members were not recorded.
- The resolution adopted by the town council was originally drafted by the town planning department and IFC before being put on the final SUP town council agenda.
The general makeup of the committee was proposed by town council, but IFC invited and picked the members.

In the initial committee, those who shared concerns during the SUP hearings were specifically excluded by IFC as neighbor participants except for one seat. After the town council intervened, a few additional neighbors who were known to have concerns were added.

It was clear that the majority of the committee members would vote for whatever IFC wanted.

IFC was free to include or ignore input from the members of the committee. The committee had no say in what actually appeared in the document. The committee could not require specific wording nor specific elements.

Votes were not taken on required elements, wording, etc.
For The Record

- No draft of the plan was made available on IFC's neighbor plan website prior to April 30th, 2012, despite many committee members and several town council members requesting this.

- The final version proposed by IFC was NOT provided to the committee prior to being submitted to the town council.
  - Just to be clear, the final version proposed by IFC was NOT endorsed or otherwise ratified by the committee.

- There were significant gaps in what the closest actual residential neighbors wanted versus what ended up in the document and policies. It is *not* the case that everyone was on the same page. Significant controversy remains.

- The plan does not currently propose how it will be modified and approved, though this was discussed during several meetings.

- Had drafts been provided more quickly, the neighbor plan could have been completed many months earlier.
Membership
Only a few are “real” neighbors
Only 1 Likely Neutral Member on Committee

- Who:
  - Lives within 1 mile
  - Is not running for town council
  - Was appointed by IFC Sponsoring Org or Church
  - Was Not Handpicked
Committee Members Living within ½ Mile

- 1 Town Council Candidate
With Minor Kids Within 1 Mile

- Two Members
  - One Neutral
  - One Church Affiliated
Members Attended Any of 6 Shelter Subcommittee Meetings

- (NONE)
Small Business Owners Within 1 Mile

- (NONE)
Staff of 2 Adjacent Preschools

- (NONE)
Where Committee Members Live

- **Green**
  - Handpicked or
  - IFC Church
- **Purple**
  - Council Candidate
- **Yellow**
  - Neutral?
  - Added 3rd Mtg

70% of Committee lives MORE THAN One Mile Away
Area Around Homestead Park

- Three preschools
- Two afterschool programs
- Homestead Park
  - soccer
  - baseball
  - playgrounds
- 13 Neighborhoods
  - 1,700 homes
  - 3 mobile home parks
  - 900 student beds at Chapel Ridge/Chapel View
- Senior center

Source: Orange County Property Tax Records

Findings 1, 3, 4
Neighborhood
Already Home to
Freedom House

- 17 Detoxification Beds
  - Detoxes ±850 Substance Addicts Yearly
  - 50% Orange County Residents / 50% Outside County
- 22 Drug Rehabilitation Beds
  - House for Men; House for Women
  - Thousands served yearly in outpatient programs
Area Home to Homestart Women’s Shelter

- 56 Bed Women and Children Shelter
- Located on Homestead Road just SW of Homestead Park

American Planning Assoc Says

“The over-concentration of social services may lead to fewer positive impacts for both residents and those seeking social service programs, which is the opposite of the positive impacts expected from efficiencies of scale when like services are provided in close proximity.”

Source: Zoning Practice, Jan 2010, provided by planning
Findings 1,3,4
The US Justice Dept Says

"...if a neighborhood came to be largely composed of groups homes, that could adversely affect individuals with disabilities and would be inconsistent with the objective of integrating persons with disabilities into the community"

"A consideration of over-concentration could be considered in this context"

U.S Dept of Justice, 2008. Also see Cincy proposed amendments, p.38. Findings 1,3,4
# Impacts of Services

Vary Widely by Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Incidents (no EMS calls)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Shelter</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Shelter</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald McDonald House</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSI Umstead Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Teacch” Division</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Point Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Ridge Group Home</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC Tasc</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>