Committee Members

The following committee members contributed to this presentation:

- Carl Schuler
- Jason Kirk
- Steve Kirschner
- Mark Peters
- Tina Coynesmith
Neighbors’ Hope for GNP

- That the substantive issues would stop being deferred
  - That these would be addressed in the neighbor plan and the lease
- That a level of confidence would result from defining mitigation for impacts and situations where things do not go as planned

If these issues are ignored, then it harms the chances that this facility can be successful
Town’s Long Term Responsibility

- In the second meeting, a neighbor asked:
  - What if, against all good intentions, something bad happens? What is IFC promising the neighbors that it will do?

- This is your (town council’s) 50 year lease

- There should be no ambiguity in the neighbor plan or Lease
Not Dispute Resolution

- We asked for the dispute resolution center to facilitate the meeting process.
  - But, DSC was hired only to facilitate discussion with two main functions*
    - To encourage a civil tone
    - In absence of a recording, to provide notes

- Andy Sachs did a good job at what he was hired to do, but the neighbors asked council for a more traditional dispute resolution to reach a mutually agreed document

*See the background materials for email from Andy Sachs with details
Mayor Kleinschmidt: “Can we put it in as stipulation in the SUP that the 17 people would assemble in Carboro.”

IFC Lawyer: “That is what we proposed. Issues of operational concern (such as where people are picked up) are better put in the good neighbor plan.”

Town Lawyer: “Add provisions to the good neighbor plan. Plan for identifying emergency guests for this location at an offsite location. Could be included in the GNP.”

[May 9, 2012 Hearing]
Excerpts from SUP Hearing

_Council Member Easthom:_ “How will people be admitted on an emergency basis and how do they get to the location at MLK?......what are the details”

_Council Member Ward:_ “As the lawyer suggested, we should add that to resolution C... the details for that need to be incorporated in the GNP. I support it being an element of the GNP.”

[May 9, 2012 Hearing]
Excerpts from SUP Hearing

- **Council Member Czajkowski:** “Plan that was presented to us tonight that some # of people who need emergency shelter will happen at an offsite location.”

- **Mayor Kleinschmidt:** “This facility is not a walk up facility. We are going to put in as a **requirement hopefully in the good neighbor policy**, which I would support in resolution c, a requirement that people be brought in from offsite. **Needs to be somewhere that is not this site, so it does not become a walk up facility**….when the night is over they are taking off site. It addresses a lot of the concerns…”  
  [http://youtu.be/s_Jt5v0lwkI](http://youtu.be/s_Jt5v0lwkI)

[May 9, 2011 Hearing]
Mayor Kleinschmidt: “Several amendments for resolution C. “
Council Member Ward: “Bring into the GNP things like the offsite location and other elements that we are not thinking about tonight.”
Mayor Kleinschmidt: “We need to include that in the list.”
Council Member Ward: “Including details about an offsite location for receiving and returning guests”

Council Member Easthom: “The resolution does not have enough teeth.”
Mayor Kleinschmidt: “Council is ensuring that while a lot of the things that were asked for tonight may not have been deemed appropriate for a SUP approval are increasingly relevant in what resolution C proposes.”

[May 9, 2012 Hearing]
Unaddressed Concern #1

Drop-In Policy

IFC stated at the SUP hearings there would be no drop-in’s

Council Members approved the SUP because emergency shelter clients would be transported to and from the facility and no drop-ins would be allowed
What assurances can IFC give the community that safety and security in surrounding neighborhoods will not be compromised?

- Not a drop-in center
- IFC will do assessments, screen and check sex offender registry before men are enrolled
- IFC will have residents sign contracts and agreements on basic rules, expectations and consequences
- Security systems will be installed, with cameras inside and outside the building
- No personal visitors policy
- Actively discouraging loitering, panhandling and inappropriate behavior on adjoining property
- Resident arrests very small percentage
Unaddressed Concern #1

Drop-in Policy Loophole

“Community House standard procedures will prohibit anyone from being admitted to IFC’s emergency shelter or transitional housing programs on a drop-in basis.” GNP p7

“If drop-ins occur, Community House staff and volunteers will explain emergency shelter and transitional housing application procedures and refer these individuals to other social service agencies when needed. Repeated drop-in requests by the same individual may result in the loss of Community House services including being trespassed from IFC properties.” GNP p7 [emphasis added]
Unaddressed Concern #1

The Drop-in Loophole

- Plan language is ambiguous – could allow for drop ins
- Over 50 year lease drop in exceptions could become the rule
- Neighbors offered alternatives which were not incorporated into the document
  - The police crisis unit could be used to intake emergency shelter guests after hours
  - IFC could keep its administrative offices open later or open to do intake
Unaddressed Concerns #2

Government ID still not required for emergency clients

- IFC said identification would be required but GNP document says IFC can print its own “IFC Identification”
- IFC’s prior operating model was appropriate for downtown…
- But new site is adjacent to 200 preschoolers and Homestead Park
- Given that this site was chosen by the town, there must be different standards
Unaddressed Concern #3

Issues with Alternative to Government ID

Emergency clients with no government ID can provide a name, birthdate, and social security number for intake. IFC will check a background database to verify information and perform a background check.

The client can provide a false name and SS number to pass the background check.

IFC does not define the background check process and the specific information the client needs to provide to “pass” the “ID substitute” background check.

Monthly reporting should list all clients who passed background checks at intake without a government ID.
Unaddressed Concern #4

Reporting Gaps and Temporary Reporting

Important Data Missing from Reports
  ◦ Verification that background checks were run on all clients & number of failed checks
  ◦ Dates that emergency shelter was provided and number of clients served each night
  ◦ Verification that the 17 emergency shelter guest limit was adhered to each night

IFC should make a commitment to provide reporting for the term of the lease – no reporting for 48 years is not good for neighbors
No Consequences for Failed Operational Procedures

If IFC fails to ID clients, transport shelter guests, run background checks, adhere to occupancy limits, or defaults on any other operational procedures required in the neighbor plan, there are no consequences.

Plan assumes IFC will operate perfectly for 50 years.
Unaddressed Concern #6

No Consequences for failure to mitigate any impacts to the community

Many jurisdictions require licensing and yearly renewal of licensing for shelters, but not Chapel Hill

Neither the SUP, the neighbor plan, nor the upcoming Lease specifies remedies that Council may leverage to mitigate community or neighborhood impacts
Unaddressed Concern #7

Cots should be removed after an emergency shelter opens

There is major consensus in the community that this site is not appropriate for an emergency shelter. Please codify these provisions in the Lease.

We don’t want to see a PORCH II situation where a new shelter competes with IFC for emergency shelter funding. The new facility should own the mission and the associated funding stream.
Emergency Shelter guests who are high or under the influence of alcohol will be admitted.

Disruptive clients will be discharged into the neighborhoods. The police stated that if they are called and there is insufficient grounds to arrest, they will release men onto the MLK sidewalk.

Might be fine for downtown, but not adjacent to preschools and the park
Unaddressed Concern #9

Plan can change tomorrow with NO council approval

Council can pass Plan today, but IFC can change it tomorrow

We provided specific recommendations for*
  ◦ Advance notification to neighbors
  ◦ Required neighbor meetings
  ◦ Approval via Council consent agenda

But IFC ignored these requests

*See background materials
Neighbors Request To Council

- Do not approve the plan until IFC clearly addresses concerns
The Lease

Kleinschmidt:

“We own the lease approval process. The burden tonight is for the ifc on the 4 findings. They [IFC] have an additional burden ahead of them to make you feel good to approve the lease.”

[May 9, 2011]
Neighbors Request Council

- Require These Lease Terms
  - No Drop Ins
  - Require Government Issued ID
  - Codify sex offender limitations & Acknowledge that they are not served in Orange County
  - Council can stop Emergency Shelter at will (without cause)
  - Emergency shelter component will not operate on any night another shelter near CH/C is open
  - Permanent closure of emergency shelter after another one opens
  - Council can reduce occupancy & services to mitigate impacts at will
Neighbors Request Council Also

- **Require Fair Share by Ordinance**
  - Declare Homestead Park Area Saturated
    - No additional homeless emergency shelters, transitional, soup kitchens, day shelters, drug detox, drug rehab, detention facilities, or jails within 1 mile of Homestead Park
  - Require separation or density limits by ordinance
    - Example – No more than two 20+ person shelter/transitional/drug rehab+detox facilities in 1 square mile. Note that Homestead will have 3 in one-fifth (1/5) of a square mile.
BACKGROUND MATERIALS
Dispute Settlement Center’s Role

The following is take verbatim from an email from Andy Sachs on May 21, 2012:

My contract with IFC for this process defines my role as follows, “DSC will provide facilitation services to IFC in support of IFC’s efforts to convene and sustain a work group process through which stakeholders to be identified by IFC will advise IFC on the development of a Good Neighbor Plan for the Community House Transitional Housing Program.”

The committee’s role was to advise IFC, not to resolve disputes or create a consensus.

The committee didn’t take votes on substantive matters, but instead conducted an ongoing conversation with IFC participating and listening as well as it was able to.

As facilitator, I focused my attention on helping IFC and the group have well-structured meetings and civil conversations.

I did not write or edit or mediate the contents of the Good Neighbor Plan. I kept the group’s meeting notes, which I believe to be a good record of the discussions.
Suggested Modification Process

Wording Proposed by ABetterSite and rejected by IFC:

Neighbors who have indicated that they wish to be notified of CHAC meetings or other IFC or Community House communications will be notified 30 days in advance via email that changes to this document are being considered by the CHAC. This communication will provide the date where said changes will be considered as well as the draft (or link to a draft) of said changes (with said changes marked up to distinguish from the previously approved document).

Neighbors within 1000 feet will be notified by postal mail at least 30 days prior to the submission of changes to this document to town staff so that neighbors may comment on the changes prior to submission. This will also allow neighbors to be aware that the changes will appear on an upcoming Town Council agenda.

The Town Council agrees that it will accept changes via an action item its agenda, likely on the consent agenda. This will allow non-controversial changes to be approved without using Council time. It will also allow changes of a controversial nature to be discussed and modified where necessary.