

Meeting Notes
**TLNA Steering Committee Meeting for the Dane County Proposal for
a Day Resource Center for the Homeless at 1326 E. Washington**

2 May 2016, Christ Presbyterian Church, 944 E. Gorham St.

Attendees:

TLNA Representatives, City and County Staff, Contractors, Elected Officials:
Satya Rhodes-Conway, Former District 12 Alder and Meeting Facilitator
Patrick Heck, TLNA Development Committee Chair
Heidi Wegleitner, District 2, Dane County Supervisor
Ledell Zellers, District 2 City of Madison Alder
Todd Violante, Director, Planning and Development, Dane County
Lynn Green, Director Human Services, Dane County
Casey Becker, Human Services, Dane County
Dawn O’Kroley, Dorchner Associates
Tim Parks, City of Madison Planning Division of Dept. of PC&ED
Jim O’Keefe, City of Madison Community Development

Potential Funders/Operators/Service Providers/Organizational Reps.

Deedra Atkinson, United Way
Jackson Fonder, Catholic Charities
Linda Ketcham, Madison Area Urban Ministries

Neighbors and Interested Parties:

Steve Wilke, Marsha Cannon, David Staple, Shawn Kapper, Joe Hoey, Karla Handel,
Tom Kapper, Cameron Field, Mary Lang Sollinger, Pat Kelly, Bob Klebba, Jerusha
Daniels, Tim Olsen, Rigina MacNaughton, Mary Lou Snowden, Alan Gold, Jeff
Spitzer-Resnick, Patrick McDonnell, Sandra Ward, Rich Freihoefer

Introduction:

Alder Zellers called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. She introduced Satya Rhodes-Conway who will facilitate the meeting in TLNA President Patty Prime’s absence. Satya introduced that meeting ground rules and agenda. Attendees then introduced themselves.

County Update:

Casey Becker from County Human Services, representing Lynn Green who would arrive late due to another meeting, presented recent updates to the proposal. She said that the Draft Concept Paper released in April had a couple more meetings to go through to gather input. The funders and project partners put this draft out for public input. The general hope is that they will get some good feedback, including issues and recommendations from the neighborhood. The paper was informed by several things,

including the 2013 process and results from the City-County Homeless Issues Committee's 2013 work and Urban Ministry's work.

County Update (design):

Dawn O'Kroley said the design plan was the same as was currently on the TLNA development website (see Initial Design Drawings - 1/20/2016). Green areas are daily needs services areas while blue are resource center areas. Darker colors are more enclosed rather than open like the light green and light blue areas. She reiterated that this will not look like or be the current Messner building. They plan to remove the 1960s era additions and will restore the original Coca-Cola building. The current addition on the front will be deconstructed, so it will be pulled back from E. Washington, having landscaping and courtyard space.

Jeff Spitzer-Resnick asked how far the setback from E. Washington will be and what the distances to neighboring spaces will be. Dawn said that E. Washington is at the bottom of the image – the current showroom is right up to sidewalk, so its removal will result in a 15' setback from the E. Washington sidewalk. On the west side they will deconstruct that addition for a courtyard, while on the east side a garage-type structure will be deconstructed for another courtyard area. Pat Kelly asked where the Tenney Nursery is located on the image – Dawn answered that it was at the top of the image and to the right.

County Update (timetable):

Todd Violante presented updated estimates to the County's timeline. They anticipate a 17-month process from today to projected HRC opening. There are a lot assumptions going into that estimate, but it is their best ballpark estimate (see revised project timeline from 5/2/2016 on website). Details:

- late May: issue RFP for operator
- Early August: select operator
- Early August: pre-notice and meeting with City staff concerning submittal
- Early September: formal submittal (30 days after pre-notice)
- September through end of 2016: Urban Design Commission, Plan Commission and the City process
- January 2017 – could be start of construction

Joe Hoey asked if their timeline included any provisions for neighbors appealing to the Common Council if a Conditional Use Permit is approved and a lawsuit after that if Common Council doesn't overturn Plan Commission. Todd said it would add more time, but he's not familiar with how it could impact the timeline. Tim Parks from City Planning says that an appeal of a CUP requires signatures of 20% of the nearby neighbors and/or the cooperation of the district's alder. Then two-thirds of the Common Council must vote to overturn a PC decision. Another path is that the County could appeal to Common Council if Plan Commission turns down their CUP. Satya interjected that the appeal process is about 2 months – Tim agrees, maybe a bit more. Joe asked how long other lawsuits have taken. Tim said that various levels of courts and many hundreds of thousands of dollars are involved so it could vary a lot. Jeff Spitzer-Resnick, an attorney, said that lawsuits are not necessarily what some think. The City/County or whomever you

are suing can say you have no standing, they can just ignore a lawsuit, depending on their lawyers' recommendations. A lawsuit doesn't always delay something unless an injunction is made. A court has to make a legal decision, so the existence of a lawsuit doesn't necessarily delay anything.

Heidi Wegleitner asked about the Draft Concept Paper timeline and process from here forward. Casey Becker said that the City-County Homeless Issues Committee meeting is next Monday (May 9) at 6:30pm and will be another opportunity for input. It was asked if there are other opportunities. Casey said that so far no other committees were scheduled to take up the concept paper. The Human Services Consortium Board of Directors wants to discuss it on May 20th – typically their meetings start at 11:00am. There are no other public meetings scheduled. The concept paper has been shared with TLNA, the Tenney Nursery and with the general membership of the Homeless Services Consortium. Satya asked what happens after input is taken. Casey said input would help inform the RFP process, but the goal is to issue the RFP. Satya asked if there would be a vote by any County body on the Concept Paper – Casey said no, it is just a concept paper that is being circulated for feedback. Heidi Wegleitner said that key pieces of the Concept Paper and the RFP process are the amount of funding the County and its partners have committed – are the commitments solid? Will more work be done between now and the RFP issuance with the County Board and others to solidify the financial commitments? Casey answered that the County's pledged \$130k should hold – it is what the County budgeted in 2016 for HRC operations. The other partners have pledged the amounts in the Concept Paper. The estimated total operating cost is more than the amount pledged, so the onus is on the provider to leverage partners, the public and private sectors to complete the budget.

Funding/Budget Discussion:

Jim O'Keefe said the City of Madison 2016 budget appropriates \$80k for HRC operations. Obviously, that won't be needed in 2016. Council has said that amount can fund gap services in 2016 since the HRC won't be open. The 2017 budget deliberation will have the same conversation as 2016. He can't speak for the mayor or council, but he thinks it is likely they will approve the \$80k again for 2017. There is also a \$20 gap that he thinks they are likely to approve. Deedre Atkinson said United Way has a \$100k budget item for the HRC that is still on their books. Their budget is always subject to the success of their annual campaign, but she is optimistic. Heidi added that the \$80k of funding for Bethel in the 2016 County budget is not part of their \$130k calculation, but she wants that \$80k to go into the same pot, so the County's funding could be increased.

Alan Gold asked that since they were \$180k short on the operating budget, will the operator have to depend on strangers and fundraising and then even more fundraising in the future if current pledges don't continue year to year. Satya said yes, that is how non-profits work – they raise their budgets each year. Mary Lang Sollinger said that she is a fundraiser for many causes - there are 3,000 non-profits in Dane County, so a lot of competition. \$180k is a lot of money to raise. Heidi said that the whole budget is up for grabs, but the situation and pledges can change. Non-profits operate under these assumptions. Mary asked who the fundraiser is for the budget gap and what happens if services change and the operator needs to raise \$220k next year? She said that

fundraising for operating expenses, in particular, is very difficult compared to fundraising for a building, a program, etc. Satya yes, it is clear that the operator will be required to raise what is required to fill the gap each year. Heidi asked the County to explain the difference between the funding gap in the failed RFP and now. Why will a prospective operator come to the table now (as opposed to the last RFP when only one response came in and it was way over the RFP budget)?

Lynn Green (now in attendance) said that the last RFP expectations were not clear on funding levels, but she thinks they have been extremely clear all along that the government won't cover the entire expense. They will acknowledge this in this RFP – the response will have to detail fundraising, in-kind donations, etc. Pat McDonnell asked if the County envisions their funding as an ongoing commitment or is it seed money that will be augmented later by the operator? Lynn answered that the County runs on an annual budget like the City does, so there is no commitment now for future years. There never is a commitment past one year, but the County's commitment is genuine and the vision is that it will be ongoing money. Pat Kelly asked if the RFP is issued in mid- or late May and an operator is chosen by July, does Lynn think the operator will say how they will raise the \$180k to fill the gap or will it be a more amorphous claim that they will raise it? What happens if they can't raise it? Lynn answered that the expectation is that they will have a really solid plan; some agencies in town are already thinking and/or working on this. The fundraising doesn't have to be cash – it can be in-kind too. The County's commitment is \$130k, but it is also committed to include in-kind donations beyond that, e.g., Forward Service will have employment and training services onsite. There will be a computer lab, mental health services are under contract with Journey Health, Community Action Coalition will be there and others. A help desk at the job center will move to the HRC - all of those would be considered in-kind.

It was asked what happens if they don't raise enough money or if the operator is not successful. Do they then cut services? Casey Becker said that once an operator is chosen, a contract negotiation begins. The goals, services and fundraising details are laid out in the contract. The agreement/contract would be tracked over time, so it wouldn't be a surprise if there were performance shortcomings. Shawn Kapper asked about Bethel's annual county funding. Lynn said they funded both Bethel and Porchlight for the Hospitality House. Shawn said Bethel needed double their funding (Lynn said they requested 3 times), to sustain their operation. Based on what happened at Bethel, Shawn says she has a hard time believing that the County knows what it will cost to operate this. If the County was unaware of Bethel's true costs, how does this fit in? Lynn said that the Bethel situation is very different; they began with no government money and a couple of years ago agreed to expand. The County funded that. Bethel then decided that the County should start paying more because the church couldn't keep paying what they were paying. It was a church decision. Lynn added that her agency has a budget of \$286 million with \$150 million of that contracted out. The arrangement with a provider is a contract and she assumes they won't default and they almost never do. She added that Bethel's costs didn't change; the church just stopped giving as much. Satya asked how confident are they in the operations budget. Lynn answered that their comptroller did the budget and she is confident.

Heidi added that the Bethel situation was unusual because they came to the budget meeting and asked for an increase, which they got. Then different people representing the church came and said no, we actually want this amount, so there was conflict between the parish council and staff. She appreciates the concern though and wants more detail on the in-kind components of the budget in a revision to the Concept Paper. She reiterated that the County may allocate Bethel's \$80k in addition to the \$130k commitment.

Bob Klebba said that if we actually get all the features documented in the Concept Paper, it could be more palatable to neighborhood. He's worried though that an entity that has never run a resource center like this, and will have a big fundraising commitment that may or may not be met, will be in a situation that can't be sustained in the long term. Maybe for a year they can do it and fill the budget gap, but he is worried about the year after. If the requirement for fundraising is too onerous, then it becomes a warming shelter rather than a resource center – that is not palatable to neighborhood. Ultimately, they need a Conditional Use Permit that is contingent on what is described in the Concept Paper for an operator and if the operator does less, could the CUP be revoked? Ledell said there is continuing jurisdiction and Tim Parks explained. The CUP is predicated on the plans and letter of intent (operations plan for HRC). There is room for maneuvering if the reality is somewhat different. The approval is not so airtight that minor changes reopen the entire CUP process, but the vast majority of a project should operate as approved. After a CUP is approved and an operation or building is in place, any member of the public or a public official can complain to the City's zoning administrator if there are purported shortcomings. The zoning administrator would then report to Plan Commission about the approved conditions and plan. PC can have a public hearing and consider modifying a CUP or revoking a CUP, although that has happened only once that he knows of. There have been maybe a handful of modifications.

David Staple asked if in-kind services/donations would then reduce the required fundraising budget. Lynn said that she thinks the budget is generous, so volunteerism and in-kind could help. The budget is very adequate for full-time paid staff. National models say this much fulltime staff isn't necessary, so there is some flexibility in the budget. David asked if the budget is reduced due to in-kind, could 3.5 staff members then become 2.0 paid staff and 1.5 volunteers? Lynn said that an RFP asks for the respondents to tell the County how the respondent will run the shelter; it has to meet the requirements. David adds that they will have to look further at the proposal, but he doesn't see how in-kind and volunteerism will cover the budget gap. Satya said that yes, in-kind typically can reduce the need to provide a thing, yes it can offset the budget. It could result in fewer staff from the chosen agency. Tim Parks added that Plan Commission does review the operations plan, but they do not approve a budget or consider what the center might be in 3 years, for example. If the County and its operator say they will do these things, then the CUP will include that as proposed. They will not include budget or fundraising in their consideration – it is not the city's purview. Typically, if you add other components or don't do the originally approved things, then CUP standards might not be met.

Tim Olsen asked if the County can provide us with the baseline race to equity 2008 report with all temporary housing sites (particularly in Tenney-Lapham) - he wants an updated GIS version with exact addresses. Satya says it is out there, but might not include 2016 data. Jim O'Keefe added that the city has recently updated these data.

Jeff Spitzer-Resnick said that there are realities to fundraising. If the HRC succeeds, the money will continue coming from government and private partners. We are also a part of whether or not it succeeds. There are many underfunded resources that government owns or partially owns, e.g., Monona Terrace and the Overture Center. They have had deficits for many years at much greater costs than the HRC proposal, but the community has decided not to let those fail. If the HRC really succeeds, then the need for its services will reduce and over time it will cost less. Mary Lang Sollinger added that the Overture Center and such are revenue generators, so that explains why the community has decided to support them.

Mary Lang Sollinger asked if they have a contingency for the construction going over budget. Dawn O'Kroley said any overage would be a capitol budget item - not operating expenses. The County will though approve a contingency in the contract for construction overrun, typically 10%. Heidi said the construction cost is in the 2016 budget and the both the County Board and the County Executive are committed to keeping that in the 2017 budget. Is it still \$2.1 million? Heidi said it is around \$2 million left for the construction because some has been spent.

It was mentioned that Sue Springman from the Mullins Group estimated that the HRC needs about \$156k for security – that should be in the budget. Sue's estimate is based on Mullins' experiences nearby. Pat Kelly asked how much was budgeted for security. Lynn said that if we start getting into these budget line items, we will get bogged down. Satya told Lynn that she should answer the question. Lynn said there is \$52k in the budget for security – it would cover onsite security when the program is open and is based at what they pay at the job center. Security would probably also be onsite one hour before opening and one hour after closing. Pat McDonnell asked if security then was only on during the day? Lynn said yes. It was asked then who was responsible for security for the other two-thirds of the day and in the neighborhood?

Key Points of Funding/Budget Discussion:

- Clarify funding gap and need to fundraise in the RFP
- How much confidence in the budget estimates?
- Provide more details on partners' funding sources and in-kind donations
- Need confidence in ability to implement Concept Paper (long-term) and how to tie its implementation to the Conditional Use Permit
- Are security costs in the budget?
- Need a more detailed budget
- What requirements of previous experience does an RFP responder need?

More Discussion on Content of the Draft Concept Paper

Satya polled attendees about whether or not they wanted to discuss the content of the Draft Concept Paper or talk about the process by which the Paper was drafted. Most people wanted to continue talking about the content.

Marsha Cannon described a 2-day workshop on homeless issues that she recently attended. There were 150 people there who had a common purpose. Why didn't the Concept Paper include any of this? She wonders what is happening to the people who have been using Bethel and now will have nowhere to go. The Concept Paper lists no goals, there is no mention of the problem, no mention of client numbers, no homeless people are represented at this meeting or at the 2-day workshop she attended. Ronnie Barbett corrected Marsha – he is homeless. The paper has no mention of the neighborhood – this is not how you get consensus. She thinks homeless people need homes. She got the impression that the homeless don't know how to navigate social services. There is no feedback from the neighborhood represented in the paper. She distributed a column by the County Executive from the TLNA newsletter that said the neighborhood would be engaged in the process.

Ronnie Barbett, a member of the City-County Homeless Issues Committee, said he thinks the Draft Concept Paper explains everything well. He praised the City and County, and thinks that whoever comes onboard to run the Center will do it. There is a need for a permanent Day Resource Center. He worked for 7 months at the DRC that was on E. Washington. There was outreach from Porchlight and Briar Patch. There was van service, free pizzas came from Roman Candle and there was other community involvement. They received a certificate from Catholic Charities and a commendation from the Mayor. Michael Ryanjoy from the neighborhood volunteered there, but Rich Freihoefer wasn't happy with it when he visited. The HRC needs laundry, storage, computer access, and a spot for the homeless to call their own. They are a source of income for the neighborhood's liquor stores, restaurants, businesses, etc. The County's Resolution 87 looks out for homeless people. Ronnie distributed copies of Res-87 and the Mayor's commendation.

Alan Gold asked if the HRC would be fully staffed 365 days per year. Will it be fully staffed on holidays or will it be just a warming shelter those days? Rich Freihoeffer said that he sees a lot of homeless people at 8:00 in front of Bethel and that's what it will be like. It is not pretty – a lot of bags, etc., he is against the proposal. Nobody will run it and nobody knows what's going on. The County is like a chicken without its head on; he is ashamed. Bob Klebba pointed out that there will be an increase in the number of police calls - not good next to a nursery and a safe block route to/from schools. This isn't addressed in the Concept Paper. Also not addressed – there will be the same problem as at Salvation Army – the operator of facility will have no jurisdiction off property. As soon as a problem leaves the site, the security provided for in the proposal no longer applies. The neighborhood will have to police the problems.

Joe Hoey said that the County's process of having closed meetings is reflected in the Concept Paper's contents. People with children won't go to the HRC. Who is the population to be served? They want to help people, so they need to get them a house; he

wants more specifics in the concept paper. Many of the services are for chronically homeless yet they will be in same place as families trying to get back on their feet. Will all clients see a caseworker? Can clients keep coming if they make no progress? Will it be all chronically homeless? There will be needles, no bathrooms off hours - are you asking us to take that in our neighborhood, just like on the square? He wants to help both populations, but this is not smart.

Jeff Spitzer-Resnick says that for what the Draft Concept Paper is - a relatively short document – he thinks it is great. It is meant to be an overview, not a dissertation. He assumes that anyone who applies to be the operator will have a lot more detail in their proposal. The Concept Paper can be improved though. Its biggest flaw is that security is listed as an additional consideration. Security is important to both the neighborhood and the HRC's clients. Transportation issues could also be better addressed – it is not a 24/7 shelter, so the operator and the neighborhood need to understand the transportation plan. He thinks some comments about capacity are legitimate; we need to know this. Hopefully, we will reduce homelessness and it won't hit maximum capacity. The paper should state how the HRC fits into the overall reduction of homelessness in our community. He thinks that it can address some concerns that have been raised.

Pat Kelly asked about the van transportation mentioned in the Concept Paper - is it expected that Catholic Charities, if they were selected as the operator, would provide transportation within the proposed budget? Lynn Green said no – the County has a separate Porchlight contract with 2 vans provided. The van transportation in the Concept Paper is just those 2 vans. Discussion about who pays for van driver salaries followed since the van transportation is in Concept Paper. Lynn said again that it is an overall generous budget; she thinks there would be a lot of van service. There could be both Porchlight's van service and an operator's van service. It is expected that everything in the budget would be done by the operator unless other arrangements are made.

Heidi asked if the budget includes funds for bus passes - no. Casey Becker says that the budget is for core costs, but it doesn't mean that an RFP respondent couldn't include bus passes in their response plan.

Rigina MacNaughton, chief operations manager at Pasqual's Cantina on E. Washington, says that the HRC should work to get clients out of homelessness. The computer lab is in there, as are job service. If she were a client and she wanted to secure her stuff in the shelter while she goes to work, she can't work 8 hours if she has to be back by 5:00pm to get her stuff. The hours of service are a flaw in the HRC model. Clients need a job and they need access to the facility when they aren't working.

Pat Kelly asked who ultimately makes the decision on what the final product is here? Who decides what version of the Concept Paper moves forward? There is a lot of resentment in the neighborhood about the process that produced the Paper because our alder wasn't invited, the neighborhood wasn't included, etc. Bob Klebba asked if they would share the budget information rather than just the total amount. After some equivocating, Lynn said yes that they would share it.

Tim Olsen said that the Draft Concept Paper doesn't seem to require any particular location in Dane County for the shelter. Is it specific to a particular geography? Casey Becker said that 2013 document describing the shelter did define the ideal area in which it should be placed –within about a 1.5 mile radius from the Capitol. A reference to the Messner site in the Concept Paper was pointed out.

Joe Hoey asked that when they revise the Concept Paper, will they consider adding 24/7 security for the neighborhood? He knows that they have said that they can't control the behavior of people once they leave the shelter, but if the clients have nowhere to go, they will stay in the neighborhood. He also asked about the Paper's listing of services that would be added as the provider builds organizational and financial capacity. Is the County saying that someone will get a contract without a proven track record? Are you are going to hire someone to operate the shelter who does not already possess the organizational or financial capacity to operate this center? Casey said the Concept Paper lists services that will be available on day one and also those that would grow as they develop Memorandums of Understanding with other providers to bring in those services. So, there are 2 sets of services with the 2nd set being additional services that are grown. Joe says that he thinks it is disingenuous. He thinks that on day one it will be a warming shelter, and then maybe other services will be added if the operator develops capacity. Casey says no, the initial community services and initial co-located services will be available on day one.

Shawn Kapper asked if the budget includes the cost of a better fence and other improvements at Tenney Nursery due to the shelter's presence. Dawn O'Kroley said that the fence would be part of the capitol budget, not the operating budget. It was asked if the County will install fencing and lighting at the nursery - who is going to pay for the nursery improvements? Heidi said that there is a precedent for paying for similar improvements, e.g., the Rainbow Project on E. Washington when there was a day shelter adjacent, so it can be an anticipated cost, but would need to be spelled out more. Heidi added that this is an important part of the conversation and would be a capitol cost, so wouldn't belong in the Concept Paper – it isn't an operator concern.

Ledell asked about the storage facilities at the shelter - does the Concept Paper address the storage question? No, the operator will have to propose how the storage capabilities will work.

Key Points of More Discussion on Concept Paper Content:

- Need clarity about minimum staffing levels, especially on weekends and holidays.
- What population will be targeted?
- What is the maximum capacity?
- Need to address transportation and transition when the facility closes.
- Job services need to be more prominent.
- Do the hours facilitate employment?

- Is the Concept Paper in line with the overall plan on Homelessness?
- How can they include the voices of homeless people?
- Operator has no jurisdiction. How can this be addressed?
- What population will be targeted?
- Are there any expectations of the clients?
- They need to clarify initial services vs add-on services and how that impacts the budget.
- Who will pay for a fence between the site and the nursery?
- The security plan needs to be front and center.
- Storage is a concern – what will it be?

How Will Input to the Draft Concept Paper Be Used?

Pat Kelly asked for clarification on how the process will now proceed and what they will do with all of the suggestions. She thinks they need to come back to the neighborhood with responses and a revision, then let the neighborhood respond to the revision too. Satya said that by the end of May the RFP will be coming out, so asked what will the process be until the RFP? Casey said that a number of the questions could be answered and she could distribute those answers. Some will be edits to the draft, but other comments will still be coming from other meetings. Lynn added that the County is serious about taking reactions/feedback and will try to use them. They hope to get feedback from the Nursery and MPD too. They will incorporate as many suggestions as possible. It was asked if the Concept Paper will be finalized before the RFP is released. Lynn said that she hopes so; it will be the foundation for the RFP details. Heidi asked if it could be expected that a final draft will be ready at the Homeless Services Consortium BOD meeting on May 20. Lynn said that she hopes some issues could be addressed at that meeting too, so there may be some changes after that. Pat Kelly said that outside of the homeless, those impacted by this are the neighborhood - to not bring the final paper back to us is negligent.

Jerusha Daniels said thank you to all who have participated, but they need to recognize that their opinions may not be the majority of the neighborhood. Their voice is not the only voice in the neighborhood. It was said that we have a steering committee setup for participating, but Jerusha said that not all can attend so all voices aren't being heard.

Casey said that they may get feedback on the 20th at the HRC BOD meeting, so maybe we can have another meeting when the paper is finalized. Lynn said she can't commit to that. The County wants the RFP out soon - the end of May at the latest – so there may not be time.

Heidi said she is committed to attending a meeting answering questions and explaining any Concept Paper revisions. The neighborhood should continue to be involved; it is important and there should be feedback. She has some feedback to give too. At some point the County will issue the RFP though, so you have to close the window for input. She is happy to meet with folks, but they can't continue to just keep going back and forth. She asked how people can send additional comments. Lynn said that even if the Concept Paper is done and the RFP issued, input will continue. Bob Klebba said he has been

communicating with Deedre Atkinson and Lynn Green since February, asking them to accept more input from the neighborhood, yet we were refused at each try. He wants to be in a meeting where we can collaborate on this.

In the interest of time, Satya brought the meeting to a close. No follow-up meeting was scheduled, but Patrick Heck agreed to notify everyone via email and the TLNA website if another opportunity for input presented itself.

More Takeaways:

- The County needs to respond to issues in the TLNA Steering Committee Issues and Recommendations document
- Need proactive involvement of neighborhood in solving the problem of homelessness.
- The Concept Paper needs to be way more specific