

Dear Assembly Member:

I can appreciate why you may perceive there is a need for a city-wide standard for licensing. I am most certainly in favor of measures that will help any individual at a difficult time in their lives.

I have questions concerning what the person you're calling the "director" will be calling for down the road.

My concern specifically is for what will come following the passage of this Homeless and Transient Shelter Licensing you are codifying in your new chapter of the Municipal Code.

The stipulations that were enumerated in the earlier proposal draft in 2020 which I was told was "scrapped" appeared to me to be pervasive and controlling.

Even though those stipulations are not highlighted in this present draft, are we able to get from the Assembly an assurance that the shelter providers will not have to be concerned with a revisiting of many of those points, that this new chapter is not the framework on which to hang your earlier intentions?

For example:

- You proposed the suspension of all service restrictions during a weather alert except in the case of immediate threat of danger to another's health or safety. I can't speak for any other area shelter, but a quick call to the APD will suffice to show the infrequency of the Mission's need for police assistance. The suspension of all service restrictions would invite the very atmosphere we have sought to avoid.
- The former draft proposal specifically mentions the absence of any prescribed limit as to how long a client may remain sheltered in a given facility. Many shelter guests will never be motivated to do

anything different with their life as long as the option remains for a respective shelter to become their permanent address.

- You have mentioned in this present draft, as well as the former, that operators will provide a minimum of 6 feet between beds in sleeping areas. This is understandable in times of Covid-19 mandate, but in normal times this stipulation would most certainly place a burdensome constraint on the number of guests a shelter would be able to safely serve.
- The same goes for the 50 Square feet of living space per client your draft proposes. Two things in this regard:
 - 1) Again, the number of guests we could serve would be reduced.
 - 2) The guests we serve do not live at the shelter. They are overnight guests who will be gone in the morning.

Questions concerning the current chapter draft:

- In this present draft you propose mandating background checks for all employees and volunteers to be paid for by the respective shelter. We are in the *second chance* business here on Tudor Road. A number of our staff, as well as volunteers, have at some point in their lives had a run-in with the law. We have chosen to come alongside such individuals for the purpose of supporting a decision to radically alter their lives for good. To have to say to them they could no longer work here would limit their recovery and hardly benefit the community. Mandating background checks

for shelter volunteers when some shelters rely heavily on volunteer hours to operate would be a hardship.

- The Mission is an overnight shelter. Would we be required to have a Day Shelter License for those days when I've chosen to offer the clients who stayed with us the night before the option to remain indoors owing to very low temperatures, or other inclement weather conditions?