

SUMMARY OF MINUTES

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/HOUSING/GENERAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

3:00 P.M., TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2008

COMMITTEE ROOM

ROOM 239, CITY HALL

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Council Member Nelson L. Malloy, Jr. Chair
Council Member Dan Besse, Vice Chair (in at 3:58 p.m.)
Council Member Evelyn A. Terry (in at 3:21 p.m.)
Council Member Molly Leight

OTHERS PRESENT: Mayor Allen Joines (in at 3:27 p.m., out at 5:05 p.m.)
Council Member Joycelyn V. Johnson (in at 3:59 p.m.)
Council Member Wanda Merschel (in at 5:25 p.m.)

Chair Malloy called the meeting to order and stated that without objection, the Committee would first consider the Consent Agenda.

Council Member Leight requested to pull Item C-6. Chair Malloy requested to pull Items C-1 and C-4. No other items were pulled for discussion.

Council Member Leight made a motion to approve the balance of the Consent Agenda. The motion was duly seconded by Chair Malloy and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

- C-2. IN-HOUSE CITY-WIDE VECTOR CONTROL BAITING PLAN UPDATE AND CITY SURVEY. *[The Public Works Committee voted in February to remand this item to the Community Development/Housing/General Government Committee.]*
- C-3. RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BASEBALL CONCESSIONS BUILDING IN HANES PARK. *[Finance and Community Development/Housing/General Government Committees voted to continue this item, pending a meeting with community representatives.]*
- C-5. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS CONSIDERING AND ADOPTING APPROPRIATE AND VERIFIABLE PERCENTAGE GOALS FOR PARTICIPATION BY MINORITY AND WOMEN OWNED BUSINESSES:

Chair Malloy made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Leight and carried unanimously.

- C-4. NO PARKING ON THE LAWN ORDINANCE DRAFT UPDATE. *[The Community Development/Housing/General Government Committee voted to continue this item, pending additional work by staff.]*

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Ritchie Brooks, Neighborhood Services Director, stated that a draft document and letter were sent to several external groups, but that staff had only heard from a few internal groups at the time information was needed to present to the Committee. He also stated that staff is soliciting comments through the City website to obtain more information. He further stated that staff has received some comments on enforcement of the ordinance, and staff consulted the Police Department and they will be able to assist.

Chair Malloy requested a list of the groups that the draft document and letter was sent to. He also stated that there may be some neighborhood associations who did not receive the information and it will need to be provided to them.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Brooks stated the information will remain on the City's website for 30 days. He also stated that information will be updated prior to being provided to the Committee. He further stated that staff will bring an update back to the April Committee meeting.

Chair Malloy requested that staff contact the Stonewall Neighborhood Association and provide them with the information.

- C-6. ORDINANCE ORDERING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V, SECTION 10-203(f)(1) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM: *[Repairs less than 50% of value of structure (<50%) six months].*

- a. S.E. Snyder Group LLC 1652 N. Cherry Street

Council Member Leight stated that the owners of properties at 1652 N. Cherry Street and 1616 N. Cherry Street were completing work on the structures and moved that the properties be allowed six months to complete needed repairs and bring the structures to code.

Chair Malloy stated that the properties would be considered separately. He also stated that he spoke with the owner of the property at 1652 N. Cherry Street and that repairs are being made.

Mr. Brooks stated that he spoke with Mr. Snyder three weeks ago, has visited the property several times, and suggested that Mr. Snyder attend today's meeting to request an extension. He also stated that Mr. Snyder advised him that he would be in attendance. He further stated that the dwelling was formerly a rooming house and Mr. Snyder indicated that he is renovating it to be a single-family home. Mr. Brooks noted that he is unaware of any renovations underway at 1616 N. Cherry Street.

Chair Malloy stated that he spoke with Mr. Snyder two weeks ago, he informed him that the

Committee meeting time had changed and Mr. Snyder stated that repairs were being made. He also stated that Mr. Snyder indicated that all repairs would be complete within 60 days.

(Council Member Terry in at 3:21 p.m.)

Ms. Michelle McCullough, Project Planner representing the Historic Resources Commission, stated that both properties are located within the North Cherry Historic District and requested more time to work with the property owners. She also stated that repairs are being completed on the property at 1652 N. Cherry Street and requested six months for the property owner to complete the repairs. She further stated that she has seen no repairs completed at 1616 N. Cherry Street within the last few weeks, but she does not want to jeopardize the integrity of the neighborhood by losing additional structures.

Chair Malloy noted that both properties are located within the redevelopment plan, and that they should be rehabilitated and saved.

Mr. Brooks recommended that the Committee had a few options. The Committee could not adopt the ordinance and request that staff speak with the property owner and offer a voluntary demolition agreement as a means of delaying the order and stipulate a timeframe that work is to be completed by, or the Committee could adopt the ordinance to demolish the dwelling with the condition to offer a voluntary demolition agreement and allow a certain number of days for the work to be completed.

Chair Malloy made a motion to accept staff's recommendation with the amendment of seeking a voluntary demolition agreement to be signed by the property owner and to allow 120 days to make needed repairs. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Leight and carried unanimously.

C-6. ORDINANCE ORDERING THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF A STRUCTURE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE V, SECTION 10-203(f)(1) OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM: *[Repairs less than 50% of value of structure (<50%) six months]*.

b. Permuda Capital LLC

1616 N. Cherry Street

Mr. Brooks stated the owner of 1616 N. Cherry Street has not contacted staff for an extension and recommends that the Committee adopt the ordinance as presented.

(Mayor Joines in at 3:27 p.m.)

Mr. Brooks stated that the home address of the property owner is 3208 Clemmons Rd., Clemmons, NC. In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Brooks stated that staff did not speak to a live person, but the correspondence indicates for property owners to contact City staff for extensions or questions.

Chair Malloy stated that the property has been in disrepair for some time and does not look favorably at trying to preserve it. He also stated that there appears to be no interest from the owner in repairing the property and would like to move forward with the demolition as recommended.

Council Member Leight stated that the property is a contributing structure in the area to the historic

district and asks that the property owners work with the Historic Resources Commission.

Council Member Terry requested that staff look for similar programs to Revitalizing Urban Commercial Areas to restore historic areas where no one takes ownership of the properties and restoration. She stated that some neighborhood organizations may not have the resources to complete repairs, but asked staff if there is a program to preserve historic structures.

Mr. Paige stated that a similar concept has been presented three times to the General Assembly to grant the City authority to acquire properties without a willing seller, via eminent domain. He also stated that once a property is acquired, staff could work with non-profit organizations in the community to rehabilitate the property.

Mr. Brooks stated that in addition to a willing seller, staff would need a willing owner to repair the property. He also stated that many properties are probably eligible for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, but there is a lack of owner interest to take risks and rehabilitate historic properties.

In response to Council Member Terry's question, Mr. Brooks stated that staff has attempted the various suggestions that the Committee has made, but there is a lack of willing property owners. He also stated that staff currently works with local Community Development Corporations (CDCs) and there is a program in place to provide funding for restoration.

Council Member Terry expressed concern that the City is losing too many historic structures.

Mr. Paige stated that while there are programs currently in place to rehabilitate historic structures, there is a lack of willing property owners and the General Assembly has not granted the ability to acquiring property through eminent domain. He also noted that staff has spoken with several CDCs who are willing to work with property owners.

Chair Malloy stated that he does not always agree with the designation of a property as historic because it is subjective. He made a motion to adopt the ordinance. Council Member Leight seconded the motion, noting that the owner will be allowed 90 days to repair the structure or it will be demolished.

Council Member Leight stated that historic designation is anything but subjective, as it is based on when and where a property was built.

Council Member Terry abstained from the vote. Voting in favor of the motion were Council Members Malloy and Leight.

GENERAL AGENDA

- G-1. CONSIDERATION OF REVISED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CITY-COUNTY PLANNING STAFF (UDO-181). *[This item was remanded to the Community Development/Housing/General Government Committee by City Council on December 3, 2007.]*

Ms. Margaret Bessett, City/County Planning, stated that the amendment to the Salem Lake Watershed Ordinance will allow termination of conservation easements that were granted under paired parcel provisions, as long as specific conditions are met. When City Council reviewed the item in October, some questions were raised regarding restoration of site soils to predevelopment conditions. She also stated that staff reviewed potential alternatives and met with Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System (WS/FCS) representatives regarding the proposed alternatives. She further stated that the presented draft is similar to the original proposal, with some additional language and information regarding the review process. Ms. Bessett noted that staff believes the proposed amendment to be environmentally responsible by allowing the release of the paired parcel conservation easement if the public purpose for which it was required is no longer in place.

In response to Council Member Terry's question, Ms. Bessett stated that there are two sites owned by WS/FCS that are currently under the paired parcel provision. She also stated that the sites are tied to a portion of property located in the watershed area close to Salem Lake. She further stated that there is a provision in the ordinance allowing pods to be removed, requesting that the Planning Board revise the paired parcel approval, and then requesting that the City Council release the conservation easement. Ms. Bessett noted that once the pods are removed, the site must be restored to its pre-development condition.

Council Member Leight stated that she will not support the amendment as Council agreed to the ordinance as written outlining permanent conservation easements. She also stated that once a natural area is altered, development activities are detrimental to that property.

In response to Chair Malloy's questions, Ms. Bessett stated that when the paired parcel provision was originally established, there was an understanding between Planning staff, the Assistant City Attorney and WS/FCS, that they would be able to terminate the easement. She also stated that then City Attorney Ron Seeber noted that there were no provisions written to allow termination. She further stated that the presented amendment will allow for termination. Ms. Bessett noted that WS/FCS hope to develop a future site that is currently placed under a conservation easement. She also noted that the need is not immediate, but that WS/FCS representatives would like to have the option for development.

Mr. Lee Garrity, City Manager, stated that in the next two years, WS/FCS would like to remove pods and ask for the removal of a paired parcel provision. He also stated that the site would then be restored and a paired parcel property near Salem Lake will be released.

Council Member Terry stated that current demographics dictate that a removal of pods would indicate a need for more space. She requested that the item be postponed until further information can be presented.

Chair Malloy stated that staff should make every effort to protect land, trees, and pristine natural areas from development.

Council Member Terry requested that staff meet with the Planning Borad and WS/FCS officials to discuss better land use planning.

Mr. Paul Norby, Planning Director, stated that staff will continue to have discussions with WS/FCS administration when considering future sites, as well as performing site studies, sharing information on proposed rezoning, and sharing information on possible impacts. He also stated that WS/FCS communicated their desire to allow for a paired parcel text amendment when the need arose for more space, and they had learned elsewhere that the state allows paired parcel agreements. He further stated that staff worked with WS/FCS officials on the amendment and that they were requesting flexibility in the regulations. Mr. Norby noted that the intent of WS/FCS is to make use of the land by removing the pods and making use of the site closer to the lake. He also noted that any permanent construction on the site will need to meet watershed site rules, and that the proposed amendment allows the available site to be used along with a professional engineer to attempt to restore the site to its pre-development condition. He further noted that staff will make suggestions and new development sites will have to be reviewed by the Planning Board.

Council Member Leight expressed concern that the involved parties intended for the site to be modified, rather than abiding by the ordinance approved by Council.

Council Member Terry requested that the item be held in Committee and reviewed at the May meeting, to allow more time for research and discussion.

G-2. DISCUSSION OF GRAFFITI ABATEMENT DRAFT ORDINANCE. *[The Community Development/Housing/General Government Committee voted to continue this item to March 17, 2008.]*

Mr. Brooks stated that several comments have been received regarding the draft ordinance and it has been suggested that the removal fee be doubled and that graffiti abatement offenses be treated as serious transgressions.

(Council Member Besse in at 3:58 p.m.)

Council Member Leight noted that while Council Members attended a conference in Washington, D.C., they were notified that the City of Ft. Worth, Texas combines all confiscated paint and uses it to cover graffiti.

(Council Member Johnson in at 3:59 p.m.)

Mr. Brooks noted that the abatement period was shortened to five days and that this item is for information only.

Mayor Joines noted that graffiti removal is a complex issue and that while motivated to deal with the removal of gang markings, staff should be careful not to infringe upon individual property owners rights. He also noted that the business community and private property owners should not be punished with removal fees. He further noted that heavier penalties should be applied to gang members when they are apprehended. Mayor Joines also commented that staff is working on gang legislation through the General Assembly.

Mr. Brooks stated that there is no fine to the property owner, rather they will receive a notice to remove the graffiti and if it is not removed, City staff will seek permission to remove it. If permission for removal is not granted, the graffiti will be removed via a court order, at a fee of \$25 per occurrence. In response to Chair Malloy's question, he stated that two additional maintenance workers may be hired to complete the removal. He further stated that there are different treatments for the graffiti removal based on the surface it has been applied to.

Chair Malloy requested that a volunteer pool be established for graffiti removal and that staff review the use of individuals sentenced to community service. He further suggested that the pool is established and ready to work as soon as needed.

Mr. Brooks noted that the first option for removal will be volunteer sources along with individuals serving probation and other resources. He also noted that Keep America Beautiful is heavily involved in graffiti removal across the United States. He further noted that quicker removal is better, and staff may not focus on waiting to find volunteers for removal.

Mr. Garrity noted that there are two issues with graffiti removal: lack of authority to enter onto private property and who will pay for the removal if the authority is granted. He also noted that the \$25 removal fee will not cover the cost of a two-man crew and supplies. He further noted that staff may consider a phased approach by obtaining the authority to enter private property, reviewing existing resources that may be used, then suggest an appropriate fee to Council.

Mr. Richard Miller, 626 North Trade Street, stated that graffiti is a crime that victimizes property owners. He also stated that recent graffiti that has been covered on local buildings are splotches, rather than a wall covering. He further stated that the Police Department should take responsibility and enforce that vandalism will not be tolerated and hold the offenders responsible for removal.

Mr. Mark Saunders, 3800 Crusade Drive, stated that gang graffiti is a real issue for property owners in Winston-Salem. He also stated that his company dispersed three crews to remove graffiti when they were threatened by gang members, and will not go back to remove further graffiti. He further stated that it will be difficult to remove graffiti within five days and City employees' safety may be at risk. Mr. Saunders questioned whether or not the City is prepared to provide police protection to business owners.

Mr. Paige stated that Recreation and Parks crews had been threatened in City parks, which is a reason why volunteers were not readily thought of for removal. He also stated that staff is reviewing a multi-person crew and will have police personnel on standby. In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Paige stated that the situations were reported to the Police Department, but the offenders had left the scene prior to police arrival.

Council Member Besse suggested that police personnel and cameras be sent with removal crews.

Chair Malloy noted that graffiti is a problem locally and people should not be threatened for doing their job. He suggested that staff invite public input and review information to find the best possible solution.

Mr. Randy Honeycutt, 6033 Forest Trails Drive, stated that if a business owner has been hit eight times by graffiti, reduce the removal fees so the business owner is not punished.

Mr. Glenn Montgomery, 2438 High Point Road, stated that New York City and Los Angeles are utilizing a device call the “mosquito” which emits a high-frequency sound that can only be heard by individuals aged 12 to 24, and the sound drives them away from the area.

Chair Malloy noted that if an ordinance is passed, it can always be reviewed and amended.

Mr. Paige stated that in addition to the proposed front-lawn parking ordinance, this ordinance can be placed on the City’s website to allow public input and it will be brought back to next month’s Committee meeting.

Council Member Besse requested that an unmarked police car be sent with removal crews where threats have been made.

Chair Malloy suggested that an undercover officer possibly accompany removal crews.

Council Member Besse noted that it will be known within the community that threats will not be tolerated.

G-3. DISCUSSION OF MINIMUM HOUSING CODE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION UPDATE. *[The Community Development/Housing/General Government Committee voted to continue consideration of this item to March 17, 2008.]*

Mr. Brooks stated that this item was for information only, and that a committee was appointed by the Mayor to review the housing code. This committee reviewed processes and standards, and provided staff with a full set of recommendations. He also stated that some committee members disagreed with a few of the changes that addressed health and safety.

Chair Malloy thanked committee members for their commitment to the project.

In response to Council Member Leight’s question, Mr. Bruce Bailiff, Code Enforcement, stated that smoke will travel up a wall and curve inward toward the ceiling, so smoke detectors should be at least twelve inches from the intersection of the wall. He also reviewed major discussion items that came up within the committee regarding heating sources and maintenance of those sources and an increased minimum electrical capacity.

In response to Chair Malloy’s question, Mr. Bailiff noted that a dwelling can be cited for peeling paint on an exterior wall, but it is considered a minor violation. It is also recommended that the property owner paint the exterior surfaces.

Mr. Brooks noted that there is no enforcement mechanism in the City code to force a property owner to paint a dwelling. He also noted that minor violations are inspected every 90 days.

Chair Malloy requested that the code be amended to force individual property owners to paint the exterior of a dwelling.

Mrs. Angela Carmon stated that unless the dwelling is unfit, state statutes will not allow authorization.

Ms. Nancy Gould, 195 Executive Park Boulevard, stated that it was a pleasure to serve on the committee, that several local realtors were in attendance, and that some specifics needed to be reviewed.

Mr. John Renaldo, 365 Butler Avenue, stated that he is concerned with mold, mildew, and lead-based paint as public health issues. He also stated that although there are removal costs involved, it is a big problem. He further stated that rats have become a problem in the City and the City Council is the only group that can solve it.

In response to Chair Malloy's concern, Mr. Brooks stated that lead-based paint is considered a health hazard and there are grants available to cities to have it removed. He also stated that the state has not addressed lead-based paint, nor mold or mildew in its housing code.

Mrs. Carmon noted that local housing codes cannot be more stringent than state housing codes.

Council Member Leight assured Mr. Renaldo that the City is currently reviewing a vector control program for rodents.

Mr. Brooks explained the vector control program, and the use of possible in-house abatement.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Brooks noted that the state housing authority inspects for housing quality standards and the local housing authority inspects for minimum housing standards. He also noted that the local housing authority has contracted the City to complete all housing inspections and the City was previously contracted to perform all Section Eight Housing inspections. Mr. Brooks further noted that he will discuss the need for continuity in inspections with the City Manager's office.

Mr. Paige noted that staff is currently reviewing the local housing commission.

G-4. REPORT ON UNDOCUMENTED WORKERS AND ILLEGAL ALIENS.

Mrs. Martha Wheelock, Assistant City Manager, stated that there is language in City contracts regarding the use of undocumented workers and illegal aliens, along with a system of verifying a worker's eligibility. She also stated that undocumented workers are addressed in federal immigration laws, and the federal government is responsible for investigating founded violations. She further stated that the immigrations and customs enforcement area currently has a large backlog of cases, and the Department of Homeland Security utilizes a program called E-Verify. When an employee is hired, the employer is required to gather information on an I-9 form and prove eligibility to work in the United States. Mrs. Wheelock reviewed the E-Verify process. She noted that federal contractors are required to use the E-Verify system, along with school systems in North Carolina. She also noted that in City contracts, contractors are required to abide by all federal, state, and local guidelines. She further noted that staff could include some language in contracts to call attention to the law. Mrs. Wheelock pointed out that a justifiable reason to question a possible undocumented worker must be proven and revocation of a business license cannot be discriminatory.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mrs. Wheelock stated that the referenced E-Verify report in the agenda book was prepared by an electronic information systems think-tank, and is based solely on opinion. She also stated that database errors were found, along with extensive delays and failure to meet time requirements.

In response to Council Member Leight's inquiry, Mrs. Wheelock noted that when an employer accepts information, it should appear legitimate and prove valid citizenship.

In response to Chair Malloy's questions, Mrs. Wheelock stated that the North Carolina state school system does use the E-Verify program and has a 90% success rate, but it receives few Hispanic applicants and the percentage may be skewed. She also stated that City departments utilizing contracts must ensure that language included in contracts requires them to abide by regulations as set forth by the Immigration Reform and Control Act. The Freedom of Information Act can only be used to gather information. She further stated that a breach of contract provision can be included if the contractor is found to be using undocumented workers. Mrs. Wheelock noted that complaints have to be substantiated and time must be allowed for the contractor to cure the breach.

Mrs. Carmon stated that staff is just beginning the process and particular language could be added to City contracts, but there are several legal issues involved and staff may bring the item back to Council at a later date.

Mrs. Wheelock stated that staff is monitoring what similar municipalities are doing.

Mayor Joines noted that the minimum housing code item will remain in Committees and input is encouraged from all interested parties.

(Mayor Joines out at 5:05 p.m.)

G-5. UPDATE ON TREE ORDINANCE

Mr. Glenn Simmons, Planning, gave the presentation on the proposed tree ordinance.

Mr. Norby stated that specific details will be addressed in the actual ordinance, and staff has proposed to meet with interested stakeholders to discuss the ordinance and fine-tune the verbiage. He also stated that a draft item was completed for a hearing with the Planning Board. He further stated that the item will come forward formally as a *Unified Development Ordinance* (UDO) text amendment and Forsyth County Commissioners will decide if they wish to consider the ordinance for their jurisdiction.

Chair Malloy thanked citizens for their participation in the proposed ordinance.

In response to Council Member Besse's question, Mr. Norby stated that Growth Management Area (GMA) 5 or rural areas are comprised of low-intensity zoning, so development in large lot areas will not include clear-cutting of trees. He also stated that developers will not want to increase grading on large lots containing trees as development costs will increase. He further stated that activity centers are located in intense mixed-use areas and core areas and as the core areas are maintained, concentrated development will occur.

Council Member Besse suggested that staff tie exemptions to zoning districts rather than GMAs. He also requested that staff present any draft documents from Planning staff and citizens to the Committee so the process may be tracked from beginning to end, as well as presenting information prior to any policy changes.

Mr. Norby stated that staff will hold meetings with interested parties rather than reconvening the committee.

Mr. Simmons stated that a draft ordinance will be compiled and brought to the Committee for review.

Mr. Norby stated that the ordinance may not be clearly understood until all details are compiled. He also stated that staff will take into consideration the structure of the present UDO and apply some flexibility. He further stated that the item will be brought to the Committee to explain the reasoning.

(Council Member Merschel in at 5:25 p.m.)

In response to Council Member Leight's question, Mr. Simmons stated that there is no current rule regarding tree canopy or minimum open space at metro-activity centers but the ordinance will support uses around it, and that large canopy trees can be installed.

Mr. Norby noted that when an MU-S rezoning was approved on the West Clemmons Road extension, there were a few areas of flood plain that did not make sense to develop. There was a large portion that could be preserved while other areas of the site would be intensively developed and similar trees should be planted to maintain the character of the area.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Mr. Simmons stated that there are some provisions that address radical tree-mutilations and violations of the current ordinance to address enforcement. He also stated that developers could be encouraged to save existing trees, but until the ordinance is changed, it will be difficult to enforce.

In response to Chair Malloy's inquiry, Mr. Norby noted that under the current UDO, there is no requirement in the buffer yard area to save existing trees and buffer yards will have to be restored in planning specifications. He also noted that if a notation is not made on a site plan, there is no requirement for the developer to save the trees.

In response to Council Member Leight's concern, Mr. Charles Norton, Inspections Director, stated that the current ordinance has maintenance requirements for required trees, but once trees are topped or mutilated, the only requirement is to replant trees greater than the minimum required for that area.

Council Member Leight suggested that fines should be assessed under the new ordinance regarding tree-topping and tree-mutilation.

Mr. Norton noted that zoning violations are subject to civil penalties if not corrected, but there is no penalty in the current ordinance.

Mr. Simmons stated that staff's next step is to solicit public comments and there is no intention to change the draft ordinance.

Council Member Besse requested that staff bring the draft document back to Committee only if it is substantially different from the Committee's recommendation. He also requested to see any major changes and policy questions that are discussed.

Mr. Norby stated that it is the intention of staff to modify the existing ordinance rather than create a new document.

Council Member Besse requested that the item be brought back to the Committee prior to the Planning Board presentation, and that public comments should be solicited prior to that time.

G-6. TEN-YEAR PLAN TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS ANNUAL REPORT.

Ms. Andrea Kurtz, 301 N. Main Street, stated that in April 2007, staff of the Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness held its first Homeless Connect Event with 375 participants and were able to house 17 people. She also stated that there has been an increase in the number of people found living on the street with a major drop in the number of families housed, due to a policy change regarding family housing shelters. She further stated that the opening of a new housing resource center between several community groups has helped to create a one-stop shop for shelter and case management.

In response to Chair Malloy's question, Ms. Kurtz stated that the resource center located at the Bethesda Center operates a day shelter and case management services, but the housing resource center located at Goler Memorial Church brings resources together in one place at one time. She also stated that she hopes the day shelter and case management services will soon be able to connect for a one-stop shop.

ADJOURNMENT: 5:46 p.m.