

**Town of Brunswick, Maine**  
**Shelter Task Force**  
**Wednesday, July 25, 2018**  
**4:00 PM**  
**85 Union Street – Council Chambers**

---

**Meeting Minutes**

**Task Force:** Councilor James Mason (Chair), Councilor Kathy Wilson, and Councilor Alison Harris

**Staff:** John Eldridge, Town Manager; Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development; Jared Woolston, Town Planner; Kristin Collins, Town Attorney

**Chair Mason** opened the meeting.

**Acknowledgement that the meeting was properly noticed:** Town Manager Eldridge affirmed that the meeting was properly noticed.

**Adjustments to the agenda:** None.

**Continuation of Staff Recommendations and Discussion of Zoning Districts and Standards**

**Chair Mason:** We will continue where we left off at last meeting, and I will invite public comments for each section.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:**

- *Hours of Operation* – Based on staff’s research as far as zoning regulations, hours of operation does not generally fall into that – maybe under a management plan – but specifying hours of operation is less common. Staff recommended the Task Force look at options and have a more specific discussion, if that is still of interest.

**Chair Mason:** I have concerns how onerous for an operator running a shelter to find someone a specific place to go. I didn’t sense the Task Force wanted to go down that road, and I certainly don’t. We don’t require that of any other business.

**Kathy Wilson:** I understand your point; however, there is a difference. We are dealing with people who deserve respect and rights, but they are often needier in some respects, which is why they’re there. I think it needs to be a whole package. I do think there should be something available. For instance, if the shelter is closed during the day and there’s no place available, there should be some means of making sure they’re safe and have somewhere to go.

**Kristin Collins, Town Attorney:** This may be a little more specific than how it may end up reading. You may have a performance or approval standard that says there needs to be adequate assurance of a location where occupants may go during the hours that the facility is closed that wouldn’t need a formal contract or exchange of money.

**Alison Harris:** The point about communications and access to staff – I’m not sure that’s unreasonable as long as it’s not a hotline where staff has to be available 24/7. I think it would be helpful – I’m not sure it should be written into the performance standards. If you’re staying at the shelter, how do you communicate with Tedford if the building is closed? I’m also hung up on the apartment-style versus non-apartment-style – it’s my understanding that current practice in Brunswick is that, while there are staff members at the apartment building during the week during the day, they’re probably not there all day, every day, and residents of the apartments come and go as they need to, and presumably have an emergency contact for Tedford. The adult shelters run quite differently – strict hours when you can be there, when you have to be checked in for the night – so it’s hard for me to think of one set of rules for both types of shelters.

**Kathy Wilson:** It appears there is a definite difference between rules and regulations at the apartments and at the adult shelter.

**Public Comment on Hours of Operation:**

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** People lease our Everett Street apartments as tenants, and are strictly considered apartment buildings – nothing to do with the sheltering system. The Federal Street family shelter does have case manager there Monday through Friday; not always on site, but there is always a phone number to call. Families are a bit more on their own. There are various requirements on nights and weekends to connect with the Cumberland Street facility, and they know who to call with a problem – generally Cumberland Street. We feel that we can provide people a place to be, but we’re not a place for keeping people. They need to be out in the community – looking for jobs, taking courses, etc. Between our place, the Gathering Place and MidCoast Hunger, there’s always a place that’s open. There’s a working understanding between us that that is how it operates.

**Kathy Wilson:** You do believe that it’s important to provide some place for them to be if the shelter is closed during the day?

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** That’s correct. I consider the language Kristin used to be part of a management plan. Our folks are pretty responsible.

**Alison Harris:** Craig, you said that nights and weekends there’s some communication between the families and Cumberland Street. Is that obligatory that they check in or just available to them?

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** Both. Every night of the week the family folks call Cumberland Street as well as the people at Federal Street. If there is a problem they can call Cumberland Street and if staff at Cumberland Street feel the situation has risen to some level that needs additional resources there’s an on-call person.

**Alison Harris:** You also have certain restrictions on visiting at the family shelter. Is that correct?

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** Strictly the family of the clients at the shelter.

**Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing:** Family guests are required to call in to the shelter every night. That’s for safety reasons to make sure that the unit is occupied, and for our own census

purposes. If we don't hear from them, we'll call them. All guests are cleared through staff, so we know who is in the building, and that is part of our daily operations.

**Kathy Wilson:** So that wouldn't be out of the way to require that.

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** No. The staff recommendations did not find any other communities with such a requirement for facilities similar to a homeless shelter, non-apartment-style. The system of homeless services involves the Gathering Place and MidCoast Hunger - we think that's a responsible way to go. To require a facility duplicate would be unnecessary additional costs of resources which are precious and hard to come by. If you go by the Gathering Place on Union Street, the sign includes the term day shelter, which is their mission in their community.

**John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer:** Tedford and many other similar shelters are operated on the basis of funding. Tedford's goal is to operate in the best way that it can, but if a shelter is attempting to provide overnight housing for people who otherwise have nowhere else to sleep, they feel that they can address the needs of the community best. If the zoning code says any such shelter must also have contracts with different facilities to make sure that daytime facilities are available, or must have staff on hand for more hours, what you're then doing is adjusting the use of the funding. Tedford wouldn't be able to operate. I ask you to bear that in mind when you're putting things in as requirements. The code should be worded to recognize that not every shelter can guarantee that those things will be available. I'd also ask you to try not to write requirements that treat overnight residents as though they were long term residents. They may or may not be.

**Alison Harris:** I think if anything we're talking about a management plan. Speaking for myself, I do not think that requirement belongs in the zoning code. I think we do want to be careful that given the transient nature of your guests they aren't just told to get out at 9:00 in the morning and go away and come back at 5:00 - it's not good for the neighborhood. I think we want to ensure that this does not become the practice of any shelter that we'd have in town. I don't know how we draft the language and in what format it is, but I would think it would be less formal than a zoning code.

I understand what you're saying about you don't know about the adult shelter, how many people you may have each night, but it seems to me there must be some inkling because you only have 16 beds. So I mean you can't just say, well gee, we might have 40 people showing up tonight. We might have a couple people. There must be some management system you have for knowing what your census is going to be at the adult shelter.

**John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer:** I'll go out on a limb and say that that's true.

**Kathy Wilson:** It was my understanding that when someone comes here that, what few belongings they have, they get to leave there during the. So that would be some assurance that you would know who was coming back on a nightly basis.

**Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing:** As long as people are working with their plan, we try and assist them with housing, so we do have a fairly good predictable sense of who's going to be there from night to night. Sometimes people will exit for whatever reason, then we have a bed available early. Rarely does that bed go unfilled because there's such a demand. People don't sign a document saying they are going to be there for 60 days or whatever.

**Chair Mason:** I agree with Allison in that I'm not looking to have something like that spelled out in the zoning code, but having it as part of, if we're going to require some sort of management plan, an application. I certainly don't want to see a requirement of contracting the facility or anything like that, but I think that's a pretty valid question to ask them to at least say what are you going to do?

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** Yeah. I think that's a pretty clear direction.

**Chair Mason:** I want to briefly amend my own agenda - toward the end of the meeting last time I asked people to, if they had further comments, so if anybody has something they're prepared to talk about from last meeting, I want to give you that opportunity.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I have one clarification from last time that a couple of people have commented on or approached me, and that was the GR6 zoning with the contributing resources within the VRO. I think staff wasn't clear at the last meeting that when we suggested a conditional use for shelters as well within that GR6 district, I think the thought was along the lines of having the same criteria as a hotel or inn would have as far as being limited to the contributing resources and, and not being able to build a new structure from scratch within that VRO area. I think there was some concern that there we were recommending shelters of unlimited size or the ability to replace a contributing resource. I don't think that was our intention, although I don't think we probably worded it that well. I think we made a footnote citing the standards that the hotels have to follow for a conditional use within that district and I think we envision a shelter would have to fall along those same lines.

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** I sent you a memo asking you for some clarification on residential use only as being an ancillary use, and then mixed use as being thought of as a resource center, or a primary use. When we say resource center, we think of that as onsite services, and onsite services are part of our residential use, which is an ancillary service versus a mixed use resource center being our primary purpose.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** That's actually on the agenda to discuss on page 12, under onsite facilities. Staff had the same questions. Is there a percentage or square footage where if they provide some office space, say it's 33 percent of the building - is that now a principal use or is that still an accessory use?

**Jim Bridge, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition:** Just wanted to get clarification from Matt, what you said about the shelters versus hotels. It wasn't clear to me if what you're doing that's the same is the same requirement or you're going to do a similar type of an approach of defining for shelters.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** GR6 is unique in that it allows hotels as a conditional use, but it's with very stringent criteria that's basically the redevelopment of contributing, maybe historic inns that are existing, instead of new uses. Hotels in general - staff's approach to this was based on our definition of hotel. The only real difference is one requires compensation and one does not. I don't think we necessarily mimic in our recommendations what a hotel is, but that was an additional use that we kept in mind when formulating our recommendations.

**Jim Bridge, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition:** My concern would be that there need to be criteria for both, but they aren't the same. I mentioned that in a memo that I sent earlier in the week. There's a huge difference between hotels and shelters.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** To address your memo, it focuses on a stereotypical hotel, or you name brands and different markets. I think oftentimes hotels or motels operate, as far as the land use, more similarly. I think a lot of your arguments are more economic.

**Jim Bridge, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition:** Footprints - totally agree. Traffic patterns are different for the two.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I think a hotel is more intense than a shelter.

**Jim Bridge, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition:** There are a lot of differences between the two, and as I said in the memo, if you don't believe that, go walk around by the Holiday Inn in Portland and then go walk around by the Oxford Street. There is a difference. If there had been a hotel put there, it would be a different neighborhood. That's not pushing shelters out of the way. My concern is there are different criteria for each when you define what's required.

**Alison Harris:** It comes back down to a hotel. You can use your room 24 hours a day and then the shelter you may not be able to. I think that is a key difference.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I think a hotel would probably have a peak. There's turnover at the time in the morning before 11 and there's probably a higher turnover around four. It's not the same, but it's one of those similarities that we saw that merited a review of how we treat hotels as part of this analysis.

**Kathy Wilson:** I think there is a difference. I agree with Jim and there is a difference in the clientele. Most hotels are usually people that have a home, they're employed and they're either on vacation or business. And a shelter is a whole different clientele. It's people that don't have a home and according to the numbers that we're seeing, maybe half of them have a job. So that does change things.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** We are looking at it mostly from a land use, not an economic model. It's certainly a very, very different economic model, but they share some of the same land use impacts.

**Courtney Neff, NWA:** I was in this room when Margaret Wilson and Anna Breinich were concerned that old houses in GR6 not fall into disrepair because they are big and expensive to maintain. This was an alternative that they could be turned into inns, with a little expansion up to 20 percent. That was the whole purpose. The recent hotel was left in and not differentiated from an Inn. This was one of the last things they discovered, but they didn't want to spend the time to define a hotel versus an inn. That's the only reason it stayed hotel. What kind of a hotel can it really be if it's got to be a house on the historic list?

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** We discussed this and staff's thinking was what makes it attractive for an inn? Have we gone and defined inn, might make it attractive for a shelter? We looked at as a frame of reference, but the same situation that would make some of

those homes or facilities attractive to develop as an inn might make the same attractiveness to a shelter.

**Courtney Neff, NRNA:** Why couldn't you turn a big old house into an inn in any other growth residential. Our neighborhood is not unique in that respect. It looks unique because it says hotel on the zoning, but it's still different from having big old houses in other parts of town.

**Alison Harris:** I'm not sure that in my mind there's a huge distinction between an inn and a hotel and the way they operate. I've seen communities where a building is sometimes called an inn and sometimes called a hotel depending on who owns it and is operating it.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** Everything is just a staff recommendation. I think it could be worth additional discussion as to whether or not a shelter is inappropriate in that GR6; we had thought with a limited range.

**John Eldridge, Town Manager:** The other thing that was mentioned was there is a shelter in GR6; could have suggested it'd be a nonconforming use if it was no longer permitted, but it wasn't based solely on the hotel.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:**

- *Location/Proximity* - At the June twelfth meeting there was discussion regarding proximity to either transportation or central services. One of the suggestions was a quarter mile of a transportation stop or public transportation that was cited as an example. There was a strong preference for being able to encourage location near central services. Staff's take is these are certainly good ideas. We just have some concerns about how these would operate in practice. I think the idea is almost if you build it, they will come. If there's a need for a stop, usually a service will be responsive to that and can provide some sort of improvement or enhanced transportation to that area. Most shelter residents don't have a vehicle, so the thought would be that we need something that everyone can walk to and there are a lot of things that prevent people from walking. Is it a certain concentration of essential services that we'd be looking for or just one essential service? There are zoning districts that the intent and regulations don't match what's currently out there. The intent and regulations might suggest that they be for pedestrian friendly environments and higher densities, but they're currently not that way. So if a shelter were to locate there, they may not be within close proximity to a central services, but the idea would be that essential services eventually could be located within that area. Say we did require proximity to a transit station or essential service and then that leaves. We don't want to create a situation where someone's nonconforming because another use left the area.

**Chair Mason:** We've had a lot of discussions about services and proximity to services and I think there was some point in one of our meetings you put together a map of services that you had identified and located. And as Matt just said, there's not a core; there's no great place that is around all of these services that could fit within these locations. Downtown would be very well located, but what land is available for that? What I do like is the recommendation as part of a management plan that any applicant should identify how they are proposing their residents get to these services? But to put it into the zoning code for the specific services when, what that could do is say find a place downtown, and there's no place for that.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** It is a somewhat common practice to establish separation requirements from certain facilities. If you have families, especially without cars, you want them as close to the school as possible. Maybe a conversation of any sort of minimum distance requirement from other types of uses would be worth pursuing?

**Chair Mason:** I don't see a reason to prohibit any shelter from proximity to any location.

**Kathy Wilson:** I don't agree with you on that. What we set up today is going to be in play for some time and other things can change. A school could build closer or whatever. I was so impressed with Waterville and, and their rules and regulations and how, how things were run. I wouldn't have any problem with anything next to that shelter. I'm not sure about others in the state. I almost think we need to be more focused on some of the services and the convenience of folks without a car more so than anything else. The location now is near perfect. I think we have to keep in mind that the town itself is going to change.

**Alison Harris:** I agree with both of you. I think the schools have a lot of protocols for safety.

**Kristin Collins, Town Attorney:** This discussion seems to me to be a classic zoning and planning discussion. You're trying to envision what certain zones are going to become and where shelters fit within them, and a big component of that is access to services, so it should be that zoning these and where they're allowed to be within town answers this question of proximity to services or where we hope services are going to be, and you're planning for the future not knowing exactly how it's going to develop rather than saying you have to be x feet x miles of every single service we can envision.

**Alison Harris:** I think something we have to address is what are essential services. If we're going to be even thinking about encouraging a shelter developer to think about how their clients are going to get to the essential services, we should make a list of what those essential services are.

**Kristin Collins, Town Attorney:** I'd say just keep in mind putting too much in the management plan; remember that none of that will be enforceable. It works well for someone like Tedford who has a good conceived plan and everything works out. But if you did have somebody that came in and started a shelter and made promises about how people were going to get places but didn't ultimately follow through, you would have no means of doing anything about it.

**Alison Harris:** Is the only way we could fix that by licensing? I think there's a quandary with licensing, but licensing at least gives you the clout to do something.

**Kristin Collins, Town Attorney:** Either you front load it in terms of putting them in places where you know they'll have access to services, and requiring them to demonstrate that in order to be approved; you give it up entirely and maybe put it in a management plan, but it has no teeth; or you do licensing. Those are the three options.

**Alison Harris:** I'm with Jim and I think we have to get real about Brunswick. Portland has a public transportation system, Brunswick doesn't. The Explorer has limited hours and limited days. We don't have public transportation at work in Brunswick, so it's taxis or dedicated vans and drivers provided or walkability. I think you should look at Brunswick Landing as potential sites.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** It would be nice if it was that easy that we could just draw a circle and say you're in or you're out. I guess staff's question then would be, if

it's going to be part of a management plan, how do you foresee that - just a list of the services within x distance - what would you like to see?

**Kathy Wilson:** Are there other towns that absolutely say no? Can we say no to shelters in this town?

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** In the list provided there are some that just don't address it - I am unaware of anyone who says this is a use and it's not allowed anywhere. That probably wouldn't be constitutional.

**Kristin Collins, Town Attorney:** The general rule is that you can't fully ban a use from a town unless you can make a case that it just does not fit in anywhere -it's inherently objectionable - which would be very hard to do with shelters. It might be easier for like a heavy, heavy industrial use in a totally populated town.

**Alison Harris:** If we're moving toward a management plan, as unenforceable as it might be, it's got to be a mix of proximity to what we identify as essential services and a transportation plan.

#### **Public Comment on Location/Proximity**

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** I just wanted to remind folks when we first started this process the idea of our resource center/onsite services was to improve the access to various services that either Tedford can do onsite or other resources can do onsite.

**Kathy Wilson:** But what do you believe that that could be something that would be required? I know you talked about offering it, but if it was required, not just for you but for anyone, you're thinking then then that that is okay?

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** We've gone down the road because we feel it's part of our mission and part of how some shelters practice these days. Probably the minimal shelter of 30 years ago it would not fit as a requirement, but we've certainly raised the bar in terms of what an organization would be able to do.

**John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer:** We have no intention of trying to operate a shelter to which the residents can't get and from which they can't get to the places they need to be. We appreciate the comments you've been making because you've been expressing the need to preserve the flexibility to address that problem in various ways.

**Clark Labbe, Brunswick resident:** I don't believe at this point the definition has addressed wet versus dry shelters or what type of folks will be permitted or not permitted. So when you talk about proximity and proximity to schools, what might not be a problem today for the shelter that we know in Brunswick may be a problem for the shelter that comes tomorrow. So I think you should look at both of those factors before you zero in on anything. A management plans is a good idea, but it's not enforceable, and having spent 20 some odd years enforcing rules and codes in this town, if you're going to have a management plan that's unenforceable, don't bother. Why don't we decide what we need to enforce and make sure it's written in there so we can. And if it's unenforceable, leave it out.

**Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing:** I also had the same idea of what is actually meant by essential services. In the course of conversation over the last couple of meetings, it's been raised a couple

of times about employment services. I think we do serve people that have a variety of needs around employment services. I think as we talk about essential services, we really need to define what essential means. I would say that the most essential service is housing, and there is a real lack of affordable housing in this area.

**Emmy Brown, 33 Pleasant Hill Road:** Listening to the conversations that have focused on Tedford and the fine service that they provide for the last 30 years in Brunswick is commendable. But in thinking about focusing on just Tedford, my concern is recovery shelters for drug abuse, domestic violence shelters. When I was a member of the Board of the United Way in this area, there was a shelter, but it was located in Portland. There wasn't one in Brunswick. I toured it; it was in a secret location known to the police department, but not known widely in the community. People have talked about going down to Portland and seeing the folks on Oxford Street Shelter and so forth. Some of them will accept teens, but there isn't a designated place, so thinking of an overall shelter protection program I think may not be as identified as it should be.

**John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer, 8 Spring Street:** Not speaking for Tedford, just as a Brunswick citizen. Zoning is about land use. It's not about people and when we regulate people, we regulate behavior under the law. If there are certain behaviors that are troublesome, we will regulate those behaviors and make them offenses and we have ways to deal with them. The wrong view is to say we prejudge the people who live in a particular area or in a particular housing development to be dangerous. We deal with the behavior. We don't regulate the people and say, you can't come to our town.

**Chair Mason:** I think one of the things I've heard was come morning, a lot of people are going to be out of the shelter and where are they going to go? And we know that not all of the people who are going to be in the shelter are going to jobs, and that's why we have The Gathering Place. Where are they going to go from 8:30 to four? I just want to make sure that that particular point is brought out because that's a citizen concern of any shelter. The reasons they're concerned about it are reasons that are similar to those you've talked, but the physical proximity of where people are going to go during daytime hours who do not have otherwise have jobs I think is a concern that we want to address. That's an issue that's more of just the people who do not have employment and were residents at an overnight shelter. And we don't have to worry about that in the context of the apartment shelter where there's not that time where you have to leave. I've seen nothing from the task force for recommending that there needs to be a shelter open 24 hours. We just had that discussion, but I think we definitely need to think about that. I think about enforcement as well, of whether we're going to give that up when we draft something? Maybe a recommendation will be that we do.

**Kathy Wilson:** I think that actually in many ways that becomes the core issue.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** This is the issue that I don't know how you address it through a zoning mechanism.

**Kristin Collins, Town Attorney:** The other option is as a management plan you could have it actually be reviewable for substance by whoever is reviewing these applications. So the Planning Board could be tasked with reviewing the management plan to assure that it adequately does A, B, C and D, which is fine as long as you have a Planning Board that's applying it in a rational and nondiscriminatory manner. It's just a matter of how much faith you want to put in the Planning Board to do that from application to application and on the subject matter in general.

**Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing:** We could build spaces and hire staff and that type of thing, but it doesn't mean that people will stay there. That's not something that we're required or the town requires of other facilities.

**Chair Mason:** I don't think there's any sense from the task force that you want to put the onus of providing a daytime facility on Tedford. It's just that that is a concern of citizens. And that's not just Brunswick. That's a concern whenever I have seen the issue of, of homeless shelter being addressed when the shelter does not have 24 hour access. We've got to consider what happens during the day.

**Jim Bridge, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition:** Proximity implies that you are housed near where one of these essential services is; access means you can get there. The Brunswick Express gives transportation options to people during the working hours for most of us. Maybe it's time Brunswick knuckled down and had a public transportation system. The other piece is the critical first step - finding employment. Until somebody has employment they can't afford even affordable housing. Going back to the proximity of the employment centers where a person is able to walk when there's no transportation is a critical piece to help the process of taking a homeless person to a homed person.

**Chair Mason:** We're talking about a shelter that is providing emergency overnight, though not limited, usage. It's not a job it's a bed. I agree with you that that's an important part of the discussion, but I'm not sure that needs to be as part of how we situate an emergency overnight shelter.

**Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing:** I'd like to just disagree with the last point brought up about the most essential service is employment versus housing. When a lot of our folks do go to work they work in low end service sector jobs which are the most prevalent jobs around. If you look at what a minimum wage job gets you in terms of housing, you might get a quarter of an apartment. Affordable housing is housing that doesn't cost more than 30 percent of one's income. One of the things that we try to do is assist people with temporary or permanent housing vouchers that make housing affordable. So we are a housing first organization.

**John Eldridge, Town Manager:** Do you have any idea how many Section eight housing units are available in Brunswick and what other things you would put in the category of affordable housing that would meet that definition that you just described?

**Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing:** I don't have that number in terms of how many units, but you could start off by contacting either Brunswick Housing Authority or Maine Housing. Various housing authorities have certain types of vouchers. Those are all basically providing the cost of the apartment above and beyond 30 percent of somebody's income. What are lacking are the units themselves – we know that there's not enough.

**John Eldridge, Town Manager:** Can you give us a listing of the voucher type programs that you utilize? I'm really trying to get an understanding like we did with how many clients that you serve, how many affordable housing units under the various programs exist in Brunswick. If you know what the resources are in addition to Section eight, if you could just give us a listing, we could work through Maine State Housing to get a handle on that. I've heard it mentioned enough that I think people would be interested to know how many units are available in Brunswick.

**Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing:** I don't have a number that could tell you how many affordable housing units there are. I can tell you the types of housing vouchers that Maine Housing has that are dedicated to homeless programs. There's a voucher called Stability through Engagement Program and those are vouchers with their renewals for up to one year. Those are temporary vouchers that help people get back on their feet, and then the idea is that after one year the people would be able to afford those. A more permanent voucher is a Housing Choice Voucher, which is a type of Section eight voucher. Those are also available through a Maine Housing. Also local public housing authorities - Bath Housing Authority, Brunswick Housing Authority - have some of their own vouchers.

**Chair Mason:** Is there any way you could provide this information to John?

**Field Griffiths, Tedford:** My sense is that your ideal of the task force and Tedford's ideal might be fairly similar in terms of the kind of locations we would love to put a shelter in. So there'll be pluses and minuses of some of them having to do with proximity, cost, size, accessibility, etc. I would encourage us not to get too specific on it. What I'm suggesting is that it may not be a horrible thing to just have it be addressed in the business plan, and an applicant's definition of proximity to the most important uses might be a little bit different than ours, but may be just as valid.

**Alison Harris:** For me the crux of the issue is the clients' access to the services that they need. Access could be because they're next door - access could be because there's a transportation plan - access could be because the provider has a facility where they're able to bring in providers of training or healthcare. For me it's not proximity and it's not the physical structure, it's that the clients have the access to what they need to move beyond homelessness. I would like to get away from this notion of proximity and how far we are from everything - employment centers, hospitals, and libraries. The issue is how the provider is going to ensure that their clients are able to use those services.

**Chair Mason:** I'm going to skip over onsite facilities and just directly address minimum separation from similar uses. I don't see a reason to have minimum proximity. Either proximity to services or the provider's ability to give access to the services. Minimum separation from similar uses, I don't see a reason to have that. I think what it's trying to prevent is clustering. We just had this long discussion about access to services and how we need it needs to be proximate or a plan for.

**Alison Harris:** Maybe Portland's a good example. We have shelters all concentrated in one neighborhood, one area, whatever. The fact of the matter is they're going to end up where land is available at a price they can afford that's zoned in a way that they can build the facilities they need to run a shelter, and then that they can also comply with any management plan that we might put in force. What is the rationale for having these thousand foot separations?

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** Just to prevent a clustering of uses with the assumption that there might be more of a land use impact with a use that if they are clustered in combination might make those issues more pronounced. The basic idea really is to keep up the block appearance; a one use per block idea is probably where this originated. Staff's thinking was that it didn't seem too onerous, but we're certainly open to recommendations.

**Kathy Wilson:** The distance of a thousand or 1500 feet - if you're trying to prevent clustering. I don't think that does it. I can see a good reason for, and a good reason against.

**Alison Harris:** I guess what we're talking about here is if we talk about the separation of similar uses, but we're also talking about we want to develop or encourage resource centers where they're all piled into one facility, to say they can't be two buildings adjacent to each other, but it's okay if they're in the same building as a resource center. It doesn't make sense to me to have that in there. I mean we live in a town where there's a restaurant every 30 feet, so we certainly have duplicative uses next to each other.

**John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer, 8 Spring Street:** I agree with what I've been hearing and I wanted to add one more point. If we had a rule like this you might end up with one shelter that gets the spot right near all the facilities and then no other shelter can be located near that.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I remember a publication by the American Planning Association where there is some discussion about a concentration of social service facilities and how they may overwhelm the carrying capacity of a neighborhood. I'd be more than happy to share this article either via email or at the next meeting.

**Alison Harris:** That would be helpful. And if you put it online as well. I'm just put up on the website.

**Chair Mason:** That's as much time as we have for this week. We'll do the first and then the 15th, probably not the 22nd.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I think density and proximity were the two big ones. I think next week we'll be able to get through what's left.

**Chair Mason:** Let's get through the first and then sometime the following week, get something back to us with all of those that we can discuss as a group on the 15th.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I think what we can have is everything we've discussed compiled down into one updated document and I know we're up against a time. I don't if somehow we can get through Planning Board in September and Town Council in October.

**Chair Mason:** If you guys think you can after next week's meeting, then have two weeks to get a something again, get it to us and we can get it up on the website.

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** I really think next week's items are pretty brief and if we can go back to density and finalize that, staff would have plenty to put together into a draft final recommendation.

**Chair Mason:** So I think next week we'll finish up, and do we think we should go back to the zones again? That'll give us some feedback for the 15th. Does that sound like a doable plan?

**Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:** Definitely so, and based on what John's finding over there, I think even if we needed to accelerate in some way I think we're getting pretty good direction on it.

**Chair Mason:** This task force will meet on August first and August 15th here in this room from four to six each of those days. We will get materials up on the website as quickly as possible, but

enough time that we and the public has a chance to review them before the 15th. That's when you guys are going to get it to us for that meeting and we can hopefully get a proposal together. Maybe get it to us Friday the 10th.