

Combined Comments Related to Text Amendment Under Consideration and Shelter Concept Plan - After November 16, 2009 Public Hearing

From: Mary U. Andrews [mailto:muandrews@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 8:53 PM
To: Town Council
Subject: homeless shelter

Mike and Mary Andrews, long time residents of Chapel Hill, support the Planning Board's unanimous recommendation to eliminate any cap on beds for the IFC's shelter.

Every person deserves a bed! That is not asking too much of any of us.

Mike and Mary
 605 Fountain Ridge Rd
 Chapel Hill, NC 27517
 929-6635

From: Kenneth Brown [kbinc@mindspring.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 11:31 AM
To: All Communications & Public Affairs
Cc: abettersite
Subject: IFC men's homeless shelter: Show us the data

IFC men's shelter: Show us the data

The request of the Inter-Faith Council (IFC) for a special use permit to construct a homeless men's shelter at the corner of MLK and Homestead has met with considerable opposition, and rightly so (see CHN article, 10.25.09, and Marc Joseph's letter, 11.08.09). IFC needs to find a site where inevitable loitering of adult men, homeless or not, will not be a problem.

IFC apparently feels that the "homeless" characteristic is the sole concern, claiming "homeless aren't any more likely to abuse drugs, suffer mental illness or perpetrate crime than the general population [*italics added*]" (IFC's Chris Moran, CHN, 10.25.09). Is that creditable? Consider that:

- . 23% - 37% incidence rates in those three categories have been reported for homeless men elsewhere¹,
- . Chapel Hill Police have reportedly issued 39 reports and made 25 arrests related to 100 W. Rosemary St.1, site of IFC's Community House, already this year, and
- . IFC's Community Service on Main Street has a "Ban List" of 60-70 names with dates and types of offense, mostly from the Community House. The offenses range in severity and include assault and fighting.

Mr. Moran, the burden of proof is on you, not on others to disprove your

hypothesis. Show us the data so it can be tested statistically. And consider opening your records for the homeless shelter, with names redacted.

Kenneth G. Brown
511 Palafox Dr.
960-3618

1Presentation to Town Council, 10.19.09, by Tina CoyneSmith, with references.

From: Tina CoyneSmith [xenatc@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2009 11:51 AM
To: Town Council
Subject: Citizen Opposition to LUMO Text Change--Please copy for 11-16-09 public hearing

Dear Mayor and Town Council Members,

I am unable to attend tonight's town council meeting (I will be watching our children while my husband attends the meeting). I wanted, however, to voice my strenuous objections to the text change to the land use management ordinance that would amend the definition of "shelter." Please copy this email for distribution to the town council this evening.

I register my strong opposition to the text change based on 3 factors:

1. The text change is premature (since no SUP requesting a 52-bed facility has yet been presented by the IFC). At the 10-20-09 planning board meeting, the planning board suggested that the text change does not exist only for the men's shelter, and indeed two chapel Hill shelters are currently NOT in compliance with the 25 resident ordinance. The planning board suggested that the text change needs to happen to bring these two facilities (Homestart and the current men's shelter) into compliance.

But the issue comes up NOW as a direct result of of the proposed men's shelter Concept Plan (According to Town Council Resolution 2009-06-08/R-2). While I understand that the text amendment does not exist only for the men's shelter, the expedited process for the text amendment is a direct result of the IFC's 4 May 2009 petition regarding the men's shelter, as explained in detail in a memo from Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason dated 16 November. To suggest otherwise would be both misleading and inaccurate.

There is no urgency about bringing the other two shelters to compliance NOW (they've been out of compliance for over a decade). As Planning Board member Del Snow argued at the 20 October 1009 planning board meeting, it makes great sense to postpone the text change until further conversation happens between the IFC and the neighborhood representatives (plans for conversation using the dispute settlement center are underway).

2) The text change completely removes the upper limit for size of a shelter in Chapel Hill, which seems enormously problematic. An applicant can submit a Special Use Permit (SUP) for any size shelter.

Furthermore, the text change removes a barrier/step when a shelter wants to expand.

3. According to article 4.4 of the Land Use Management Ordinance which established the intent of zoning amendments, "this chapter shall not be amended except:

a) to correct a manifest error in the chapter; or

b) because of changed or changing conditions in a particular area or in the jurisdiction generally; or

c) to achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan.

The 16 November memo to Roger Stancil states that there is no cause for the text change under points a or b.

It states that the cause for the text change is point c: to achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan, specifically to create and preserve affordable housing opportunities.

THIS IS INCORRECT REASONING. Making a larger shelter does not create or preserve affordable housing in Chapel Hill. A shelter is a very different thing from affordable housing.

Thus, based on the very definition and three criteria in article 4.4 under which the LUMO text can be changed THERE IS NO CAUSE FOR THE PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE. I encourage

you to vote against this text change, whose lack of limits and discordance with the comprehensive plan make it bad for Chapel Hill.

Respectfully,

Tina CoyneSmith

From: stillis [mailto:stillis@nc.rr.com]

Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 11:53 AM

To: Town Council

Subject: Expansion of shelter capacity

Dear Council Members;

I want to endorse the comment by Qingqi Chen quoted in today's (11.15.09) Chapel Hill News: "A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness." These are my sentiments too, and Chen says it very well.

My wife and I are elderly and live nearby, in Glenn Heights. I think this change will increase our vulnerability to crime in the neighborhood, as well as at the bus stop and in local shopping and recreation.

I am also extremely concerned about the effects of supporting more homeless in the area since I think this expansion will encourage more homeless to come here to take advantage of the resources we offer. An then, when more come the "need" for more resources will be documented, and another expansion of resources will be demanded.

Public safety should be of greater concern to the Council than hosting the homeless!

Please heed residents concerns in this matter.

Robert David Ekstrom,
147 Windsor Circle.

From: Mahdi Fahim [mahdi.fahim@gmail.com]
 Sent: Monday, November 16, 2009 3:54 PM
 To: Town Council
 Subject: Opposition to LUMO Text Change

Dear Mayor and Town Council Members,

I am unable to attend tonight's town council meeting . I wanted, however, to voice my strenuous objections to the text change to the land use management ordinance that would amend the definition of "shelter." Please copy this email for distribution to the town council this evening.

I register my strong opposition to the text change based on 3 factors:

1. The text change is premature (since no SUP requesting a 52-bed facility has yet been presented by the IFC). At the 10-20-09 planning board meeting, the planning board suggested that the text change does not exist only for the men's shelter, and indeed two chapel Hill shelters are currently NOT in compliance with the 25 resident ordinance. The planning board suggested that the text change needs to happen to bring these two facilities (Homestart and the current men's shelter) into compliance.

But the issue comes up NOW as a direct result of of the proposed men's shelter Concept Plan (According to Town Council Resolution 2009-06-08/R-2). While I understand that the text amendment does not exist only for the men's shelter, the expedited process for the text amendment is a direct result of the IFC's 4 May 2009 petition regarding the men's shelter, as explained in detail in a memo from Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason dated 16 November. To suggest otherwise would be both misleading and inaccurate.

There is no urgency about bringing the other two shelters to compliance NOW (they've been out of compliance for over a decade). As Planning Board member Del Snow argued at the 20 October 1009 planning board meeting, it makes great sense to postpone the text change until further conversation happens between the IFC and the neighborhood representatives (plans for conversation using the dispute settlement center are underway).

2) The text change completely removes the upper limit for size of a shelter in Chapel Hill, which seems enormously problematic. An applicant can submit a Special Use Permit (SUP) for any size shelter. Furthermore, the text change removes a barrier/step when a shelter wants to expand.

3. According to article 4.4 of the Land Use Management Ordinance which established the intent of zoning amendments, "this chapter shall not be amended except:

- a) to correct a manifest error in the chapter; or
- b) because of changed or changing conditions in a particular area or in the jurisdiction generally; or
- c) to achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan.

The 16 November memo to Roger Stancil states that there is no cause for the text change under points a or b. It states that the cause for the text change is point c: to achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan, specifically to create and preserve affordable housing opportunities. **THIS IS INCORRECT REASONING.** Making a larger shelter does not create or preserve affordable housing in Chapel Hill. A shelter is a very different thing from affordable housing. Thus, based on the very definition and three criteria in article 4.4 under which the LUMO text

can be changed THERE IS NO CAUSE FOR THE PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE.
I encourage you to vote against this text change, whose lack of limits and discordance with the comprehensive plan make it bad for Chapel Hill.

Regards,
Mahdi Fahim

From: Margaret Hung [mailto:mh34102@msn.com]

Sent: Monday, November 16, 2009 5:06 PM

To: Town Council

Subject: Land Use Permit for Shelters

· Dear Mayor and Town Council Members,

·
· I am unable to attend tonight's town council meeting. I wanted, however, to voice my strenuous objections to the text change to the land use management ordinance that would amend the definition of "shelter." Please copy this email for distribution to the town council this evening.

· I register my strong opposition to the text change based on 3 factors:

· 1. The text change is premature (since no SUP requesting a 52-bed facility has yet been presented by the IFC). At the 10-20-09 planning board meeting, the planning board suggested that the text change does not exist only for the men's shelter, and indeed two chapel Hill shelters are currently NOT in compliance with the 25 resident ordinance. The planning board suggested that the text change needs to happen to bring these two facilities (Homestart and the current men's shelter) into compliance.

· But the issue comes up NOW as a direct result of of the proposed men's shelter Concept Plan (According to Town Council Resolution 2009-06-08/R-2). While I understand that the text amendment does not exist only for the men's shelter, the expedited process for the text amendment is a direct result of the IFC's 4 May 2009 petition regarding the men's shelter, as explained in detail in a memo from Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason dated 16 November. To suggest otherwise would be both misleading and inaccurate.

· There is no urgency about bringing the other two shelters to compliance NOW (they've been out of compliance for over a decade). As Planning Board member Del Snow argued at the 20 October 1009 planning board meeting, it makes great sense to postpone the text change until further conversation happens between the IFC and the neighborhood representatives (plans for conversation using the dispute settlement center are underway).

· 2) The text change completely removes the upper limit for size of a shelter in Chapel Hill, which seems enormously problematic. An applicant can submit a Special Use

Permit (SUP) for any size shelter. Furthermore, the text change removes a barrier/step when a shelter wants to expand.

- 3. According to article 4.4 of the Land Use Management Ordinance which established the intent of zoning amendments, "this chapter shall not be amended except:
 - a) to correct a manifest error in the chapter; or
 - b) because of changed or changing conditions in a particular area or in the jurisdiction generally; or
 - c) to achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan.
- The 16 November memo to Roger Stancil states that there is no cause for the text change under points a or b. It states that the cause for the text change is point c: to achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan, specifically to create and preserve affordable housing opportunities.
- THIS IS INCORRECT REASONING. Making a larger shelter does not create or preserve affordable housing in Chapel Hill. A shelter is a very different thing from affordable housing. Thus, based on the very definition and three criteria in article 4.4 under which the LUMO text can be changed THERE IS NO CAUSE FOR THE PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE.
- I encourage you to vote against this text change, whose lack of limits and discordance with the comprehensive plan make it bad for Chapel Hill.

Respectfully,

Margaret Hung, MLS, EA
Resident of - 421 New Parkside Dr., Chapel Hill
mh34102@msn.com

From: Marc Jeuland [jeuland@email.unc.edu]
 Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 9:48 PM
 To: All Communications & Public Affairs
 Cc: Shu Wen Ng; mattczajkowski@nc.rr.com; laurineasthom@gmail.com; Kevin Foy; sally@ibiblio.org; ed.harrison@mindspring.com; markkleinschmidt@gmail.com; jimmerritt@nc.rr.com; jimward@nc.rr.com

Subject: Comment for public hearing November 16 2009

Dear members of the Chapel Hill Town Council,
 I am writing in advance of tomorrow's public hearing, which I unfortunately will not be able to attend due to a scheduling conflict. I was dismayed to read the article this morning in the Chapel Hill News regarding community opposition to allowing an enlarged Men's Shelter at the new site off of Homestead Road. I was particularly shocked by the two aspects of the article: first, the intolerant stereotyping of the town's homeless population by people who have probably had little to no contact with this population; second, the impression the article gave that there was little to no community support for the shelter solution that has been proposed, as made apparent by the dozens of letters opposed versus the single letter in support of the change allowing expansion beyond 25 beds.

I have been a member of the United Church of Chapel Hill (we will be neighbors to the new shelter) since early in 2005, and fully support the relocation. In addition to this, I feel I can safely say that all regular members of the church are well aware of the plans, and that I have not heard any objections from the hundreds of church members who would be so near to supposedly "undesirable" homeless people from our community. Further, my wife (copied to this email) and I have volunteered at the Community Kitchen on numerous occasions and have never felt threatened by its residents. We believe that the IFC does a terrific job supporting the shelter, and expect to continue to contribute in various ways in the future.

I would like the council to keep in mind that voices of opposition to change will always turn out in force, no matter how much of a minority opinion they may represent. I know the council understands this, as it is a reality of our political process. If you have not received hundreds of letters from members of the United Church of Chapel Hill expressing opposition to the shelter, you should know that this is because there is no such opposition to speak of. Please keep this in mind and do not hesitate to contact me about this matter.

Sincerely,
 Marc Jeuland

From: Cindy Kahler [lkahler@nc.rr.com]
 Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 7:36 PM
 To: All Communications & Public Affairs
 Cc: Chris Moran; Rick Edens
 Subject: Nov 16th Town Meeting - homeless shelter facts

To Town of Chapel Hill Commissioners:

I have followed with great interest the negative stance of many in Chapel Hill who are against the building of a men's shelter on the Homestead Road and Martin Luther King Street site. At the last meeting I heard the fear in the voices of those who do not want the shelter at the proposed site. I am a member of the United Church of Chapel Hill and on the Liaison Board of the IFC representing my church. I have volunteered at the Women's Shelter when it was at the combined men's and women's shelter on Rosemary Street, and presently volunteer with a group of women from my church at the present Homestead Road Shelter for women. In addition, for several years I managed a clinic within a shelter for refugees passing through Buffalo, New York on their way to seek asylum in Canada. These men, women and children, young and old, were not only in the US illegally, but were from over 20 different countries on any given day. The shelter was located in a neighborhood of houses, not unlike Carrboro. Therefore I believe that I have a very good grasp of the realities of being homeless.

In a recent (November 7, 2009) New York Times Op-Ed article entitled "The Forever War of the Mind", statistics told of veterans as representing a substantial proportion of those in homeless shelters. With Veterans Day having been celebrated this week, the article was very timely. To quote part of this well written article by Max Cleland, a Vietnam veteran: "Veterans returning today represent the first real influx of combat-wounded soldiers in a generation. They are

returning to a nation unprepared for what war does to the soul. Those new veterans will need all of our help. After America's wars, the used-up fighters are too often left to fend for themselves. Many of the hoboes in the Depression were veterans of WWI. When they came home, they were labeled shell-shocked and discharged from the Army too broken to make it during the economic cataclysm."

"So it is again, with too many stories about veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan ending up unemployed and homeless. Figures from the Department of Veterans affairs show that 131,000 of the nation's 24 million veterans are homeless each night, and about twice that many will spend part of this year homeless." Tell me, are we going to repeat the behavior of treating our veterans poorly as we did during the last few years of Vietnam? Have we not learned compassion to all our neighbors. Chapel Hill can do better than this! Let's join hands, and instead of being afraid, lets walk together to make sure the shelter gets built.

Thank you,
 Lucinda Kahler
 225 Woodcreek Ct. Ext.
 Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Homeless Men's Shelter & Occupancy Limit

Nov. 15, 2009

To the Mayor & Town Council, Gene Poveromo, & Phil Mason:

1. It is important to move the Men's Homeless Shelter out of the Chapel Hill Downtown.

For many years it has been common knowledge that people outside of Chapel Hill in highly stressed circumstances would find a way to come to Chapel Hill to use the services of our town shelter because it was believed that comparatively unconstrained resources were available at the Chapel Hill shelter. At a Town Council meeting on or about October 19, 2009, the woman who has been the in-take person for the last 2+ years assured residents that, during her time at the IFC Shelter, program and training obligations have been put in place along with background checks.

2. There is still more need for more plus more integrated services at the IFC shelter along with the overall N.C. need for more and better mental health services.

3. The proposal now being considered by the Mayor and Council to locate the Homeless Men's Shelter at the corner of MLK Blvd. and Homestead Road will require perhaps more supervision than is possible due to the proximity to a heavily used public park. The Healing Place in Raleigh is located far off from residences and is often cited as a preferred way to locate people who need many kinds of public services. Our free bus system, supported by two towns and our university, could develop a run to a similar kind of location.

At that late October Council meeting, Mark Kleinschmidt simply expressed pride in our town for being part of a homeless shelter plan. Matt Czajkowski confirmed his support for a town plan but asked what many residents were asking:

4. What specific programs will the new Men's Shelter offer? How will overflow entrants be handled? These are key concerns that have long troubled the current IFC shelter operations. Chapel Hill needs the answers to these questions.

5. Regarding the 25-person limit, or a higher number to be established by ordinance, it seems that more than 25 people may have occupied the IFC Shelter from time to time anyway. What number of actual Chapel Hill residents might be expected to need the new Men's Shelter?

I usually seek to avoid delays, but the new Men's Shelter will be so different from the existing shelter, it seems most practical and prudent to await knowledge of real programs and projected occupancy before changing our existing ordinance. I hope this will be done.

Sincerely,

Lynne Kane
11 Lark Circle
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
(Tel. 919-960-0983)
(mizmurmyz@yahoo.com)

From: SHILPA SHAH [shilpaparikh3@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2009 3:58 PM
To: Town Council
Subject: re: opposition to LUMO text change

Respected Mayor and Town council members,
I strongly oppose the proposed change LUMO text change and am in agreement with an E-mail sent to you earlier today by Tina Coyne Smith explaining her reasons for opposing this.
Thank you

SHilpa Shah
413 Palafox Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

From: hockeycat58@gmail.com [mailto:hockeycat58@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2009 10:48 AM
To: Town Council
Subject: Changes to Land Use Management Ordinance - Please Vote No

Dear Honorable Mayor and Council:

First, thank you for your thoughtful consideration of the issue. The main issue is that there is no need to make this change based on any of the reasoning given so far. By voting in favor of this change, you are not changing the fact that the IFC Shelters have been in violation of the law for many years.

Changing the rule now without any real debate or understanding of why it was implemented in the first place is a mistake. The results of this mistake, we will all pay for with higher Police activity in response to the criminal activity that this will bring. This will not solve the issue of Homelessness and the justification of providing housing is contradictory to recent decisions saying that 700 feet is not enough space to be called affordable housing by a developer. A single

bed is certainly less than 700 feet and is also not even permanent.

At the end of the day, this ruling will create a Flop House - the very thing everyone opposes from the IFC to the general community. At some point, one of the Hotels, like the Red Roof Inn will go under and the fact that it has been approved for 150 residents will create the very thing that everyone does not want. I am less concerned with plans on the table than the one that may occur when an unprofitable hotel reforms as a 501(c)3 and uses this provision. Because of the sloppy wording this is a real possibility.

The change I would suggest that is both Humanitarian and Reasonable is to keep the minimum standard at 25 and allow Emergency Housing to 50. It will prevent the Flop-House that we can expect to be built in the future.

Since the requester of this change has a vested interest in a new shelter being built, it might make sense to review this request with an outside body and involve people in the Homeless and Public Policy communities who do not have a vested interest in getting new offices or making a profit. The appearance of impropriety - while I am not sure there was any intent of this - calls for prudence on this issue.

Please consider further study, because I realize the good intentions here. It's just that I have seen too many times in other places I have lived where good intentions created massive problems. This could be one of them without tightening the language and studying this with some of the elite Public Policy experts at UNC.

Thank You,

Steve Wells
Chapel Hill Resident



MEMORANDUM

To: Phil Mason, Principal Planner
From: Chris Moran, Executive Director
CC: GGA Architects
Program Committee
Date: November 5, 2009
Re: Occupancy Numbers for Community House

Phil,

I have prepared some language and provided you a little history that I think will help you with your memorandum to the Town Council.

Proposed Community House

1. The proposed Community House facility is a long-term transitional facility that will have 52 beds on the upper level.
2. Dormitory beds include two 10-bed (5 bunks in each room) dormitory type rooms for residents initially approved for Community House services.
3. Transitional beds include 5 quad rooms (two bunk beds per room) for 20 persons who are stepping up to another level of services.
4. Transitional beds also include 6 double rooms (two single beds per room) for twelve residents who are transitioning in the program to a final phase that provides more freedom with responsibilities (residents will have their own keys at this level).
5. Since the proposed Community House is defined as a "shelter" in the town ordinance we would naturally make allowances for some floor space on the lower level in case of a community wide disaster, medical emergency, storm, white flag nights (when weather makes it dangerous for people to be on the streets*), power outage or referral by police/fire agents, local emergency response team, hospital or emergency management officials.

* Temperatures drop below 40 degrees, heavy rains, snow and hail etc.

Current Men's Residential Shelter at the Old Municipal Building (OMB)

1. The IFC currently has 54 spaces that are occupied by male residents every night.
2. 54 spaces include 30 beds and 24 floor spaces.
3. Before the creation of HomeStart the IFC served men, women and children residents at the OMB.
4. After the IFC renovated the OMB in 1989, homeless women and children occupied 18 beds on the basement floor.
5. The Community Kitchen moved from Merritt Mill Rd to the main floor at the OMB in 1990.
6. Homeless men occupied 34 beds on the second floor.
7. The total number of beds did not include floor space which has become a more frequent need in recent years.
8. The IFC stopped serving single women and women with children at the OMB in 2003.
9. The OMB basement floor is now used for storage only.

HomeStart Campus for Homeless Women and Children

1. Project HomeStart opened in 1998 as a transition housing facility for homeless families.
2. The IFC renamed (HomeStart) and redefined HomeStart's mission and resident population in 2003 to include "homeless women and children".
3. There are three cottages on a 3 acre parcel at the Southern Human Services Center.
4. A total of 56 beds/cots are available in the HomeStart program.
5. The Emergency Shelter program in one cottage has a 16-bed capacity.
6. Two Transitional Housing cottages have a 20-bed capacity or 40 total beds.
7. General floor space for emergency situations is not available.

Supporting Materials for Comments from Mark Peters on 11/16/2009

SAMPLE ZONING ORDINANCES AND LAWS

Winston Salem, NC

<http://library1.municode.com/default-test/DocView/14363/1/10/11#TOC.5.77>

2-5.70.1 SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS

(A) HEATED BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE A minimum of fifty (50) square feet of heated building space shall be provided per resident.

(B) SPACING REQUIREMENT A new Shelter for the Homeless may not be located within a distance of two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet from any other Shelter for the Homeless use, or from any use which, though not classified as a Shelter for the Homeless under this Ordinance, would, if it were reclassified, be classified as a Shelter for the Homeless. All measurements shall be made by drawing straight lines from the nearest point of the lot line where the proposed Shelter for the Homeless is to be located to the nearest point of the lot line of another Shelter for the Homeless. All Shelters for the Homeless, or facilities that would be classified as a Shelter for the Homeless if it were reclassified today, existing as of the effective date of this Ordinance shall be exempt from this two thousand five hundred (2,500) foot spacing requirement for the purposes of expansion or intensification of the use. These existing Shelters for the Homeless must comply with all of the provisions of Section B.2-5.70.1 and obtain a Special Use Permit from the Elected Body for such expansion or intensification of the use.

(C) OPERATION

(1) The Shelter for the Homeless facility shall be contained within a building owned and/or operated by a government agency or nonprofit organization.

(2) The Shelter for the Homeless facility operator(s) shall provide continuous, on-site supervision by an employee and/or volunteer during all hours of operation.

(D) PROHIBITION ON RETAIL SALES No retail sales shall take place in the facility.

(E) MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY A Shelter for the Homeless may house no more than one hundred (100) residents. In the event that housing is provided for more than fifty (50) residents, additional conditions may be imposed to prevent adverse impacts on nearby properties and uses.

(UDO-163(W), § 3, 2-19-07; UDO-163(F), § 3, 4-10-07)

Iredell County, NC

<http://www.co.iredell.nc.us/Departments/Planning/minutes/April2006pbminutes.pdf>

SR 57. Homeless Shelter.

(D) No such facility shall be located within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing shelter for the homeless or any other group care facility.

Fairfield, CA

<http://www.codepublishing.com/ca/fairfield/html/Fairfield25/fairfield2524.html>

25.24.4.3 Homeless Shelters in the IL Zoning District

The purpose of this section is to establish regulations for the location of homeless shelters in the IL Zoning District. Objectives include minimizing land use conflicts and ensuring that there are adequate services for homeless individuals within the vicinity of the shelter.

- c. The parcel on which the facility is located may not be adjacent to a residential zone, school, or park.

Sioux Falls, SD

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/South%20Dakota/siouxfalls_sd/partiirevisedordinances/appendixbzoningordinance*?f=templates\\$fn=document-frame.htm\\$3.0\\$eq=%5Brank%3A%5Bsum%3A%5Bstem%3A%5Bshelter%5D%5D%5D\\$x=server#LPHit14](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/South%20Dakota/siouxfalls_sd/partiirevisedordinances/appendixbzoningordinance*?f=templates$fn=document-frame.htm$3.0$eq=%5Brank%3A%5Bsum%3A%5Bstem%3A%5Bshelter%5D%5D%5D$x=server#LPHit14)

15.59.384. Temporary or emergency shelter:

Temporary or emergency shelter may be permitted provided it is found that:

- (1) The location is compatible with characteristics of surrounding uses, and not injurious to surrounding properties, including residential neighborhoods.
- (2) The facility is being fully enclosed within a building, except for a designated outdoor enclosed area.
- (3) The distance between the proposed use and any elementary or secondary school measured from lot line to lot line is not less than 1,000 feet.
- (4) Submittal of a site plan in accordance with 15.59.040.
- (5) Submittal of a written management and security plan which outlines management and security provisions, and includes a neighborhood issues management strategy.
- (6) A neighborhood meeting, which shall include, but is not limited to, a city staff representative and a city council representative, shall be conducted prior to a city public hearing which addresses site improvements, building design, and "good neighbor" components, and addresses the means for dealing with any future problems as may arise, including crime prevention, alcohol, and drug use policies, etc.
- (7) Additional neighborhood meetings shall be organized and held by the applicant to ensure conditional use permit compliance. One neighborhood meeting shall be held

within 90 days after business operations begin, and another neighborhood meeting shall be held prior to the one-year anniversary date of business operation.

Gilroy, CA (has an entire document outlining requirements for a shelter CUP which Chapel Hill should consider)

http://www.ci.gilroy.ca.us/cityofgilroy_files/city_hall/community_development/planning/policy_handouts/homeless_shelter_guidelines.pdf

CUP Guidelines

2. Homeless shelters serving Singles should be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from schools, parks, day care centers, and adult businesses.
3. Homeless shelters should be located a minimum of 600 feet from other homeless shelters. It is preferable that homeless shelters are located a minimum of 2 miles from other homeless shelters.

Homeless Georgia Sex Offenders Directed to Woods

The muddy camp on the outskirts of prosperous Cobb County is an unintended consequence of Georgia law, which bans the state's 16,000 sex offenders from living, working or loitering within 1,000 feet of schools, churches, parks and other spots where children gather.

400 bed shelter

- [New York](#) - <https://www.doe.org/news/pressdetail.cfm?PressID=17&type=current>

300-350 bed shelters

- [Baltimore, MD](#) - http://mlis.state.md.us/2008RS/budget_docs/All/Capital/ZA00C_-_Misc_Homeless_Shelter_and_Resource_Center.pdf
- [Oahu, Hawaii](#) - <http://www.hawaiiexpress.com/main/ArticlesMain/tabid/56/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/112/State-dedicates-last-homeless-transitional-facilities.aspx>

200 bed shelters

- [Charlotte](#) - <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/local/story/933380.html>
- [Washington, DC](#) - <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1P2-1013509.html>

- [Broward, FL](http://140.174.126.150/browardoutreach.htm) - <http://140.174.126.150/browardoutreach.htm>
- [Ohio](http://www.development.ohio.gov/CDD/HTF/counties.htm?id=314) - <http://www.development.ohio.gov/CDD/HTF/counties.htm?id=314>

“In April of 1984, over 1,400 men slept in a single room in one City operated shelter.” -

http://www.coalitionforthehomeless.org/FileLib/PDFs/litigation_summary.pdf

Thursday, December 17, 2009

Chapel Hill Town Hall
405 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

I would like to follow up, on the record, on item 1b from November 16, 2009 which is tentatively scheduled for continuation on January 11, 2010. This proposal would remove the 25 bed limit and allow a shelter of any size. The proposal also updates the zoning matrix to require the Special Use Permit "SUP" process for shelters. I request that the Town Council **not** approve the removal of the limit and instead consider new ordinance text which is outlined in these comments.

As Chapel Hill grows from a small town into a larger community it should establish regulations for the location of homeless shelters and other at-risk facilities to minimize land use conflicts. Planning Commissions in hundreds of jurisdictions throughout the US such as Winston Salem NC, Sioux Falls SD and Fairfield CA have crafted thoughtful and deliberate guidelines that document all facets of shelter siting, shelter approval, and operating limitations as part of responsible growth. Well defined ordinances provide equal knowledge for all members in a community and serve to reduce future conflict. Today, Chapel Hill's shelter ordinance consists of **one sentence**. This lack of definition has created the current conflict surrounding the proposed LUMO text change for homeless shelters.

[Appendix A](#) provides samples of shelter ordinances. Here is list of considerations other communities have found important to define and regulate:

- ✓ How close shelters can be sited to other shelters and to drug / alcohol rehabilitation facilities and group homes
- ✓ How close shelters can be sited to schools and daycare
- ✓ How close shelters can be placed to parks and other public facilities
- ✓ How large shelters can be. Shelters with 100, 200, and 400 beds exist throughout the country. This should be considered before removing the limit completely.
- ✓ What square footage is required for a facility and for each resident
- ✓ When residents can access the facility. Many ordinances require that residents be allowed 24/7 hour access to the facility so that they are not out on the street.
- ✓ Whether facilities can be expanded in the future. Many document limits to and an approval process required for expansions of facilities and functions
- ✓ How shelter requirements for families may vary from shelter requirements for singles
- ✓ How shelters are reviewed annually to proactively insure compliance. Many require an annual permit review process like there are with nightclubs so that the shelter can be reduced in operating size or moved to another location

when crime becomes too much for a particular site. Having this review as an item on the council agenda would allow the town to receive materials to proactively see what crime and other problems are occurring around shelters while also giving residents a formal opportunity to bring matters regarding operational difficulties or crime to the Town Council.

In considering the LUMO change, the Planning Board has not taken into consideration facts that effect existing neighborhoods and public spaces.

1. The proposed ordinance change does nothing to assure shelters will be built with appropriate buffers and limitations. There are no protections preventing all at-risk facilities from being dumped in one tiny area in the town and county. The black triangle shown in [Appendix B](#) connects the two existing overnight at-risk social service facilities with the proposed men's shelter, the only facilities of their type in the county under the propose relocation. The town council owes it to all the residents of our town to equally distribute such social services, to be up front with intent and to create zoning rules that provide assurances that citizens and property owners will be protected from the whims of a future council.
2. The Planning Board did not consider the magnetic effect that existing facilities provide for half way or residential recovery homes. It is convenient for organizations to locate residential recovery homes near facilities like Freedom House who provide programs. This further concentrates at-risk individuals in one small area. Oxford House residential halfway houses have been opening up in North Forest Hills across from Freedom House (see [Appendix C](#)). According to Phil Mason, registration is not required for these facilities; the Town Planning Board has no knowledge of where they are and no ordinances to limit them.
3. The Planning Board did not consider normal capacity vs. white flag capacity. The current men's shelter is a white flag site; it provides shelter beyond regular capacity on inclement weather nights. There are over 200 white flag nights per year based on the IFC's current weather criteria (see [Appendix C](#)). On these nights, the shelter will allow as many people in as fits on the floor. These men will have to leave the shelter first thing in the morning as is currently done in the existing men's shelter. The ordinance does not distinguish between shelters and residential programs, so a facility approved as a shelter can operate with an emergency shelter model if not otherwise restricted in the SUP. Special Use Permits are no substitute for writing the rules down when it comes to regular shelter occupancy capacity as well as a defined capacity during the 200+ white flag nights.
4. The Planning Board did not study crime statistics around shelters and does not look at crime maps in their planning efforts. The town does

not publish any "heat-map" or aggregated crime information beyond an annual town-wide count of personal versus property crimes. Crime is already significantly higher in the square mile centered in Parkside and North Forest Hills than in other similar suburban neighborhoods. [Appendix D](#) details incidents/ calls tracked by police at the addresses for Freedom House Recovery Center, Rainbow Court public housing and the HomeStart women's shelter. [Appendix E](#) details incidents for the current men's shelter.

Changing the shelter size is not justifiable according to current zoning regulation. Article 4.4 of the Land Use Management Ordinance which establishes the intent of zoning states; "In order to establish and maintain sound stable and desirable development within the planning jurisdiction of the Town it is intended that this chapter shall not be amended except:"

- a) to correct a manifest error in the chapter
- b) because of changed or changing conditions in a particular area or in the jurisdiction generally
- c) to achieve the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan

Item a): to correct a manifest error in the chapter - A manifest error is an indisputable error of judgment in complete disregard of the facts of the case and the applicable rule or law. An example of a manifest error would be if you had records of a passed motion in support of a 25 bed limit and then someone typo'd the actual ordinance and put 15 in it. Unless that you can show that some other figure was actually decided in the meetings leading up to the LUMO change other than 25, then you have no grounds for a manifest error. In fact, the town materials fail to show that a different value was even contemplated. The revised version for reason "A" internally contradicts itself in that the old shelter limit was intentional in 1985 and is somehow now considered an error. Just because the text is old does not make it a manifest error.

Additionally, the October 20th memorandum from Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason stated for *Item a)*: "Argument in Support: We are unable to identify any arguments in support of the necessity of correcting a manifest error in the Ordinance." This calls into question the wording in the later November 16th memorandum.

Item b): because of changed or changing conditions in a particular area or in the jurisdiction generally - The revised reason for *Item b)* is not defensible. There are no "changed conditions" that support the proposed change. In fact, the change of conditions in the Homestead area **contradicts** the proposed LUMO change. These changes are the addition and expansion of two large at-risk overnight facilities as well as significantly higher crime totals than other similar suburban residential neighborhoods in Chapel Hill. Given these changed conditions, it is clear

that additional risk factors are not appropriate for the neighborhoods around Homestead and MLK and mitigation or prevention of these risk factors should be a part of the LUMO text change.

Second, regarding the jurisdiction generally, the IFC can still serve 50 men under the current shelter LUMO definition, they would just need to do it in two 25 bed shelters. The efficiency argument is specious in light of the increased public safety risk of men who are removed from the shelter for disciplinary reasons (See [Appendix F](#)), men who are turned away if the 20 emergency bed allocation is full, and the unlimited number of men who are discharged after being allowed to stay during a white flag night. These public safety issues occur outside of the shelter premises but occur due to the presence of the shelter. If shelters were smaller and geographically distributed, then the public safety issues would also be distributed, a single neighborhood area would not have to bear all of these issues, particularly if the neighborhood already had at-risk overnight social services.

Additionally, similar to *Item a)*, the October 20th memorandum from Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason states for *Item b)*: "Argument in Support: We are unable to identify any arguments in support of the necessity of correcting a manifest error in the Ordinance." This again calls into question the wording in the later November 16th memorandum.

Item c): to achieve the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan - The plan talks about improving the quality of life of residents within the town, such as:

- "Neighborhoods: Protect the physical and social fabric of Chapel Hill's neighborhoods."
- "A fundamental challenge for the future is: how do we manage change in a manner that best promotes the overall well-being of the community. "

The proposed ordinance change does not promote the well being of the community because it unfairly concentrates at-risk overnight social services in one area of the town. In the future, the comprehensive plan should set more explicit goals to reduce crime and to use crime data in planning decisions.

In the town's attempt to justify *Item c)*, it asserts that the change will "*create and preserve affordable housing opportunities*". Without making the proposed change the IFC can still "*create and preserve affordable housing opportunities*" under the existing ordinance for as many people as they desire by providing facilities for people in groups of 25 or less.

The town asserts that the change will "*provide quality community facilities and services*". There is no evidence that large shelters will provide better community facilities and services, in fact smaller twenty five bed shelters could do more to promote safety and well-being within Chapel Hill than uncapped, unlimited sized shelters. Smaller facilities could provide a higher quality of life, residents can live in a smaller, more personal setting, and the public safety issues are reduced for the neighbors and their quality of life is also higher.

I have requested more information regarding existing SUPS, SUP enforcement, and other items but have not yet received responses. It is impossible to fully comment without this information. Here are some items that have not been considered:

- ✓ What process does a soup kitchen fall under if it was to be added now or at a later time to the proposed shelter since this use is not identified under ordinance?
- ✓ What standards will be used to determine normal occupancy? What are the standards to determine maximum occupancy for white flag nights?
- ✓ What were the resident addresses of people who were arrested by CHPD? The records I have to date indicate where the arrest occurred, but not where the arrestee resided at the time. Kevin Gunter is trying to get this information for me.

In Summary, I recommend Chapel Hill's Town Council not approve the proposed LUMO text changes but rather task the Planning Board with creating new zoning ordinance text that documents reasonable parameters for shelter locations and develops measurable guidelines for use. The Planning Board should study similar zoning from other localities, talk with the community, and review incident and crime data for existing facilities. **One sentence** within an ordinance cannot serve to manage land use for shelters in Chapel Hill and lack of public guidelines for shelter use will continue to create conflict between so many well intended members within our community and ultimately hurt those members of our community who need help, the residents of our shelters.

Regards,

Mark Peters

APPENDIX A – SAMPLE SHELTER ZONING ORDINANCES AND LAWS

Winston Salem, NC

<http://library1.municode.com/default-test/DocView/14363/1/10/11#TOC.5.77>

2-5.70.1 SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS

(A) HEATED BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE A minimum of fifty (50) square feet of heated building space shall be provided per resident.

(B) SPACING REQUIREMENT A new Shelter for the Homeless may not be located within a distance of two thousand five hundred (2,500) feet from any other Shelter for the Homeless use, or from any use which, though not classified as a Shelter for the Homeless under this Ordinance, would, if it were reclassified, be classified as a Shelter for the Homeless. All measurements shall be made by drawing straight lines from the nearest point of the lot line where the proposed Shelter for the Homeless is to be located to the nearest point of the lot line of another Shelter for the Homeless. All Shelters for the Homeless, or facilities that would be classified as a Shelter for the Homeless if it were reclassified today, existing as of the effective date of this Ordinance shall be exempt from this two thousand five hundred (2,500) foot spacing requirement for the purposes of expansion or intensification of the use. These existing Shelters for the Homeless must comply with all of the provisions of Section B.2-5.70.1 and obtain a Special Use Permit from the Elected Body for such expansion or intensification of the use.

(C) OPERATION

(1) The Shelter for the Homeless facility shall be contained within a building owned and/or operated by a government agency or nonprofit organization.

(2) The Shelter for the Homeless facility operator(s) shall provide continuous, on-site supervision by an employee and/or volunteer during all hours of operation.

(D) PROHIBITION ON RETAIL SALES No retail sales shall take place in the facility.

(E) MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY A Shelter for the Homeless may house no more than one hundred (100) residents. In the event that housing is provided for more than fifty (50) residents, additional conditions may be imposed to prevent adverse impacts on nearby properties and uses.
(UDO-163(W), § 3, 2-19-07; UDO-163(F), § 3, 4-10-07)

Iredell County, NC

<http://www.co.iredell.nc.us/Departments/Planning/minutes/April2006pbminutes.pdf>

SR 57. Homeless Shelter.

(D) No such facility shall be located within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing shelter for the homeless or any other group care facility.

Fairfield, CA

<http://www.codepublishing.com/ca/fairfield/html/Fairfield25/fairfield2524.html>

25.24.4.3 Homeless Shelters in the IL Zoning District

The purpose of this section is to establish regulations for the location of homeless shelters in the IL Zoning District. Objectives include minimizing land use conflicts and ensuring that there are adequate services for homeless individuals within the vicinity of the shelter.

c. The parcel on which the facility is located may not be adjacent to a residential zone, school, or park.

Sioux Falls, SD

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/South%20Dakota/siouxfalls_sd/partiirevisedordinances/appendixbzoningordinance*?f=templates\\$fn=document-frame.htm\\$3.0\\$q=%5Brank%3A%5Bsum%3A%5Bstem%3A%5Bshelter%5D%5D%5D\\$x=server#LPHit14](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/South%20Dakota/siouxfalls_sd/partiirevisedordinances/appendixbzoningordinance*?f=templates$fn=document-frame.htm$3.0$q=%5Brank%3A%5Bsum%3A%5Bstem%3A%5Bshelter%5D%5D%5D$x=server#LPHit14)

15.59.384. Temporary or emergency shelter:

Temporary or emergency shelter may be permitted provided it is found that:

- (1) The location is compatible with characteristics of surrounding uses, and not injurious to surrounding properties, including residential neighborhoods.
- (2) The facility is being fully enclosed within a building, except for a designated outdoor enclosed area.
- (3) The distance between the proposed use and any elementary or secondary school measured from lot line to lot line is not less than 1,000 feet.
- (4) Submittal of a site plan in accordance with 15.59.040.
- (5) Submittal of a written management and security plan which outlines management and security provisions, and includes a neighborhood issues management strategy.
- (6) A neighborhood meeting, which shall include, but is not limited to, a city staff representative and a city council representative, shall be conducted prior to a city public hearing which addresses site improvements, building design, and "good neighbor" components, and addresses the means for dealing with any future problems as may arise, including crime prevention, alcohol, and drug use policies, etc.
- (7) Additional neighborhood meetings shall be organized and held by the applicant to ensure conditional use permit compliance. One neighborhood meeting shall be held within 90 days after business operations begin, and another neighborhood meeting shall be held prior to the one-year anniversary date of business operation.

Gilroy, CA has an entire document outlining requirements for a shelter CUP which Chapel Hill should consider

http://www.ci.gilroy.ca.us/cityofgilroy_files/city_hall/community_development/planning/policy_handouts/homeless_shelter_guidelines.pdf

CUP Guidelines Relevant excerpts:

- 2. Homeless shelters serving Singles should be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from schools, parks, day care centers, and adult businesses.**
- 3. ... It is preferable that homeless shelters are located a minimum of 2 miles from other homeless shelters.**

PURPOSE

The City of Gilroy, through its General Plan Housing Element and Community Development Block Grant Action Plan, recognizes that there is a homeless population within Gilroy that requires assistance through the provision of emergency food, job training, and emergency shelter. A variety of agencies within Gilroy assist in the provision of food and job training to the homeless. However, few agencies provide shelter to homeless individuals and families. These Homeless Shelter Guidelines set forth criteria to allow homeless shelters to locate and operate in Gilroy, so that the needs of Gilroy's homeless citizens can be addressed. These guidelines shall apply only to homeless shelter facilities serving more than six clients, since facilities serving six or fewer clients are considered residential uses. These guidelines shall not be applied in such a way that they prohibit or discourage homeless shelters from being located in the City of Gilroy.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUIRED

The operation of all homeless shelters within the City of Gilroy shall be contingent upon receiving Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Each CUP shall be valid for a determinate length of time, as specified in the CUP approval. Approval of the CUP shall be based upon the shelter's compliance with the following guidelines:

Location Considerations

One of the most critical factors involved in developing a homeless shelter is ensuring that it is properly located. It is therefore necessary to identify both desirable and undesirable locations for homeless facilities. Qualities of desirable locations include:

- Closeness to public transportation
- Closeness to professional services, such as doctor's offices, barber shops, and legal offices
- Closeness to grocery stores
- Closeness to job development centers
- Closeness to providers of services often utilized by the homeless (i.e. medical clinics, food banks)

Qualities of undesirable locations include:

- Nearness to residential areas

- In industrial areas
- Nearness to adult entertainment facilities
- Near areas with a high concentration of bars and/or liquor stores

Therefore, the following criteria shall be used to locate a homeless shelter:

1. Homeless shelters may be located in any zoning district.
2. Homeless shelters serving Singles should be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from schools, parks, day care centers, and adult businesses.
3. Homeless shelters should be located a minimum of 600 feet from other homeless shelters. It is preferable that homeless shelters are located a minimum of 2 miles from other homeless shelters.
4. Homeless shelters should be located within 0.25 miles of a public transportation system.
5. Homeless shelters should be located near job development centers, medical clinics, and food banks. Homeless Shelter Guidelines 2 Adopted March 6, 2000

Management of Shelters

All proposed homeless shelters shall be required to submit a management plan, which will be reviewed through the Conditional Use Permit process. Shelter management plans shall address, but not be limited to addressing, the following issues:

- Clearly defined forms of transportation to and from the shelter, including bus and pedestrian routes
- Client supervision
- Food Service
- Client services
- Program for ensuring good relationships with properties surrounding the shelter
- Conflict resolution
- Crime prevention
- Control of loitering
- Control of littering
- Length of client stay
- Number of staff, and duties to be performed by staff

Number of Clients Served

Shelters shall be limited to a maximum of 140 beds.

Recreational Areas

Homeless shelters should provide for recreational areas outside of the shelter. If families are housed in the shelter, a play area for children should be provided.

Required Parking

Required parking for shelters will be established based on the individual needs of each facility. As a rule, shelters that include services for families will be required to provide more parking than shelters that provide services exclusively to homeless individuals.

Exterior Lighting

Lighting of the property on which the homeless shelter is located should be designed to provide a minimum maintained horizontal illumination of at least one foot candle of light on the parking surfaces and walkways.

Hours of Operation

Homeless shelters shall remain open 24 hours a day. Homeless Shelter Guidelines 3 Adopted March 6, 2000

Separation of Clients

Homeless shelters shall provide for separation of families from individuals and special needs clients.

Provision of Services

Each homeless shelter shall provide the following services:

- Food service
- Job counseling
- Alcohol and drug addiction screening and counseling
- Domestic abuse counseling
- Health Care
- Mental Health Care
- Case Management

Alcohol and Drug Use Prohibited

All homeless shelters shall create a zero tolerance policy for alcohol and illicit drug use among its clients and staff. The policy shall include a provision that shelter clients who are suspected to be under the influence of illicit drugs and/or alcohol shall be subject to drug testing, as allowed by State and Federal law. A copy of this policy shall be provided to the Planning Division for review and approval.

[Homeless Georgia Sex Offenders Directed to Woods](#)

The muddy camp on the outskirts of prosperous Cobb County is an unintended consequence of Georgia law, which bans the state's 16,000 sex offenders from living, working or loitering within 1,000 feet of schools, churches, parks and other spots where children gather.

APPENDIX B – Concentration of At-Risk Social Services

The black triangle below connects the two existing overnight at-risk social service facilities with the proposed men's shelter, the only facilities of their type in the county in the future. The larger area is Orange County and the medium sized area is Chapel Hill and Carrboro.

Corners of triangle:

- Freedom House Drug Detoxification and Rehabilitation Center
- Homestart Women's and Children's Shelter
- Proposed Men's Shelter



APPENDIX C – Oxford Houses

Freedom House is already drawing **Oxford Houses** and likely other drug halfway houses in the area for the proposed Men's shelter. No one knows how many because the Town of Chapel Hill does not track them.

From <http://www.choosehelp.com/northcarolina/drug-rehabs-alcohol-rehabilitation-programs/oxford-house>

Oxford House - Dixie Lane
105 Dixie Lane
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
(919)932-7508
Men

From <http://www.oxfordhouseenc.org/Locations.htm>

[Oxford House Stateside](#)
100 Stateside Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
919/240-5147 { X }

APPENDIX D – White Flag Nights

Calculated with white flag weather conditions and historical weather data from 2008 and 2009 show over two hundred white flag nights exist in Chapel Hill every year.

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2008	11	24	49	28	0.2	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	11	25	49	28	0.02	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	11	26	51	27	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	11	27	60	30	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	11	28	62	35	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	11	29	48	37	0.08	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	11	30	42	37	0.9	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	1	46	35	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	2	44	28	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	3	50	24	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	4	55	36	0.001	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	5	48	31	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	6	40	29	0.001	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	7	40	27	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	8	41	21	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	9	63	32	0.01	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	10	66	59	0.45	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	11	67	54	1.03	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	12	54	30	0.31	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	13	46	26	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	14	45	30	0.01	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	15	67	42	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2008	12	16	56	40	0.2	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?	
2008	12	17	53	40		0.12		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	18	54	42		0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2008	12	19	68	52		0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2008	12	20	59	50		0.2		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	21	53	30		0.39		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	22	33	18		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	23	40	21		0.001		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	24	56	38		0.54		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	25	63	39		0.03		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	26	45	36		0.001		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	27	55	42		0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2008	12	28	66	54		0.01		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2008	12	29	58	42		0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2008	12	30	63	40		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2008	12	31	52	25		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	1	40	21		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	2	44	28		0.09		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	3	56	28		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	4	55	42		0.18		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	5	61	52		0.1		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	6	57	35		0.98		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	7	62	35		0.55		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	8	50	34		0.001		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	9	47	25		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	10	56	33		0.001		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	11	54	36		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	12	46	27		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	13	42	29		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	14	43	25		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	15	37	20		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	16	26	13		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	17	31	10		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	18	42	30		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	19	46	30		0.001	T		TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	20	33	19		0.01		0.5	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	21	37	16		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	22	50	21		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	23	61	28		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	24	57	34		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	25	37	30		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	26	46	32		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	27	41	36		0.23		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	28	61	35		0.44		0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	1	29	50	29		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	30	44	27		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	1	31	45	21		0	M		TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	1	59	31		0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	2	61	33		0.12	T		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	2	3	42	29		0.02		0.1	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2009	2	4	33	20	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	5	33	16	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	6	53	19	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	7	68	30	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	8	72	44	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	2	9	67	38	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	10	70	49	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	2	11	69	50	0.17	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	2	12	63	46	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	2	13	67	39	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	14	61	42	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	2	15	52	34	0.01	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	2	16	45	29	0.01	T		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	2	17	47	26	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	18	50	38	0.59	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	2	19	51	30	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	20	41	22	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	21	52	21	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	22	45	27	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	23	41	22	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	24	44	19	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	25	54	28	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	26	64	36	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	2	27	59	49	0.2	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	2	28	53	34	0.46	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	1	35	32	1.16	1.8	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	2	33	17	0.09	3.9	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	3	33	14	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	4	44	19	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	5	57	28	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	6	69	40	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	7	78	46	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	8	80	54	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	9	80	57	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	10	67	48	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	11	79	55	0.01	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	12	55	45	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	13	45	36	0.08	M		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	14	41	36	0.63	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	15	47	40	0.93	M		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	16	47	44	0.35	M		FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	17	60	42	0.04	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	18	65	41	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	19	73	44	0.09	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	20	60	41	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	21	53	32	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	22	65	33	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	23	65	37	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	3	24	56	40	0	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2009	3	25	47	38	0.15	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	26	61	38	0.07	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	27	62	48	0.42	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	28	60	52	0.51	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	29	67	44	0.06	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	30	65	37	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	
2009	3	31	65	43	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3		60	55	0.08	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	2	63	55	0.39	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	3	72	50	0.09	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	4	73	41	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	5	80	44	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	6	65	41	0.47	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	7	49	35	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	
2009	3	8	58	32	0.01	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	9	67	40	0.001	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	
2009	3	10	69	51	1.11	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	11	68	45	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	12	63	39	0	0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	
2009	3	13	62	48	0.13	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	14	63	48	0.12	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	15	65	48	0.001	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	16	65	41	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	17	71	41	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	18	79	45	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	19	71	54	0.001	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	20	75	56	0.56	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	21	69	46	0.05	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	22	64	43	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	23	77	43	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	24	88	48	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	25	88	61	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	26	86	61	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	27	85	59	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	28	80	56	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	29	79	56	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	30	71	54	0.01	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3		79	64	0.03	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	2	79	63	0.001	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	3	80	63	0.01	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	4	80	64	0.03	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	5	65	55	1.75	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	6	76	55	0.13	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	7	81	63	0.07	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	8	78	58	0.001	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	9	87	64	0.21	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	10	78	61	0.001	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	
2009	3	11	67	48	0.29	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	
2009	3	12	73	46	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2009	3	13	74	50	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	14	80	57	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	15	80	66	0.13	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	16	80	67	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	17	70	52	0.28	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	18	65	47	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	19	69	42	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	20	75	45	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	21	79	58	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	22	80	59	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	23	80	62	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	24	76	67	0.13	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	25	83	67	0.07	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	26	76	68	0.05	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	27	81	67	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	28	84	65	0.28	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	29	84	65	0.03	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	3	30	82	59	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	3	31	86	62	0.1	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	1	85	62	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	2	90	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	3	88	67	1.19	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	4	80	64	0.94	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	5	72	61	1.44	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	6	79	62	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	7	83	59	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	8	86	66	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	9	89	67	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	10	84	63	0.32	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	11	84	66	0.18	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	12	86	66	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	13	87	67	0.01	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	14	83	68	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	15	82	68	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	16	72	65	1.44	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	17	74	67	0.15	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	4	18	88	71	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	19	89	68	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	20	93	75	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	21	88	73	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	22	87	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	23	87	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	24	88	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	25	89	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	26	91	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	27	91	71	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	28	88	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	29	88	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	4	30	90	62	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2009	5	1	90	62	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	2	86	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	3	82	61	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	4	84	61	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	5	78	70	0.01	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	6	82	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	7	88	63	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	8	88	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	9	81	66	0.03	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	10	82	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	11	87	69	0.32	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	12	90	70	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	13	85	69	0.11	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	14	85	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	15	86	63	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	16	88	73	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	17	90	71	0.06	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	18	82	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	19	83	63	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	20	78	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	21	81	65	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	22	87	69	0.06	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	23	87	70	0.06	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	24	88	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	25	92	67	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	26	94	69	0.22	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	27	90	70	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	28	89	69	0.14	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	29	85	70	0.1	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	5	30	89	68	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	5	31	90	72	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	1	88	72	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	2	80	72	0.39	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	3	88	71	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	4	92	67	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	5	92	70	0.08	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	6	86	70	0.11	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	7	86	66	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	8	90	70	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	9	95	72	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	10	96	73	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	11	94	72	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	12	78	69	0.02	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	13	86	66	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	14	88	68	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	15	89	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	16	89	68	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	17	92	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	18	93	71	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2009	6	19	93	73	0.02	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	20	86	72	0.34	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	21	91	73	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	22	83	72	1.14	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	23	86	68	0.2	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	24	83	66	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	25	87	68	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	26	90	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	27	91	68	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	28	85	71	0.02	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	29	87	70	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	6	30	87	70	0.01	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	6	31	72	62	0.79	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	1	77	58	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	2	76	56	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	3	80	56	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	4	86	59	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	5	88	62	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	6	85	64	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	7	82	63	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	8	81	67	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	9	81	63	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	10	74	62	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	11	81	58	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	12	85	61	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	13	84	60	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	14	86	63	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	15	86	64	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	16	74	67	0.76	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	17	70	66	0.28	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	18	72	66	0.08	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	19	72	64	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	20	78	65	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	21	79	63	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	22	74	63	0.1	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	23	82	69	0.87	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	24	87	69	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	25	74	61	0.001	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	26	63	59	1.64	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	27	80	57	0.05	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	28	83	53	0.29	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	7	29	70	48	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	7	30	72	49	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	1	70	50	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	2	73	52	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	3	77	54	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	4	72	48	0.001	M	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	5	63	55	0.14	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	6	65	59	0.03	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE

YEAR	MO	DY	MAX	MIN	D	WTR	SNW	<=40?	RAIN?	white flag?
2009	8	7	80	56	0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	8	73	46	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	9	80	58	0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	10	76	60	0.63		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	11	68	56	0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	12	58	52	0.32		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	13	76	48	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	14	61	45	0.14		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	15	53	43	0.15		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	16	56	47	0.001	M		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	17	53	40	0.01	M		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	18	52	39	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	8	19	60	35	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	8	20	72	37	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	8	21	76	45	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	22	73	43	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	23	78	58	0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	24	73	55	0.39		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	25	61	49	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	26	62	46	0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	27	57	52	1.46		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	28	72	56	0.07		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	8	29	69	50	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	30	61	54	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	8	31	70	58	0.48		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	1	63	48	1.46		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	2	63	45	0.001		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	3	71	40	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	9	4	62	36	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	9	5	62	38	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	9	6	62	36	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	9	7	65	34	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	9	8	76	42	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	9	71	43	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	10	60	54	0.67		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	11	54	45	2.49		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	12	49	43	1.76		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	13	62	48	0.01		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	14	73	52	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	15	77	45	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	16	73	44	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	17	61	45	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	18	54	49	0.04		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	19	59	53	0.22		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	20	62	43	0		0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
2009	9	21	57	40	0		0	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE
2009	9	22	54	36	0.1	M		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
2009	9	23	50	46	0.89		0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE

APPENDIX E – Rainbow Court, Freedom House and HomeStart Women’s Shelter Incidents

DATE_TIME	INCIDENT	DESCRIPTION Rainbow Court & Freedom House	NORMALIZED_STREET_ADDRESS
2/12/2004 8:31	403966	HARASSING PHONE CALLS-NO THREATS	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
2/24/2004 16:50	405187	LARCENY OF BICYCLE COMMUNICATING THREATS -	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/27/2004 19:25	420318	INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL ...	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/4/2004 23:00	424145	INFORMATION	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/29/2005 17:06	525077	TRESPASSING	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/12/2007 0:00	707174	LOST PROPERTY	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/15/2007 20:53	720083	CALL FOR SERVICE	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/31/2008 12:05	815070	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/4/2008 0:00	818236	NARCOTIC SNIFF	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/15/2008 12:57	819254	BIGAMY-MARRIAGE LAW VIOLATION	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/13/2009 19:57	926467	COURT VIOLATIONS	100 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/28/2003 17:43	313171	INFORMATION INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	101 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/23/2007 11:52	723933	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	101 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/4/2008 1:04	806194	MISSING PERSON INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	101 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/5/2008 16:31	806390	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	101 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/23/2008 22:23	814367	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	101 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/1/2008 22:20	806005	ASSIST EMS	101 BRIGHTSUN PL
11/22/2005 22:14	530404	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	102 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/12/2009 14:20	920946	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	102 NEW STATESIDE DR
6/21/2004 0:27	416817	INFORMATION	103 BRIGHT SUN
4/8/2003 0:38	308368	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/27/2003 2:19	310074	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
6/10/2003 0:00	314436	RUNAWAY	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/26/2003 22:15	324887	HARASSING PHONE CALLS-NO THREATS	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/23/2006 20:22	610814	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/31/2008 0:00	815094	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
1/24/2009 0:00	902092	DOMESTIC AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/27/2009 10:19	907671	DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/20/2009 14:36	909967	AUTOMOBILE THEFT	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/4/2009 19:14	911340	DISTURBING THE PEACE	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/20/2009 16:50	918778	ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/28/2009 0:00	922393	TRESPASSING	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/28/2009 19:25	922400	DISTURBANCE	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/7/2009 20:19	923324	ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	103 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/17/2004 23:02	419354	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	103 BRIGHTSUN PL
7/31/2009 0:00	919879	INFORMATION	103 BRIGHTSUN PL
6/10/2004 21:45	415813	INFORMATION	104 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/23/2008 16:50	811376	B&E STORAGE SHED NO FORCE	104 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/1/2008 11:36	826823	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	104 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/18/2003 13:47	318126	SUICIDAL THREATS	104 BRIGHTSUN PL
11/24/2003 6:31	330638	THREATENING PHONE CALLS	104 BRIGHTSUN PL
12/14/2003 17:58	332459	INFORMATION	104 BRIGHTSUN PL
1/26/2007 21:57	702467	RUNAWAY CHILD	104 BRIGHTSUN PL
3/3/2003 10:59	305191	LARCENY FROM AUTO /PARTS AND	104 NEW STATESIDE DR

DATE_TIME	INCIDENT	DESCRIPTION Rainbow Court & Freedom House ACCESSORIES	NORMALIZED_STREET_ADDRESS
6/10/2003 13:33	314439	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/17/2003 19:37	329956	INFORMATION/SUICIDE THREATS	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
5/3/2004 19:26	411911	REFUSE TO LEAVE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
8/10/2004 19:05	421587	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL ...	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
3/2/2005 16:08	505353	LARCENY FROM BUILDING	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
3/2/2005 14:17	505344	LARCENY FROM BUILDING	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/10/2005 12:28	523236	DISTURBANCE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/22/2005 20:08	527335	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
2/13/2006 19:01	604020	TRESPASSING	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
5/28/2006 9:11	614473	UNAUTHORIZED USE OF CONVEYANCE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
8/6/2006 7:18	621689	REFUSE TO LEAVE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
8/11/2006 11:26	622213	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
8/28/2006 7:04	624180	TRESPASSING	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/2/2006 3:09	624720	2ND DEGREE KIDNAPPING	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/2/2006 21:25	631371	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
6/14/2007 11:43	717050	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
6/28/2007 21:50	718416	DISTURBANCE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
7/23/2007 0:00	720837	LOST PROPERTY	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
8/9/2007 11:35	722517	MISSING PERSON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/13/2007 22:21	729314	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/14/2007 16:04	729400	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/26/2007 8:29	730608	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/2/2007 16:13	731359	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
12/12/2007 17:47	735546	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL ...	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
1/16/2008 8:28	801473	MISSING PERSON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
1/23/2008 15:29	802127	REC. STOLEN AUTO FROM ANOTHER JURISDICTION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
2/20/2008 10:44	804957	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL ...	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
2/23/2008 22:31	805350	SUSPICIOUS CONDITION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
2/20/2008 13:15	805456	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
3/6/2008 0:54	806423	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
3/27/2008 22:46	808626	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
4/3/2008 16:49	809361	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
4/12/2008 22:47	810384	SUICIDE ATTEMPT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
4/27/2008 19:14	811721	DISTURBING THE PEACE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
5/21/2008 23:15	814172	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
6/28/2008 10:31	817693	MISSING PERSON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
7/3/2008 18:19	818193	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
7/9/2008 23:15	818782	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/29/2008 13:11	829687	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/14/2008 21:12	831194	INFORMATION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR

DATE_TIME	INCIDENT	DESCRIPTION Rainbow Court & Freedom House	NORMALIZED_STREET_ADDRESS
2/20/2009 20:44	904511	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
3/1/2009 18:23	905292	OVERDOSE INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
3/21/2009 22:36	907190	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
4/23/2009 15:34	910241	SUSPICIOUS CONDITION	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/4/2009 16:47	923002	FORGED PRESCRIPTIONS INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/21/2009 22:07	924573	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/23/2009 20:17	924719	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/24/2009 19:54	924806	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/15/2009 10:21	926590	AUTOMOBILE THEFT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/14/2009 13:30	929290	DISTURBING THE PEACE INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/16/2009 18:31	929503	CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/14/2009 13:30	929294	DISTURBING THE PEACE	104 NEW STATESIDE DR
8/25/2009 20:38	922109	COMMUNICATING THREATS	105 BRIGHT SUN
3/12/2003 7:17	306055	AUTOMOBILE THEFT	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/19/2004 21:39	422354	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/16/2006 5:53	626256	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/14/2008 20:40	828185	INFORMATION	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/17/2008 13:32	828464	SUSPICIOUS COMMUNICATING THREATS BY PHONE -	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/22/2008 10:45	828976	INTIMIDATION, NON ...	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/26/2008 17:04	829449	ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/27/2009 20:01	922285	DISTURBING THE PEACE	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/7/2009 23:06	925942	SUSPICIOUS CONDITION	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/8/2009 19:17	926002	FIGHTING/ AFFRAY	105 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/1/2004 19:15	411715	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	105 BRIGHTSUN PL
11/12/2009 21:35	929124	FELONY LARCENY	105 NEW STATESIDE DR
6/6/2003 21:57	314097	TRESPASSING	106 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/19/2003 10:53	321093	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	106 BRIGHT SUN PL
1/18/2004 17:29	401637	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	107 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/28/2004 0:00	420344	RUNAWAY	107 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/23/2007 12:17	720816	REFUSE TO LEAVE	107 BRIGHT SUN PL
2/25/2008 13:38	805452	CARELESS AND RECKLESS DRIVING	107 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/31/2008 15:06	820794	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	107 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/17/2005 16:25	523942	RUNAWAY	107 BRIGHTSUN PL
10/29/2007 16:37	730880	LARCENY-MONEY PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON	108 BRIGHT
3/5/2004 21:24	406164	AGGRAVATED VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/7/2005 13:12	516924	(WILLFUL) VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/24/2006 14:57	614055	(WILLFUL)	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/15/2007 12:58	710780	ASSAULT ON FEMALE	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
6/5/2007 21:01	716159	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/8/2007 5:21	719389	RUNAWAY	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
7/8/2007 20:07	719425	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/13/2007 19:27	726138	INFORMATION	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/9/2008 22:27	813052	INFORMATION	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/21/2008 0:14	825007	HARASSING PHONE CALLS-NO THREATS	108 BRIGHT SUN PL

DATE_TIME	INCIDENT	DESCRIPTION Rainbow Court & Freedom House	NORMALIZED_STREET_ADDRESS
10/1/2008 8:05	826818	HARASSING PHONE CALLS-NO THREATS	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/20/2008 7:48	828762	AUTOMOBILE THEFT	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/20/2008 9:30	828769	DOMESTIC SIMPLE ASSAULT	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/2/2009 0:45	908230	BARKING DOGS	108 BRIGHT SUN PL
1/19/2004 13:59	401710	VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (WILLFUL)	108A BRIGHT SUN PL
7/12/2006 23:16	619306	LARCENY OF LICENSE PLATE	109 BRIGHT SUN PL
1/10/2007 20:46	700894	ARMED ROBBERY	109 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/2/2007 1:25	725009	LOUD MUSIC/PARTY/OTHER NOISE	109 BRIGHT SUN PL
2/14/2003 15:32	303797	VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (WILLFUL)	109A BRIGHT SUN PL
7/8/2009 13:16	917624	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	110 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/10/2009 15:07	923582	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	110 NEW STATESIDE DR
11/8/2009 2:59	928782	DISTURBING THE PEACE	110 NEW STATESIDE DR
9/8/2003 21:48	323184	DISPUTE	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/12/2004 9:06	412797	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
4/21/2007 20:17	711359	WEAPONS-OTHER	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/20/2007 13:28	714680	DISTURBING THE PEACE	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/20/2008 11:31	828775	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/27/2009 18:42	907726	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/10/2009 18:15	926219	TRESPASSING	111 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/29/2003 4:04	322117	TRESPASSING	111 BRIGHTSUN PL
2/6/2004 18:03	403395	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE	111 BRIGHTSUN PL
9/10/2005 22:14	523289	INFORMATION	111 BRIGHTSUN PL
6/27/2008 8:51	817686	INFORMATION	112 BRIGHTON CT
1/2/2003 0:00	300131	RUNAWAY	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/7/2003 22:27	305642	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
6/30/2004 12:57	417703	POSSESSION STOLEN VEHICLE	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
11/13/2004 23:42	431240	INFORMATION	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
10/11/2005 18:47	526288	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL ...	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
11/11/2006 19:07	632332	SUSPICIOUS PERSON	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
12/15/2006 8:46	635715	LOST PROPERTY	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
9/28/2007 19:00	727683	RUNAWAY	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
5/12/2008 9:40	813244	RUNAWAY	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
6/2/2008 20:36	815293	FIGHTING/ AFFRAY	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/26/2008 0:00	823415	RUNAWAY	113 BRIGHT SUN PL
3/13/2003 19:03	306212	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	113 BRIGHTSUN PL
11/22/2003 16:19	330505	VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (WILLFUL)	113 BRIGHTSUN PL
5/22/2006 18:12	613842	TRESPASSING	113 BRIGHTSUN PL
8/6/2004 18:20	421224	TRESPASSING	113A BRIGHT SUN PL
6/19/2006 21:37	616969	AUTOMOBILE THEFT	1208 NEW STATESIDE DR
10/4/2004 18:46	427116	INFORMATION	200 BRIGHT SUN PL
8/5/2009 8:21	920285	INDECENT EXPOSURE	305 NEW PARKSIDE DR AND NEW STATESIDE DR
9/26/2004 0:10	426198	DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE	BRIGHT SUN PL
8/27/2009 23:11	922301	INFORMATION	BRIGHT SUN PL
3/28/2009 20:12	907843	DOMESTIC SIMPLE ASSAULT	BRIGHTSUN PLACE AT NEW STATESIDE DR
5/3/2007 9:30	712872	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	INT OF BRIGHTSUN PL AND

DATE_TIME	INCIDENT	DESCRIPTION Rainbow Court & Freedom House	NORMALIZED_STREET_ADDRESS
1/11/2006 4:26	600826	INFORMATION	NEW STATESIDE MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD AND STATESIDE DR
1/31/2008 12:44	802965	SIMPLE POSSESSION	MLK BLVD AND NEW STATESIDE DR
4/21/2009 13:39	910058	ABANDONED VEHICLE	MLK BLVD AND STATESIDE DR
2/10/2008 2:39	803939	NARCOTIC SNIFF	MLK BLVD AT STATESIDE DR MLK JR BLVD AND NEW STATESIDE DR
12/6/2007 12:26	734862	INFORMATION	NEW STATESIDE AND BRIGHTSUN PL
6/18/2009 11:40	915669	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	NEW STATESIDE AT MLK JR BLVD
4/8/2009 7:09	908848	ABANDONED VEHICLE	NEW STATESIDE DR
4/24/2004 20:45	411039	SUSPICIOUS CONDITION	NEW STATESIDE DR
3/31/2007 12:15	709178	FOUND PROPERTY	NEW STATESIDE DR AND BRIGHT SUN PL
5/9/2009 12:29	911808	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE REC. STOLEN AUTO FROM ANOTHER JURISDICTION	NEW STATESIDE DR AT NEW PARKSIDE
3/12/2009 8:41	906267		NEW STATESIDE DRIVE AND BRIGHT SUN PL
10/8/2007 19:34	728753	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	NEW STATESIDE DRIVE AND BRIGHT SUN PL
10/8/2007 19:50	728757	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	BRIGHT SUN PL NEW STATESIDE DRIVE AND BRIGHT SUN PLAE
11/9/2009 17:55	928908	AUTOMOBILE THEFT	STATESIDE DR
6/2/2003 0:00	313645	RECOVERED STOLEN VEHICLE	STATESIDE DR
1/31/2006 0:00	602739	NARCOTIC SEARCH	STATESIDE DR AND MLK STATESIDE DR AND MLK JR BLVD
2/20/2008 0:00	804986	SUSPICIOUS CONDITION	
9/17/2006 20:26	626412	POSSESION OF CRACK COCAINE	

Date/Time	Incident #	Description - HomeStart Women's Shelter	
8/10/2003 9:45	320251	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
9/26/2003 8:04	324828	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
10/21/2003 16:57	327304	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
4/14/2004 7:45	409918	VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (WILLFUL)	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
5/9/2004 10:31	412506	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
7/7/2004 21:20	418437	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
9/2/2004 19:32	423856	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
11/10/2004 17:27	431017	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
11/11/2004 23:00	431134	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
2/24/2005 21:16	504854	COMMUNICATING THREATS -INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
2/27/2005 20:54	505140	SUSPICIOUS PERSON	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
4/12/2005 16:53	509092	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
4/20/2005 16:01	509926	LARCENY FROM AUTO /PARTS AND ACCESSORIES	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
3/22/2006 20:51	607731	ASSAULT ON FEMALE	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
4/5/2006 16:22	608992	LARCENY FROM BUILDING	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
5/18/2006 11:02	613392	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
6/2/2006 22:09	615087	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
6/29/2006 17:14	617997	RUNAWAY	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
7/31/2006 7:27	621079	B&E BUSINESS-FORCE	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
11/26/2006 13:06	633782	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
1/12/2007 17:14	701096	ASSAULT ON FEMALE	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
1/28/2007 15:35	702672	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD

Date/Time	Incident #	Description - HomeStart Women's Shelter	
4/11/2007 14:33	710407	VOLUNTARY MENTAL COMMITMENT	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
4/18/2007 9:38	711068	SUSPICIOUS VEHICLE	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
5/30/2007 19:14	715605	PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON AGGRAVATED	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
6/6/2007 20:38	716251	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
6/8/2007 15:05	716432	B&E BUSINESS NO FORCE	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
7/26/2007 12:48	721138	VOLUNTARY COMMITMENT	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
10/18/2007 0:06	729735	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
10/27/2007 14:10	730713	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
12/13/2007 10:28	735603	LARCENY FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
2/4/2008 7:18	803325	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
5/12/2008 18:11	813308	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
5/15/2008 9:27	813544	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
10/20/2008 0:00	828786	CHILD ABUSE/ASSAULT-NO INJURY	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
11/20/2008 13:09	831744	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	2501 HOMESTEAD RD
1/13/2009 10:15	901087	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
4/25/2009 7:59	910399	TRESPASSING	2505 HOMESTEAD RD
7/22/2009 11:24	918940	COMMUNICATING THREATS -INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	2501 HOMESTEAD RD

APPENDIX F – 100 W Rosemary (Community House Men's Shelter) Incidents

This is a preliminary list of crime found in the CHPD incident database. There are a significant number of other crimes and incidents which occurred in the area which CHPD would have to research to determine if it involved the shelter. Thus, you may consider this to be a partial, initial list.

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
1/6/2003	11:49:00	0300477	ASSAULT ON A FEMALE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/6/2003	18:56:00	0300511	DRUNK AND DISRUPTIVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/11/2003	8:03:00	0431367	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY
1/17/2003	22:51:00	0301420	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/4/2003	0:09:00	0302863	LOITERING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/4/2003	18:42:00	0302937	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/5/2003	17:36:00	0302994	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/11/2003	13:24:00	0303497	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/14/2003	23:31:17	0303814	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/14/2003	23:43:33	0303822	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/15/2003	19:12:00	0303895	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/15/2003	20:31:00	0303900	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/1/2003	9:18:00	0304981	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/12/2003	13:37:00	0306079	ROBBERY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/13/2003	10:55:00	0306163	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/31/2003	21:55:00	0307780	VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (WILLFUL)	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/15/2003	1:22:00	0925306	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/24/2003	20:25:00	0309792	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
4/28/2003	5:15:00	0917607	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/7/2003	17:46:00	0311159	CALL FOR SERVICE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/15/2003	14:40:59	0909774	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/17/2003	7:53:00	0312113	STALKING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/17/2003	20:59:00	0908524	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/10/2003	0:00:00	0314434	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/10/2003	12:24:00	0314429	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/11/2003	12:15:00	0314529	REFUSE TO LEAVE	100 W ROSEMARY
7/5/2003	2:19:00	0316850	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY
7/7/2003	19:09:00	0834822	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/1/2003	18:20:00	0833411	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/17/2003	9:36:00	0320906	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/17/2003	19:26:04	0320951	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/20/2003	15:02:00	0321225	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY
8/21/2003	18:00:00	0321334	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/3/2003	22:25:00	0322672	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/6/2003	19:05:00	0322935	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/6/2003	23:28:00	0322972	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/9/2003	12:15:00	0323221	FIGHTING/ AFFRAY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/13/2003	15:20:00	0323590	SUSPICIOUS CONDITION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/15/2003	20:09:00	0323787	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 WAST ROSEMARY ST
10/30/2003	0:00:00	0328027	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/23/2003	3:24:00	0330564	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/1/2004	19:03:00	0400061	CALL FOR SERVICE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/15/2004	0:00:00	0407073	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/22/2004	0:00:00	0833060	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/27/2004	23:11:00	0414397	SIMPLE ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/9/2004	2:46:00	0415651	ARMED ROBBERY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/15/2004	7:31:00	0421951	ASSAULT ON FEMALE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/5/2004	12:49:00	0424187	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	100 W ROSEMART ST
9/8/2004	18:00:00	0424492	SIMPLE ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/22/2004	13:06:00	0832801	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/6/2004	23:52:22	0832360	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/18/2004	18:20:00	0428620	OBTAINING MONEY BY FALSE PRETENSE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/2/2004	19:55:00	0430266	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/14/2004	5:39:00	0831621	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/30/2004	11:35:00	0432809	PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON AGGRAVATED	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/6/2004	6:12:00	0433307	DEATH INVESTIGATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/7/2004	13:06:00	0433427	LARCENY	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
12/22/2004	19:04:00	0434803	INFORMATION/POSSIBLE DRUG OVERDOSE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/30/2004	12:58:00	0435331	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY
1/3/2005	22:01:00	0500190	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/26/2005	17:42:00	0813451	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/27/2005	19:06:00	0502406	ATTEMPTED SUICIDE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/31/2005	13:37:41	0502659	RESISTING ARREST	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/21/2005	19:08:00	0504614	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/15/2005	6:28:00	0506514	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/19/2005	18:38:07	0509847	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/26/2005	18:51:00	0510439	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/28/2005	12:19:00	0805443	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/3/2005	9:58:00	0511015	UNAUTHORIZED USE OF CONVEYANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/6/2005	11:45:00	0511298	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/17/2005	15:59:00	0512287	ASSAULT ON LEO	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/9/2005	18:20:00	0514336	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/17/2005	12:22:00	0515104	INFORMATION/WANTING TO HURT OTHERS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/23/2005	20:18:00	0515730	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/2/2005	18:34:00	0516561	INFORMATION(RUNAWAY)	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/7/2005	19:14:00	0516944	AWDW INFLECTING SERIOUS INJURY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/9/2005	18:53:00	0803575	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/13/2005	20:55:00	0517629	HARASSING PHONE CALLS-NO THREATS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/6/2005	18:04:00	0519975	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/11/2005	6:37:00	0520371	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/31/2005	18:10:00	0522326	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/8/2005	11:46:00	0801633	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/2/2005	12:23:03	0525416	DISORDERLY CONDUCT	100 W ROSEMARY
10/5/2005	19:00:00	0525756	FRAUD-ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/11/2005	19:57:00	0526294	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/16/2005	23:07:00	0800038	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/20/2005	11:00:00	0527105	LARCENY FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/12/2005	17:16:00	0529410	AFFRAY THREATS -INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/20/2005	5:47:00	0530144	THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/30/2005	0:00:00	0531042	RUNAWAY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/2/2005	0:00:00	0531236	MISSING PERSON	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/2/2005	18:11:00	0531257	ASSAULT ON FEMALE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/14/2005	12:25:00	0532325	ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/27/2005	22:09:00	0737289	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/12/2006	18:50:00	0728228	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/12/2006	20:27:00	0600994	TRESPASSED	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/14/2006	13:21:13	0601171	FORCIBLE RAPE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/19/2006	11:56:00	0725123	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/31/2006	20:57:00	0602804	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
2/2/2006	7:02:00	0602910	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY
2/5/2006	7:15:00	0603264	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/9/2006	22:32:00	0725030	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/18/2006	9:34:00	0604493	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/24/2006	21:21:00	0605131	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/7/2006	6:42:00	0606221	SIMPLE ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/11/2006	6:03:00	0606690	UNAUTHORIZED USE OF BICYCLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/13/2006	0:00:00	0606871	NARCOTIC SEARCH	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/27/2006	20:00:00	0608150	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/20/2006	10:30:00	0613599	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/30/2006	5:31:00	0614615	ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/22/2006	7:40:00	0617228	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/23/2006	10:26:00	0617373	DRUG INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/23/2006	14:22:00	0617400	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/28/2006	14:51:00	0617884	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/7/2006	20:15:00	0618796	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/22/2006	18:21:00	0620335	CITY ORDINANCE VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/3/2006	17:26:00	0717786	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/8/2006	12:26:00	0621867	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/9/2006	22:01:00	0622043	LOST PROPERTY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/10/2006	0:00:00	0622161	NARCOTIC SEARCH	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/18/2006	17:24:00	0623034	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/21/2006	0:21:00	0717430	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/29/2006	17:17:00	0624410	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/29/2006	14:11:39	0715924	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/11/2006	18:33:00	0628940	HARASSMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/17/2006	10:31:37	0632875	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/18/2006	6:46:00	0632979	FOUND PROPERTY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/30/2006	13:53:00	0634147	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/8/2006	17:44:54	0635055	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/9/2006	17:11:11	0635154	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/11/2006	19:30:47	0635341	DRUG VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/17/2006	18:23:00	0635966	SIMPLE ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/20/2006	7:17:00	0636197	LARCENY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/20/2006	21:55:53	0712865	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/21/2006	18:43:00	0636361	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/17/2007	12:24:00	0712339	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/20/2007	0:15:29	0701826	MISSING PERSON	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/29/2007	11:01:00	0702740	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/3/2007	0:33:00	0703268	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER COMMUNICATING THREATS -	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/14/2007	14:20:50	0704427	INTIMIDATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
2/14/2007	22:54:00	0704457	REFUSE TO LEAVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/16/2007	19:16:00	0704646	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/19/2007	18:38:00	0704930	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/26/2007	19:31:00	0705599	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY
3/3/2007	4:06:00	0706124	UNDISCIPLINED JUVENILE LESS THAN 16 YEARS/BUT OLDER THAN 6	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/4/2007	7:59:35	0706256	B&E , LARCENY F/VEHICLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/16/2007	18:50:00	0707617	PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON AGGRAVATED	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/16/2007	23:43:00	0711092	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/21/2007	2:06:00	0708004	VANDALISM / DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (WILLFUL)	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/23/2007	17:33:00	0708288	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/29/2007	15:01:00	0708984	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/29/2007	21:32:00	0708940	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/1/2007	8:23:00	0709274	SUICIDE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/4/2007	14:00:00	0709624	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/17/2007	23:10:00	0711032	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/18/2007	14:47:00	0707640	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/22/2007	18:28:00	0711602	URINATING IN PUBLIC	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/28/2007	18:43:00	0701564	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/3/2007	6:34:00	0636264	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/5/2007	8:30:00	0713067	CCW-POSS/CONCEALING WEAPONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/27/2007	20:07:00	0715318	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/2/2007	21:19:00	0627701	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/16/2007	13:59:00	0717232	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/18/2007	0:00:00	0717385	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE P.O. VIOLATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/18/2007	20:47:00	0623301	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/22/2007	11:51:00	0621431	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/30/2007	22:46:00	0718643	ASSAULT ON FEMALE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/1/2007	20:31:00	0718728	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/4/2007	11:22:00	0718983	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/12/2007	21:41:37	0719811	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/15/2007	12:37:00	0720042	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/15/2007	13:09:00	0720045	LARCENY OF PURSE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/16/2007	11:29:00	0720131	ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/24/2007	5:45:00	0720904	ROBBERY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/3/2007	11:39:56	0721937	SUSPICIOUS PERSON	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/15/2007	0:00:00	0723084	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/27/2007	16:57:00	0724406	REFUSE TO LEAVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/1/2007	17:34:00	0724960	DRUNK AND DISRUPTIVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/2/2007	0:00:00	0603671	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/3/2007	14:42:00	0601588	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
9/11/2007	11:12:00	0725884	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/28/2007	18:25:00	0727674	PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON AGGRAVATED	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/4/2007	22:56:00	0600983	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/12/2007	1:40:00	0729087	URINATING IN PUBLIC	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/27/2007	21:09:00	0730741	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/30/2007	3:00:00	0730925	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/1/2007	12:26:00	0731236	TRESPASSING WARNING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/9/2007	12:26:00	0732162	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/13/2007	19:36:00	0732565	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/4/2007	17:41:00	0734660	ALCOHOL VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/19/2007	17:15:00	0736249	VOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/21/2007	0:39:00	0736392	VOLUNTARY MENTAL COMMITMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/27/2007	10:56:00	0736889	DISTURBANCE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/31/2007	17:59:00	0533311	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/1/2008	0:00:00	0526801	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/15/2008	19:48:00	0801440	TRESPASS WARNING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/17/2008	22:27:00	0523040	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/20/2008	4:18:00	0801850	ROBBERY	100 W ROSEMARY ST AND N COLUMBIA ST
1/24/2008	21:25:00	0802248	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/6/2008	0:00:00	0517176	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/8/2008	8:55:47	0803735	HARASSMENT/THREATS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/12/2008	19:35:00	0804224	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/25/2008	14:12:16	0510575	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/25/2008	18:50:00	0805478	CALL FOR SERVICE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/27/2008	17:57:54	0805655	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/13/2008	8:25:00	0807129	LARCENY OF MEDICATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/21/2008	20:05:00	0808027	DRUG VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/3/2008	13:22:33	0809335	SUSPICIOUS PERSON	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/16/2008	7:45:00	0810654	CALL FOR SERVICE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/19/2008	17:19:35	0811013	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/20/2008	8:02:00	0811075	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/11/2008	12:30:00	0813180	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/14/2008	11:55:00	0502304	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/19/2008	17:09:25	0813985	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/23/2008	13:08:00	0814308	HARASSMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/26/2008	7:00:00	0814535	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/29/2008	14:12:00	0814856	IDENTITY THEFT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/17/2008	18:43:00	0816724	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/26/2008	12:35:00	0820314	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/29/2008	11:51:00	0823686	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/10/2008	12:32:00	0824872	INFORMATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
9/23/2008	7:28:00	0826043	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/18/2008	19:45:00	0828612	SIMPLE ASSAULT-OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/31/2008	2:42:00	0829834	ASSIST HILLSBOROUGH PD	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/7/2008	13:29:00	0830536	ASSIST OTHER AGENCY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/8/2008	18:53:00	0830676	DOMESTIC SIMPLE ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/9/2008	14:01:00	0830752	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/19/2008	9:11:00	0427367	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/22/2008	18:49:00	0832037	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/25/2008	23:39:46	0425799	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/28/2008	12:46:00	0832574	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/28/2008	21:17:00	0832598	SIMPLE POSSESSION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/1/2008	19:23:00	0407767	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/4/2008	20:00:00	0317067	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/6/2008	16:24:00	0833194	DRUG VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/9/2008	11:23:00	0312161	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/13/2008	18:54:00	0833878	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/21/2008	12:48:00	0834565	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
12/25/2008	0:41:00	0311918	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/1/2009	13:17:00	0900057	WEAPON VIOLATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/8/2009	17:28:00	0900673	ASSIST HARNETT CO SD	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/15/2009	18:50:00	0901292	ALCOHOL VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/17/2009	0:31:55	0901373	DRUNK AND DISRUPTIVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
1/22/2009	7:04:00	0901848	LARCENY OF LAPTOP COMPUTER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/9/2009	15:52:00	0903470	ASSIST CARRBORO POLICE DEPT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/12/2009	18:39:00	0903760	INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENT-NON CRIMINAL DETAINMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/15/2009	12:44:00	0904029	CALL FOR SERVICE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/22/2009	20:06:00	0904677	DISORDERLY CONDUCT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/27/2009	19:57:25	0905124	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
2/28/2009	19:18:00	0905217	DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE/NO ASSAULT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/5/2009	19:34:00	0905611	DRUNK AND DISRUPTIVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/19/2009	9:00:00	0906897	VOLUNTARY MENTAL COMMITMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/19/2009	15:25:00	0906934	PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON AGGRAVATED	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/24/2009	18:34:00	0907434	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
3/25/2009	18:30:00	0907534	FIGHTING/ AFFRAY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/4/2009	21:06:00	0310218	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/18/2009	5:54:00	0308937	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
4/20/2009	18:10:00	0909985	REFUSE TO LEAVE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/12/2009	19:46:00	0912146	VOLUNTARY MENTAL COMMITMENT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
5/31/2009	8:20:00	0913918	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
6/18/2009	21:22:22	0915709	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST

Date	time	Incident	Description	Address Normalized
6/25/2009	11:51:00	0916373	TRESPASS WARNING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/8/2009	11:30:00	0300883	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY ST
7/15/2009	7:20:00	0918283	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/3/2009	2:22:00	0920081	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/17/2009	7:30:00	0921335	DISTURBING THE PEACE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/27/2009	12:20:00	0922251	LARCENY- ALL OTHER	100 W ROSEMARY ST
8/29/2009	10:32:00	0922464	LARCENY	100 W ROSEMARY ST
9/30/2009	0:00:00	0319409	TRESPASSING	100 W ROSEMARY STREE
10/1/2009	19:47:00	0925413	ALCOHOL VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/16/2009	10:06:31	0926659	COMMUNICATING THREATS - INTIMIDATION, NON PHYSICAL THREAT	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/18/2009	6:30:00	0926860	PHYSICAL SIMPLE ASSAULT-NON AGGRAVATED	100 W ROSEMARY ST
10/26/2009	5:34:43	0927589	DEATH INVESTIGATION	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/3/2009	12:51:00	0928343	LARCENY OF BICYCLE	100 W ROSEMARY ST
11/4/2009	19:59:00	0928467	ALCOHOL VIOLATIONS	100 W ROSEMARY ST