

**OBJECTION TO ISSUANCE OF  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

(rev. 8/2020)

**I/We hereby object to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit at the following location (include address and tax parcel number from Notice of Hearing):**

1720 Jackson Street  
Tax Parcel 17-40017-30

**I/We object for the following reason(s):**

We are writing this objection letter because of concerns we have about a vote the La Crosse Common Council will be making Thursday, October 12. A group of our neighbors met with representatives of Tellurian and became concerned with their answers and how these answers have changed over time.

Our group then met with our aldermen to voice our concerns about the negative impact placing this type of short-term crisis facility would have on our residential setting. Our group then attended the Judiciary & Administration Committee on October 3rd where we were further informed that each patient admitted to this facility would be drug tested and scanned for possible weapons and that the area surrounding the facility would lit up. The very need to take these measures speaks to an underlying admission that there is potential for concern.

Initially, the spokesperson from Tellurian stated the proposed facility would be a 6 bed crisis center where clients would stay no more than 24 hours with many leaving within a few hours. It would have 7 cameras checked every 15 minutes and a staff of 5 in the day and 2 at night. These answers have changed as time has progressed so we are unsure of the intervals, however, it does not change the nature of our general concern. (Although it was not initially mentioned), it was later stated that there is an exit plan for clients, however, the doors are not locked and clients are always free to leave. If a client steps out to smoke unattended they would be locked out. Mobile Crisis and the police would be bringing clients in who are experiencing mental distress. Tellurian will also have their own driver.

We were told the plan to locate the facility at 1720 Jackson Street was mainly based on cost with a secondary argument that it would have a neighborhood feel. Given their anticipated quick turnover of clients this makes little sense to us. We have been making great strides in our neighborhood over the years, with homes being improved and families with little children moving in. The addition of this type of facility with a steady flow of clients (being scanned for weapons and drug tested) and the outside lit up with cameras has us very concerned. At one point it was stated that the impact on our residential area would not be any different than the dentist office that was previously at this location. We strongly disagree.

We agree that there is a need for a facility for those in crisis, but placing one with a need for these types of measures within 200 feet of families with children is an inappropriate location given how short-term the stay is for clients and the related comorbid condition of drug addiction that is so often found with people struggling to cope with mental illness.

Please reconsider this decision.

