



Lewiston Disability Advisory Commission
MEETING MINUTES
September 11, 2025 - 12:00 PM
Lewiston City Hall – Back Conference Room – 1134 F Street
Lewiston, Idaho 83501

Members Attending: Chairman Constance Vance, Mark Havens, Mike Feeney, Jolene Cliffe, Heather Moore, Matt Ruth, Jessica Grainger

Non-Members Attending: Ged Randall, City Attorney Jennifer Tengono, Nikki Province, Leah Burriss

A. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Meeting called to order at 12:01pm

B. CITIZEN COMMENTS

- a. Ged Randall comments that he is glad to see “young people” involved in DAC, but they might be at a disadvantage in understanding the struggles of the older population.

C. DISCUSSION ITEMS - Discussion on accommodation for a sober living home, and the city’s process for requested accommodations.

- a. HR Director and ADA Coordinator Nikki Province discusses ADA requirements when an accommodation is requested by a citizen. She states the City is working on a policy for accommodations, which she could bring to DAC for review and discussion. When it comes to recovery for drugs and alcohol, that is a protected disability. The City recently received a request like this related to housing and went through the interactive process and an accommodation was provided. There has been some public feedback and therefore, wanted to discuss the topic with DAC. Councilor Wright reiterates that he thought this was a pertinent topic to bring to DAC. City Attorney Jennifer Tengono adds that under the ADA and Fair Housing Act, cities are required to respond to accommodation requests and as long as it meets certain criteria, are required to approve it. Ms. Tengono describes in more detail the recent accommodation request the City received. Mr. Havens clarifies this issue had nothing related to modifications to the property and Ms. Tengono confirms that’s correct, it was strictly related to use of the property. Mr. Havens also asks if the issue went in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Ms. Tengono states it did not and explains why. Mr. Ruth asks about the precedent being set by this accommodation and asks about larger dwellings. Ms. Tengono explains the difference between single family, two family, and multi-family dwellings. Chairman Vance confirms the issue with this request was the nature of the use for the dwelling. Ms. Province confirms that yes, because the property is being used for a recovery home, that has been part of the issue, but because those in recovery are protected by the ADA, the City is not required to notify neighbors. Chairman Vance agrees as a person’s disability status is protected by HIPAA. Ms. Moore asks if those living in a sober living home have to go through a process to confirm their disability. Ms. Tengono explains no, there is not a requirement for documentation from the individual, just the nature of the property and their dweller’s qualifications for those allowed to live in the dwelling. Mr. Havens asks about citizens appealing the City’s decision and Ms. Tengono says there is no appeal process. Mr. Havens discusses if there would be a state requirement for notification if someone set up a home for the treatment of those on the sex offender registry, as this has happened in Boise. Ms. Tengono

states that it is probably covered by State Law, and there probably would be some kind of notification process. Chairman Vance adds the comment that if there are people that felt like they should have been notified, at what point then would it stop, and agrees the City had no responsibility in notifying neighbors. Mr. Ruth states he would recommend the City look into long term solutions to this as he, personally, would not be happy if a dwelling like this was next to his residence and wants to protect the people that need to be protected. Ms. Grainger states she would be curious if the company providing the facility has requirements for those allowed to live in the dwelling or if there are any regulations on that. Mr. Ruth questions the definition of a family dwelling if those in the dwelling don't have to actually be a family. Becky Collee, a neighbor of the dwelling, discusses the specs of the home and states it only has one kitchen, one address, etc. and therefore, it is a single family home which should limit to 8, not 16, individuals. Ms. Tengono explains how the nature of the accommodation request impacted this. She adds the property does support that amount of people. She also states the City would never notify neighbors when any other protected class of individual moves into a home. The group discusses other issues they see with the accommodation request and the facility. Chairman Vance states she feels the main issue for some people is that they disagree with people in drug and alcohol recovery being classified as a disabled and being considered a protected class. Mr. Ruth states he disagrees and sees the issue is more the amount of people allowed in the dwelling is 16, not 8, which others agree with. Ms. Grainger states most likely, both are probably true. Mr. Ruth states he would like to see what code changes can be made and Ms. Tengono states that this is federally regulated and under state code, so the City is limited. Councilor Wright states he wanted to bring this to DAC because he thinks DAC could, knowing this will probably happen again, approach this in an out of the box way to make these occurrences less confrontational.

D. ACTIVE AGENDA

- a. Approval of August 14, 2025 Meeting Minutes – *action item*
 - i. Ms. Grainger motions to approve the minutes. Ms. Cliffe seconds the motion and the minutes are approved.

E. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- a. The group discusses having someone that works at a sober living facility speak to the group.

F. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

- a. Chairman Vance states it is Direct Support Professionals appreciation week.

G. STAFF LIAISON COMMENTS

- a. None.

H. ADJOURNMENT

- a. The meeting is adjourned at 1:06pm.