



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Roberts and City Councilmembers

FROM: Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DATE: March 15, 2016

RE: Documents received at 3/14/16 Council Meeting

CC: Debbie Tarry, City Manager  
John Norris, Assistant City Manager

---

Attached hereto are documents received from the public at your March 14, 2016 City Council Business Meeting.

- 1) Written comment regarding homelessness submitted by Brad Lancaster.
- 2) Written comment regarding minimum wage submitted by Dan Jacoby.
- 3) Written comments regarding taxes submitted by Rhonda Gardner.
- 4) Written comments regarding 145<sup>th</sup> St. Light Rail Station submitted by Dave Lange.

## COUNCIL TALK

3.14.16

My name is Brad Lancaster. I live in Shoreline.

I am suggesting ways the Council might change social policy in Shoreline to make things better for low-income persons. I have discussed a permanent tiny house village for homeless parents with school-age children. I have asked you to fundamentally revise the permitting process for homeless encampments. I described how the City might use two dedicated homeless encampment sites. I suggested revisions to the City's Accessory Dwelling Unit statute to make those ADUs more accessible as low-rent housing stock.

Tonight I introduce the Open Homes initiative.

This Open Homes idea starts in Europe. In Geel, Belgium, 500 psychiatric patients, all presently under care, live in the homes of the citizens of Geel. The Geel psychiatric hospital has led the way in de-institutionalization of psychiatric care. These many families of Geel provide a home base and social universe for Geel's mentally ill citizens. I speak of Geel to make a point. American attitudes about privacy are not the only attitudes possible. It may well be better for us if we welcome in, rather than shut out, distressed people. It would certainly be better for the distressed people.

The citizens of Shoreline have shown tremendous compassion toward the encampment at my residence. With some encouragement and structure, Shoreliners who are willing might open their homes to one or two homeless people.

An Open Homes initiative might have problems that should be addressed up front. First, families that welcome homeless people to their homes should charge no rent to these guests. A no-rent policy will avoid entanglements with the Washington Residential Landlord-Tenant Act. Second, any homeless person who wishes such housing, and any homeowner who provides such housing, should be deeply screened by the homeless encampment supervisory non-profit. Training for both parties should be provided. Third, a dispute resolution process should be put in place before the program commences. There will be disputes. Fourth, current commission of crimes and active warrants should bar guests from this program. I would, however, recommend allowing people into the program who have served their time and are compliant with their terms of probation.

The Open Homes initiative is an act of conscience and the human heart. It is not legislation. Some Shoreliners may open their homes. That generosity alone might house all of Shoreline's homeless persons. So I ask. Can you open your home?

Thank you for listening.

**Dan Jacoby**

*Public comment to the Shoreline City Council*

*March 14, 2016*

There is a 7-Eleven near my house, where I often stop in to pick up various items. I've gotten to know the owner, who also owns a store in Seattle, so I asked him what he thought about a minimum wage increase in Shoreline. He hopes we do raise it.

If we raised the minimum wage, with 7-Eleven being a convenience store where nobody shops because of the prices, he could just raise prices a dime here and there to make up the cost difference without losing customers. Meanwhile, a higher minimum wage would mean far lower employee turnover. Right now, there is only one person working there whom I recognize; the rest are far too new.

And that's the major business benefit of a higher minimum wage. Overall spending increases don't make much difference, but businesses save a lot of time – and money – hiring and training new workers, and get higher productivity from their workers because they stay longer. A higher minimum wage is actually good for a low-wage business's bottom line.

It's also good for Shoreline.

First, it's good for Shoreline, on a small level, because any higher prices, and any increase in spending generally as a result of the higher minimum wage, means more sales tax revenue — and more jobs for Shoreline. The city's budget is scheduled to go into the red very soon; this could help.

Second, it's good because more people could afford to live here. A 40-hour week at current minimum wage translates into less than \$600/month available for housing. At even \$12/hr., a minimum wage job adds another \$100/month, and at \$15/hr. such a job means another \$250/month and more, not to mention more money available for other bills!

Finally, as the Corresponding Secretary for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Legislative District Democratic Organization, it is both my duty and my pleasure to inform you officially that last Wednesday our members voted unanimously in favor of a resolution calling on Shoreline (among other cities) to raise its minimum wage. I am attaching a copy of that resolution.

In short, there is no down side, and a lot of up sides, to raising the minimum wage. I urge the Council to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Jacoby

Shoreline

Ho I looking out for the tax payers  
Why do we vote The people voted  
No for King Dome and tunnel  
did it any way waste of taxes  
We pay for parks yet their was  
talk of raising the price on cover  
plastic area <sup>and bidding on tolling</sup> which makes it more  
unaffordable like Obama care  
Government has known for years that  
food cards are being traded for  
drugs yet no one does anything to  
stop it so now we have more and  
more drugies and have less more  
taxes now us home owners are ~~taking~~  
money from IRA's and stocks to survive. I am

personally preparing for a earthquake

~~(in more ways than one)~~

I am asking you as a counsel that  
making some of your decisions you  
find other mean of raising money  
like fundraisers for HopeLink who  
does a lot for the community. I know  
you give them money but that also  
comes from us taxpayers because  
the less taxpayers more welfare  
more homeless more drugies where is

206-487-0187

the solution instead of a bandaid

Dave Lange, Shoreline

Lets talk the light rail station at 145th. Shoreline has been asleep at the wheel and our friends at ST aren't much better. We fought hard for a station at 145th, it coexists with the 145th interchange because the rails are elevated. The current design has buses entering the station from 5th Ave NE using a new traffic light at 148<sup>th</sup> (I hope). The bus rejoins 5th Ave at an uncontrolled driveway and the 60 foot bus has to cross multiple lanes of traffic to get to the left turn lane back to the Northshore/Tri-cities. Those traffic lights and travel time from 145<sup>th</sup> to the station and back to 145<sup>th</sup> can easily add up to more than 6 minutes, just to drop off commuters. We have a long term rail station that can't handle the initial bus route, whose frequency could increase to 6 minute cycles and any other routes that get added are more than a hundred feet away from the street side stops. Having buses turn around at 5th Avenue is a poor operational choice, especially if Shoreline adds a bunch of density feeding into 5th Avenue.

Lets move the station over 145th with door to door service for the 145<sup>th</sup> traffic going east and west. Run the Northshore bus over to Aurora and up to the park and ride at 192nd and Aurora (which is already configured for Bus Rapid Transit). This adds transfers to and from Metro Rapid Ride and Community Transit Swift and goes through downtown Shoreline. This builds a much stronger ST3 option where voters in Shoreline actually see some benefit, instead of the 522 dogleg. A single seat busride from 192/Aurora to Bothell with a rail connection in the middle really pushes an East/West solution. Getting more commuters from Aurora, including Shoreline Place, to the station without additional buses helps everyone.

We need to have the station discussion again with 3 layouts: the original 145<sup>th</sup> design, the idea of an elevated foot path from the current station to the other side of 145<sup>th</sup> and a station design bridging 145<sup>th</sup>. There are multiple answers to get commuters close to a station door with an efficient flow of buses. Pretend we have bus routes approaching the station from any direction and then leaving. Where does the existing bus exit help and where does it hurt? Do the same experiment with stops on 145<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>. This isn't a time to go cheap, but the only chance we have to design a good station for the life of this rail line. Creating congestion at the entrance and exit for most of Ridgecrest doesn't serve cars, pedestrians, buses or Shoreline in the future.