

I have read the The Planning Commission's proposed code amendments as well as Mr. Lancaster's response listing 6 items of concern.

I believe continuing to use TUP Criteria is appropriate due to the type of exposure presented by providing temporary shelter for those without homes. Adding the criteria specific to transitional encampments further clarifies the special considerations required including safety of the host and guests as well as protection for surrounding neighborhoods. By "safety" I mean protection from weather, health hazards, crime from third parties and the condition of the premises. Waiving of the TUP fee and fire fee (if required) recognizes that this is not an income producing event.

Items 1 & 2: Mr. Lancaster lists these as two separate items but they are basically the same. He comments that a 20' setback will be detrimental to church sponsors who may be giving up more parking spaces. The Staff report allows modification of the setback based upon site conditions and ability to meet the established criteria. With church sponsored encampments already operating in Shoreline, I do not believe this suggested setback will cause churches and their congregations to "dramatically reduce" the number encampments for the homeless. They may be able to host smaller groups, or obtain a modification of the setback.

Item 3: Redefining the Managing Agency to include city-recognized non-profits or religious organizations will increase the likelihood that a Managing Agency is a legitimate organization with experience in organizing complex long term events, with access to a list of workers or volunteers and to supporting services, and that is covered by liability insurance. I note that the criteria is limited to city-recognized sponsors. There is no mention of City-Oversight of the church sponsor as Mr. Lancaster gratuitously suggests.

This is no different from other jurisdictions and would prohibit someone from setting up a non-profit organization and applying for a TUP the following day as a means to subvert this part of the law.

Item 4: The school year can present difficulties. Children may "be required to haul camp and change schools mid-year." Having to "haul camp" and move is one of my greatest grievances against these encampments. They offer nothing permanent. It's funny Mr. Lancaster does not have a problem with forced mobility for the adults, or for children after the end of the school year. In fact, he skips right over the the extension of the camp from 3 to 6 months.

But this argument is moot. The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act is a federal law that provides funding to the state, which then goes to local districts to ensure school stability and provides funds to transport students to a students school of origin.

Item 5: The proposal to disallow backyard encampments as a "constitutional" issue under freedom of religion is not only a stretch but a thinly veiled threat. Each homeowner has a right to use his or her property for the purpose it was purchased and

laws are in place to protect the constitutional rights of everyone. Religious preferences are not a competition over whose religion supersedes another. If providing for the homeless is part of your religious belief or practice, there are numerous ways to do this without stepping on the constitutional rights of your neighbors.

Item 6: Cryptic Discrimination, generally used in the same sense as “redlining”, resulted from certain zoning changes that adversely affected some of the citizens of a government entity. This might be most recognizable today as rezoning voting districts to favor a political party. Mr. Lancaster uses it to say that the proposals are designed to exclude homeless persons from Shoreline. I re-read the Staff proposal, Page 1, Council Resolution No 379, that states “these amendments have been initiated to facilitate churches and other human service non-profit organizations to provide the homeless with temporary and safe shelter without more process or expense” (emphasis mine).

I support the proposed changes.