



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Roberts and City Councilmembers

FROM: Jessica Simulcik Smith, City Clerk

DATE: January 9, 2017

RE: Documents received at 1/9/17 Council Meeting

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

---

Attached hereto are documents received from the public at your January 9, 2017 City Council Regular Meeting.

- 1) Written comment regarding homeless encampments submitted by Kim Lancaster.
- 2) Written comment regarding homeless encampments submitted by Ginny Scantlebury.
- 3) Written comment regarding non-motorized bridge to 145<sup>th</sup> Light Rail Station submitted by Tom Poitras.
- 4) Written comment regarding restrooms at Light Rail Stations submitted by John Evans, Sound Transit.

KIM'S COUNCIL TALK

1.9.17

My name is Kim Lancaster. I live in Shoreline.

The City Council charged the Staff with removing obstacles to and discrimination against homeless people in Shoreline. The Planning Commission's proposed amendments to the City Code have exactly the opposite effect. Many of the changes are in fact "cryptic discrimination" against homeless persons, pretending to effect public safety, while in fact excluding homeless persons from Shoreline.

I ask the Council to, first, kill the Planning Commission's 20 foot minimum setback. This is veiled discrimination against Shoreline's homeless residents. This setback is a commercial zoning setback which has nothing to do with transitional encampments in Shoreline. This amendment will disqualify many churches whose parking lots are not of sufficient size to accommodate the setback. Those churches whose lots are large enough to accommodate encampments will be further discouraged from doing so, because now the camps will take up a much larger portion of their parking lots, leaving them with too few parking spaces to accommodate their congregations. (Seattle's encampment setback is zero.) The net effect of the setback will be to dramatically reduce the number of places in Shoreline that homeless encampments can be sited. Second, the Planning Commission proposes the City will approve the oversight organization for the camps. As a constitutional proposition, the City lacks competence to do so whenever such organizations are religious in orientation. Third, extending camp stays to six months (from three months) fails to address the needs of school children, who may still be required to haul camp and change schools mid-year. Currently camps can stay at a hosted site for up to a year. The proposed amendment makes things harder for homeless school children. Is that what we want to do in Shoreline? Fourth, the proposed amendments violate my constitutional right to have compassion for the homeless. It precludes individual homeowners from hosting encampments, even when no church has stepped up to host the encampment and the City has failed to provide a permanent location for such an encampment. That exclusion of individuals violates the religious freedoms of any person who might wish to host the encampment to exercise her religious convictions.

Please change the zoning code to help, not harm, homeless persons.

Thank you.

Kim Lancaster

[kim@lancasterlawoffice.com](mailto:kim@lancasterlawoffice.com)

January 9, 2017

To all Shoreline City Council members:

Why is the Shoreline Planning Commission responding to a few Richmond Beach residents who have decided they don't want any back yard encampments near their homes? (The only reason the Lancasters hosted an encampment Fall of 2015 was because the homeless people had no other place to go).

It seems to me that the Planning Commission's 20' minimum setback was in answer to these few Richmond Beach residents. However, the effect of this amendment is to disqualify most of the churches in Shoreline. I believe there would be only 3 or 4 churches in Shoreline with large enough parking lots to accommodate the encampment.

I am on the Camp United We Stand board of directors, and our goal is to help the campers improve their lives. We don't want them to end up on the streets. So, while we all work together on a solution for the homeless, please consider changing the zoning code to help, not harm, homeless people.

Thank you for your consideration of my ideas.

Ginny Scantlebury  
19625 – 27<sup>th</sup> Ave NW  
Shoreline, WA 98177

As I said in the letter I wrote to the Council today, the huge cost of a second Non-Motorized Bridge to the 145<sup>th</sup> ST Station is not justified. There will be a new pedestrian bridge right next to the upgraded 145<sup>th</sup> ST overpass. I'm sure the 145<sup>th</sup> ST Bridge can do the job. Do we just need a second bridge so that pedestrians and bikers from west of I5 will never have to wait for a light to cross an intersection? People coming from east of 5<sup>th</sup> Ave will still need to cross intersections with lights. Is our goal to put pedestrian bridges at every intersection on Aurora and other busy intersections?

In the letter I sent about the 148<sup>th</sup> ST Bridge walkshed, the following total was pointed out. After subtracting the 145<sup>th</sup> ST walkshed (15.2 acres) from the total 148<sup>th</sup> ST walkshed (63.3 acres) you have 48.1 acres. The best case medium and high density scenario in the REAL 148 walkshed is: Total of additional acreage (48.1 acres) minus R6 (14.4 acres) minus Aegis (5 acres) minus MUR-35 (4.2 acres) = 24.5 acres. This assumes all churches and homeowners in the MUR-70 zone sell to developers and all homeowners in the MUR-45 zone also sell to developers. If you're going to spend 15 to 20 million dollars or more on a bridge, it should serve more people than in that small area, even if it's someone else's money. If you are going to spend someone else's money, you should deserve it, not just because it's there.

The staff have known about there being a new Non-Motorized Bridge at 145<sup>th</sup> ST when the overpass is upgraded for a long time. I have seen them discuss it with Planning Commission members. I have no doubt they've discussed it with the Council too. Staff even discussed it in their presentation Dec 12 2016, yet the City Council and the Planning Commission have acted like they've never heard of such a thing. This goes back to when the Council voted to spend ½ million dollars to study these extra bridges. I don't recall ever hearing any Council member suggest that maybe the 145<sup>th</sup> ST Non-Motorized Bridge would be sufficient.

January 9, 2017

Good Evening Mayor Roberts and members of the Shoreline City Council. My name is John Evans Sound Transit project manager for the Shoreline segment of the Lynnwood Link light rail.

Sound Transit is concerned with the change proposed in Ordinance 769 which would amend section 15.05.080 to require public restrooms at light rail stations.

As a matter of Board policy, Sound Transit typically works with local jurisdictions to construct public restrooms at its transit facilities only where staffing is present and effective maintenance and security can be provided and capital costs are not prohibitive.

Sound Transit has built public restrooms into a few of its light rail stations where the station is a terminus or where it has been required as part of the local permitting process. However, it has been our experience as well as the experience of transit companies nationwide that restrooms attract criminal activity.

While these restrooms may provide a convenience to transit riders, we prefer to have these public accommodations located in transit oriented development areas, or nearer to shopping districts.

The proposed amendment to ordinance 769 would require Sound Transit to design and build public restrooms into all Shoreline stations, this not only increases the construction costs for the station, but also the long term maintenance, and security costs.

We note that as standard practice, Sound Transit will include bathrooms for rail and bus drivers that will not be open to the public.

We support the existing code as it was adopted by the Council in October 2016, which provides the necessary flexibility to assess the requirements and suitability of public restrooms in each neighborhood station.

We appreciate your consideration <sup>of</sup> this issue and the ongoing collaborative professional relationship provided by City staff on the project, and we look forward to continuing this over the next several years to bring light rail to Shoreline.