

Archived: Thursday, October 15, 2020 4:15:01 PM

From: webmaster@shorelinewa.gov

Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 4:50:39 PM

To: [agenda comments](#)

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Comments

Sensitivity: Normal

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Comment on Agenda Items
Date & Time: 10/14/2020 4:50 pm
Response #: 791
Submitter ID: 39426
IP address: 50.35.103.177
Time to complete: 51 min. , 3 sec.

Survey Details: Answers Only

Page 1

1. Tylor Husske
2. Shoreline
3. (o) Richmond Highlands
4. thuske@thuske.com
5. 10/26/2020
6. Ordinance 906 and Enhance Shelter
7. I would like to submit on the record that I oppose the change of allowing homeless shelters in R-48 zoned areas. Hastily making changes without actual plans (besides putting a low barrier shelter at 16357 Aurora Ave N) is not a way to make what should be community decisions. The fact that this zoning change is being proposed reinforces the beliefs of many community members that this is a special project of a few council members and is being rushed with a complete disregard of the people they are supposed to be representing. But from what I have found there isn't a single council member within almost 2 miles of this proposed facility so maybe that is a part of it.

Lake City Partners has admittedly no experience running a low barrier "enhanced" facility and hasn't taken the time to learn why all the other similar facilities have ended up failing. This doesn't really give anyone confidence that they are really concerned about why those facilities have been run out of those areas by the local citizens and their focus (like some of the city council and king county representatives) is to simply get it started and deal with the issues later. Oddly, the facility they currently operate with the churches has stricter rules than the facility that you are proposing.

There is something that I keep hearing in the responses from King County and some city council members that is concerning. It is that "we could" do something or that "we should" look into something. To me this is a setup for a bunch of "misunderstandings" that will simply be hid behind later. Even the code of conduct that was released uses terms that gives leniency to allow people to stay as long as they want. Saying they will abstain from illegal drug use and there is no actual definition of how long temporary is. This will result in my favorite response of "I was led to believe" and you simply saying you misheard or misinterpreted.

And lastly, I would like to mention something to Mayor Hall. In the city council meeting on Aug 17th you were quick to note that people in apartments or in their own homes don't have anyone there to enforce or act as a barrier to prevent drug use or abuse alcohol in their homes. I am not saying that doesn't happen and I am not saying it is more acceptable but what I will point out is, those are people who contribute to the tax base in this community and don't live off of it. As a tax paying citizen I am against providing a facility that blindly (it has been said you can't search anyone so you are going on the honor system here) gives people with mental health and drug use issues a free place to stay and let them wonder out into our community to use and abuse with no set plan in place. If you truly want to help then they should be required to be getting help in those areas. But that isn't what this is about. It seems like this is a numbers game so you can say that your community contributed in getting x number of homeless a place to sleep.

In summary, I am against this hastily planned and forced on us idea of a shelter and against giving city council free reign to put a shelter wherever they see fit.

-Tylor Husske
8. (o) Oppose

Thank you,
City of Shoreline

This is an automated message generated by the Vision Content Management System™. Please do not reply directly to this email.