

Meeting Transcripts: SeattleCityCouncil

Summary Information

Organization: SeattleCityCouncil

Number of Meetings: 140

Date Range: 2015-04-20 to 2022-07-19

Included Meetings:

Meeting ID	Date
SeattleCityCouncil_04202015	2015-04-20
SeattleCityCouncil_05042015	2015-05-04
SeattleCityCouncil_05262015	2015-05-26
SeattleCityCouncil_06082015	2015-06-08
SeattleCityCouncil_06222015	2015-06-22
SeattleCityCouncil_06292015	2015-06-29
SeattleCityCouncil_07132015	2015-07-13
SeattleCityCouncil_07272015	2015-07-27
SeattleCityCouncil_08172015	2015-08-17
SeattleCityCouncil_09082015	2015-09-08
SeattleCityCouncil_09142015	2015-09-14
SeattleCityCouncil_09212015	2015-09-21
SeattleCityCouncil_12072015	2015-12-07
SeattleCityCouncil_12142015	2015-12-14
SeattleCityCouncil_01112016	2016-01-11
SeattleCityCouncil_02012016	2016-02-01
SeattleCityCouncil_02292016	2016-02-29
SeattleCityCouncil_03142016	2016-03-14
SeattleCityCouncil_03282016	2016-03-28
SeattleCityCouncil_04112016	2016-04-11
SeattleCityCouncil_04252016	2016-04-25
SeattleCityCouncil_05022016	2016-05-02
SeattleCityCouncil_05162016	2016-05-16

SeattleCityCouncil_05312016	2016-05-31
SeattleCityCouncil_06132016	2016-06-13
SeattleCityCouncil_07182016	2016-07-18
SeattleCityCouncil_07252016	2016-07-25
SeattleCityCouncil_08082016	2016-08-08
SeattleCityCouncil_08152016	2016-08-15
SeattleCityCouncil_09062016	2016-09-06
SeattleCityCouncil_09122016	2016-09-12
SeattleCityCouncil_09262016	2016-09-26
SeattleCityCouncil_11142016	2016-11-14
SeattleCityCouncil_11212016	2016-11-21
SeattleCityCouncil_12162016	2016-12-16
SeattleCityCouncil_01092017	2017-01-09
SeattleCityCouncil_02212017	2017-02-21
SeattleCityCouncil_02272017	2017-02-27
SeattleCityCouncil_03202017	2017-03-20
SeattleCityCouncil_04102017	2017-04-10
SeattleCityCouncil_05222017	2017-05-22
SeattleCityCouncil_05302017	2017-05-30
SeattleCityCouncil_07172017	2017-07-17
SeattleCityCouncil_07242017	2017-07-24
SeattleCityCouncil_08142017	2017-08-14
SeattleCityCouncil_09052017	2017-09-05
SeattleCityCouncil_09182017	2017-09-18
SeattleCityCouncil_09252017	2017-09-25
SeattleCityCouncil_10022017	2017-10-02
SeattleCityCouncil_11202017	2017-11-20
SeattleCityCouncil_12042017	2017-12-04
SeattleCityCouncil_12112017	2017-12-11
SeattleCityCouncil_01022018	2018-01-02
SeattleCityCouncil_02052018	2018-02-05
SeattleCityCouncil_02122018	2018-02-12
SeattleCityCouncil_02202018	2018-02-20
SeattleCityCouncil_03052018	2018-03-05
SeattleCityCouncil_04232018	2018-04-23
SeattleCityCouncil_05212018	2018-05-21
SeattleCityCouncil_05292018	2018-05-29
SeattleCityCouncil_06182018	2018-06-18

SeattleCityCouncil_06252018	2018-06-25
SeattleCityCouncil_07232018	2018-07-23
SeattleCityCouncil_07302018	2018-07-30
SeattleCityCouncil_08062018	2018-08-06
SeattleCityCouncil_08132018	2018-08-13
SeattleCityCouncil_09042018	2018-09-04
SeattleCityCouncil_09242018	2018-09-24
SeattleCityCouncil_10012018	2018-10-01
SeattleCityCouncil_11132018	2018-11-13
SeattleCityCouncil_11192018	2018-11-19
SeattleCityCouncil_12102018	2018-12-10
SeattleCityCouncil_12172018	2018-12-17
SeattleCityCouncil_02042019	2019-02-04
SeattleCityCouncil_03112019	2019-03-11
SeattleCityCouncil_03182019	2019-03-18
SeattleCityCouncil_04012019	2019-04-01
SeattleCityCouncil_05132019	2019-05-13
SeattleCityCouncil_05202019	2019-05-20
SeattleCityCouncil_06032019	2019-06-03
SeattleCityCouncil_06102019	2019-06-10
SeattleCityCouncil_07012019	2019-07-01
SeattleCityCouncil_09032019	2019-09-03
SeattleCityCouncil_09162019	2019-09-16
SeattleCityCouncil_10072019	2019-10-07
SeattleCityCouncil_11182019	2019-11-18
SeattleCityCouncil_01132020	2020-01-13
SeattleCityCouncil_02182020	2020-02-18
SeattleCityCouncil_02242020	2020-02-24
SeattleCityCouncil_03022020	2020-03-02
SeattleCityCouncil_03092020	2020-03-09
SeattleCityCouncil_03162020	2020-03-16
SeattleCityCouncil_03302020	2020-03-30
SeattleCityCouncil_04202020	2020-04-20
SeattleCityCouncil_05182020	2020-05-18
SeattleCityCouncil_05262020	2020-05-26
SeattleCityCouncil_06012020	2020-06-01
SeattleCityCouncil_06152020	2020-06-15
SeattleCityCouncil_07062020	2020-07-06

SeattleCityCouncil_08102020	2020-08-10
SeattleCityCouncil_08172020	2020-08-17
SeattleCityCouncil_09082020	2020-09-08
SeattleCityCouncil_09142020	2020-09-14
SeattleCityCouncil_09212020	2020-09-21
SeattleCityCouncil_09292020	2020-09-29
SeattleCityCouncil_10052020	2020-10-05
SeattleCityCouncil_11092020	2020-11-09
SeattleCityCouncil_11232020	2020-11-23
SeattleCityCouncil_12072020	2020-12-07
SeattleCityCouncil_12142020	2020-12-14
SeattleCityCouncil_01192021	2021-01-19
SeattleCityCouncil_02012021	2021-02-01
SeattleCityCouncil_02162021	2021-02-16
SeattleCityCouncil_02222021	2021-02-22
SeattleCityCouncil_03222021	2021-03-22
SeattleCityCouncil_03292021	2021-03-29
SeattleCityCouncil_04192021	2021-04-19
SeattleCityCouncil_05032021	2021-05-03
SeattleCityCouncil_05102021	2021-05-10
SeattleCityCouncil_05172021	2021-05-17
SeattleCityCouncil_06012021	2021-06-01
SeattleCityCouncil_06142021	2021-06-14
SeattleCityCouncil_07262021	2021-07-26
SeattleCityCouncil_08092021	2021-08-09
SeattleCityCouncil_09132021	2021-09-13
SeattleCityCouncil_09202021	2021-09-20
SeattleCityCouncil_09272021	2021-09-27
SeattleCityCouncil_11222021	2021-11-22
SeattleCityCouncil_12062021	2021-12-06
SeattleCityCouncil_02082022	2022-02-08
SeattleCityCouncil_02222022	2022-02-22
SeattleCityCouncil_03012022	2022-03-01
SeattleCityCouncil_03152022	2022-03-15
SeattleCityCouncil_03292022	2022-03-29
SeattleCityCouncil_04122022	2022-04-12
SeattleCityCouncil_05172022	2022-05-17
SeattleCityCouncil_05242022	2022-05-24

SeattleCityCouncil_05312022	2022-05-31
SeattleCityCouncil_06142022	2022-06-14
SeattleCityCouncil_07192022	2022-07-19

Consolidated Transcript (All Meetings)

The report of the Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item number 11 Council Bill 118362 relating to the Stormwater Code amending sections 22.80 0.04, 0.05050 and 0.060 of the Seattle Municipal Code. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you very much. And thank you to Seattle Public Utilities that came to our committee the last month and provided us with the information about the stormwater code. The bill passed unanimously out of our committee under the Federal Clean Water Act's Municipal Stormwater Permit. Seattle and similar municipal governments are required to periodically update regulations for stormwater practices and facilities. This ordinance includes three immediate changes that save the city money while still controlling pollution and complying with ecology requirements and those requirements. They include a number of specific projects, but they're going to make our water quality treatment thresholds for the roadway projects equivalent to ecology thresholds. They will exempt from Seattle public utility drinking water pipe projects from water quality treatment and green stormwater requirements consistent with the ecology requirements. And will also allow our Seattle Public Utilities Director to designate areas through a director's rule where new development may be exempt from the code's stormwater flow control requirements. Because the city drainage system has sufficient capacity to handle any increases in flow related to the development. I know that sounds very exciting to those of you who haven't been participating in it, but it's a very exciting project that I appreciate ESP moving forward on. So we will achieve equivalency with the Ecology 2014 Stormwater Manual. There have been many stakeholders involved in this over the last two years and we recommend do pass. Thank you. Any questions or comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Rasmussen I So Want Back shot. By. Gordon Harrell. I. O'Brien hi I'm president Burgess I 70 favorite and opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item 12. You got the right one. Utilities relating to the rates and charges for water services of Seattle. Public Utilities authorizing withdrawals from the water fund, revenue stabilization sub fund, revising water rates and charges and credits to low income customers, and amending the Seattle Municipal Code. Sections 21.04 430 21.04 440 and 21.7 6.00. The committee recommends a council pass. Thank you, Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you very much. Last week at our Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhood Committee meeting, the water rates were adopted out of our committee, and every one of us wants to do our very best to keep our water rates low. And I want to just insert here something that many of you may have seen in last week's front page story in Seattle Times. Under the headline of Rain Soaked, Seattle has the nation's highest water bills. The fact i

s that that's not true. And I just wanted to clarify that for the record here. In some respects, this story was informed, informative and clarifying, but there were some basic inaccuracies. And as we are voting for these new water rates, I just want to clear this up. The Times compared our hypothetical water bills from a number of cities around the country by multiplying water rates for each city, and then they selected their own consumption rate. The fact of the matter is, in the city of Seattle, the median family size is about 2.4 persons, and that typical family will use only 125 gallons of water daily. And the other fact that they seem to have missed is that our drinking water bill and our sewage and wastewater bills are combined. And our typical monthly spew bill for the water, sewage and drainage is about \$119 per month, not the \$300 that the Seattle Times reported. So what we're doing today is approving the water rates for 2016 and 2017. All of you will remember that last year that as part of the SBA strategic business plan, we had established a number that we were shooting for, and the proposed rate increase is less than what had been in the strategic plan. So in our committee, we move this forward, and I would also like to ask this for council's endorsement. Thank you. Thank you. Questions. Comments. Councilmember So on. Thank you, Councilmember Bagshaw. Also, the as is customary, Mexico said this is a 1.7% rate increase which is smaller than the rate increase that was projected by the strategic plan was adopted by the Council as a resolution last year. And I wanted to thank Meg Moorhead from Gunnison Central staff for her hard work that made the rate increase smaller than it would otherwise have been. I agree with Councilmember Baxter. This is a relatively small rate increase, but I think it's important to take this into account, you know, using a broader context. The question is who pays for the vital services in

our society and what are necessary for life itself is perhaps the most vital service the city provides. And taken as a whole. Seattle and Washington State have a very regressive tax structure with workers, poor and middle class, paying a much higher portion of their income in taxes than the rich. And rather than raising rates on residential customers as small as the rate increase may be. I would like to see the Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhood Committee look into cost allocation formulas, just like we did in the Energy Committee last year, where a little bit of research helped us to find out that corporations like Boeing pay less per kilowatt hour than residential families like you and I. And we would like to be investigating that this year again. And I hope that as a council we can work on that, and it'll be great if we can use that same approach for public utilities as well. I will be voting no on this, but I also understand that this is one of the smallest increases we have seen. But as I said, it's a part of a big

ger structure of regressive taxes. Thank you, Tim. Councilmember Okamoto. Thank you, President Burgess. I'd like to speak in favor of this ordinance. While no one likes utility rate increases, I believe the utility has scrubbed its operating budget and its capital budget to really look at what is necessary to support the utility and its infrastructure. It's reexamined its financing plans, taking advantage of more of cash reserves as well as cash on hand, and that those rate increases that are being proposed here are substantially lower than those that had been adopted by Council Resolution 31, 534 in August of 2014. In that, the strategic plan had identified projected rate increases for 2016 of 5.2%. The actual being proposed is 1.7%, and in 2017 they had a projected increase of 5.2%. The actual proposed is 2.7%. Thank you. Councilmember Bagshaw. I'm sorry. Did you have your hand up? No. Sorry. No, I just. I guess just to put a period on this, we recognize that we've got a regressive tax system in the state of Washington and that we all need to be working to change that. But that doesn't have anything to do with what we're voting on today. And I would just urge approval by this council. Thank you. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Back shot by Gordon Harrell. II. The Carter. II. O'Brien II Okamoto. II. Rasmussen. I so want know and President Burgess I in favor one opposed bill. Passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item four. Agenda item for Council Bill 118378 relating to Seattle Public Utilities authorizing the director of Seattle Public Utilities to submit the plan to protect Seattle's waterways and to fulfill the obligation set forth therein to fulfill, fulfill obligations under a consent decree required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the State of Washington Department of Ecology. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Banks. Thank you very much. Last week, once again at our committee, Seattle Public Utilities joined us and talked about the work that they have been doing to protect Seattle's waterways. This is something that SPU has been working on for years now, and I really want to say thank you to all in Seattle public utilities that have been working on this. The city's federal consent decree for control of combined sewer overflows. That means both the wastewater that comes from our home and businesses, plus the overflow from our city streets and off our roofs. The federal government mandated that our overflows going into Puget Sound and into Lake Washington not exceed one site 1% per year. So we have entered into a consent decree with the federal government and we now have an opportunity for the city to delay the achievement of that standard in favor of what's called stormwater projects that have better water quality results. I'm really very impressed with the work that SPU is doing. And no rate increase are going to go beyond those that were identified in our st

ategic business plan. But it will result in the adoption of this Council bill that allows us to extend the time in terms of implementing the consent decree. So we earlier approved the plan at a conceptual level. We had discussions about this last year and then several times in my committee this year. The integrated plan is a significant policy choice is going to add \$100 million of capital costs through 2030, and it will really boost our infrastructure work. The benefits of this plan are that we're going to have cleaner water faster. We're actually going to get more bang for the buck. We'll be spending more money, but we'll have a significantly higher water quality outcome. So our committee recommends moving forward with this and to adopt Council Bill 118378. Thank you. Questions or comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Back shot. I got in. High. Peril. All right. Look. Hi, O'Brien. Hi, Okamoto. Hi. Rasmussen. So want and President Burgess nine in favor and opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item five. The Report of the Public Safety, Civil Rights and Technology Committee. Agenda item number one, resolution 31578. Reaffirming the City of Seattle support of Somali communities to continue remittances to Somalia

and the Horn of Africa. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Thank you, Councilmember Harrell. Thank you very much, council president. So this resolution is addressing a very serious concern in the Somali community, in the Horn of Africa community, relative to the remittance policy. I think many of you are following the issue that when the Merchants Bank of California closed down the accounts of all Somali-American money transfer operations in 2015. This has been devastating to the community, Somali community, trying to send money down to their families. And you've seen in the last several years of this cracking down, if you will, and it has devastated many communities and in particular, our local community as well. And so this is an attempt to address the seriousness of the issue and to really think about how the city can work with the Somali community to come up with policies, processes, advocacy strategies, solutions that will help the Somali community address this and also, in that process address many of the issues, such as access to capital and access to credit as well that would help local communities. So again, I want to thank the executive for reaching out and convening several meetings and I think council members so want a Luccardo O'Brien and others for being deeply involved in the community, trying to work with community members, help us move forward, finding solutions. So this resolution states our commitments and I look forward to the ongoing work as we address to Somali remains issue should pass out of committee with full vote and I ask for your support and are you going to move a substitute and I am going to do something that the clerk asked me to do, which is

I move to amend Resolution 31578 by substituting version for perversion three. And as I move that, there was just some semantic, some semantic issues raised by the law department, but I don't think a change of substance at all. Also I'll second the motion. It's been moved that we substitute version four for version three. Are there any questions or discussion on the substitution? All in favor of approving the motion vote. I oppose vote no. So we now have version four in front of us. Any questions or comments? Councilmember Swan. Thank you. President Burgess Just to add to the comments by Councilmember Harrell, this is a very important resolution. While the City Council does not have any legal jurisdiction over the banks that we are talking about. It does help to put pressure on the federal government, which is, you know, this this the the language of the resolution is really geared towards that. And I want to mention that we following Minneapolis as a city that also has passed a similar resolution, I thanked Eisenberg for bringing this forward and for also for being open to the amendments to be brought forward on the suggestion of community activists. And above all, thanks to the community activists, we have two of them here, the Abdullah and Hassan, these thank you for your involvement. And clearly, of course, we have a lot of work to do for the welfare of the community, but this was definitely a big part of that. Thank you. All in favor of adopting version four of resolution 31578. Indicate by voting. I oppose vote no. The resolution is unanimously adopted and the chair will sign it. The report of the Finance and Culture Committee. Please read item two. The Report of the Education and Governance Committee Agenda Item two Council Bill 118398 An ordinance relating to city employment, commonly referred to as the first quarter 2015 employment ordinance. Committee recommends passage of this legislation. This is a fairly routine piece of legislation that we get each quarter. This establishes new titles and salaries in the civil service. It establishes premium pay for certain licensing requirements at the Seattle center. It increases funding for the Human Services Operating Fund. It designates certain positions exempt from civil service. And it also ratifies several collective bargaining agreements with city employee unions. Are there any questions? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. McCarter I. O'Brien i. Akimoto I. Rasmussen, i. So aren't. I beg your. Gordon I Harrell President Burgess. Hi nine in favor and nine opposed the bill. Passes and the chair will sign it. The Report of the Park Seattle Center Libraries and Gender Pay Equity Committee. The Report of the Park Seattle Center. Libraries and Gender Pay Equity Committee. Agenda Item three Council Bill 118392 relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation authorizing the acquisition of real property commonly known as 8118 Greenwood Avenue North. The Report of the Education and G

overnance Committee Agenda Item one Resolution 31587 relating to the Seattle Preschool Program Levy and approving a partnership agreement between the City of Seattle and the City of Seattle School District Number one, as required by ordinance 124509, the committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Thank you. This resolution carries the memorandum of agreement between the City of Seattle and Seattle Public Schools related to the Seattle Preschool Program, which is the preschool program approved by the voters of Seattle last November. This agreement

lays out the framework and the policy goals and values shared by the city and the school district for the implementation of the preschool program and the school district's ultimate participation in that program. There have been between the time this Version 17 was introduced to the council and the school board made their final decisions last week. There have been four technical changes to clean up some language and correct some typographical errors. So I would move version 18 for consideration. Are there any questions or comments? All in favor of the amendment to substitute version 18 for version 17, Vote I. I oppose Vote No. The amendment is adopted. We have version 18 in front of us. Any other questions or comments? Please. Or this is a resolution. So resolution 31587 as amended. Those in favor vote I oppose vote no. The resolution is unanimously adopted. The report of the Housing Affordability, Human Services and Economic Resiliency Committee. Please read items two and three. Agenda Item ten Resolution 31594. Setting the public hearing on the petition of the Seattle City LT Department for the vacation of Pontius Avenue North between Danny Way and John Street in the South Lake Union Urban Center neighborhood of Seattle. Thank you. Councilmember Rasmussen. Yes. This is and I'm sorry. This is a routine amendment where we set the date for a public hearing, and this will be a public hearing on the Danny substation site at Pontius and Denny. And thank you. That is what we'll do. Do we have a date set? It is in the resolution itself. If you have a copy of that. Well, maybe somebody could. We will find a solution. Up in the restaurant. You didn't exactly seem prepared on this since. I was. Getting prepared for the next meeting. Does somebody have it up on their screen? July 30th. I had my. Thank you. Councilmember. It's July 30. All right. So we're setting a date for a public hearing. That's all we're doing. And that public hearing will be held here in chambers on July 30. And we know the time. It would be at 936. At the Belltown Community Center. Oh. So it's July 30 at 930 in the morning at the Belltown Community Center. Five 3530. In the. Morning. Sometimes it takes teamwork to do these things. Teamwork. All right. We'll say that one more time. It's July 30th, 530 in the evening. Belltown Community Center. Okay, great. Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Yes, Councilmember. So on. I'm

glad we have the day because that was my whole comment is about why we should let people know when the hearing is. They just want to say that usually allegations are non-controversial issues. But I just wanted to draw a little attention to this one. As chair of the Energy Committee, this litigation is for the construction of the Denny substation, which is a very large Seattle City Light project in the middle of the Cascade neighborhood, the residential neighborhood and several low income housing buildings are immediately adjacent to the construction site, and substations usually don't go in such dense, densely populated areas. But this one is an exception. I do know that City Light has done a lot of outreach so far to the community and has found ways in which to mitigate the potential impact of the construction of this project on the neighbors. And I support moving forward to the public hearing. Just wanted to highlight the hearing just in case somebody is listening and wants an opportunity to comment. So thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. So to repeat again, the hearing is July 35, 30 PM at the Bell Town Community Center. Any other questions or comments? All in favor of adopting Resolution 31594 setting the public hearing vote. I oppose vote no. The resolution is unanimously adopted. Is there any other business? Councilmember Gardner, the Central Waterfront Committee will meet next. And beginning at what time? May I suggest that because of the very large number of citizens here in support of the resolution on the Vietnamese Heritage and Freedom flag, please can we plan 15 minutes between full council and the waterfront committee so that council members may briefly join the community in the birthday Atlantis room if they wish. However, since we do expect an audience at the Waterfront Committee and we will not be able to start the committee until there are at least five council members. So let's be back promptly at 330. All right. Thank you. So we'll reconvene at 330 as the Select Committee on the Central Waterfront. The city council is now adjourned. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. The report of the Select Committee on Transportation Funding. Please read item one. The Report of the Select Committee on Transportation Funding Agenda. Item one Council Bill 118402 relating to transportation providing for the submission to the qualified electors of the city at an election to be held on November 3rd, 2015, a proposition authorizing the city to levy regular property taxes for up to nine years in excess of the limitation on levies in Chapter 84.55 RTW for the purpose of providing city facilities and services, including transportation improvements, both capital and operating with possible debt financing. Creating a new oversight committee. And ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass as amended.

Thank you, Councilmember Rasmussen. Thank you very much. First of all, just an item of bookkeeping

or formalities. I have a substitute version to offer and this would be the number for version number four. It combines several grammatical and legal corrections that have been recommended to be made by the law department, and that it also includes Councilmember Harrell's revision to Section eight, which is language concerning the racial equity toolkit analysis in the event that levee funds are used for streetcars. I also include clarifying that as to the suggested ballot title, we saw that the original version that had been submitted by the executive was unintentionally over the 75 maximum word limit. So therefore, I move to substitute version four for the version that we voted on last week in the committee meeting. Second. It's moved in. Second, and that we substitute version four for Council Bill 118402. Are there any questions or comments all in favor of the amendment vote? I oppose vote no. The amendment is unanimously adopted. We now have version four in front of us. Thank you. First of all, Councilmember, thank you for your participation in the five meetings that we had of our Select Committee on Transportation Funding. We've had strong and very involved participation from each of you as well as from the public. And that's understandable because the number one issue, according to polls that we've seen of this region, is transportation through this measure. And to others that have recently been approved by Seattle, voters were responding to public concerns about safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, to frustration about the condition of our roads and bridges and frustration with traffic congestion. Last year, Kane County voters rejected a ballot measure to increase metro service throughout the county. But in response, the city placed a similar measure on our fourth ballot, and that was approved by 62% of Seattle voters. We are now funding hundreds of thousands of hours of transit service in Seattle, including more weekend and late night service that especially benefits transit dependent students and working men and women. But we have to do more. And this is a third ballot measure in four years to improve our transportation system. Voters approved last fall, as I mentioned, the transit measure, and they also voted to approve in 2012 improving transportation safety by funding the replacement of our waterfront seawall. Now, we'll ask the voters again to approve a multipurpose levee to continue the work of the expiring Bridging the Gap transportation levy. If this is approved by the voters, \$930 million would be invested over nine years to meet three fundamental needs. First, the largest amount at \$420 million or 45% of the levy is for maintenance and repair of our bridges and streets. This will significantly help to pay for repaving major roads in every every area of our city from North 130th Street to south west Roxbury Street. \$140 million will go for seismic upgrades to 16 of our most vulnerable bridges and to replace the Fairview Avenue

Bridge and eliminate the backlog of spot repairs. Planning and design funding is included for replacement of the Ballard and Magnolia Bridges, which one of the speakers spoke to during our public comment person? While those bridges are safe, they do not meet current standards, and each of those bridges is roughly estimated to cost between three and \$450 million. Other funding sources will have to be found for those bridges. Secondly, the largest amount of funding after maintenance repair is to go to congestion relief in order for our expanded bus service to be more reliable and to gain ridership. We have to make our transportation system work more efficiently. For that reason, major investments will be made to improve the operation of transit along seven major transit corridors and identify. In our transit masterplan. Routes for transit throughout the city will be improved, including Ridgeway, Rainier Avenue, South and Jackson Street. Pardon me. Just changing pages. Market and 45th Roosevelt, Northgate, Madison and 23rd Avenue investments are planned to improve pedestrian access to the new light rail stations included in the north gate, bike and pedestrian bridge, the accessible Mount Baker Station Plan and the new Graham Street Station. Freight investments are essential and funding is included to rebuild East Marginal Bay and to match funding from the state for the line to street overpass and for spot improvements in manufacturing and industrial areas and for general traffic. Funding is included for a new traffic signal timing equipment and for intelligent transportation systems and more traffic signs and markings. And then the third major funding area in this package is for a safe route for all. The amount proposed for this category is \$207 million or 22% of the levy. This category includes several schools, with the levy funding a project for every public school that is 90 schools and it prioritizes low income. Elementary schools across the city will increase funding to implement Vision Zero, and this includes 2215 corridors such as Rainier Avenue, 35th Avenue, Southwest and Lake City Way.

Each of those are included in this to improve safety. There will be funding for 150 new blocks of sidewalks and repair of 225 blocks of sidewalks, 50 miles of new protected bike lanes and 60 miles of neighborhood greenways. And one half of our bicycle master plan will be able to be funded out of this levy. And with this funding, we'll see more productive, protected bike lanes downtown in the University District and our neighborhood greenways. Will ensure accountability and transparency in how the levy dollars are spent. We did that with an expiring bridging the gap measure and this will be done again. There will be a citizen's oversight committee and the Council will add requirements and has added requirements for implementing minimum spending levels in each category. And we're ensuring general fund contributions to our Department of Transportation are not r

educated of the Mayor and the Council are committed to equity and the distribution of the funds of this levy. And the Department of Transportation presented to us an equity toolkit analysis for the levy. We saw that investments will be spread citywide and we will be investing substantially in areas and neighborhoods that have been overlooked in the past for transportation improvements. For example, a major safety project is planned for Rainier Avenue, and North Seattle will see many more sidewalks built and Delbridge will have significant investments in a transit corridor. And \$10 million will be invested in South Park for drainage, repaving and sidewalk projects. While this levy is between 11 and \$12 a month more for the average household than the current bridging the gap measure, I think it's important to note that we have a \$1.8 billion maintenance backlog and more people than ever are traveling to Seattle or living in Seattle. We not only have to repair what we have, but people want improvements made to how the system works. Now people are frustrated with congestion. They want more sidewalks, more reliable bus service, and safer routes to schools and safer for for bicyclists and better free mobility. We must continue the successful work that is being funded nowadays or today by bridging the gap. And we have to make these investments. This is the mayor and the city council's answer to the needs that we're hearing from the public. But this only meets part of the need. Council members, last week, all of you voted on this at our last meeting, and the recommendation of the select committee is to pass this measure. Thank you. Questions or comments? Councilmember Lakota. Thank you for that summary, Councilman Rasmussen. I do believe that has been a number of improvements in the legislation. You made some amendments in Council. President Burgess made some idea, and I know other council members did as well. The categories have been tightened up and reporting requirements also have been, well, I would say, identified with periodic reports back to the Council of Government. I had two concerns. I still have them. One is that the mechanism we're using, I don't believe, is the fairest distribution, the financial burden that could be distributed across our residents or those people who will be gaining the advantage of this of this legislation. The question is, who will who will pay? I think that many of the renters who unfortunately will probably be impacted, as is the costs are flow through to them. And we each live in our own sort of world of who we hear from. I run through a number of of my colleagues in city government who say that they don't know anyone opposed to it. I seem to have gotten the emails that they did with people who are not necessarily all that excited about it and oppose it. I know that I can afford it and I believe in it is what they what's in the what's in the package. It's without a doubt needed in the city. I just don't know how my nei

ghbors are going to file on this issue. And part of the reason is the size, as was pointed out by Councilman Rasmussen, again, this is quite a bit larger than bridging the gap, which replaces I think it's about two thirds larger. Bridging the gap past that 53% was on the lower end of the scale of what levees generally pass in the city. So I think there's some risk here. I think some some significant risk that it may not pass. And if it doesn't, more than a quarter, perhaps as much as a third of our budget in transportation will be lost for at least a year, if not two years. But I voted it out of committee. I believe that let the people decide on the ballot. And I hope that whatever the decision is, I hope we can move forward with the improvements that we need to make in this city, particularly in the area of fighting congestion and making a road safer for those who drive who like bikes or pedestrians. Thank you. Councilmember Lucchino, we'll look forward to having you on the campaign trail with us. Councilmember Bagshaw, thank you. I want to, first of all, extend my appreciation to all who worked on it, all of you who have been here encouraging us and moving us forward. I know that this is a big package, and I frankly am someone who's going to support this from the top to the bottom because of the changes that we have made . And Councilmember Rasmussen, thank you for your leadership in reframing the kinds of investments we're going to

make. First, we're going to be maintaining what we already have. And I think every taxpayer knows that that's got to be our first priority. And secondly, we're going to make sure that our investments reduce congestion wherever I go. People say to me, the worst problem that the city has is congestion. And unless we can reduce that and accommodate all the people that are coming, we're going to be in significant trouble. And I know that this package is going to be designed to do that. And thirdly, we're really promoting safety for all. I know that you have all heard that I am the poster child for Cascade bicycle clubs all ages and abilities and riding my bike again. And I ride all over the city. I want to have the protected bike lanes so I can get all over the city safely because right now I'm playing dodge a car and dodge a bus after the the lanes that we already have just end. So I am very much supporting this package, both as somebody who drives a car, occasionally rides a bus, rides my bike and walks. And I really appreciate all the work work that's gone into this. And thank you for bringing up Magnolia Bridge. That's something that I hear from neighbors in the north. And frequently we do know that the cost of replacing Magnolia Bridge is about half the size of this particular package. So it cannot be the resource that we use. But there are other resources. We do have money in here to do planning for Ballard Bridge and Magnolia, and I'm very pleased with that. But also, I want to encourage the state legislature, if

they haven't already finished their work today, to make sure we have a transportation package that addresses the \$15 billion that we need to have our light rail extended and to make sure that we've got resources so that we in the city and region can take care of what we have already got. And again, recognizing that freight needs to get around, that we need a network, we can't separate this from cars or busses or pedestrians or bikes. Our trucks we all need to get around. We've got 100,000 more people coming and a lot more employers. This is a region that's got to work. So I want to say thank you. I will be supporting this. And I also want to talk to you, the two women that stood up. I want to understand what your concerns are and how we can make sure that we listen to you and bring your concerns to the campaign. So please talk to me. Thank you very much. So I'll just close by saying that I too appreciate the work of the state, especially in all of the detailed analysis and recommendations that the plan is very specific and I think context is very important and that is the typical Seattle homeowner will pay on average 11 or \$12 more per month over what they're paying now for bridging the gap. If this measure passes, some will pay less and some will pay much more. Especially commercial property owners are going to pay a lot more than 11 or \$12 a month. So I think the burden of paying for improvements in our transportation system is is equitably distributed. Councilmember Rasmussen, do you want to close our discussion. Simply to say thank you to all of my colleagues on the Council for working so hard on this measure? We've taken it very seriously. We know that we have a significant responsibility to maintain our our transportation network and to address the concerns that we're hearing from the public also about congestion reduction and to provide safe routes for all. So specifically in terms of who I would like to thank, in addition to my colleagues on the council, the advocates from the public, the community advocates said neighborhood greenway organizations, there are many of them from many neighborhoods, our bicycle advisory board, our pedestrian advocates, feet first and Transportation Choices Coalition and also members of the freight community , including our Freight Advisory Board. All of them have helped to inform this package long before it came to the City Council. We've only heard most recently from them, but there was a great deal of community outreach done by the Mayor's Office and the Department of Transportation for many months before this package was even brought to the City Council. Thank you again to the community advocates for your work to help shape this package then and then now the one that's before us today. Also, I have to thank the mayor and his staff for working with the community and working with the Department of Transportation to develop this package, in particular, Andrew Hastings of the mayor's office . And then, of co

urse, we wouldn't have this package assembled, as it is with some specificity and so much details without the work of the Department of Transportation, particularly Sky Crew Blake and his staff, including Hannah Mackintosh, Chris Ruffini, Doris Costa, Charles Schwab. Our Budget Office crunched the numbers a number of times for many of us, including when we looked at alternative funding sources. And then Nobel, who we know and have a great deal of confidence in, was very helpful on that, including his staff, Kristy Parker, Saroja Reddy and David Harris, and finally our council staff that worked on our behalf to ensure that this package reflected all of our priorities and

the priorities that we were hearing from the public, and that includes Dan Heder, Calvin Chao and Peter Lindsay, and then Anthony Auriemma of my staff, who really kept us moving forward at the council. And I very much appreciate his work as well. So thank you colleagues and staff and the public for all of your work. And now we will take this out to the public. We'll work with organizations like the League of Women Voters to ensure that all of their questions are answered. Thank you again. Thank you. The clerk will call the roll on passage of Council Bill 118402 version four got an. I. Harrill Right. Lakota Guy O'Brien Hi. Rasmussen I want. My. Back. I am President. Burgess My agent favored and opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. The report of the Transportation Committee. Please read item two. Agenda item three. Clerk file three. One, two, 125. Full unit lot subdivision application of Toni wrong to subdivide one parcel into 13 unit lots at 1756 Ballantine Place South Project Number 3012372 Type three. Introduced February 13th, 2012. Oh. Councilmember O'Brien. Okay. So I'm going to go ahead and speak to this item in the next agenda. Item two. The first is a clerk file and the second will be a council bill. This is a fairly unique circumstance because we don't see subdivisions of this sort in the city very often. So I'm just going to walk through for the public exactly what's happening. We're considering a final plat approval for a subdivision located at 1756 Valentine Place South in the North Rainier Urban Village. This is a block west of Rainier Avenue South. The subdivision of this site will facilitate the sale of nine new single family homes and four townhomes. There are essentially three steps on how this process happens. The first is when someone wants to be considered for a subdivision. The Department of Planning Development is not another city and county departments. They're going to provide services to that review a preliminary plat and then DPD Macon makes a recommendation to the hearing examiner. The next thing is that the hearing examiner holds an open public record, a hearing to review the primary plat and then issues a decision consistent with state law. That decision of the hearing examiner then constitutes authorization to develop the improvements sh

own on the preliminary plat. The final step is the verification after those improvements have been made as the DPD and Council review the final plat to determine whether the improvements made were consistent with the preliminary plat and any conditions opposed by the hearing examiner. Have been upheld. At this time, DPD start and central staff have reviewed the final plat and determined that the improvements are consistent with the primary plat. And so I will urge the council will put the clerk file on file and approve the subsequent Council bill. Thank you. Is there a second to his motion? Good. It's moved in, seconded that the clerk file be placed on file. Are there any further comments? Councilmember Rasmus question for Councilmember Brian. I reviewed the materials in the file. It wasn't clear who the petitioner is. Is this a nonprofit agency that is providing housing for affordable housing? Is it Seattle Housing Authority? Who is the petitioner and what type of housing will be provided? The applicant is Tony. Tony Wong I. My understanding is they're selling the parcels, but I don't know specifically what will be built on them. Right. That was unclear. From the materials. So. Any other questions or comments? Those in favor of placing the Clark file on file, please vote i. I. There was oppose vote no. The motion is unanimously approved and the file is filed. Item four is the Council bill. Are there any questions or comments regarding number four? Did we read it in yet? Sorry. Please read it into the record. Bill passes and the chair will sign it. The Report of the Park Seattle Center Libraries and Gender Pay Equity Committee. Please read Item ten. The Report of the Park Seattle Center Libraries and Gender Pay Equity Committee Agenda Item ten Council Bill 118434 Relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation authorizing the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation to sign a lease with Sprint Communications Company L.P. for continuing use of subsurface fiber optic cable installed in the Bert Gilman Trail. The committee recommends a bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Gordon. This bill authorizes the continuing use of subsurface fiber. Optic cable installed alongside. The Burke Gilman Trail. The committee approves its path. Thank you. Questions or comments? Please call the roll and the passage of the bill. Okamoto. Hi, Rasmussen. All right. So want I back? Shot by Gordon Harrell? All right, look, Carter, I O'Brien. I am President Burgess. Nine in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. The adoption of other resolutions. Please read item 11. Council Bill 118424 relating to the City Light Department declaring certain real property rights and improvements surplus to the city of Seattle's utility needs and authorizing the release of an access easement and permit for a groundwater observation well and the conveyance of ownership of said groundwater well to James and Valerie Van Dike and Ponderay County, Washington. The commit

tee recommends the council bill pass. Thank you. Council members who want. This council bill releases an easement for a well in Ponderay City Light was required to dig the world tested groundwater there. The test is now complete so this council bill will give the well back to the owners of the property where it's located the safe city light from having to pay the bill for the decommissioning of the well. And again, the energy committee held a legally required public hearing for this council bill. There were no comments made and recommend passage of the bill. Thank you. Questions or comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Okamoto Rasmussen I so want. I betcha. I. Got him. I Harrill I Lakota. I O'Brien. I am President Burgess. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item six. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item six. Agenda Item six Council Bill 118441. An ordinance relating to the City Department authorizing the execution of the Maintenance Obligations and Ownership Agreement for boundary substation with the Bonneville Power Administration and ratifying concerns confirming certain prior acts, the committee recommends a full council pass. Thank you. Council Members one. The substation in question is maintained by an agreement between City Light and the Bonneville Power Administration. This council approves an update to the maintenance agreement, which had not been updated since the 1960s. There are no substantive changes to how the agreement works, so it will just formalize what has been done in practice all along. The Energy Committee recommends council passed this bill. Questions or comments. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Okamoto I Rasmussen I so want I back shot by Gordon Harrell, the Carter O'Brien and President Burgess nine in favor nine opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item seven and you can stop reading at the first semicolon. Thank you. Agenda Item seven Council Bill 118443. Relating to the rates, terms and conditions for the use and sale of electricity supplied by the satellite department to customers in the city of SeaTac and amending SeaTac. The Report of the Finance and Culture Committee Agenda Item three Council Bill 118452 authorizing in 2015 acceptance of funding from non city sources authorizing the heads of the Executive Department, Department of Planning and Development, Department of Parks and Recreation, Human Services Department, Seattle Police Department and the Seattle Public Utilities. To accept to accept specified grants and private funding and to execute, deliver and perform corresponding agreements and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The Committee recommends the Council bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember God. This Council bill will accept is a grant acceptance ordinance sent along with the second quarter supplemental. This Council bill will allow the acceptance of 3.675 m

illion in grants. The committee unanimously approved its passage. Thank you. Questions or comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Gordon I. Harrell, I. O'Brien Okamoto. Rasmussen All right, so want. My. Back show and President Burgess eight in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item four through the first semicolon. Agenda item four Council Bill 118453 relating to the 2015 budget amending ordinance 124648, which adopted the 2015 budget, including the 2015 to 2020 Capital Improvement Program Program. C. I. P. Agenda Item eight Council Bill 118474 relating to the North Precinct Project and the Department of Finance and Administrative Services amending ordinance 124648, which adopted the 2015 budget authorizing the loan of funds from the city's consolidated residual cash pool or its participating participating funds in the amount of 2,750,000 to the 2016 Bond Fund for bridge financing of the North Precinct Project establishing a budget control level in the 2016 Multipurpose Let's Go Bond Fund increasing 2015 appropriations of 1,500,000 in the 2016 and the 2016 Multipurpose Go Bond Fund and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts all by a three fourths vote of the City Council. The committee recommends the Council bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Gordon. Council Bill 1184785 is a bridge loan for the North Precinct Project. The loan is for 2.75 million and increases the 2015 appropriation of 1.5 million in the 2006 Multipurpose LTG o fund and will be repaid by 2016. LTG o bond. We urge passage. Thank you. Questions or comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. I got in, Carol. I O'Brien. Hi. Okamoto. Rasmussen. I want back here. I am President Burgess. Eight in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read items nine and ten. Agenda items nine and ten appointment 179 an appointment 178. The appointment of Marissa 810 Ameera as members Seattle Music Commission for a term of confirmation two May 1st, 2018 and the reappointment of Douglas Araf as member Museum Development Authority Council for Term of Confirmation to July 12, 2018. The Report of the Planning, Land Use and Sustainability Committee Agenda Item 11

Council Bill 118407 relating to land use, zoning and environmental policy. Thank you. Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. This is what we refer to as the omnibus bill. It comes through the land use committee. Every year, 18 months or so. It's a multiple page document that has a series of clean up pieces of legislation that staff basically accumulates over the course of a year or so. We've had a chance to review this legislation in committee over three different meetings and took public comment on this. At this point, there are three amendments that are on the agenda today to consider. And I want to talk through those in order just to clarify for folks. This omnibus bill is legislation that amends the current law. All three amendments we

're talking about today are going to amend the omnibus bill by removing a portion. So these amendments would make the current law stay exactly as it is today. So it's a little confusing because we're amending a bill that amends it to undo it. So the First Amendment, I would like to put forward amendment number one, which I would move and ask for a second. This amendment relates to Wallingford design guidelines. So the omnibus legislation makes changes to the map where Wallingford design guidelines apply. The Wallingford community had concerns about these changes and had not had a chance to be briefed on it. They raised those concerns in committee. At committee. We asked for an amendment. It wasn't prepared at the last committee meeting, so they brought that after discussion of committee. They brought that amendment to us today. This amendment would remove those map changes so the underlying existing current law would continue to apply. That would give the community time to hear why DPD would like to change that, and those could be considered at a future piece of legislation. I would go ahead and ask for a vote or questions on amendment number one, I guess. Questions or comments on the First Amendment. All in favor of approving amendment number one on the Wallingford design guidelines. Vote I. I oppose vote no. The amendment is adopted. Councilmember Harold, do you want to address amendment number two? Oh, I will. Amendment number two basically asked that Section eight of the omnibus legislation be removed, which would have been consistent then with what the department actually submitted for approval to the committee. Let me give a little background. If you look at the central staff's preparation of the committee discussions, they make it very clear what the purpose of an omnibus bill is. I'll just read from both memos, General. Generally, the omnibus bill corrects typographical errors, corrects cross-references, clarifies existing regulations, and makes other minor amendments identified by DPD in the course of code administration. The Omnibus Omnibus bill is not intended to be a vehicle for addressing significant policy issues. So I think Councilmember Brian and the committee that approved Section eight had some good intentions in mind about how we protect neighborhoods from developers circumventing the system, using what can be called loopholes and that kind of thing. And certainly we are now having discussions where we want to prohibit, discourage and not have that kind of activity. What we do know, though, is in 2016, the HALA Committee will look at design review and the HALA Committee will recommend that the program be streamlined, streamlined to facilitate quicker review. And so, in essence, what I'm asking for is a striking of Section eight, which basically modifies the design review process. I think it's very appropriate had that discussion and Hala actually looks at through the design review process, we may you, I think, fully unde

rstand that we will be asking developers, we're going to look for opportunities to streamline the design review process in certain circumstances. So basically what I am suggesting is that we remove this and be consistent with what DPD originally planned. Make sure that in the HALA process that we look closely at the design review process and then make sure we come up with our policy recommendations. And again, I started this by saying the purpose of an omnibus bill are pretty much typographical errors and technical clean ups. And I think we have to have more conversation when we start looking at the design review process. So I think a striking section in it would be appropriate. Do you want to move your amendment? So I move my amendment with strikes, section eight. And I asked Councilmember Brown what he gave me, a courtesy second. Courtesy second. And I'll say everything I just said all over again. So what this basically does is. We're not going to allow that. Okay. All right. We have proposed amendment number two design review in front of us. Councilmember Bagshaw, I. Think you have a question actually. This is going to be addressed to the two of you. And help me understand this. My goal is to make sure that neighborhoods have the opportunity to weigh in when we've got development proposed that are on lots that are close. And I agree with what Councilmember Harrell was saying about having a full

review, and I'm all in on that. But my understanding of what Councilmember O'Brien is suggesting is that in the interim, that if develop if there's development planned on two adjoining lots, that Councilmember O'Brien's amendment would require design review in the neighborhood before both are given authority to proceed. That's the direction that I want to vote. So I'd like some clarification between the two of you. I think your understanding is correct. I mean, it's nothing else. I think you have a correct understanding. You know, when I use the term design review, a full design review is about 18 to 20 month and administrative review is 13 or 14. And the streamline reviews 8 to 9 months. And the OHA is going to look at all the review process and come up with strong recommendations. But you are correct that Councilmember Bryant's amendment addresses the situation you talked about. That's a member. O'BRIEN And so thank you, Councilmember Harrell, for bringing this forward. This amendment is an amendment that the committee put in and added to the bill. It wasn't a deputy's request. I think there's always a fair question to ask of what's appropriate for an omnibus bill or not. My intent in bringing this amendment forward, not the amendment we're discussing today, but the one that was already in the bill that's before us was to really honor the intent of the Council in regards to design review and what size projects should be going through that. Councilmember Harrell is correct in saying that there is an ongoing review of the design review process which will

I likely see recommendations later this year and legislation sometime in 2016. To Councilmember based on his point, my intent with the legislation is it is that it would go ahead and bring these changes to date recognizing that sometime next year we may modify that when we consider the broader design review package. One just correction. I believe, Councilmember Harrell, that next year this will be taken up probably in the land use committee, not the whole committee. The whole committee will delegate that to the land use committee next year. Any other questions or comments. So we're voting on amendment number two related to design review, which deletes section 23.40 1.00, four point a eight and all in. Sorry. Yeah, I think. I think it's good to discuss this. Oh, I'm sorry. If I could just clarify one thing, Councilmember Gunn. So I will be voting no on this amendment and Councilmember Harrell's amendment to leave the legislation as it was previously amended in committee. Thank you, Councilmember Gordon. I was just going to repeat that, that I would also be voting. You know, it does seem to me that it requires more discussion. It seems to take away a portion of design review. It makes it more difficult for neighborhoods. And I think that this that I would like to vote no on this one. Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions? Councilmember Harrell Yeah, I want to make it crystal clear to that. I think it does warrant more discussion and that's why I am supporting it. And I had a note from central staff that that the holler would be making some rec and a recommendation to pretty much streamline some design review process. I think we all want to protect neighborhoods. I don't think there's any debate, a debate about that. We want to make sure that it's done thoughtful at a time where we're going to try to increase housing. So, again, I don't think it should be put in an omnibus bill. That's really the point. I'm not going to defend the pros and cons of the merits of this legislation. I just think it's a little dangerous to sort of do a one off during an omnibus omnibus legislation. I think that's that's the only point I wanted to make. Thank you. Any other comments or questions? All right. So this is amendment number two to delete Section eight of 23.40 1.00488. All in favor of the amendment vote. I. I. I. I. Nice try. All opposed vote. No, no. Sorry Bruce. Seven eight. I didn't I didn't complete. One in favor. Seven opposed. The amendment fails. There's two in. There. Were there. John was also. Oh I'm sorry. Two. Okay. Two in favor, six opposed, same result. All right, amendment number three, Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. So I will go ahead and move. Amendment number three, relating to citation option. The citation option for noise variance. If I could get a second. Second. All right. So this is an amendment that we did not discuss in committee. So I want to just take a second to explain it in the omnibus legislation as proposed

by DPD. Let me say first, the current law for a noise ordinance violation on a construction project gives the APD. The only option is to issue a stop work order. The legislation, as proposed by DPD would allow a separate path where they could also issue a citation. The reason I'm proposing this amendment is concern was raised in public comment over this, and I neglected to actually have a chance to discuss that in the committee. And so, without further discussion, my recommendation at this point would go ahead and remove that language. The DPD had proposed to leave the underlying current law, as is, until there's an opportunity to future time to fully discuss that. The

report of the full council agenda item one Resolution 31613 Creating the Demographic Data Task Force to recommend strategies to standardize and disaggregate demographic data used by city departments in allocating resources and developing city policies, programs and services. Introduced September eight, 2015. Thank you. Councilmember O'Brien. Excuse me, Okamoto. Thank you. It's getting to be a long day here. Yes, we always have it. Yes, yes. So have you. As you have heard me speak in the past about data, disaggregation and the importance of it. As the city becomes more and more diverse, we're finding new populations moving into our city, populations that have service needs but unfortunately are often invisible by government and the services we provide. For example, federal and city race data both for diverse immigrant and refugee communities from Europe, the Middle East and North Africa into the white category. Those from other parts of Africa into the black category, and immigrants and refugees from more than 25 unique countries and cultures into the Asian American and Pacific Islander category. The reality is, though, as we lump these different, diverse refugee and immigrant groups into these larger categories, we often miss their their unique needs that they have because their data and their needs are masked within these larger groups. I convened a group of data managers from several departments with the support of the Mayor, and in our discussion we determined that data is collected and analyzed in different ways across different departments. Some departments use federal data, which is often our data or has a high margin of error. In other cases, departments just captured data on populations they serve, but not on populations that they should be serving but aren't being collected. This resolution today takes a step forward on what we've learned. And basically, in a nutshell, it creates a task force made up of data managers from departments and offices across the city to find ways to standardize and just aggregate data and make it easily accessible for policymakers and make major administrative decisions when it relates to our services and allocation of resources. This task force will will come back to the City Council and make recommendations on what's needed to, again, both st

andardize and desegregate data so that we aren't missing high risk populations that need our services. I urge you to support this resolution. Thank you. Questions or comments? All in favor of adopting Resolution 31613 vote. I oppose Vote No. The resolution is unanimously adopted and the chair will sign it. The last item on our agenda today is consideration of an administrative appeal. The City Council will now consider an administrative appeal to an exclusion issued to an individual on August 13, 2015. The question before the Council is whether the decision to exclude this individual from council meetings for a period of 20 days should be sustained. Those in favor of sustaining the exclusion will vote, ie. Those opposed to sustaining the exclusion will vote no on August 13, 2015. Marguerite Richard was served with an exclusion notice. At the full council meeting on Monday, August three, 2015, the presiding officer repeatedly directed Ms. Richards to end her comments at the expiration of the allotted time. Ms. Richards ignored those directions and continued to shout from the podium and it became necessary for the Presiding Officer to request the assistance of our security officers to remove her from council chambers. On Tuesday, August four, 2015, at the park's Seattle Center Libraries and Gender Pay Equity Committee. Ms.. Richards engaged in similar behavior and continued to shout from the audience for several minutes after the expiration of her allotted public comment time. She ignored repeated requests from the presiding officer to stop this behavior and again was escorted from the chambers on Tuesday, August 11, 2015, at the Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods Committee meeting. Ms.. Richards engaged in similar disruptive behavior by talking past her allotted time and then disregarding repeated directions to end her disruption, leading the presiding officer to request that she be escorted from the chambers. The same behavior was repeated at the Finance and Culture Committee meeting on Wednesday, August 12, 2015. Are there any questions or comments from council members? Those in favor of sustaining the exclusion vote by those opposed to sustaining the exclusion vote no. The motion carries and the exclusion remains in effect. Is there any other business to come before the council? Thank you. We are adjourned. Agenda Item 38 Council Bill 118484 relating to the Cedar River watershed authorizing five years of ecological thinning in accordance with the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and sections 15, 16, 21 and 22. Township 22, North Range seven, East W.M. Sections eight and nine, township 22, North Range eight, East W M Sections two and 11. Township 21, North Range nine East W.M. Sections 34 and 35. Township 22, North Range nine East W.M. Sections three, four and ten. Township 21, North Range ten, East W.M. and sections 32 and 33. Township 22, North Range ten East W m declaring the logs resulting from the

ecological thinning

to be surplus to the city's needs, authorizing the sale of such logs pursuant to applicable city contracting and surplus property sale procedures and directing deposit of the proceeds therefrom to the Water Fund. For the purposes of the Habitat Conservation Plan implementation, the committee recommends a Council bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you. This ordinance will authorize Seattle Public Utilities to enter into a contract for five years of forest thinning projects. And these do have ecological benefits in our Cedar River habitat as part of the conservation plan. It authorizes the sale of surplus logs that result from the ecological thinning. I actually went out and looked at the site. The thinning activities are really small in comparison to what I think some people were concerned about. We're not going in and taking out old growth. It ultimately helps us with the water quality and the timber revenues are not that significant. They thin the the the forest generally with some things that are smaller in size, but then it'll result in about \$40,000, which will be deposited in the water fund to offset the costs of implementing the plan. The design is to improve forest health. It also will decrease forest fires possibilities and it is consistent with our habitat management practice and we recommend approval. Thank you. Questions or comments? This is item 38, correct? Correct. Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Harrell I look at it. I o'brien. I, okamoto. Rasmussen I so want I shot. I. Got in I am president Burgess high nine and favorite on the post. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item 39 to the first semicolon. Agenda item two Council Bill 118491 authorizing the acceptance of the grant of an easement for public access over and across a portion of the property commonly known as Old Fire Station seven, located at 402 15th Avenue East in exchange for the city's extinguishment of certain deed restrictions. Encumbering Title to Fire Station seven and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The Committee recommends the Council bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Licata. This is legislation that resulted in converting some parking space in front of the old fire station seven on Capitol Hill on 15th Avenue east into basically a mini park, an open area. And we were able to do that by the city, allowing for easement of public access. In exchange, we dropped some of the covenants around the property that were no longer relevant. We did retain three important ones. The building and site improvements should not be altered in exterior appearance or from the original exterior configuration. In other words, we're not going to go back to a parking space. We'll keep it an open public space the second that the building and say improvements may be maintained in good and sound state of repair. We want to make sure that's maintained. And third, the grantee shall maintain, repair, repaint and refurbish the

building as necessary to comply with the second condition, as well as making sure that everything is as functioning in the building as well. So this is a great tradeoff. The community has gained some open space. We've allowed the people in the building to assure that they'll maintain that space as well as the building was a historic building. Thank you. Thank you. Questions or comments? Councilmember Rasmussen. Thank you. I see Councilmember Licata in the fiscal note. There's reference to a historic preservation deed. Would you describe that, please? Is this landmarked? I believe it is red marked. It's been a historic building for a long time. I think it was decommissioned as a fire station maybe as long ago as the early sixties or so. I know I moved to Capitol Hill in the early seventies and by that time it had been already converted to a community use. It looks landmarked. I was wondering whether that had been formalized. I. I assume so, but I, I can't guarantee that. Other question. All right. Well, we can check into that. Thank you. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Look at her. Hi, O'Brien. Hi, Okamoto. I rasmussen. I want. I. Back shot. I got it. I Harrill I am president burgess. Nine In favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Adoption of other resolutions. We will now consider resolution 31615 as introduced to today's meeting. Council members want. Councilmember O'Brien. Excuse me. Well, if I could just make a quick comment to clarify something that happened during public comment on the resolution regarding their use of youth detention. Someone commented that they appreciated how quickly that passed, and I just want to clarify that we just passed to refer it on to the Public Safety Committee meeting Wednesday at 2:00. So it hasn't actually passed out yet. There will be discussion and debate there. Thank you for the clarification. Councilmember Swan. Thank you, President Burgess. I want to thank you all who came today, especially members from the Seattle Education Association, those who spoke at public comment. I especially appreciate your presence here because I know that your more important work is to be on the picket lines and to be discussing

with your fellow members. So it's your presence here is, you know, really noted. And I'm sure many of you haven't slept well in many nights over the past decade, as we've seen, public education has come under a ferocious assault by successive Republican and Democratic administrations across the country. We've seen schools being deeply underfunded and forced to teach more and more to standardized testing. There have been attempts to dismantle public education, first with vouchers and now with charter schools. And education unions have been attacked with anti-union legislation and court battles here in Washington state. We know the Supreme Court has deemed the legislature to be criminally underfunding public education in this context. The strike of our Seatt

le educators to fight for this cause Seattle deserves is truly historic pay, and ours for educators is absolutely vital. Outrageously, the district wants to extend the workday for teachers by 30 minutes per day without paying teachers for this. And we have to note, this is also a women's rights issue in the face of gender persistent gender inequality, gender pay disparity, because this is a profession that is that has majority women educators. Unfortunately, though not surprising, the stories that have been real of buy lose distortions by the Seattle Times on your demand on pay. But what's heartening is to see that the community is clearly, clearly rejecting those lies and is on your side unambiguously. But in addition to your own pay and hours, you're also fighting to stop those serious racial biases that persist in school discipline. You're fighting to limit the overreliance on high stakes testing. Even equity in recess time for elementary school students in different schools is something the union has had to fight for. And you won a significant victory in the face in the form of a minimum 30 minute recess. You're also fighting for caseload caps, for special education so that students can get the support that they need. If the union wins on these demands. It will be a huge step forward. A victory for students and educators that make up Seattle Public Schools. However, a victory for the union will also be a victory for education around the country because it will show that if we organize and remain united, we can resist the attacks against public education. It will also be a victory for all workers in Seattle who will be emboldened to organize in unions and campaign to have a say in their workplaces. This resolution gives the Council support for the work that all educators do. And. I wanted to congratulate President Jonathan Knapp of the Seattle Education Association, your negotiating team that has worked so hard over months, led by Phyllis Component, the vice president of the union, and all the members of your union who have stood strong not only for teachers, but for public education. I really commend you. And I also wanted to thank all my colleagues for all the involvement, the advice you provided and for supporting the resolution. Lastly, I wanted to say this. There is a crisis in funding for public education, but the solution to that is not to shortchange teachers unions, but for the school board to concede on these reasonable demands and fight with the union for full funding of public public education throughout the state. And really, one of the best ways to help end the school to prison pipeline is to fully fund public schools and give the educators a fair contract. I do want. To mention that I have donated \$500 to the Seattle Education Association Strike Fund. I will be donating another \$500, and I would urge all my colleagues to also do the same so that we have a real show of support for your you know, for your action. Right. Any commen

ts or questions. All those in favor of adopting. Excuse me. I was going to say something. Councilmember Help! Please make it short and sweet. I want to correct the record since we're correcting record on the Garfield situation. I met my mother and father went to Garfield, too. I wouldn't be alive if it weren't for Garfield, by the way. So Bruce got a little deeper than my older son graduate from Garfield. Thank you for this fight. I support this legislation almost, I would say unconditionally. You're showing leadership to these children. Last weekend, I had an opportunity to to go in the locker room of some of your students before what they call the Memorial Classic. And these are students that I don't know if it's good or bad for them. They have to practice on their teams, but they're not in school. And so it's a weird dynamic here. And I just briefly talked to them on the sidelines about what they're going through. They are the most important and they are behind you so strongly. I was I was I was pleasantly surprised by that. And I think many of, you know, my my daughter graduated from Cleveland High School last year, and I testified in front of the school district several times as a PTSA representative. And I was very angry, too, at a few things. So I say this to say that it is just simply my honor to support you. You are doing this critical work with passion, with commitment. You went to school for the noble cause to help others, and I don't think there is anything any stronger than that. So thank you. And so let's make a lot of noise. Let's end

this strike. Let's protect your rights. Let's win. Thank you very much. As long as we're giving our Garfield credentials. My older brother graduated from Garfield. More importantly, all three of my daughters graduated from Garfield. So we really appreciate where Garfield Garfield does. And to echo what Councilmember Harrell said, I think the people of Seattle understand the importance of education. We see that repeatedly when the district's levies pass. We saw it last November when the preschool measure passed overwhelmingly. We want to invest in the future of our children, and we do that with them and with you to make sure that they receive the the education that they deserve so that every one of them has a strong and fair start as they pursue their education in their life. All those in favor of adopting Resolution 31615 indicate by voting I. I opposed vote no. The resolution is unanimously adopted. So what do we do? Thank you. Thank you. The council will adjourn in a moment and then we will reconvene. Right. So we're just going to repeat one little element here. If the clerk would read the title of the resolution, please. Okay. We're done with that part of the title. Yeah, we're done with the resolution. So now we're going to do this. So at this point, we are going to do a little special business. Ready actually that our guest. This will be interesting. At this time the council will consider other b

usiness. And I would ask the clerk to read into the record the findings of the Public Employment Relations Committee decision. Notice to employees. State law gives you the right to form, join or assist an employee organization union bargain collectively with your employer throughout a union chosen by a majority of employees. Refrain from any or all of these activities, except you may be required to make payments to a union or charity under a lawful union security provision. The Washington State Public Employment Relations Commission conducted a legal proceeding and ruled that the city of Seattle committed an unfair labor practice and ordered us to post this notice to employees. We unlawfully changed represented employees working conditions by charging an employee with a violation of the code of ethics and initiating charges at the Seattle Ethics and Elections Commission. S.E.C. After we had previously disciplined the employee for the same misconduct to remedy our unfair labor practices, we will close the SCC investigation of Ron Allen's October 2010 misconduct. We will notify IBEW Local 77 and Allen in writing of the date that the case is closed, we will follow the disciplinary process in the collective bargaining agreement . We will notify the union of proposed changes to working conditions and bargain upon request. We will not unilaterally change represented employees working conditions or implement proposals that have not been bargained to agreement or impasse. We will not in any other manner interfere with restrain or coerce our employees in the exercise of their collective bargaining rights under the laws of the State of Washington. Thank you. We've satisfied the notice requirement. At 10 minutes to three, the Council will reconvene as the Select Committee on the Central Waterfront and we are adjourned. The Report of the Education and Governance Committee Agenda Item 13 Council Bill 118503 relating to city employment, commonly referred to as the second quarter 2015 Employment Ordinance establishing new titles and or salaries designating positions as exempt from civil service status. Amending Seattle Invisible Code Section 4.13.01 No amending Seattle in this code. Section 4.72.080 and ratifying, confirming certain prior acts all by a two thirds vote of the city council. The committee recommends the Council bill pass. Thank you. This is routine legislation that we get each quarter related to the city employment roster and also positions that are exempted from civil service status. It establishes a new title and rate of pay for electrical inspectors. It removes ten positions and makes them exempt from civil service. And it amends the municipal code to update the exempt list of civil service exempt positions. Questions or comments. Please call the role on the passage of the Bill O'Brien. Hi, Okamoto. Hi, Rasmussen. All right. So, want back shot? Got him. Hi, Harold Licata. I am President Burgess High nine favorite and opposed. The bill passes an

d the chair will sign it. Please read item 14. Agenda Item 18 Council Bill 118490 related to the Appropriations for Seattle Center amending Ordinance 124648, which adopted the 2015 budget amending Ordinance 124349, which adopted the 2014 budget, lifting a proviso and changing appropriations within the Seattle Center Department. The committee recommends the bill pass as amended. Thank you, Councilmember Gordon. This bill will lift a proviso and change appropriations within the Seattle Center Department. It will allow for the use of funds originally allocated to a memorial stadium action plan to go forward with a strategic parking study and real estate consultant, which are critical in the next steps to guiding the redevelopment of both the Seattle Center, Northeast Quadrant and the Uptown Urban Center. The committee recommends approval.

Questions or comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the Bill. O'Brien. Okamoto. All right. Rasmussen. All right. So what? I shot Gordon. I. Harrell the Carter II and President Burgess nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item 19. The Report of the Transportation Committee Agenda Item 28 Council Bill 118482 relating to an open space improvements over and across Utah Avenue south between South Stacy Street and South Lander Street. Councilmember Rasmussen. Thank you. This council bill would renew a ten year permit to maintain a pedestrian plaza that's in front of the large former Sears building on south Utah. It is for a period of ten years and the annual fee would be \$21,800 per year. The pedestrian plaza is there now and it has been working very well for pedestrian safety and for all of the residents of the tenants in the large building to produce an enjoyment. And the committee recommends approval. Questions or comments. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. OKAMOTO Excuse me. O'Brien Hi. Okamoto. Rasmussen I. Want. I. Fracture Gordon. I. Harrell Lakota. I am president Burgess 90 favorite and opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign that please read items 29 through 36. Agenda items 29 and 30 appointments 165 and 168. The appointment of Kevin Duffy Greaves as member Seattle Transport Transit Advisory Board for a term of confirmation confirmation to August 2nd, 2017, and the appointment of Celeste Gillman as member of Seattle Transit Advisory Board for a term of confirmation. Agenda Item 21 Council Bill 118589 relating to Seattle Public Utilities authorizing the Director of Seattle Public Utilities to enter into an interlocal agreement with Kitsap County to acquire light detection and ranging data and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you. This is the last item from Seattle Public Utilities. This legislation authorizes an inner local agreement between Seattle Public Utilities and Kitsap County. The agreement would allow SPU to acquire LIDAR data, which

stands for light distance and Ranging that will be used for Seattle Public Utility Service Areas and other city department purposes. We're also being joined by King County in this and the common purposes and uses for this imagery will be landslide risk modeling. The data will be acquired as part of a project with King County and other cities. So we're sharing the cost in the region, and it results in an economy of scale and cost sharing that will be very useful for SPRO. We recommend approval. Thank you. Questions or comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Back shot. By. Gordon Gonzalez, Harrell. Licata II. Rasmussen and President Burgess. Seven in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Report of the Transportation Committee. Please read item 22. Great questions or comments. Those in favor of confirming Mr. Strong vote. I oppose vote no. The confirmation is confirmed. The report of the Public Utilities and Neighborhoods Committee. Please read item number 39. The report The Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item 39 Council Bill 118 584 Relating to Historic Preservation, imposing controls upon the Seattle Post-Intelligencer Globe, a landmark designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board under Chapter 25.12 of the code, and adding it to the table of historical landmarks contained in Chapter 25.32. Mr.. The Committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Harrell. Thank you very much. I am filling in for Councilmember Bagshaw on this. This is a historic designation for the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Globe I think you've been in Seattle for any period of time. You've probably seen it at least once. A little background on it. It was actually built in 1948 and it was originally located on the pie building at Sixth Avenue and Wall Street. And then in 1947, the newspaper held a contest for it. Well before that, the newspaper had held a contest for an emblematic sign to mark their newly completed building in a University of Washington art student Jack Corsage concept was selected and that was over 350 entries. And of course, his idea is to create a curved map of the world to be located above the main entrance for the flashing lights. And that would connect Seattle to other world sites with important news. So the Globe remained in its original position until the P-I relocated to a new facility on Elliott Avenue West in 1985. And in January of 1986, the Globe was split, split at the equator into two hemispheres and strapped to flatbeds and carefully tucked to its present location, where it sits on the roof, facing, facing out to Elliott Bay. So that globe is about 30 feet in diameter. It's capped by an impressive 18.5 tall neon eagle. It's wrapped by a revolving neon sign that reads It's in the P-I. It's in its entirety. The structure is estimated to weigh about 18.5 tons. So this landmark was nominated by councilmembers Gordon and Burgess and former council member Clarke s

hortly after the Post-Intelligencer transitioned to an online news resource and vacated their building on Elliott Avenue. So this historic designation will control the entire globe, but doesn't include the structural steel base or the penthouse closure and the building upon which it sits. We want to thank those councilmembers for that idea, and with that, the committee recommends designation and the historical designation for the Globe. Thank you very much. The council members at the time, who were all former journalists, council member, Guardian Council member, Clark and myself thought it would be great to preserve this landmark in our city. And I want to recognize former P-I columnist, council member Gordon. So very, very pleased that we're finally able to conclude this historic designation. It's something that we've been working on ever since the epic lows, since we got that final print edition of the PI that said You meant the world to me and there was a picture of the globe on it. It is a symbol of competitive journalism. It is a symbol of our faith in having the news reporting to us fairly and accurately. And I am very, very pleased to take my last vote virtually on this council after 12 years on this particular item. Thank you so much. You're welcome. Thank you.

Councilmember Rasmussen. Just a technicality. And I don't want to take any longer than we took to discuss the council rules. But who owns this and is not required to be attached to the building where it is now? So how does this work? It is it just whoever happens to own it has to save it in perpetuity. Maybe. Councilmember Gordon, do you want it? Councilmember Gordon does not own it now. The Museum of History and Industry does. And I think there's still negotiations for where it will ultimately occupy, but it's being allowed to stay where it is for now. All right. Thank you. Other questions. But just. Thanks for saving me on that. Yeah, you're welcome. Always happy to help. But question number here. Item 39. Please call the role on the passage of council bill 118584. Garden. I. Gonzalez Harrell, Licata O'Brien, Rasmussen on President Burgess ii8 in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read item 40. The resolution is unanimously adopted and the chair will sign it. The report. Thank you. Report of the Finance and Culture Committee. Please read item five. The Report of the Finance and Culture Committee. Agenda number five Council 118 489 relating to taxicab transportation network company and for hire vehicle drivers in many section 6.3 10.1 ten of the seven. Mr. Code adding a new section 6.3 10.7 35 to the code and authorizing the election of driver representatives. The committee recommends the bill passes amended. Thank you, Councilmember. I'll turn. It over. Thank you. Um, this ordinance is, I'm sure you're all aware of, relates to a taxi cab transportation network company and for hire vehicle drivers. It's actually probably historical or a history

setting in what we are attempting to do here to advance the rights of drivers. But I am not the main sponsor. Councilmember O'Brien is and I'm going with the council bridges presence agreement will turn the floor over to customer O'Brien, who will speak and to it and describe it in greater detail. Thank you. Yes, please, Councilmember O'Brien. Okay. Thank you. Excuse me. Some colleagues. I would I'll speak to this briefly. And then we have two sets of amendments that I'd like to propose we walk through. I haven't heard any questions or concerns about those in the last few days, so I don't know that there's any controversy around those. And then we can have the final package before us and have a discussion about that would be my proposal, unless someone would rather us go a different route. I'll just briefly say in my opening that the intent behind this legislation is consistent with a lot of the things we've been doing in a city, which is to try to make sure we set the landscape in our city, create an environment where workers in our community have a chance to be treated fairly and have a living wage. And we're seeing a lot of innovation and a lot of changes in the workplace in recent years for a whole variety of reasons. And in this particular industry, in the for hire taxi and taxi industry, which is regulated in Seattle, we're seeing a lot of changes that has been very disruptive. Some folks have benefited from that disruption. We hear from a lot of folks that appreciate the new technology and how that creates new opportunities for folks. The intent of this legislation is frankly to create a regulatory environment where innovation can continue to happen, but not at the expense of the workers continue to happen, but to the benefit of those workers so that the companies can be successful. So the customers have access to the services they want, but all done in a way so that the drivers, in this case the workers, have some say in the terms of their employment and can make sure that they will continue to have access to lift their families out of poverty into these middle class jobs. We passed this out of committee almost two months ago, and we take the unprecedented step of taking a significant amount of time to have some of our experts at the city do a very thorough review of this legislation. The first set of amendments that I want to speak to is what's being recommended by our law department. And so

that would be to substitute version five for version four. That is a series of amendments that our law department believes supports the intent of the legislation as originally discussed in committee, but is a more robust approach to that. The second set of amendments that I'll speak to in a second has also been reviewed by the Law Department and Finance Administrative Services, the division of the city that administers this part of the taxi code. These are not legal in nature. They're more technical in nature, but they've been reviewed by folks on b

oth sides. And I believe that they're kind of clean up in nature. So I will go ahead and move to substitute version five for version four. That's the document that's on on the website and on our devices that can. It's moved in second and that we substituted version five for version four. Are there any questions or comments? All in favor of the motion. Vote I. I oppose vote no. The motion is adopted. We have version five in front of us. And so now I would like to move to substitute version six for version five. So this builds on what the law department has the base of the legislation before us. And this is a series of amendments, as I mentioned, that are more technical in nature, not legal in nature, but address some of the concerns about how the city would actually administer this. So I would move that. It's moved and seconded that we substitute version six for version five. This is progress. Any questions or comments? Councilmember Gordon Well, I'm just very, very pleased to be able to support this ordinance as an active card carrying union member myself. I want to extend that opportunity to other workers that I have been able to enjoy, and I hope that this will enable them to negotiate with their employer for wages, for good working conditions and for benefits. Thank you for introducing this. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Gordon. Motion before us as to substitute version six for version five. All in favor of the motion vote. I oppose vote no. The motion carries unanimously. We have version six in front of us. So again, I'll keep my comments just brief. We've had a lot of discussion about this. I'm open to answer any questions or thoughts. I imagine they might have a little discussion here. And then council president would like to be able to just wrap up at the conclusion of that. Yes. Why don't I just leave my comments at that for now. All right. Questions or comments? Council member Swan. Rasmussen was before. Please go ahead. Sisters and brothers, thank you for being here. For what I think is the spouses will be a historic step towards offering collective bargaining rights for. Otherwise precarious workers. All of those stalled my comments by echoing the comment by my sister, Marcia Boxer, when she said Uber does not share and does not care. I think that is absolutely correct. The sharing economy. The so-called sharing economy is nothing new. It is not innovative. Ever since sharecropping, the sharing economy has meant sharing in one direction. That is, workers have the privilege of sharing what they produce with their bosses. And just like in the past, these workers have to take out loans to buy a car to use for work. And then they are trapped by debt, by the sharing economy into the sharing economy. As other speakers have said, Uber drivers can be deactivated, which is a fancy word for being fired for no reason with no legal protection. Last week, Uber drivers in Seattle were asked to sign a new contract, agreeing that they are privat

e contractors and not workers and not eligible for worker rights. And just like for so many other precarious workers, such as adjunct professors and I used to be one of them, the free market, the so-called free market has given big business total dictatorial power to set the rates and conditions in the workplace. The important point here is that this situation is a reflection of the decimation of the union movement in the past many decades. Union density in the private sector has fallen to 6.6% in 2014, from a high of 33.9%. And as workers have lost that organized union movement to fight for our rights. Income inequality has skyrocketed. Median income has not kept up with inflation, and more and more workers have become precariously employed. Now, a full one third of US workers identify as freelance, and most of those are not six figure salary earning consultants for Microsoft. Most of those workers have precarious employment with virtually no rights in the workplace. All of this can start to be reversed by rebuilding the union movement. And by doing that, we can rebuild workers, pay benefits and conditions. This bill is passed, will be one step towards that process. And we should note that we do have power because without people to drive, Uber could not make a penny in profits. What the council is doing today. What the council is doing today is the easy part. Any council member who votes no on this will clearly be saying that they care more about the profits of a multibillion dollar company than the rights of Seattle workers. One argument. One argument I've. Heard is, isn't it just easier to legislate worker workers living in working conditions? Meaning, can we just have separate legislation on pay rates and so on? Why should we? Why

should the council be voting on allowing workers to have collective bargaining rights? Well, first of all, no. Workers themselves should have a say in negotiating their conditions. And I would like to remind my colleagues that the same council members who might be saying that workers rights can be legislated might be the same council members who voted against workers right to paid parental leave a couple of weeks ago, at which time they said, well, unions need to negotiate this. Well, I think one way or another, these are ways. These are excuses to deny workers their rights. And I think it's a very easy task for the council today to vote yes on this because it's straightforward. There is nothing complicated about it in terms of what workers will gain. The next step for drivers is far more difficult. Drivers will have to put in the long hours to actually build a union. You will have to go around talking to your coworkers. You will have to answer the big lies and myths that big business will continue to use to disrupt your efforts. You will continue to be risking deactivation and other intimidation tactics. But when you win, you will win a decent life for yourselves and your families, and you will be doing a huge serv

ice for other workers. Councilmember O'Brien for his work on bringing the legislation forward. I thank the Teamsters and other unions and the labor movement for doggedly fighting for workers rights. And I have the deepest respect for all the workers who have joined this fight, particularly the 200 Uber drivers who organized your own strike last year despite being denied any legal protections. You have shown all workers the courage you need to fight for a better world. And especially, I want to thank you for putting forward the idea of driver unity. Many of you have placards that say Driver Unity, taxi I based and for hire drivers have to unite. That is the only way forward. And the union member, myself, I'm proud to vote yes on this bill. Member of Rasmussen. Thank you very much. I am not a member of the committee and so I wasn't able to participate in the vote because I was attending another meeting away from City Hall. So I approached the legislation very carefully because of the controversy, weighing the pros and cons and the risk, because the legislation is, to the best of my knowledge, unprecedented. And everyone expects this ordinance to be challenged in the court. But to me, that's the cost of seeking innovative policies that address issues such as income inequality and working conditions. And Seattle is often led the way in innovative policies. If this city council or our previous ones were to be discouraged from enacting reform legislation because of the threats of lawsuits, we wouldn't have had our early open housing laws back in the sixties. Early laws protecting the LGBT community from discrimination. The \$15 minimum wage ordinance, local hiring, the mandatory sick leave ordinance. So this legislation is comprehensive. It's a bold approach to try to address the problem that several councilmembers have spoken about that our new economy is creating with workers who have few worker rights, who are given unilateral contracts without benefits, worker protection or minimum wages. So I'm happy to support this legislation, and I look forward to a positive outcome in the courts. It's a number of guns on. As many of you council members, fellow colleagues know, I'm the daughter of immigrant Mexican immigrant migrant farmworker parents. I'm also was a migrant farm worker myself. And I understand through that experience the importance of having a voice as a low wage worker when you are dealing with massive corporations and big interest who seek to make their money off of literally your family's back. I have always and I will continue to believe that the voice of workers is stronger when it is united and collective. Many of you in this room have been fighting that fight and have been building this movement slowly and every day, cautiously and carefully and with care for the workers that we as elected county elected officials are vested with the responsibility and the obligation and the moral duty to continue protecting. And I stand with each of yo

u in that fight and in continuing to build that movement. I believe that passage of this bill will benefit all of us in the city of Seattle, not just the drivers, but all of us, those of us who use it, those of us who want to use it. This is good policy for our city. And I ask all of us today to ask ask ourselves the question, do we want to use the law as a shield or do we want to use it as a sword? I say let's use it as a sword. Council member, Harris. Well, we have some gifted speakers up on this day, a story on all ends. You know, it's absolutely my pleasure to support it. And, you know, I'm looking at the vote count. You know, this this past seven and 7 to 0, no opposition out of committee. And then the two names that aren't on there already said they're supporting. And so I don't think it's a big mystery as to how this may what the outcome will be this afternoon. I do want to say a few things about moving forward. Many of you know my story and I've understood your story. I think we had about, what, 20, 23 meetings right here looking at this whole industry. And this has been an industry that was saved

and supported and built, quite frankly, by people that didn't even want these jobs, black and brown people, people from the Immigrant Refugee Committee and whites and others. Don't get me wrong. But these were jobs and no one were like clamoring around to. And these are unsafe jobs. And we get from that point to a point we're really trying to not only make sure the conditions and the competitive conditions for our employees are great and safe, but using this sort of as a catalyst for what's happening in this country, which is the labor movement, the labor movement is critical in what's happening in this country, that we do have to shift the balance of power. And so I look at this in the bigger scheme of things, of what we're trying to do in this this, this country. Now, I got to tell you, the work cannot stop here. And we had opposition or I should say concerns by many of my friends in the in the industry about whether their voice was heard. We have concerns from the executive. Valid concerns as to whether we have the resources to enforce this. We have concerns from our law department, valid concerns about whether this will be legally challenged. My attitude about that is that's the work that we've chosen to do, that none of this kind of work is is easy. It's hard work. And we have to, from this point on, keep plowing ahead, keep working with community, keep talking to everyone in the industry. We still have other issues in the taxi or what I call the legacy taxi industry that are completely unresolved in terms of how we issue licenses, who we listen, license licenses to, how the regulated industry competes with what's sort of an unregulated, unregulated industry with the the TNC. This is the beginning of something, certainly not the end. So for those who do have concerns, I don't think anyone's here today, I don't know, maybe three or four folk

s that have concerns. I just want to make impress upon you that the work is beginning now, not ending. And it's absolutely my pleasure to not only support this legislation, but to come in my colleagues for pressing through thoughtfully and committed to workers, to drivers and to the consumers out there that will now have options. So thank you very much. It's my honor to support this. Councilmember Liccardo. Well, this is a great example of what happens when you have good organizers in the community, Don, and the other folks from Teamsters, but also grassroots folks who recognize the need to improve their own living condition in concerts, listening. And in particular, I want to thank Councilmember O'Brien for really digging down and doing a lot of the hard work. Thank you. And also, as Councilmember Harrell had mentioned, the work isn't over. It's my understanding, in fact, that somehow maybe chairing a taxi committee next year. And so he may end up being a point person on this. So you'll be seeing more of him. I think overall, one of the things that O'Brien mentioned is important to keep in mind is that technology will continue to evolve. It will continue to create new challenges, but also continue to create new opportunities. And that means we have to look at our working conditions differently each time that technology changes. We have to look at the laws in force, and we have to look at how we change those laws to take advantage of the new technology, to make sure that there's room available for working people to exercise their rights. And that's what makes this legislation so unique. It's taking advantage and recognizing that technology has changed. We're not going to just step aside. We're going to actually work with it to improve people's lives by changing rules to allow workers an opportunity to have their needs expressed . Now, just this morning, the mayor did send a letter out and he made two very important points. One was that he's always supported the rights of workers to organize and to create a fair and just society. And the mayor has been very strong on that. And also that this would be the first jurisdiction in the nation to come up with this model. And that's a very important element we should keep in mind. And because the council here is so united in supporting this legislation, I believe the mayor's two concerns that he mentioned, which is cost, which is legitimate, and also the question of staffing, how we deal with the question of the duties that have been placed on the council. We can deal with those because I believe the council, given that we've studied this issue and now United moving forward, will work with the mayor and the various departments to make sure that this can be accomplished. And that's a very important road to go down. It's important point to keep in mind because we have to continue working together to make this success a success. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember O'Brien, you can close our discussion on thi

s. Thank you. I want to start by just thinking of my colleagues for on our last day of full council business and this session it's learning. I know you're relatively new, but you get to wrap this up with us. It's been great to work with you all on this on this piece of legislation. I think it's an example of the type of good work that we do here in the city. I also want to acknowledge some of my friends

who spoke today with concerns. I hope you continue to believe that my intent is to make sure that the people and the drivers and the workers in our community continue to have access to good wage jobs. And even if we disagree on this one, that we'll be back working together soon and have been all along. I want to thank so many folks. I'm not going to name my name, but in the law department who've done a lot of really hard work over the last few months to really do the research to help with the amended legislation that's before us today. I also want to thank folks in finance, administrative services, specifically the folks in the division that works on taxi industry to really help us think through this work. As others said, this isn't the end, but the beginning. There's more work to do there, but I really appreciate the collaborative process. Finally, I want to thank so many of you from the community. Whether you're drivers on various platforms today or whether you're just here in solidarity, in support of those for showing up today and over the past number of months to make sure that we in Seattle have a system that is fair for all the people in our honor society. So much about growing income inequality has been so devastating to communities around this country, and we're feeling it right here in Seattle. And I think this is an example of legislation that others have said allows our economy, our community, to continue to evolve and innovate, but ensures that as we do that, we do it in a way that's not a race to the bottom that benefits a few, but rather we do it in a way that sustains the whole community and lifts everyone up, especially those that are at the bottom who need access to opportunities. I firmly believe that this legislation is a great step in that direction. I'm thrilled to be able to vote yes on this in a few moments and look forward to working collaboratively with everyone as we move to implementation of this. Thank you. So in just a moment, we're going to call the roll on the passage of this bill. And then I'm confident that you will want to applaud and celebrate. But once that's over, we have about 45 other items to do. So as you leave, if you could take your conversations out to the foyer, that would really be helpful for us. Thank you very much. I would now ask the clerk to call the roll on council bill 118499. Version six. Gordon I. Gonzalez, I. Harrell Hi. Lakota. O'Brien Hi. Rasmussen All right, so. On. President Burgess High eight in favor and unopposed. The bill. Passes and the chair. Will sign. Very well. Well, thank you.

Thank you very much for coming down. Well, now move to the report of the Education and Governance Committee. Please read item. 634 of the Education and Governance Committee. Agenda number six Council 118 593 relating to city employment, commonly referred to as the fourth quarter 2015 Employment Ordinance establishing new salaries set implement 2016 increases required by ordinance 1244 Amending Ordinance 124 927 Increasing funds designated positions as exempt from civil service status and ratifying confirming certain perks all by 3/1 Item seven Council Bill 118 563 Relating to the rates, terms and conditions for the use and sale of electricity supplied by the city department. The committee recommends the bill pass. Customer swap. Thank you. This constable accepts the rates for City Light customers in the city of Lake Forest Park, and this was negotiated by that city. It will only affect the customers in that city. And in this case, the change will be that city light will start collecting a utility tax from Lake Forest Park customers on behalf of Lake Forest Park and then turn that money over to the city. The Energy Committee recommends that we pass this bill. Thank you. Councilmember Swan, are there any comments on this bill? I move to pass Council Bill 118563 and it's been moved in segment that the bill passed. Any additional comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Burgess. Gonzalez. Herbold Johnson Suarez O'Brien. Sergeant Bagshaw. President Harrell. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read this item each into the record. Thank you. Councilmember O'Brien, are there any other comments? Those in favor of adopting the resolution vote I high those oppose vote no the motion carries and the resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Next item, please. Agenda item number three Resolution 316 48 Relating to transportation, repealing and amending various sections of the Transit Master Plan as adopted by Resolution 313 67 and adopting new sections, the committee recommends the. Full council adopt the resolution as amended. Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. So the the main updates that are in the transit master plan, the first one is to reflect some of the voter approved priorities that are adopted in the MOVE Seattle levy, specifically that included seven new BRT corridors that will be funded through that levy. Those were not called out in the previous version of the transit master plan, so this will incorporate those seven bus rapid transit routes. Additionally, the previous transit master plan had called for a light rail to the Alaska junction in West Seattle. The current Sound Transit three study is studying light rail connections in two different connections in West Seattle one to the Delbridge

corridor or to the Alaska junction. So this would amend the transit master plan to have language to encompass the full range of options that Sound Transit three is discussing. Thank you,

Kathryn and Brian. Are there any other comments? Hearing that those in favor of adopting a resolution vote i. I those opposed vote no. The motion carries in the end the resolutions adopted and then chair will sign it. Is there any other further business to come before the council hearing? Then we are adjourned. Thank you very much. Agenda for the Report of the Energy and Environment Committee Council Bill 118630. To Build Energy Use Benchmarking and reporting directing the Office of Sustainability and Environment to make Building Energy Benchmarking Reports and where available and energy performance rating available to the public meeting sections to 2.9 20.0 60.125.170 of the Seattle Municipal Code and amending ordinance 124927, which adopted the 2016 budget, changing appropriations to various departments and building control levels and budget control levels and from various funds in the budget, all by a three quarter vote of the city council. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Sawant. Thank you, President Harrell. This is the first of the three pieces of legislation that have been developed by the Office of Sustainability and the Environment to require improved energy efficiency for existing large buildings. The city only requires energy benchmarking reports, which are basically an audit of how efficiently the buildings use energy in Seattle. This legislation makes that data, which until now hasn't been public to be public to be made publicly available. And when other cities have made this data public, we've seen that statistically it has had an impact in incentivizing building owners to make efficiency retrofit. So it makes sense. And as I've said before in our committee meetings, the efficient use of energy is a very good answer to the concerns that people might have about how protecting the environment might be at odds with also having good standards of living. And I think this is a good example because an energy efficient building uses less energy without loss of quality. We have and have had the technologies to live well without burning fossil fuels, without continuing to change the climate. And this legislation will go in the right direction by showing that, you know, if we have political will, we can actually make change. And I wanted to thank all the folks at the Office of Sustainability in Moman, many of whom who worked closely on it are here. Thank you so much. And also to environmental activists like the members of the Emerald Cities Coalition. And I also, as I did before, thank the having the labor representation also at Emerald Cities because we want to push forward the message that there is no dichotomy between these and living wage, unionized jobs and fighting for a clean environment . So thank you all. And the Energy and Environment Committee unanimously recommends putting this forward. Thank you. Councilmember Swann, are there any further comments? Councilmember O'Brien I'm kind of old school, so I still stand

up when I talk here. I'll get over it, I'm sure. I just think it's great that on February 29th we're passing this legislation to take a major leap forward on energy efficiency in buildings. I stole that from someone else, but it really is a great opportunity. As others have mentioned, this is just a win win win across the board. It's great to have labor partners that are excited to be out there trained and ready to do this work in living wage jobs. It's great that we have the expertise here in our city to make these investments. We have building owners that some of them are leading this charge, and the groups as a whole have done great work with the city to come to a place where they were supportive in their comments at the committee. And I want to thank all the folks in the Office of Sustainability Environment for the ongoing work. It's amazing that we have over 99% of the buildings, over 20,000 square feet in the city are up to date on their reporting requirement, which is if we could get 99% compliance on anything, I think we're doing an amazing job . Finally, I want to thank my colleague, Councilmember Swan, for your leadership on this, too. It's a great, great step forward. I'm excited about it. And we're making progress towards carbon neutrality by 2050, and I know we have a lot more work to do. Thank you, Councilmember Brenner. Any further comments from my colleagues, Councilmember Swan? Just very quickly, I wanted to say I fully agree with Councilmember O'Brien that if we had 99% compliance, for example, on labor law, this would be a very good city. And so I really second him on that. And also likewise, I wanted to thank him for his work on this legislation. Excellent. Outstanding hearing. No further comments. Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Berkshire. Burgess. Gonzalez. I herbold. Johnson. Suarez. O'Brien. So aren't. I. President Harrell. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it again. Item number five has been held. Please read agenda item number six into the record. Agenda item five Resolution 316 53. Adopting statements of legislative intent for the 2016 adopted

budget and to the excuse me, 2016 three 2021 adopted capital improvement program, introduced February 29th, 2016. Councilmember Burgess. Thank you. As we do each year after the budget is adopted, usually a few months later, we take all of these statements of legislative intent that were adopted with the budget. We assemble them into one place. And that's what this resolution does. It reflects the council's policy intent as it applies both to the 2016 budget and the 2016 to 2021 adopted capital improvement program. The slides here are modified slightly than what was passed council originally. For example, committee names have been changed to what they are today, and in some cases due dates have been revised. In all cases of due dates being changed, the primary sponsor of the slide was consulted in one slide regarding the inventor

y of natural capital. The mayors staff and the council staff agreed that some wording changes were appropriate to clarify a more tangible scope of work so that deliverables could be more easily identified. Thank you, Councilmember Burgess. I move to adopt resolution 31653. Second thing, further comments. All those in favor of the resolution vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. Resolution passes and I will sign this. That concludes our business. Is there any further business to come before the. No, that doesn't. Accrue to. Report. I'm sorry. One more item number six. Oh, I'm sorry. I was talking to my script here. Next agenda item. Oh, the big one. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yeah, I had a busy day here. Next agenda item. I'm sorry. Can we read all three at the same time? Let's read all three, please. The report. The full council agenda items. 133 Council 118 645 relating to city employment. Authorizing the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Seattle and Public Service and Industrial Employees. Local 1239 and ratifying confirming certain prior acts Council Bill 118 646 relating to city employment. Authorizing the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the city CEO and Teamsters Local Union Number 117 and ratifying confirming certain prior acts council bill 118 644 relating to city employment. Authorizing the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Seattle and Washington State Council of County and City Employees AFSCME Local 21 and ratifying confirming certain prior acts. All bills introduced March 21st, 2016. Thank you very much. So all three of these bills are basically giving the mayor the authority to implement a collective bargaining agreement between three different union bodies. All three of these agreements were established within the parameters established by the Seattle councils, the City Council's Labor Relations Committee. So the first one is an agreement between the public service and industrial employees. Local 1239. That agreement will last till the end of December 2018. And I should probably should have said that I am filling in for Councilmember Burgess in his absence on this legislation. That particular agreement with one, two, three nine affects up to 125 regular sitting employees and up to 225 active temporary employees. The second counts, Bill 118646 is between the city and the Teamsters local union. 117 And I think all of you are familiar with 117 and the agreement affects up to 15 regular city employees and up to 200 active temporary employees. Again, that agreement will last through the end of 12th December 2018. In the last bill, 118644 is between the city and the Washington State Council of County and City Employees f. S CME Local 21. And that agreement again last to the end of December 2018, and that affects up to 150 regular city employees. And contrary to some of the public testimony that you heard today, we believe that these these agreements

are acceptable to the employees, that their ability to to unionize and be a strong member of their respective unions strengthens our entire city and is for the benefit of our workers who mean the most to us. And so the certainly we recommend approval of these three agreements, which are all consistent with the parameters set by the Council's Labor Relations Committee. I move to pass in Lester. Any other comments? I will move to pass council bill 118645 second. Will the clerk please call the Roland? 118645. Johnson Suarez. O'Brian. Sergeant Bagshaw. Gonzalez. Purple I. President Harrell. All right. Eight in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. I move to pass council bill 118646. Will the clerk please call the roll for council bill 118646 Johnson Juarez. I hope. Brian Swan. Peg. John Gonzalez Purple. President Harrell. All right. Eight in favor and unopposed. The bill passes the chair was sign it I moved past council bill 118644. Will the clerk please call the roll for council? Bill 118644. Johnson Suarez. O'Brien. All right, so on. John Gonzalez Herbal I President Harrell. All right. Eight in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passed and the chair will sign it. Thank you very much. Report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. The report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts

Committee agenda item for Constable 118 649 Establishing the terms and conditions for members of the Labor Standards Advisory Commission. Amending Section 3.14 point 934 admissible code and ratifying confirmed research and prior acts. The bill passes and the chair was Wasatch. Report. Just 1/2. Reports of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee. Please read the report. The report at the Sustainability and Transportation Committee Agenda Item 13 Council Bill 118 643 Granting Quest Corporation DBA CenturyLink QC. Permission to maintain and operate an at grade fiber hut on the north side of Northeast 105th Street, east of Eighth Avenue, Northwest, and north of Algebra Place, north west for a ten year term renewal for two successive ten year terms specifying the conditions under which this permit is granted, providing for the acceptance, the permitting conditions and ratifying confirming research prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Brian. So the fiber, Heidi, is essentially what it sounds like. It's a little shack that holds some equipment at the end of a street in north Seattle. It's existing today and this renews the permit. We get a whopping \$200 per year for the right of this land. It's a relatively small footprint that's calculated based on the assessed value of the land and the neighborhood. Yeah, nothing more to say about that. Okay. Are there any further comments? Yes. Councilmember Burgess, thank you. I just want to clarify, I'm listed as an abstention in committee. I walked in for the next agenda item about 30 seconds before the committee

we voted on this item. So I just wasn't prepared to vote. That's why I abstained. Thank you councilmembers for that clarification. Any further comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. O'Brien. I picture bridges. Gonzales Herbold Johnson Suarez President Harrell II eight in favor not opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read and read items 14 through 16 together. Are there any comments regarding these appointments? Those in favor of confirming the appointments vote i. I those opposed vote no. The motion carries and appointments are confirmed. Report of the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee. Please read the report. The report of the Planning Lenses and Zoning Committee Agenda Items 11 and 12 Clerk File 314 127 Application of 2203 Eastlake Avenue, East LLC Theresa Land at 22 or three Eastlake Avenue East from neighborhood commercial one P 30 am low rise to residential commercial to neighborhood commercial to pedestrian 44 demolition of an existing structure and construction of a new five five story structure containing 45 residential units and below grade parking for 39 vehicles and 3006 square feet of commercial space at underground level, including 7800 cubic yards of grading. Can we recommend that the application be granted as condition and council? Bill 118 654 Ruling Challenges in Zoning Amending Chapter 23.32 zero occurred at Page 91 of the official land use map. Trees and property located 2203 and 2209 East Lake Avenue East from neighborhood commercial one pedestrian 30 and low rise to visit residential commercial to neighborhood commercial to pedestrian 40 and accepting a property using development agreement as conditioned of reason. Approval Committee recommends that the bill pass. Thank you so thanks for reading items 11 and 12 into the agenda at once. Councilmember Johnson, we have to be a little nimble here, so walk us through this legislation, please. So thanks. This is a property in the Eastlake neighborhood. If any of you have ever been to Serafina, it's just adjacent across the street. The committee went through the usual quasi judicial process on this. This matter went to the hearings. EXAMINER And the hearings. Examiner Recommended approval. And we have two items in front of us. One is the clerk file and one is the council bill. One of those authorizes us to execute the the what is commonly referred to as a put other the the for property use development agreements, land use development agreement in my head. But that's wrong. And we need to make a small amendment to the council bill because we had accidentally attached a draft version of the property use development agreement as opposed to the fully executed version in the in the amendments for today. So with Council President's approval, I would like to make a motion to substitute the current CUDA to the record for Council Bill 118654 and moved to amend Exhibit B by substituting an executive version of the Property Use Development Agreement

ent for the non executed version. Thank you very much. Is there a second. Second. Councilmembers move to amend Council Bill 118654, which is actually Exhibit B as he stated, all those in favor of the amendment vote I, I oppose vote no. The ayes have it and we have an amended council. Bill 118654. Are you finished with your comments on these two items? Yes, sir. Councilmember Johnson. Okay. Are there any further comments on either agenda items 11 or 12? Hearing that those in favor of granting the application as conditioned vote i. I. Those opposed vote

no. The motion carries and the application is granted as condition, and the chair will sign the findings, conclusions and the decision of the City Council. And I have to read that, you know, item 12 separately is a separate agenda item. She's broken 11. Okay. So on agenda item number 12. Please call the roll call. On agenda item number 12. O'Brian Bagshaw. Burgess Gonzalez. Purple Johnson Suarez. President Harrell. I. Eight in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair was Wasatch. Report. Just 1/2. Reports of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee. Please read the report. The Report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee. Joint Item three Resolution 316 57 Adopting updated policies regarding the establishment and management of parking and business improvement areas for the City of Seattle and superseding Resolution 303 89. The Committee recommends the full council adopt the resolution as amended. Councilmember Burgess. Thank you. The city of currently has nine business improvement and parking areas in the city. These are a collection of local interests that make collective decisions to impose fees on themselves and to use the proceeds from that fee for neighborhood improvements. Our former colleague Nick Licata requested an update on these policies that were last adopted in the early 2000s. City staff has worked with BIA stakeholders around the city to develop these policies and they provide better clarity and direction to those who want to form a BIA and how to navigate the city approval process. The policies were drafted to improve consistency, equity and predictability in the submission or consideration of proposals to establish or expand or to dis establish a BIA. Proponents of bias will now be required to submit a draft proposal to the city before circulating petitions for signatures. This gives city departments, for example, the Office of Economic Development, a chance to comment correct any errors before major work is done on signature collection. It also imposes policies that call for the executive to provide more detailed information to the Council. When a BIA is being submitted for our consideration and it imposes reporting requirements on bias that they must report to the city on an annual basis about their activities with these public funds. Thank you very much. Are there any further comments on this resolution? Councilmember Johnson. Thank you. C

ouncil President Harrell. I just wanted to highlight a couple of things. I'm strongly in favor of the proposed resolution in front of us for a couple of reasons. We rent my district office from the University District Partnership, which is the University District Business Improvement Area. So I've gotten to know the folks in the community fairly well, and I want to say that they're really doing a great public service in the university district, that the university this partnership has spent a lot of time doing basic maintenance and upkeep of our roadways and sidewalks. They're doing a lot of trash pickup, and they're also doing a lot of basic outreach to folks experiencing homelessness or having mental health issues. Oftentimes, members of the BIA, both in the university district and from downtown, are sort of our first line on the ground of folks connecting people up to social service providers in our community. And I think that they play a very important role in the fabric of the city. In addition to all the good work they do around business recruitment and retention. I think that the underlying resolution here makes sense. Add some important clarifications, add some good reporting requirements so that we've got better data on what buyers are doing and makes the process more clear for those who are trying to set up business, which are becoming increasingly popular in a lot of neighborhoods in the city. So I just wanted to say those things and I'll be strongly supported. Thank you, Councilmember Johnson. Are there any further comments? Customer herbal. Thank you. Just a couple of points. One, I wanted to thank f f has for working alongside the existing bills and developing these changes. I think they're the experts in our community on this work. I'd also like to thank. Councilmember Burgess for working with me on one of the amendments that I sponsored that made it as a best practice, something that the University of Washington did voluntarily. Last year. Where a a proponent of a BIA. Has the potential to. Be a 25%. Ratepayer. Ratepayer. Thank you. That they have to meet a higher are they? They are encouraged to meet a higher standard of agreement among other potential rate payers. So thank you for working with me on that amendment. Thank you, Councilman Herbal. Any further comments from my colleagues? Carignan those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I those a vote. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Can you say vote? Nope. Nope. No, no, no. Excuse me. Next agenda item, please. The report of the Civil Rights, Utility's Economic Development and Arts Committee agenda item for resolution 31662 relating to directed investigations, which are investigations of potential labor law violations initiated by the Director of the Office of Labor Standards and requesting quarterly updates to the Council starting the end of

the second quarter of 2016 on the development steps necessary to im

plement Directed Investigations Committee recommends the resolution be adopted.

Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. This legislation moved out of committee with a unanimous vote. Three in favor directed investigations are necessary because noncompliance with Seattle's labor laws still occurs in many sectors. Last year, the Council clarified the Office of Labor Standards Authority to do directed investigations. They are investigations that do not rely on a complaint from a worker. And specifically, the legislation passed last December provided that the Office of Labor Standards may initiate an investigation pursuant to rules issued by the Director, or when the director has reason to believe that a violation has occurred or will occur, or when the circumstances show that violations are likely to occur within a specific business sector because a vulnerable workforce is unlikely to file a complaint. What this resolution does is it sets out a process for the Office of Labor Standards to develop this as a new program. Specifically, this resolution requires the Office of Labor Standards to provide quarterly updates beginning at the end of the second quarter. And those updates will include progress on the issue of how they are involving the office sorry, the Labor Standards Advisory Commission in the development of this new program, the data that the Office of Labor Standards will use to decide where to focus its investigations, the percentage of investigations that they anticipate being these proactive, directed investigations over the next five years with the goal of at least 10% next year. In 2017, the plans for the Office of Labor Standards to allocate staff, expertise and capacity to do this particular program of directed investigations and outreach efforts to inform businesses of this new directed investigation program, as well as the timeline and process for development and implementation of the directors rules. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold, are there any further comments on the resolution? Those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries. The resolution is adopted, and the chair will sign it. Please read items five, six and nine into the. Record agenda five, six and nine Appointment 342 Appointment of Rebecca Smith as Member Labor Standards Advisory Commission for Term of Confirmation to April 30th, 2017 and Appointments 347 and 378 appointments of Chanel Perich and Jody Hall as members of Labor Standards Advisory Commission for term of Confirmation to April 30th, 2018. Agenda Item four Council Bill 118655 Relating to land use and zoning. Adopting a new major institution master plan for Swedish Medical Center at Cherry Hill and amending Chapter 23.32 of the Seattle Municipal Code at Page 111 12 of the official land use map to modify height limits and rezone property within the major institution overlay. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Johnson So this is the actual change to the

future land use official land use map to reflect the adopted major institution master plan. As I mentioned, there are three technical amendments that I'd like to bring forward today. All amendments are for Council Bill 11865655 are provided on the agenda and located in the document entitled Proposed Amendments that don't change any of the substance, but it effectively reflects the committee process and substitutes a map which better illustrates the conditions of the committee. So the First Amendment would be to amend Council Bill 118655 first recital item 14 by deleting April five and adding May three before 2016 to accurately reflect the date at which we took action at the committee. So I would move to a man accountable. 118655. First recital, Adam four. By deleting April five and adding May three before 2016. It has been the First Amendment has been moved in second and all those in favor of the amendment and I, I opposed the ayes have it. The First Amendment is approved. So I have a Second Amendment of three. I move to amend Council Bill 118655, Section three by substituting the paragraph with the following language. Quote The official land use map zone reclassification shown on page one. 12 of the official land use map is amended to depict the height, limits and zone boundaries under the major and the major institution overlay has shown an attachment to this ordinance, and the director of the Department of Construction and Inspections is directed to depict these those limits as modified by the council conditions approved in Clark file 311936 in the final major institution master plan that is compiled pursuant to SNC. 23.6 9.32 Section k. The second, the amendment basically amending Section three has been moved in second and all those in favor of vote i. I opposed. The ayes have it. The Second Amendment is approved. So my final amendment council president harrell is to amend council bill 118655 attachment a the rezone map by substituting version two for version one. There are second second. Okay the third amendment, which basically is the reason map has been moved

in second and all those in favor of the amendment vote. I. I. Oppose vote no. The ayes have it and we have an imminent piece of legislation. So I'd like to thank my colleagues for the time and energy that we put into this. I, i, as one of the new council members, stepped right into a pretty big topic area and really relied a lot on the work of my colleagues to help us get to the point that we're at today. So I want to say thank you to them and to central staff for the amount of time and energy we put into this. And without further ado, we would move to pass Council Bill 118655 as amended. Sure. A second. Okay. I'm going to actually call a rule on the passage of the bill. This was a lot of work over a long period of time without any further comments. And before we vote, my colleagues going once, going twice, I would want to say again, this has been around for a while, a very vocal

and committed community and a developer community and employer community that were hopefully listening and working together. So thank you for bringing some of this to closure. And you can inform us about the quasi judicial rules. I'm scared to talk to anyone about any of this stuff. That's my job. When that's lifted, please call the roll on the passage of the Bill. Herbold by Johnson. Juarez. I O'Brien So want back shot. Gonzalez I am president Harrell in favor and. Opposed the bill passes and the chair will sign it. Report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. The report at the Energy and Environment Committee. Agenda Item three Council Bill 118 690 relating to the satellite department amending Section 21.40 9.0 40 of the state legislature to remove an exemption from eligibility to the utility discount program for tenants of federally subsidized housing with utility allowances, and to update and modify certain program provisions that can be overcome in the bill passed. Councilmember on. Thank you, President Harrell. So this is this council bill is the companion bill to the one that we just voted on. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold, for your comments. It's exciting that we were able to finally vote on this expansion of the utility discount program. Just to add to the comments already made by Councilmember Herbold, we know that all the evidence from economic and sociological research shows that opt out enrollment programs work much better than requiring eligible people or households individually applied to subsidy programs like the UDP. And so, you know, this will removing this restriction, which is what this ordinance does, will enable the largest single expansion of the program since it was created. So this is exciting. And in addition to the people council member Herbold mentioned, I would also like to thank City Lights, Kelly and Wright and also the staff at the Public Utilities for, you know, working on this for years really, and being the driving force to make this a reality. And it's excellent that we've been able to negotiate this with Seattle Housing Authority. Hopefully it will only be the first step to a bigger auto enrollment. I think the statistics, especially from a new study from the University of Washington, shows that actually a majority of the households that could be eligible for this program are actually not enrolled yet. So hopefully this will only be the first step, not the last step. And I would encourage satellite to and public utilities really do hasten to do to expand enrollment by the end of the year and also in the coming years. And as was mentioned earlier, the Energy and Environment Committee has unanimously recommended to pass this. Thank you. Are there any further comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Whereas I O'Brien Swan. I beg Sheila Burgess Gonzalez, I Herbold II Johnson, President Harrell II nine in favor and unopposed. Bill Pass and the chair will sign

it. Next report, please. Please read the report. The Report of the Gender Equity Safe Communities and New Americans Committee Agenda Item nine Catskill 118704 Relating to voyeurism in public places amending section 12.10 point 120 of the code. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Gonzales. Thank you. This is Council Bill 118704. It essentially I spoke about this that during council briefing this morning. But essentially this particular amendment is what I would call a clean up amendment. It would clarify what an act of voyeurism is and that it occurs under circumstances where a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy in a public place. The intent of this particular amendment is to provide clarity to individuals regarding prohibited conduct by including language from the state statute that has already been upheld by our state courts as being constitutional, and also to ensure consistent application of the state and local laws prohibiting voyeurism in public places. One notable thing is that this will this amendment does not change any of the existing penalties under our ordinance. It simply clarifies the standard by which you could be charged with voyeurism in a public place. Great. Are there any comments on the bill? Clark Please call the role and the passage of the bill. Bagshaw. I. Burgess. Gonzalez. I. Johnson. O'Brien. President. Herbold. I. Six in favor. Not opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Adams ten

through 13. The report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee Agenda Item three Resolution 31669 Encouraging as a best practice the use of an individualized tenant assessment using the Fair Housing Act's discriminatory effect standards to avoid Fair Housing Act violations when criminal history is used as a screening criterion in the Landlord Screening Process, Committee recommends that the resolution be adopted as amended grade. I move to amend Resolution 31669 by substituting D four for version D three, which includes a new attachment. A And I understand Councilmember Bagshaw also has an amendment, but let's first, if we could, let me just go through the changes to the resolution since the last committee meeting. The changes are found in two recitals, as well as sections one and five are the primary changes. We added a recital that again lifts up the HUD guidance to show that a criminal history screening policy is next must serve a substantial, legitimate and nondiscriminatory interest. Another recital we included was referencing the the Seattle Fair Chance Employment Ordinance and the way they approach some of these same issues, looking at making sure that individualized assessments and prohibiting questions on initial job applications regarding an applicant's criminal record. And then in Section one, and these are changes that we worked on with stakeholders together with councilmembers, the wants office desiring to really focus on not the the impacts of this particul

ar resolution, but for what we hope to see in the future ordinance that is going to be coming to us to to regulate this area of of housing screening practices. And it identifies the principles that came out of the Hallow recommendations. And in Section five, again, this is just clarifying that the expectation in the HUD guidance is to distinguish between criminal conduct, that that indicates a demonstrable risk to residents safety and conduct that does not the resolution itself, whereas it's really focused on encouraging landlords to to follow HUD guidance that has been recently released regarding criminal records. The separate sections do. A couple of different things. Sections one and two, again, focus specifically on the future legislation that we expect to be coming out of the mayors task force. The. The next section basically says that we endorse practices that landlords should not automatically exclude individuals for housing on the basis of prior event arrests. The further sections refer refer to the process that the Office of Housing has facilitated to create procedures to select tenant screening agency guidelines for property management and affordable housing. Another section recommends that the that a landlord should not rely on records that cannot be reported by consumer reporting agencies under state law. And another section focuses on the Office of Civil Rights efforts to basically do enforcement of existing fair housing laws through testing, investigation of charges and other other means. The final section requests that as OCR when determining whether or not a complaint of housing discrimination based on the use of criminal history, whether or not there should they should it ask them to seek to determine whether or not there's a disparate impact? So that's an overview of both the resolution and the the changes that have been made since the committee discussion and vote on June 3rd. And I don't I may have started talking before I had a second. May I add a second? All right, great. Those in favor of supporting the substitute version D for 4d3ii in a OC. So we have the substitute amendment before us. Councilmember Bagshaw will move to further amend the resolution, but before consideration of the amendment, we have to move to suspend the rules because we've got we received the text for the amendment after the , I believe, noon deadline today. So I moved to suspend Council Rule three A6 relating to presentation of full council amendments before 12 noon, checking all those in favor of the motion carries and we can proceed with consideration of the proposed amendment. Great. Thank you very much. What I am proposing is the addition in our whereas section two recognize what we all worked on a year ago called the Certificate of Restoration of Opportunity or the acronym was CROP. And it really and it's designed to address what the gentleman in the front row had talked about earlier today during public testimony , the state legislature passed u

nanimously out of both houses of the Act around Certificate of Restoration of opportunity. And what it is designed to do is to offer potential public and private employers or housing providers concrete and objective information about an individual who has served his or her time in prison and is now been released. And what we're really wanting to do here is to reintegrate individuals who have had a previous criminal history to provide housing and employment opportunities so that whereas that I am recommending we ensure it comes right out of the bill. And it would say that in an act relating to certificates of restoration of opportunity that will offer potential public and private employers or housing providers concrete and objective information about an individual under consideration for an

opportunity. These certificates can facilitate the successful societal reintegration of individuals with a criminal history whose behavior demonstrates that they are taking responsibility for their past criminal conduct, pursuing a positive, law abiding future. So I'm just suggesting we add this, that it refers to this legislation, which I will hope a court will provide certificate, a restoration of opportunity, and an individual has something else in his or her hand to help him get a job or housing. So we have a first. We moved it and we second it as well. No. Okay. We have a move in a second. Now, all those in favor of the amendment to the resolution say I, I, I opposed me. And now we will have the full version before us to vote on any comments. Comment. Sorry, I have just some closing statements. I just really I think it's so important that landlords, housing providers in this community understand what the law is when it comes to developing policies and practices for making decisions based on criminal history. We know that we're not likely to have the ordinance that will do this work and until after the Mayors for Fair Chance Housing Committee will be reconvened in July, and they will have a series of meetings before they bring to us recommendations for for an ordinance. And so in the interim, it's really important that we lift up the the policies that HUD is currently currently promulgating and making sure that both landlords are engaged with the policy direction that the that the city is going to be pursuing in the future, as well as protecting themselves from fair housing complaints today. So with that those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries the resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. And now we can read items for through eight together. The bill passed and the chair will sign it. Report of the full council. Please read the report. The Report of the Full Council Agenda Item one Council Bill 118 728 relating to city employment. Authorizing the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Seattle and International Association of Firefighters, the 27th AFL-CIO. KELSEY For t

he time period of January 1st, 2015, through December 31st, 2018, amend the ordinance 124 927, which adopted the 2016 budget by increasing appropriations to the Seattle Fire Department for providing the 2015 and 2016 payments thereof and ratifying confirming certain prior acts by three fourths vote of the City Council. Councilmember Burgess. Thank you very much. This legislation authorizes the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Seattle and the International Association of Firefighters Local 27. It's a four year agreement. It lasts through the end of 2018 and affects approximately 950 city employees. The agreement sets wage increases of 2.2% in 2015, 1.1% in 2016, 3.5% in 2017, and a cost of living adjustment in 2018. The legislation includes funding for retroactive pay increases for the years 2015 and 2016. One of the terms of the agreement that the firefighters were particularly excited about is the creation of a new Seattle Firefighters Health Care Clinic at Station two and Belltown at Fourth Avenue and Battery Street. This program is designed to encourage proactive medical management and early detection and prevention of injury, illness and disease for firefighters. I visited the clinic last Friday afternoon and it officially opened today. All of the terms of this collective bargaining agreement are consistent with the parameters established by the Council's Labor Relations Policy Committee. Thank you, Councilman Burgess. Are there any other questions about this legislation? If not, I will move to pass Council Bill 118728. Second. Further comments. Please move in second. Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Whereas I O'Brien Salon. I beg Sharna Burgess. Hi. Herbold Hi. Johnson President Arroyo, eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes material signage porch of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. Bill passed in the show it agenda item number 11, please. Agenda Item 11 Council Bill 118735 relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation, authorizing the execution of a partnership agreement for the activation and programming of Westlake Park and Occidentale Square. And ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill passed as amended. Councilmember Weiss, thank you. You heard at least for the last four or five months, and you certainly heard it today. A lot of people came to provide public comment to support the activation of the parks that we've been doing in the last pilot project. So what we're going to do now is look at a five year agreement between Seattle Parks and Recreation and DBA Services, a nonprofit component of the downtown Seattle Association, also known as DSA, to activate Westlake and Occidental Park Occidentale Square Parks. This five year agreement comes after a one year pilot project that was very successful an increase in activities, safety and overall enjoyment of these downtown parks. Countless commun

ity members and organizations living and working in the downtown area have expressed support for this program. We are very proud of it. We have received letters of support from the Downtown

Emergency Service Center, the Alliance for Pioneer Square, the Public Defender Association, Real Change, Seattle Hotel Association, and many, many more. This program has shown to be such a good opportunity for partnership that the Department of Parks and Recreation is partnering with other community groups to bring activation to other urban parks, including Bell Town, Cascade Playground, Freeway, Park Hing Hay and Donnie Chin International Children's Park. The committee recommends that full council pass as amended. Thank you, Councilmember. Whereas any further comments? Please. Cosmo Johnson. I'm. I think we've got so many great agenda items on the agenda today. Council President Hill I'm trying to pick and choose which ones I talk about, so I'm going to talk about this one for a minute. Not that I didn't have a lot of a lot of Tory things to say about your previous two agenda items company wise. Yeah, I want to speak to this one in particular because it's near and dear to my heart. We, my, my wife and our three little girls and I spend a lot of time downtown that we don't live downtown. And I want to talk about how incredibly great these programs have been for our family. We we find ourselves spending a lot more time and what's like an accidental parks, we tend to interact with a lot more out-of-town guests as well as in-town folks. As a result of this, we've seen just incredible usage in parks, you know, spending time talking with the kids about flamingo dancing, which we've seen in Westlake Park. The sort of great opportunities to interact with people who work for the city as a result of this has been really beneficial. Not to say the other stuff that has gone on hasn't been great to a lot of food truck appearances, a lot of really great programming for buskers as well as for other performers in the parks. And so I just want to talk about how great this has been for us as a family and how much we really appreciate Councilmember Wise is working in getting this agreement extended for another five years. Thank you. There are no further comments of Councilmember Gonzalez and Councilmember Herbold. I just wanted to say, as the chair of the Public Safety Committee, that I think that we have really seen a transformation in our urban parks as it relates to injecting positive behavior into those public spaces. And and, you know, I consistently hear from residents in downtown, but also residents who come to enjoy downtown that they have really noticed a a very strong difference in terms of the feel of public safety. Of both Occidental and Westlake Park. And I think that this public private partnership is a good example of of programs that really do have an impact in terms of outcomes, positive outcomes, in terms of how we want to activate our public spaces without nec

essarily displacing and displacing those who who may, for example, be unsheltered and in the park. And I really appreciated the public testimony of the one individual who came in and said that this this. It's interesting to see now how both house people and unhoused people can be in the same space in in these parks and are actually interacting. And I think that that is incredibly positive change for for for our city and how we look at activating our public spaces. So I'm really excited about the extension here as well. And thank you to Councilmember Suarez for working through that. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. Just a. Similar comments to Councilmember Gonzales. But I just want to say a little bit about I remember when this proposal first got the attention of the homelessness advocates in our community last year. And I remember seeing on Facebook how people were very, very concerned that this was all going to be really focused on managing the parks. And I actually weighed into the fray at one point online and said, I think this is actually about programming the parks and programming in the parks that that everybody can can benefit and that we should really be optimistic about the Diaz's efforts to work with all of its users. And in light of the fact that we have received letters and support from each real change, DC The Public Defenders Association and REACH is a testament to the great work that DSA has done. So in just a quick, quick line. As a member of the Central City Initiative, this is REACH. We have seen the DSA bring leadership and a humane approach to addressing the significant presence of homeless individuals and unruly behavior in downtown. So thank you, Councilmember Warren's, for bringing this forward. Thank you. And I will take all credit for all good parks. Any further comments? If not, please call a role on the passage of the Bill O'Brien. Sergeant Burgess. Hi. Gonzales. I Johnson. Suarez, i herbold. Hi. President Harrell. Hi. Eight In favor and unopposed. Bill passed in the Cheryl Senate Report of the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee. Thank you. The bill passes the material signage report of the full council. Please read the report. Because the report, the full council agenda item one, resolution 316 19, providing an honorary designation of South Jackson Street from 27 south to 23rd Avenue South. S Ernestine Anderson Way. The council member o'brien. Thank you. So this is coming directly to full council. This ordinance would direct to the Seattle Department of Transportation to manufacture, install and maintain honorary signs at

the intersections of South Jackson Street and 20th Avenue, South South Jackson Street and 20th Place, south South Jackson Street and 22nd Avenue, South and South Jackson Street and 23rd Avenue South . Each will reflect the Ernestine Anderson Way honorary designation. Racine Anderson was a legendary American jazz and blues singer from Seattle Center Area and graduate of Garfield High Sch

ool and Ernestine Anderson Place, a senior affordable housing complex, was constructed in 2012 on South Jackson Street between 20th Avenue South and 20th place south. So this designation will occur adjacent to that housing complex. I did not have an honor to hear Ernestine Anderson perform. She passed away at the age of 87 earlier this year. But her legacy certainly is impressive. One anecdote I read in her obituary talked about how she was born in Houston and moved to Seattle in high school , and her father came to Seattle looking for work, but also because he wanted to be on the West Coast. And Seattle is like a sleepy town where he could get his daughter away from the music scene. Little did he know that Garfield in the Central District at that time was just emerging, and she played a significant role in that. And her overlap with Quincy Jones and Ray Charles and other folks who were in the music scene in Seattle at that time were impressive. This is a great a great chance to honor one of the leaders in our community for so long and look forward to voting yes on this bill. Thank you, Councilmember Rodney, for the comments. Alex, say a few words. No one else would. Casper and Brian, thank you for describing Ms.. Anderson's background. And many people have been around Seattle for decades and many are recent arrivals. And I just think it's critically important when we celebrate this kind of history is, as you described, she recorded over 37 albums in her lifetime and she was really celebrated as a jazz artists throughout the world when she attended Garfield High School. That's where she met Quincy Jones. And you have to talk publicly about Quincy was a classmate of my mother and father's at Garfield. High school. And so I've had the opportunity to sort of over the years, interface with Miss Anderson's family. And her daughter Yvonne was attending school with myself. She's part of some great history in Seattle with groups such as Bumps Blackwell and Buddy Catlett and, of course, Quincy Jones. And those folks, if you go to the Safeway on 23rd and in Madison, you'll see a picture of a group called Bumps Blackwell. That many folks. It was just one of the best jazz groups around. And Quincy Jones is in that picture. And my father is a saxophone player sitting right next to Quincy Jones. So it's quite extraordinary what talent has come out of this city. Quincy Jones described Ernestine his voice as, quote, honey at dusk, and he said that the world got a taste of her honey. And she performed in the Monterey Jazz Festivals at Carnegie Hall in the White House during the first inauguration of Dwight Eisenhower at the Kennedy Center. She toured Europe and had many concerts in London and New York. So again, quite a local treasure. In 1999, the Pulitzer Prize winning photographer, Brian Lenker published a book I think many of you have heard of. It's called I Dream a World. And in that book, she he describes 75 women, African-American women who really changed

America, Coretta Scott King, Sarah Vaughan, Oprah Winfrey, Rosa Parks and our own Ernestine Anderson is in that book. So, so again, she's quite a legend. And I think as we preserved what's great in this city, I think part of that is actually preserving names like Reverend McKinney and Ernestine Anderson and others. So I'm very happy to support this resolution. You know the comments. Okay. So those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i, i, those opposed vote no. The ayes have it. The motion carries and resolutions adopted and chair Cheryl, sign it. Next agenda item, please. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda Item 13 Resolution 316 81 Establishing the Shared City and Community Goals and Strategies of the Equity and Environment Agenda as that policy and a critical aspect and foundation for all environment and sustainable sustainability work. In Seattle, the committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Councilmember O'Brien So just a reminder, the Equity Environment Initiative was initially rolled out by Mayor Murray a couple of years ago. It's a great program. The Council supported it significantly through the budget process two years ago and again last year. And the work has been an ongoing effort within the Office of Sustainability Environment and their Equity and Environment lead through a community group. The community leaders came together to help create the Implementation Plan for Equity Environment Initiative, including four goals and what this legislation would do, this resolution would adopt that agenda and those specific four goals. So I'll go ahead and just highlight those four roles. The first is healthy environments. For all the intent there is to make sure that folks throughout the community,

regardless of their various circumstance, have access to clean air, clean water, green space, healthy food and safety and quality of life. The second goal speaks to jobs, local economies and youth pathways, the idea being that folks from every community should have meaningful opportunities to work in the fields that advance the environmental goals within their own community and find sustainable employment in those. An example is some more community members have been doing around local green career pathways and trying to ensure that low income communities and communities color youth from those communities can actually make careers in various aspects of the green. Economy, supporting their family and making their communities and our planet a safer, healthier place to live. The third goal is equity in city environmental programs. So making sure that everyone has access in the community, has access to the decision making process and other proposals the city puts forward. And the final goal is an environmental narrative and community leadership. And this is one way we can celebrate the stories from within our community and also make sure we're investing back in our communities. I continue to see the work done by both the Office of Sustain

ability here as the Office and the Equity Environment Directors. Joining us now as as nationally leading work. We have some amazing folks working on that locally, but I really want to give a shout out to the community partners that were part of this process that really highlighted this agenda and ensuring that the equity environment agenda is centered around the communities often most impacted by environmental degradation. But also the communities have much to gain as we continue to improve our environment. And I look forward to their ongoing involvement in this process as it continues to evolve. Thank you. And Brian, any further comments? Those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries the resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Please read the next agenda item and you can read the short version. The bill passes and the chair was signing agenda item number eight. And please read the short title, will you please? Agenda item eight Council Bill 118 737 Relating to Seattle City Employees Retirement System Creating a separate retirement plan for city employees whose membership in the retirement system begins on or after January 1st, 2017. Clarifying certain provisions and making technical corrections. The committee recommends the bill pass. Dan Simon Burgess, thank you. The retirement system that we have for city employees was created in 1929, and many provisions have been modified over the years. But the structure and the core component parts of the retirement system have not been changed until this legislation. In 2010, the City Council issued a statement of legislative intent that called for an interdepartmental team to explore options for creating different pension benefit for our city employees. The goal was to make sure that the plan remained financially strong. That work resulted in approval of a new Sears plan to benefit for new employees in the collective bargaining agreements that we ratified in late 2015 and were approved by the City Council. The ordinance creates a new plan two tier that benefits anyone hired by the city beginning January 1st, 2017. And after the new plan. Under the new plan and Tier two, employees will contribute a lower amount 7% rather than 10%. The city's contribution will remain the same. The system has a lower expected long term cost, which protects the long term viability of the retirement plan in total and puts us in a better position to fully fund the plan moving forward. Thank you, Councilman Burgess. Any further comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Thank Shanghai Burgess. Hi. Gonzalez. Purple. Hi. Johnson Maurice O'Brien. Hi. President Harrell. I. Eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Agenda item number nine, please. Agenda item number nine Resolution 316 88 amending resolution 331334. Establishing the City Council's intent to fund the Seattle City Employees Retirement System in accordan

ce with the January 1st, 2016 Actuarial Study, the committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Councilmember Burgess, thank you. This is an annual resolution that we adopt that basically pledges the city to make the necessary annual payment to the retirement system. And this resolution again says we'll do that for 2016. Thank you. Any comments? Any further comments? Those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries the resolutions adopted and the chair will sign it. Item number ten, please. Agenda Item ten Resolution 316 89 Approving interest rates set by the Seattle City Employees Retirement System Board and Admin of Administration for 2017. The committee recommends a resolution be adopted. That's been purchased. Thank you. The Board of Administration of the Retirement System is

recommending that the city establish the interest paid to city employees who withdraw their funds from the retirement system at 2.86% on contributions made after December 31st, 2011. Member contributions received before December 31st, 2011 will continue to accrue interest at a rate of 5.75%. Any further comments? Those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries the resolution that is adopted and the chair will sign it. Next report, please. Okay. So those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i, i, those opposed vote no. The ayes have it. The motion carries and resolutions adopted and chair Cheryl, sign it. Next agenda item, please. Agenda item two accountable 118 755 relating to the open housing ordinance, adding anti-discrimination protections based on a renter's use of a subsidy or verifiable alternative source of income. Adding a first in time policy prohibiting preferred employer programs. Adding Section 14.8, Windsor 52 and amending sections 14.0 8.2 or 15.0 20.0 40.0. 45.0 60.0 79.1 90 of the Seattle Municipal Code. Thank you. So this is sort of going to be an exercise and procedure as well. So we'll lead off with Councilmember Herbold to introduce the base legislation. And thank you for all your work on this this ordinance. Thank you. So the bill expands the legally protected classes to include alternative sources of income like we've heard today, such as the pension, Social Security, unemployment, child support, disability, or any other governmental or nonprofit subsidy. We discussed the bill on May 24th, June 14th, and again on July 22nd. Throughout those discussions, the legislation was amended to add three primary further protections. The first is the new policy referred to as first come, first serve screening practice. Sometimes first in time is what we call it. It prevents housing providers from giving applicants with alternative sources of income or other participation in a protected class a lower priority. It requires landlords to review applications one at a time on a first come, first serve basis and offer the unit to the first qualified qualified tenant. A b

ig part of this practice really relies on property owners notifying tenants on what it will require to qualify for a unit. So we've heard some people. QUESTION Well, will I have will I be forced to to rent to somebody who has a bad a bad tenant screening background or has done damage to two units in the past? That would not be the case. So you still have to qualify the tenant as eligible for for a unit. A second provision included in this new bill is a new eviction prevention. And now that's very distinct from what we've been hearing about an alternative source of income at the start of a tenancy. This deals with a new protection for tenants who have fallen behind in their rent and have received a three day pay or vacate. Under current law, a landlord is not required to accept a housing assistance or a rental assistance voucher during that three day pay or vacate time. At this point, with this new protection, housing providers will be required to accept that that voucher, as long as that voucher turns into cash within five days. You know, one of the things that we've. We've heard a little bit of concern about is whether or not that's going to result in greater numbers of people in the future being evicted either because this is a short term rental assistance, either on the front end or short term rental assistance during an eviction situation. And what we've found of the city's programs, we fund about ten programs through the housing lobby. And we found that of the households who have received eviction prevention funding or or move in assistance, 83% were stable in housing six months after the assistance ended. The third item that the bill includes is a preferred employer program prohibition. This encourages landlords to offer nondiscriminatory moving incentives and discourages or outlaws discriminatory move in incentives. In 2015, we heard from community members reporting discounts on deposits and other move in fees for rental applicants working for preferred employers. In this bill, with this provision would end that practice. So those are the highlights of the bill. And I know we also have some amendments to walk through. So I, I think the first one is a rather a substitute version. I have in my notes, Councilmember Herbold, that you would have a First Amendment which would basically substitute version five for version four. Correct. So I move to amend Council Bill 11 8755 by substituting version five for version four. Which. Second is their second, which just by way of context was the bill that we've been working from. So all those in favor of amending Council Bill 11875 by submitting version five for version four, vote I, I was opposed. Know you guys have it. And at this point, I think we can take Councilmember Burgess's amendment, too. Thank you. This amendment adds a requirement that the first in time measure in this legislation be evaluated by the city auditor after 18 months of full implementation. The purpose of this audit is to determin

e whether or not it has had any unintended consequences on low income persons or persons with limited English proficiency to obtain housing. It directs that the city auditor complete this evaluation,

but at their discretion, they may use an independent outside party to conduct the evaluation and to report back to the City Council by the end of 2008. So I would move amendment number two. The second city councilmember words. Did you have a comment you'd like to make on the first in time issue? I do. So just so I'm clear, this is Councilmember Burgess and Johnson's new section D first in time. Correct? Correct. Okay. So from our discussion this morning and then some more material that I looked at over the break, I wanted to just make a few comments there. Often times when we think is when we think what we think is most fair does not truly benefit those most in need. First come, first serve is one of those policies. Many programs that are meant to be economically diverse are programs that attempt to be more accessible to a wider range of populations. We use a lottery system to increase access rather than the first come first serve. Many nonprofit housing providers are also using a lottery system to place new residents in housing or on a waitlist for housing. People with the greatest level of access are often the first to be served because they have the means to apply first. I believe the intent of this provision is to limit a landlord's personal bias to cherry pick which residents they deem, quote unquote worthy and to instead level the playing field for those looking for housing. Although I agree with that intent, I am concerned this provision may unintentionally solidify into law a practice that favors those who are who already have the privilege of access. In any event, I support the amendment and to require an honest report of this provision after eight weeks, after 18 months, to evaluate its effectiveness. So thank you, Councilmember Burgess and Johnson. Thank you, Councilman. Worse. We have an amendment, an amendment that's been moved in second. And any further comments regarding the amendment? Councilmember Johnson. Yeah, thank you. Council President. I just want to echo what councilmember was that. I think my intention in joining with Councilmember Burgess on the amendment today is. To ensure that what we're doing here is not creating an unintended circumstance where people of higher incomes with access to Internet and a private vehicle can quickly get out to somewhere where an apartment is available and beat other folks to the punch. I know, as Councilmember Herbold and I have talked, that this is happening already. This is an issue that is coming before us because it is happening already. And that this is an important first in time, is an important best practice and not only the local level but at the national level from our Housing and Urban Development Department as well as several others. But I just want to make sure th

at as we get into this legislation, that we really have a good understanding about who is benefiting from this and can have the authority in a couple of years to really say all is working. So thanks for the opportunity to speak. Very good. Councilmember Herbold, thank you. And I just wanted to clarify that there is a section in the bill that states that landlords who agree to voluntarily set aside available units to serve special vulnerable populations, including but not limited to homeless people, survivors of domestic violence, persons with low income and persons referred to the owner by nonprofit organizations or social service agencies or other protected classes. The first in time policy does not have to be observed if a landlord wishes to rent to one of those types of people. Thank you. So I'm going to call on a vote on the amendment. Councilmember Burgess proposed an amendment to Council Bill 118755 Section five by adding a new Section D. All those in favor say I. I opposed say no. The ayes have it. I believe Councilmember Burgess has another amendment. Thank you. This next amendment number three in our packet is very similar and asks for the city auditor to conduct an evaluation of the use of short term vouchers to determine if that program should be maintained and whether or not there are any adverse impacts on individuals being able to remain in housing with the use of these short term vouchers. And again, we ask for this evaluation to be completed by the end of 2008. I move amendment number three. Is there a second? Any comments on Councilmember Burgess's amendment number three? I do. Councilmember, once. Again, I just wanna make sure this is a new section. What I want to add about when I was looking at this and I want to thank the low income housing alliance folks for coming in and providing information in a briefing. Much of the funding for our rapid rehousing programs and other short term subsidies to help people experiencing homelessness find stability. Finding stability comes from the document recording fees. This is a state level policy. When this program was up for review two sessions ago in Olympia. The private market lobbied to require that 45% of these dollars for short term subsidies be spent in the private market. Now we have the private market saying that they should not be required to accept these dollars. One of the issues, of course, is they believe that it would lead to more evictions. So to me, these two things don't add up. I agree that we want to ensure that people are not being set up for evictions. The auditor's report in

18 months does show that the short term rental subsidies in the private market are not supporting renters. I would expect the private market to help us change the provision at the state level to remove the 45% requirement. I know that we are going to work hard, at least our office, some other people here, my colleagues, during next year's legislative session to continue to monitor the situation. T

Thank you. Thank you, Councilman. Whereas Councilmembers Burgess Third Amendment has been moved in second. It is there. Are there any further comments? I would just comment that Councilmember Johnson is joining in, sponsoring both of these. Don't want to leave him out. So he can do it. On his. Is he's. Got a press release ready to push the button so this passes. So all those in favor of Councilmember Burgess and Johnson's amendment number three, which basically adds a new section, j say i. I oppose say nay. The ayes have it. Now, my notes, Councilman Herbold, would suggest that you would like to look at Section two dealing with meaningful access. Thank you. I'd like to take this amendment in two parts. Amendment four, I moved to amend Council Bill 11 8755, Section two, by adding a new definition entitled Ensuring Meaningful Access, meaning the ability of a person with limited English proficiency to use or obtain language assistance, services or resources to understand and communicate effectively, including but not limited to translation or interpretation services. Okay. So that's a motion. And is there a second? Second. Thank you. Councilmember Herbert, can you give a little context of why you would like to make this change? This is an amendment to the section of the bill related to the first in time policy. There is a stage within the first in time policy that if somebody needs more time to complete their application to provide information that the landlord has in advance, notified them that they are required to provide as part of a complete application. And that person either needs a reasonable accommodation because of a disability or needs to ensure meaningful access. For instance, in the example of needing translation or interpretation services that they can then get additional time. We did not have a definition for for the types of people who might need meaningful access, and it really could be a very broad definition. And we thought that it would be best for censuses. This is a new policy that we're enacting that we ought to put some brackets around it to create some certainty for for property owners. Very good. Thank you. Comes from Herbold. It's been moved to add this new definition relative to ensuring meaningful access. Has it been seconded? It has been seconded. All those in favor of amendment number four, say I. I oppose a no. The ayes have it and we have Amendment four passed. Council President Harold May. I just wanted to make a couple of quick remarks on that particular statement. Not I'm sure is not going to diminish the vote in any way, but I just wanted to make sure that I know that there's a staff in the audience from the Office for Civil Rights. And I just wanted to make sure that the intent here was not just to capture folks who have limited English proficiency, but also folks who have no English proficiency at all in. And just wanted to confirm that that was your intent. It absolutely is our intent. And then secondly, I'll j

ust say that I was really excited to see this particular narrowing of this definition. One of the things that we're going to hopefully be able to work on through my committee next year is around a language access code in our city ordinance that might lead to some some potential additional refinements of this particular language down the road. And would just wanted to put that on your radar and and the rest of the council's radar that we are looking at in conjunction with the Office of Immigrant Refugee Affairs, standing up a particular ordinance around language access and what that means beyond translation and interpretive services. And this certainly gives us an entree into having a broader discussion around that. Thank you. Catherine Gonzalez. There's a second part of Amendment four. I could. Yes. A further move to amend Council Bill 11 8755, Section five, by substituting Seattle Municipal Code Section 14.0 8.050 as presented on Amendment four. There are some underlined language and some strikeouts that primarily do a couple of things the technical amendments, removing sort of duplicative language, and then further some some changes that constrict the timeline that the the first in time policy might result in. We had there was some concern that that with the requirement to. Post notice of what the what information was needed. We needed to make sure that that property owners understood that they could they could do it at the beginning of the process, that we weren't requiring additional an additional period of time to do so. So consumer health well before it's second. And I know this is emotion. It was my understanding this is sort of a technical cleanup, but it sounds like you're trying to do more than a technical cleanup because. The the it is primarily a technical cleanup, the first in the under section one, which says in

addition to and at the same time as providing the information, that might be a little bit more than just a technicality, it just making clear that the information can be provided at the beginning of the process. It's not adding more time on to the process. Very good. Is there a second? Second? It's been moved in second second it to amend counts bill 118755 the section five by substituting shadow ministry code section 1408050 as presented on an amendment for all those in favor of that amendment, say I. I oppose a nay. The nays have no voice, so the ayes have it. That is passed as well. Let's move to amendment number five. Councilmember Baxley, I believe you have an amendment number five you'd like to discuss. Yes, thank you. It's the same that I brought forward this morning. It's really just a definitional correction or making it clear that this will not apply to single family dwellings, including accessory dwelling units where the owner is on site. I was directed to this because there was some confusion about in the individual, lived in her home and wanted to be able to have a specific effort to find a tenant that might have

something like nursing skills or others wanted to make sure that under current law that she would be allowed to do so. And indeed, this makes no changes. It just highlights the fact that it is already in law. Very good. I will take that as a form of an amendment to the Council bill. Is there a second? I need a second here. Second. Little slow on trial here. Okay. Any further discussions on Council Member Bag Shaw's amended amendment? And just so I'll stated clearly that Customer Bagshaw moved it and it was seconded by two individuals. They had a new 11th recital, which I believe is second to the last, whereas the first in time policy will not apply to single family dwellings, including accessory dwelling units wherein the owner or person entitled possession maintains a permanent residence as described in 14.08.190.3. And of course, all those in favor of Amendment five, say I. I opposed say no. The ayes have it. We're almost through. We have a comma. We have to discuss it. Councilmember her while there's a missing comma you would like to address. Thank you. I further moved to amend Council Bill 11 8755, Section two of the Seattle Municipal Code 14.0 8.0 to oh Preferred Employer Program Definition Line six of the definition to add a comma between the clauses. Other publicly funded housing comma for the benefit of city, etc.. And so Councilmember Burgess raised this issue in council briefings meetings this morning, and we found that the issue of whether or not a preferred employer program to show preference for city workers, that we want to make sure our living in the city, such as our firefighters and our police officers, that that that that was clearly delineated in the ordinance that that was permitted. It did as it was as it read without the comma, it wasn't clear that it it was covered. But with the comma, I think it's a lot more clear. Good catch. And before we start debating about this comma, we're going to have to suspend the rule. So I will move to suspend Council Rule three A6 relating to presentation of full council amendments prior to 12:00 noon. There are second. Second. All those in favor of the suspension of council rules. Three, eight, six. Say I opposed. Say no. The ayes have it. Now I'll just make the motion I move to. I'm sorry. So Councilmember Herbold amendment now can be considered. Councilmember Herbold, will you make that motion again and we can vote on it? I'm happy to make it again. I move to amend Council Bill 11 8755, Section two of the Seattle Municipal Code 14.0 8.020. Preferred Employer Program Definition Line six of the definition to add a comma between the clauses. Other publicly funded housing and for the benefit of city. There are second seconds after all that. I hope there's a second. I'll describe this as amendment number six. All those in favor of amendment number six. Vote I. I was supposed vote no. The ayes have it. Okay. We have six amendments to the base legislation. Are there any further comments or clos

ing comments before we consider a final adoption of this bill? Councilmember O'Brien Yeah, I want to I want to just say that this is a impressive piece of legislation that will have a significant impact on folks lives trying to find housing in the city. And I want to start by thanking Councilmember Herbold for your ongoing advocacy on behalf of tenants in the city and really outstanding work on this piece of legislation in particular. I want to thank folks that are here looking at folks in the background representing various landlord groups from the Rental Housing Association, Washington Multifamily Association. Really appreciate your comments today. I know that you've expressed concerns about some of how this plays out, but I want to say that your engagement in this process has made this legislation stronger. And I look forward to continuing to work with you as we work through this and understand which aspects are working well. And if there's places where we need to make changes, certainly be prepared to do that. Mostly, I want to thank the advocates who have been tirelessly fighting for folks that are struggling to find places to live in the city. This piece of legislation, along

with others that you all have worked on, has been really powerful. Do you continue to fight for those that need support the most in this community? And I'm pleased to be supporting voting in support of this legislation because of the great work you all have done. So thank you. Thank you, Councilman Brian. Councilmember Johnson. I hope we'll leave the space for you, Councilmember Herbol, to close this out. But I just wanted to make a quick comment that says, you know, as the chair of the Planning Lands and Zoning Committee, I don't know if it was explained to me when I took the committee how much of the hollow recommendation responsibilities were going to come under my purview. But I'm really grateful and encouraged by the number of recommendations that we're continuing to adopt out of the work of that committee, including the work that we did last week on the mandatory housing affordability residential framework. That dovetails really very nicely with the action that we're going to take today, as well as upcoming moving forward legislation. When you combine that with the really impressive results coming out of last Tuesday's housing levy, I think it's a real demonstration that this council in particular is very committed to whatever we can do to make the city inclusive and affordable for everybody, regardless of your income. So I want to say thank you, Councilmember Herbold, for bringing this legislation forward. I'm pleased to be voting yes on it today. Further comments, I'll say a comment unless you close to the comments. Comments from Herbold. I want to thank you. You know, we're really deep in the weeds on this legislation, but and I say that sort of tongue in cheek, because that's exactly what you have to do, I think. I think we can recognize that there are a lot

of really good landlords out there really trying to do the right thing. And we have organizations out there that, you know, a lot of these folks are not very wealthy folks. They're just trying to rent a home. Some we talk about some discrimination being unintentional. There's intentional discrimination out there, too. I mean, it's just there's no soft way to say that there are some people that are discriminating and they're are victims of this discrimination out there that are struggling with for places to live. So I think when we start going deep in the weeds like this on these kinds of policies, that is exactly what we have to do. And the Councilmember Herbold leadership and the others that have chimed in with six amendments, this is good work and I like the evaluation component because there's not a template or game plan out there that says this is exactly how you do it. So we we look at data out there and then we try to measure it to make sure we're doing the right things. So I appreciate this work, great work. And Councilman Herbold, would you like to close debate? I would. A few other words continue here. But can I interrupt for a second? Yes, Councilman Brown, you can slaughter the slaughter rules if you'd like, sir. I forgot. I need to disclose that I am a landlord and I try to do that. All the meetings we're discussing legislation that affects my landlord, so I want to make sure the world is aware of that. Thank you, Councilman Bryan. Sorry. And you still. Get a vote? I still get it, but. GOODLATTE okay. So as chair of the council committee with oversight of Civil Rights, I'm acutely aware of the need to balance both the rights of renters with the interests of our housing providers. Our city is a city of renters. Their interests must be protected if we intend to reduce the number of people living homeless and increase affordable housing opportunities. Race and socioeconomic factors must not be used to prevent people from securing safe, healthy and affordable housing. But that's exactly what has been happening. We know that on any given night in our city, over 2800 people are living unsheltered. People of color continue to be disproportionately represented in emergency shelters, especially those who identify as black or African-American. These disparities are really striking when looking at data on families served in our emergency shelters. According to a report on homelessness in Seattle, King County, people of color made up almost 50% of those accessing emergency shelter in 2013. People of color made up 46% of single adults and 72% of families accessing emergency shelters. We have a lot of funds that are available to assist people in and homelessness prevention or eviction prevention. We know the city invests about 1.9 million annually for these purposes. But if tenants are unable to use these funds, our ability to use our city's resources to prevent homelessness is just simply not as effective as it can be. I mentioned earlier this mo

ning some stats that if you bear with me, I think it really speaks to the need for a first in time policy. We can have all the anti-discrimination laws on the books that we want, but we know that discrimination in housing is still happening using HUD approved testing practices. It was revealed by association that prospective tester renters experienced different treatment than did control group renters across all three categories familial status, disability and the use of federal Section eight

voucher testers reported disparate treatment in 64% of 42 tests related to race. 67% of 43 tests relate related to national origin. 43% of 30 tests related to sexual orientation. And 67% of tests related to gender identity. For 25 years, we have prohibited discrimination based on Section eight status, and I wholeheartedly commend the Seattle Office of Civil Rights for proactively enforcing our fair housing laws. I think using a an approach like the person time policy can help us with our compliance. There's a reason why our housing providers identified as as a best practice. They use it as a best practice so that they can make sure that they are avoiding fair housing claims. I want to just take a quick minute also to thank all the folks who are involved in developing this this this policy. I thank. They had a workgroup that originally made the recommendation to expand our protected classes to include sources of alternate incomes. I thank the mayor for bringing this legislation forward. I also think my staff staff under Councilor Susie Levy, Asha Venkataraman, Director Polly Lawley, Lauren Olson. Brenda Barro, also associate with Office of Housing Kathryn Jolly as well as the source of income discrimination stakeholders that both worked before the Mayor's proposed legislation and after it as we were deliberating , including the tenants union. Washington Can the Rental Housing Association, the Washington Mall. Multifamily Housing Association. Columbia Legal Services. Wellspring Family Services. Solid Ground Northwest Justice Project. King County Bar. Why She Low Income Housing Alliance and the Seattle Disabilities Commission. And finally, thank you to my colleagues on the council. This was a truly collaborative process, and I do think we have a better bill for it. So thank you. Thank you, Councilman Herbold. When we stop there and I will move to pass Council Bill 118755 as amended. Second. Any further comments? Those in favor of the passage of the bill. Actually, I think we'll do a roll call in this script. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Bagshaw. Burgess. Gonzalez. I. Purple. I. Johnson. Juarez. O'Brien. President. Harrell. High. Aden. Favorite unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign this. Thank you. All right. Report of the planning, land use and Zoning Committee. Please read the report. Agenda Item eight Council Bill 118 some 45 relating to grant funds from non city sources authorizing the Director of Public Utilities to accept

specified grants and execute related agreements for and on behalf of the city and amending ordinance 124 927, which adopted the 2016 budget to increase appropriations to Seattle Public Utilities, the committee recommends the bill pass . Consumer Verbal. Thank you. This ordinance accepts grant funds that have been awarded to Seattle Public Utilities, two specific grants totaling \$570,000 from King County to expand their clean up programs in Thornton Creek, Pipers Creek and several additional watersheds outside of the city, including potential city annexation areas. The grants are used both to identify areas requiring clean up as well as doing the necessary cleanup once those areas have been identified. Thank you, Councilman Herbold. Any further comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Burgess Gonzalez Herbal. Hi, Johnson. Whereas I O'Brien beg sr President Harrell Aden favor and unopposed. The bill. Passes and share with Senate. Please read items nine and ten together. The report The Full Council Agenda Item one Resolution 316 95 Supporting City SEAL Initiative Measure 124 and urging Seattle voters to vote yes on Initiative 124 on the November 8th, 2016 general election ballot. Okay, just bear with me here. So as provided under state law, S.W. 40 217.8.555, the city council will now consider the adoption of Resolution 31695, which is basically a resolution dealing with hotel rates. It's a yes on initiative one, two, four. And at the conclusion of Councilmember comments, the Council will hear comments from members of the public who wish to speak either in opposition or support of the resolution. And an approximate equal opportunity to speak will be given to both opponents and from proponents. So having said that, will the clerk please read agenda item number one five. Please? You want to. Support. We have to some there's some other legislation we can do for that matter. You can turn around so we'll keep going through it. Please read. It. Supporting City Sales Initiative Measure 124 and urging Seattle voters to vote yes on Initiative 124 on the November eight, 2016 general election ballot. Okay. So. First of all, I'll move to adopt resolution 31695. Second. Okay. Before we actually move it, there's an amendment that needs to be done. So I'm going to move to amend Resolution 31695 by substituting the fourth, sixth and 11th recitals as provided on Amendment one on the agenda. Let me describe each recital. The first one I'll just read it is. Whereas providing housekeeping services can be difficult labor intensive work and can potentially lead to physical ailments or in some cases even injuries for housekeepers and sixth or recital. Whereas hotel workers, cleaning rooms and providing other services are often alone and potentially in a vulnerable position. And 11th recital. Whereas an issue of 1 to 4 would be a significant step

forward in advancing Seattle's values of equity, inclusion, inclusion and genuine racial justice. And so those

are the amendments that we want to substitute. Is there a second on those amendments? Are those in favor of the amendments? As I describe them, say I, I oppose the ayes have it. So. Okay, so we have an amended piece of legislation. Let me describe what initiative 124 that we agreed to put on the ballot does is there are several parts. At first it protects hotel employees, many of whom are people of color, many of whom are from the Immigrant Refugee Committee, many of whom are underrepresented in several groups. It protects them from violent assault and sexual harassment. So they would be required under this initiative to provide employers a hotel. Employers would be required to provide employees who work alone in a room, basically a panic button. Hotel employers must report accusations that a guest has committed an act of violence against an employee and maintain the records for five years. And any guest is accused of assault or sexual assault or sexual harassment may not return to the hotel for three years. Here in the city of Seattle, each guestroom will have a sign advising that the law protects its employees, its hotel employees from violent assault and sexual harassment, and that these employees have panic buttons and employees reporting an act of violence by a guest will be assigned a different floor or worker and be given paid time to contact the police. Consult a counselor that's part one. Part two protects hotel employees from injuries. So we want to reduce the initial says reducing workplace injuries by limiting an employee to 5000 square feet of a guestroom claims per 8 hours a day. Part three provides access, improved access to medical care for low income hotel employee. So in order for employees to afford family medical coverage, large hotel employers must pay full time, low wage employees by the 15th of each month, in addition to wages or salary, either \$200 or the difference between the monthly premium for the lowest cost gold level policy available on the Washington Health Benefit Exchange. And 7.5% of the amount of employees wages exceeds 100% of the federal poverty level. The fourth part is preventing disruptions in the hotel industry. So when a hotel ownership changes, the outgoing employee shall, within 15 days, provide the new owner with employment information on his current employees. And the incoming hotel owner shall maintain a preferential hiring list of current employees and hire from that list from the date of ownership transfer to six months after the hotel is under the incoming employer and the fifth part is enforced in compliance with the law, that we make it very clear the initiative does that retaliation is prohibited. Employers may not interfere with any employer's employees rights under the law or discharge or discriminate against employees asserting their rights. There's a there's a employees have a private right of action to enforce these rights and are entitled to costs, reasonable attorney's fees and expense

s if they prevail. So that's this part and parcel of initiative 124. Certainly there are more to it, but I tried to capture the major parts. So. At this point. I will ask any of my colleagues before we do the public hearing part. Do any of my colleagues have any statements they liked about Initiative 124 Bill before I open it up for public hearing? I see no hands going. Do anyone? Councilmember Johnson, please. I just want to say thank you to the folks at Unite Here Local eight for working really hard to put this measure on the ballot. They gathered an additional 10,000 signatures about plus what was required to make it to the ballot. And their efforts then and now to get this measure passed are crucial for building power for workers across the city, in and beyond the hotel industry. So I want to say thank you to unite here locally for their hard advocacy. Thank you, Casper Johnson. So I have one, two, three. Four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, 11, 12, 13. So I am going to declare that I have 13 speakers. So we're going to have will now take comments from those who wish to speak in opposition or support of the resolution I described. The time allocated for these comments will be 15 minutes and speakers will alternate between opponents and proponents. And so I have folks that are proponents. I'll start off with first. So we're going to go with Corinne Barragan. How much time for. Each and each break will have? One minute. And Kareen, you are on and you have one minute. Pleased to hear from you. Oh. Started over. That's on 30 seconds. I'm sorry. Just one sec. You only have the. Oh, God. Please, God. So we will. We will probably in 20 minutes. 50 minutes. Are you supporting a hotel or just 20 minutes? And then we'll get back to you. Oh, Allah. My name is Guarino Barragan Alarcon and I work at Casa Latina as a program manager of the Worker Rights Enforcement Project. I would like to see my time for Ernie Burton, but I would like to say that Casa Latina is in support of Initiative 124, and we urge you to vote in favor. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. So before you begin, I'm going to ask, is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition of. At

this time, I'm going to go back and forth as the rules require. I don't see anyone and I haven't signed up. So you're out. Hi, my name is Ernie Burton and I work at the Edgewater Hotel and I have worked in line to turn down for six years. I have been a union member for 40 years. That has all allowed me to raise my son as a young mother. But I am not. Everyone has the union rights like I initiated to vote will help protect all who work in the downtown Seattle Hotel. I was part of the civil rights movement growing up in Louisiana. TPO is definitely a civil rights issue. We need justice for all. I am past the retirement age, but I still work because I need health care insurance. Just \$50 per month provides me with great coverage. Three years ago I fell and broke my wrist and got a shoulder contusion while on

my way to work. My insurance covered a lot of my medical bills. The union benefit helps me pay my bills while I was out of work. I believe everyone deserved to have affordable health insurance. The phone would provide that. You're. Wanted to meet coworkers because I reply a lot of work to sit back. Can you? It would be hard for me to go out and find a job. The company that owns the hotel buys and sells hotel the time and we want to know our job and see if that happened to us. And when I quote to provide basic job security. Thank you, ma'am. The two cars that were introduced in and voted on a resolution to support. Doing it well. Thank you, Monica. It made their mind na nay. And they. Monica. And following Monica will be Zachary. Walking. Morgan. Morgan. Hello. My name is Monica NG and I'm here representing the Asian Pacific Islander Coalition of Washington State in King County alone. We have over 30 different API. Organizations and we would like to show support for this. Initiative. 124 But it actually like to cede my time to a hotel worker at a Calderon for the rest of my time. Thank you. Hi. My name is Ida Calderon and I work. In room service at a hotel in the area I support I 24 because I have experienced a lot of sexual harassment as a woman entering rooms by myself to deliver. Food. I've walked into a room. Where a male guest was not wearing any pants, so I mainly left and waited outside for him to put some clothes on. Once, a male guest ordered 14 shots of whiskey and told me to put on a little French maid outfit and join him in his room. I've seen guests running around the hotel with just a towel or a sheet covering their body. I once had to deliver a food to a guest who was just wearing a blanket, and I felt uncomfortable not knowing. If he would physically trap me or not. A panic button would really help me by letting security know where I am located to come and help me as soon as possible if there was a dangerous incident. We have the rights as. Human beings to not be hurt on the job and to be safe. Happy and secure at the. Workplace. My health insurance is also important to me. Both my husband and I have. Had major injuries in the past and the coverage is great. My daughter is also on my insurance. Everyone who works in the hotel. Deserves to have affordable coverage. Thank you, Mayor. Marie and City Council for introducing. But I want to. Thank you can. Zachary. Zachary, Steve. I don't see Zachary. I go to Leonard Smith. I'm following Leonard Smith as Stefon. MARRITZ Leonard, head to the OC. Stefon and then following Stefon March would be Eleanor Perez. Good afternoon. Council members. I'm also speaking on behalf of the King County Labor Council on the grant had to leave but the Labor Council has made initiative 124 the top priority for this fall's campaign season. So I want to thank Mayor Murray for introducing this resolution and for allowing us the opportunity to testify. Hotel housekeepers are cleaning bedrooms without any protec

tion, no security guards standing by, no general public watching, no surveillance cameras and initiative 124 will provide hotel housekeepers with a panic button to immediately call security so bad circumstances can can be prevented. Surveys this year show that as many as 53% of women working as hotel housekeepers have been subject to growth sexual behavior by male hotel guests. Housekeepers will have the right to know when a known harasser returns to their hotel to protect themselves. And under certain circumstances, guests will be asked to leave and not return to that hotel in the future to keep workers safe. That is the least we can do. Also, housekeepers clean, oftentimes more than 20 rooms a shift. That's lots of injuries. And 124 provides reasonable workload standards that are. Elena Perez, followed by. Howard Green at our Greenwich Village next week. Hi, my name is Elena Perez with UFC W Local 21. We are representing in the state of Washington 45,000 members who work in grocery, retail, health care and other industry jobs. And on behalf of our 10,000 members who live or work in Seattle, we are here in strong support of Resolution 31695. Thank you to Mayor Murray for introducing the resolution, which supports local hotel workers and their upcoming ballot initiative. 124 Council members. We urge you today to vote in support of Resolution 31695. Among the basic standards expected of all employers, the very

least that we should be mandating is safety on the job. Nine times out of ten guests in our local hotels are respectful and law abiding, but our local hotel operators should still be providing the equipment and protocols necessary to keep workers safe from injury, harassment and assault. More and more often, hotel workers are being forced to work faster and leaner. This results in injury rates and them working alone. Initiative 124 is a common sense solution. Please vote yes. Thank you. Four Before you begin, Mr. Greenish. Are there any speakers opposing one? 24. I'll give them the opportunity to speak right now. David, you could come here and you can sign a sheet here. Can you actually sign this sheet? And I don't know if that was one is four and one. And so so have any opponents of it saying that she will alternate time as the rules require. I'll sign it after. Is that okay? That's. That's fine. So I'm going to scrape you off there. This one here. That's what you're asking me to do. Go ahead, Miss Hinkle. Hi, everybody. I'm speaking to you on behalf of the local hotel community, and we are asking you not to support the resolution endorsement. 31695. Our local hotels are proud to be progressive members of and contributors to this community. We care deeply about ensuring a safe, healthy and supportive work environment for all our employees and are committed to protecting our employees every day. But I want 24 is about much more than safety. It has major flaws. And as you may know, deep legal concerns, including conflicts with state and federal

law and blacklisting of guests without due process. We're also very concerned about the insincere carve out included for unions. I went 24 as a policy written in isolation. There was no collaboration with hotels, hotel associates. Local and state agencies are experts. As a result, it is vague and unfunded. There are more straightforward ways to protect our employees. We ask you not to support the resolution moving back. Moving back to the support. Moving back to the support of the rezoning should be Howard Greenwich. Good afternoon, council members. I want to thank thank you and the mayor for your leadership in supporting initiative 124. Four years ago, SAGE published a report on the painful working conditions for healthcare workers in Seattle borne disproportionately by women of color and immigrants and refugees. You can find it on our website. We recognize that not all hotels are bad places to work, and many hotel employers care about exposure of workers to safety and health risks. But we need AI 124 to bring up the standards for all hotels and to advance racial and social justice in Seattle's workplace. Given the other item on your agenda, I want to highlight that before the era of mass incarceration and the war on drugs, the hotel and hotel industry was a viable union career opportunity for many African-American workers. It can and should be again. We must end the new Jim Crow. In addition to supporting I Want 24 weeks, we urge you to oppose the north north precinct resolution today. Thank you. Thank you. When we like to speak in opposition to measure 124 at this point. That's the opposition list. I can't read it from here. Do you think. Mr. Watkins, you are up, sir. Afternoon. Counsel, I just want to share a letter. This two individuals that I mentioned that have come out of the incarceration system or the criminal justice system. And I just want to share a little letter I received on Thursday from one of the guys that I'm entering, and I am a hotelier. David, how are you doing? I hope that all is well. And you are my family are in excellent health and spirits. As for me and my family, we're doing great. Great work has really kept me busy, even more so with the added response of being a manager running a stand. You are so right about hard work paying off and I will continue to thank you for the time and assistance because it has really turned things around for me. I just celebrated my 49th birthday. It was my first time as a free man in 22 years. I feel blessed to be in the position with a season is over. I'll be working on the weekends at Central Lincoln Husky Stadium, so I'm in the process of looking for a weekday job and purchasing a worker because having one vehicle is tough on my wife. And, well, I believe that I've written you a written you a novel. So take care and have a good day and I'll be on my you be in touch. Respectfully, this is just one of two individuals that I'm supporting that's come to the criminal justice system. I aske

d you to oppose 124 on the other things that we do in hospitality to take care of the community. Thank you. Thank you. Moving to the. Supports. Moving to the support list, I have Gina Owens of Gina Owens on the sports science unit here. So if Gina Owens is not here to support side. Irma. Arlene. Mike. Tuba. Irma. Arlene here. Not seeing Irma. Leon's not here? No. She coming? Cain. Or Eugene or Molly, and I call it Tuna. Okay, you're up. Please proceed. Hi. I work for the hotel for 12 years in downtown Seattle. I work for 64 hours as a room service and a server. I've been doing this job for 12 years and my sister just got harassed a couple months ago from the guest that asking

her. I came downstairs to the lobby. I was working at the room service. She's working as a night added. The guest came up to her, asked her to do look for prostitute on him and then he said my sister said it's not part of my job. And then the guest went to the internet and find an Asian Chinese. And we both Filipino and my sister and the guest was telling that the that my sister he wants a Filipino a prostitute. And he's really insulting me and my sister that we're Filipino. And. And one thing to happen to me yesterday, I guess throw a key on me in my face and it's really hurting me because the guest was key is not working. And I was working with the front desk to charge the guest room and then the guests just throw the key on me and say my keys not working. This is the third time. And then he's not. There any speakers in opposition? Speakers in opposition to measure 124 that we have not heard from. I go back to the pro side, that'd be Lana Roach Salo. Tory. Okay. You're up, right. And then following you will be Zach Claflin. Hey, council members. Hi. Laurie for allyship again. We stand. We want to thank you for introducing this resolution in support of Initiative 1 to 4, which will improve the lives of hotel workers and protect them from sexual harassment. Hotel workers often are disproportionately women of color, and also there are a lot of LGBTQ individuals working in hospitality, and we wholeheartedly support this initiative and we stand in solidarity with them and all workers who deserve safety and dignity at work. Also, take my last 30 minutes just to remind them that like 50 minutes, 30 seconds. Ari, we respect the agenda. Thank you so much for having the space to support the hotel workers. We also would really like to know when the council members go back to addressing the issues of the MCR. So thank you. Thank you. Is Zac. Claflin here? Zac Claflin and then have a Nicole Grant's. Is Nicole here? And C Nicole should leave. Okay. Are there any other speakers in opposition to measure 124 who did not have an opportunity to sign opposition 124. Okay. Not seeing anyone in opposition to I came close to public comment on initiative measure 124. It has been moved in second and before we vote on it, I'm going to ask any of my colleagues if you have any comments you'd like to

make. Councilmember Burgess. Thank you. After the King County elections certified the signatures on Initiative 124, the Council on August 1st voted unanimously to place Initiative 124 on the November ballot so Seattle voters could decide whether adopted as law or to reject it. After our discussions at City Council and our decision to send it to the voters, we we carefully wrote that referral to the voters without taking a position. We did not state whether it should be adopted or rejected. We remained neutral. And I believe that that's where we should remain today. And for this reason, I will be voting no on the resolution. There any further comments? Councilmember Beck. Yeah. Thank you very much. I am supporting this today. But there is one thing that I would like to add, and that is to request our hotel owners and our workers union that are proponents of this initiative to work together to devise protocols between now and the end of the year on how a hotel worker can identify a guest or someone who's in the hotel that you believe has harassed or worse of you. I would like to be able to record any allegations of violence, including assault or sexual assault, sexual harassment by a hotel guest. And then it would be in everyone's interest to know how that hotel guest could respond. I think that's the one of the issues in this particular initiative that concerns me. It's a little vague, and I think that's something that we could work on collectively. I will be supporting it, but I would encourage, again, our hoteliers and our workers to address that particular issue. Any other comments from any of my colleagues? Comments from Gonzalez. Thank you. Council President. I am in similar fashion to the remarks I made when we originally voted on putting this on the ballot. I'm going to state again that this one's a no brainer for me. It's it I think it is important to stand with our hotel workers as someone who at once upon a time worked three jobs to pay for college. I also had the experience of working in a hotel and you know, and had had the privilege because I spoke English of not having to clean the rooms, but having the luxury of working in the reception. But I understand that these are real struggles for our workers. It reminds me of when I worked as a migrant farm worker in terms of the work load components, in terms of the risk to injury, in terms of how. Hard. These women work to be able to put food on the table for their families. So I am going to proudly support the resolution. I am not only going to support the resolution, I have also already endorsed initiative one, two, four and am one of the signatories, along with Senator Pramila Jayapal and a Nicole Grant with the Martin King with I'm sorry, with Martin Luther King County Labor Council in submitting the ballot argument in favor of passage in November. So I hope that that we have the votes today to be able to pass on our official position as a city council that we support protecting protec

ting women, particularly women who work so hard, particularly immigrants and refugees who serve those who have the greatest privilege of paying to stay in our city. Thank you. Councilman Gonzales, any further comments? My colleague. Okay. At this point, I'm going to call for a vote. Those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended, vote i, i. Those opposed vote no. No. The motion carries. The resolution is adopted as amended, and the chair will sign it. Next agenda item, please. The Report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee an ordinance authorizing in 2016 acceptance of funding from non city sources authorizing the heads of the Executive Department. Department of Parks and Recreation, Human Services Department, Seattle Fire Department, Seattle Police Department, Legislative Department and Seattle Public Utilities to accept specified grants and provide funding and to execute, deliver and perform corresponding agreements and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass as amended. Casper and Burgess, thank you. This is the second grant acceptance ordinance of 2016 and authorize city authorizes city departments to accept just under \$4 million of outside support for a range of project projects. A couple of highlights. \$1.9 million from the Washington State Department of Commerce to the Department of Parks and Recreation to support the Urban, Forestry, Green Seattle Partnership and \$500,000 from the King County Flood Control District for SPU as the first part of a total of \$4 million in funding for flood control projects from 2016 to 2020. Thank you, Councilman Burgess. Any further comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez I. HERBOLD Hi, Johnson. O'BRIEN Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess Hi. President Harrell. Eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed and the chair will sign it. Please read the next report. Council Bill 118764 an ordinance relating to the Technology Matching Fund program making allocations and authorizing implementation of certain technology matching fund projects. In 2016, the committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you very much. This is a actual exciting bill to support. It authorizes the disbursement of about \$320,000 from our Seattle Information Technology to ten community providers whose purpose purposes, I should say, are to increase residents technology access and technology literacy and basically increasing what we call digital equity opportunities. And so the maximum allowed allowable disbursement per project is \$50,000. And these grants are one of the most effective and meaningful community investments that we seem to make in this city with respect to technology. And so these grants help people of all ages and of all backgrounds to achieve critical learning skills necessary for them to survive and live and look for jobs in the 21st century. This year's projects are also projected to provide more than 470,000 in community

matching resources. So these are matching funds, and sometimes matching funds are in the form of cash or donations of hardware and software and supplies and labor. And so we these investments will reach over 2500 residents serving 580 immigrants and refugees, 1240 seniors and 1100 people with disabilities. And so we're pretty happy that we are able to do this. And I'm just going to mention for three particular investments of the ten El Centro de la Raza will be developing a mobile computer lab with 30 new laptops to deliver ongoing technology training and tutoring for low income youth, engage in new afterschool, drop in program and the Native Girls Code is a will conduct a yearlong club for young native women to gain cultural knowledge and computer coding skills and partners will include the University of Washington Information School Digital Youth Lab and the Washington, NASA's Space Consortium. And one other one I'll mention is the Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle. They'll have a summer university for African-American students, and that will provide a six week summer university program for 60 at risk African-American, middle and high school students. And they'll provide academic enrichment and skill building programs through a science, technology, engineering and arts program on a college campus. So there's a lot of fans out there. So so I was very proud to present this to the full council for your consideration. At this time. Please call the roll on the bill if there are no further comments. No, I. Herbold, I. Johnson O'Brien. All right. Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess. Hi. President Harrell. All right. Eight in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes, and the chair will gladly sign it. Please read the next report. Agenda Item five Council Bill 118759. An ordinance relating to the Department of Neighborhoods authorizing implementation of certain neighborhood matching fund projects in 2016 and specifying that 2016 appropriations for the neighborhood matching sub fund shall carry forward automatically to future budget years. The committee recommends the bill pass. And Burgess, thank you. This is an ordinance that authorizes the release of funds from our Neighborhood Matching Fund program. This is the large projects fund were allocated \$650,000. Some of the projects that are being funded

are the 2206 Zulu's Urbana Project, which will enable arts organizations in the Central District. Free access to the historic Washington Hall at 14th and Kessler for free public events south east effective development will build and equip a professional studio for Rainier Valley Radio. Capital Campaign One America will offer residents of the Chinatown International District digital storytelling classes to teach English and digital literacy. The Lake Union Neighbors Group will provide public open space at a street right of way and location. A mini mart city park will be developed at a gas station in the Georgetown neighborhood. Friends of First Place Scholars will mak

e facility improvements at first place school, including roof in improvements and restroom repairs and beacon food. Forest will expand to include an outdoor educational space, additional patch plots, compost bins, a tool shed and Fruit Tree Guild. These are some of the projects that will be funded by. Obviously the Beacon Hill folks are here. So the committee recommends adoption of this ordinance. Very good. Any further comments? Councilmember Herbold. I just want to say a few words. One of the things that we heard in committee when we were briefed about this fantastic slate of projects that was going to be coming forward for a recommendation for approval by the Council is the role that the district councils played in the selection of these projects and have historically played in the selection of neighborhood matching fund large grants as well as simple grants. And that that as a geographically based organization, it makes sense for some sort of geographically based organization, whether or not it's district councils or some other type of an organization to do an initial vetting of projects. And so we heard about how that has worked in the past, how that worked with this particular batch of projects and the role that the district councils played in this batch. And then we talked a little bit without asking the Department of Neighborhoods to reveal their hand too much about what were what we should expect for future recommendations coming out of them for neighborhood engagement. But we did receive an acknowledgment from D.O. and director Kathleen Eiland that even if not district councils, they do acknowledge that it is very important for some sort of a geographically based organization to have a vetting role in the selection of process projects before moving on for further and further further review. So I just wanted to sort of put a pin in that and share with other council members not at the table what we heard. Thank you, Catherine. Her vote. Any further comments? I would just reinforce what Councilmember Herbold said. This is not an easy process for people to go through. And a significant number of applicants were denied this year the funds that they sought because their application wasn't ready yet. And that was a process of not only the district council's, but also a citizen committee that works to evaluate the various applications that are submitted. So it's been a good process in terms of qualifying applicants for funding. But we also know that the positive impact that these dollars have in the community is way beyond what we even are aware of. We talked briefly in the committee about a research project that was done two years ago, unbeknownst to the city, or at least unbeknownst to me and most of my colleagues on the council by some university researchers that showed the very positive impact of this grassroots community engagement on neighborhood matching funds and the resulting reduction in crime in the areas where those funds were spent

. So there's lots of reasons why the Council has always supported the Neighborhood Matching Fund program, and I'm confident we'll continue to do so going forward. Councilman Gonzales. Just to dovetail off of the comments that have already been made. I understand I'm really excited to see that one of the grants will be going to One America and the Chinese Information and Service Center. And I'm not saying that just because I'm the past board chair of One America, though, that is influencing my opinion. But I think, you know, I think it's much more than just a digital story project. And to Councilmember Bridges this point, it is an investment in a community driven investment in a project and an opportunity to both tell those immigrant stories, but at the same time also help these new immigrants and sometimes longtime immigrants here in our community be able to learn English. And through my role as chair of the New Americans Committee, one of the things that we heard from the Office of Immigrant Refugee Affairs is that language is in the lack of English proficiency is the number one indicator of poverty and cycle of poverty for immigrants. And so this is a real opportunity to have a meaningful investment within two fantastic reputable grassroots nonprofit organizations that are already making a difference in our community. And with this investment, I think we signal, again, the city's commitment to invest in communities that have historically not been well invested in. So I'm going to be very excited to vote for the full package, but wanted to take a moment to highlight what the grant recommendation to One America and CIC

means to me personally. Excellent. Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez I. HERBOLD Hi, Johnson. O'Brien Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess Hi. President Harrell. I aid in favor and unopposed. The bill passed and chair will sign it. Next item, please. Excuse me. The report of the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee Council Bill 118693. An ordinance relating to land use and zoning. Amending sections to 3.478.05 and 23.478.09 of the Seattle Municipal Code to adopt development standards for certain properties in the Ballard Hub Urban Village, the committee recommends a council bill passed. Councilmember Johnson. Thank you. Council President Harrell. Council Bill 118693 and zoning changes in the Ballard suburb and village woods supports the community's desire for a more vibrant, pedestrian oriented commercial district. The changes are a result of two and a half years of public input and community engagement, including many residents, businesses, the faith community, nonprofits in Ballard. And I'd like to say a special thank you to the Office of Planning Community Development, and specifically I think David Goldberg, who is the lead on this, as well as the Ballard Partnership for Smart Growth, who spent a lot of time and energy with us as a city over the last two and a half years to get to this conclusion. That chang

es, as I mentioned this morning, don't result in any actual height changes in the neighborhood. These are what we tend to classify as capacity neutral zoning changes. But what that means is it's changing something from a commercial designation to a neighborhood commercial designation. When we make those changes, that encourages a more pedestrian oriented development by, for example, requiring any parking be behind the building as opposed to on the street facing side. It extends the pedestrian designation, which requires development to include more active businesses on the street front as well as awnings, etc.. And also an axiom design standards to better reflect what we heard from the community, including facade modulation, light coverage, limits for lot sizes, upper level setbacks, maximum building, etc.. We had a public hearing on the bill and heard very overwhelmingly positive comments. The bill unanimously passed out a full council and I encourage my colleagues to support it. Thank you very much. Any further comments? Please call the roll on the pastor of the Bill Gonzalez i. Herbold, i. JOHNSON Hi. O'BRIEN All right, Sergeant Bagshaw. BURGESS President Harrell eight in favor, nine opposed. Bill passed and the chair will sign it next. Agenda item, please. Thank you. The bill passed. And Cheryl, sign it. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item 25 cancel 118 769 relating to historic preservation opposing controls upon the J.W. Bullock house, a landmark designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board under Chapter 25.12 Ceremonies for code and adding to the table of historical landmarks contained in Chapter 25.32 code. The committee recommends the bill pass and. Burgess Thank you. This is another ordinance establishing controls upon the J.W. Bullock house. I passed out a map that shows where this house is located. It's at 1220 10th Avenue, east between East Highland Drive and East Gaylor Street. It's essentially across the street from St Mark's Episcopal Cathedral on Capitol Hill. The house was built in 1912. It was designated as a historic landmark in 2015. The controls we will establish by passing this ordinance were specified by the Landmarks Preservation Board. As with both the Gaslight Inn and this J.W. Bullock house, the owners and residents of these two homes are enthusiastic in preserving the historic character of these buildings in their neighborhood. So committee urges us to pass this as well. Thank you. Councilman Burgess, any comments on this legislation? If not, please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Herbold. JOHNSON Whereas I. O'BRIEN Hi, Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess I. Gonzalez President Herrell Aden favor nine opposed. The bill passed and chair of the Senate. Next agenda item, please. Agenda item three Resolution 31702 Supporting Washington Initiative Measure 1491 and urging Seattle voters to vote yes on Initiative 1481 on the November 8th, 2016 general election ballot. Thank you very much. So this resolution supports

the initiative. 1491. I'm sorry. Here. I have a lot of paperwork in front of me. And as you well know, 1491 is an initiative to the people of our state relative to, I say, urging voters to vote yes relative to a law that would suspend a person's access to firearms if there's documented evidence that an individual is threatening harm to themselves or others because of dangerous mental illness or a high risk of violent behavior. And if you look at the substance of the resolution itself, and I'm not at this point in the proceeding, I'm just describing the context. This is not my pro or con statement. I'm just describing the context of the resolution. And then I will ask for comments, either pro or con, but the University of California in 2014 I'm sorry, there are several incidents that have saddened our country that are described in the legislation itself, such as the incident in 2014, the University of

California in Santa Barbara here in 2013 and Cafe Racer 2006. Jewish Federation of Seattle, the Seattle shooting. We can list the types of egregious behavior we've seen in this initiative. 1491 is modeled on the successful laws around the country and is based on a well-established Washington state system protection orders to fill the gaps in the system that allow people experiencing crisis or demonstrating violent behavior to possess and purchase firearms. So as described in the resolution, the contents are for the public safety of all people, including those who harm themselves. And at this point, I will move to pass Council Bill three. I will move to adopt Resolution 31701 and then I'll ask for comments after has been moved to adopt as their second. Okay. I'm sorry. 702i move to adopt resolution 31731702. Is there a second? Okay. Now, at this point, are there any comments regarding this resolution? So hearing then from my colleagues again, I'll just say it. Councilman Burgess, did you want to say a few words? Please do. Thank you. Council members, before you begin, I just want to make it clear as the rules that aren't known by many that the inclusion of our comments, we will hear comments from members of the public who wish to speak in opposition, and we will allow the same amount of time for those people as well as the rules require. Councilman Burgess. Thank you very much. This measure 1491, which we all get to vote on here in a few weeks at the November election, is another common sense measure around gun safety. The vast majority of gun violence incidents in the state of Washington and frankly, across the United States, almost three quarters of those cases involve suicide or unintentional shootings, what some people refer to as accidental shootings. And in many of those cases, members of families or close personal friends are often aware of the looming crisis that is being presented to a family. And so with the passage of this initiative in November, family members will be able to go before a court and petition for a protection order, which m

ay include the seizure of firearms in the possession of someone who is at great risk. And I hope that my colleagues will join in supporting this measure, supporting initiative 1491, and that the people of Washington state will likewise support that initiative. Thank you, Councilman Burgess. Any further comments from any of my colleagues? I do have at least one person who may want to speak in opposition to this particular item. And Mr.. Mr.. Locke, did you wish to speak on this item, sir, at all dealing with the Firearm Initiative Measure 1491. Did you wish to speak to that? You had signed up on several lists? No. Well, let me call for any public comment. Are there any members of the public comment that would like to speak in opposition to this particular resolution or to initiative measure 1491? He? We do. Please come forward, ma'am. And, Amelia, can you make sure this is safe? I didn't think I was going to be talking on this issue today. But I am Cynthia Lynette, the author, the artist who has produced a body of work called The Gun Show. It will be passed around. I'm very concerned about this resolution that anybody, a family member can take somebody to court. And I don't care about taking away their guns, but then they're going to be required to go through some kind of psychiatric help. And you know what that means? That means psychotropic drugs. And we do not want them anymore. So if you could put something in here that says we are not going to give these people psychotropic drugs or require them to take it, then I might consider this. Otherwise, it is not good. Thank you for your words. Do any of my colleagues wish to provide any further comments on this resolution? Okay. Hearing then those in favor of adopting the resolution vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries. The resolution stopped and chair will sign it. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item four Resolution 31703 Supporting Washington Initiative Measure 1433 and urging Seattle voters to vote yes on Initiative 1433 on the November eight, 2016 general election ballot. The Report of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee Agenda Item 15 Council Bill 118 786 Granting Swedish Health Services permission to construct maintain operated pedestrian skybridge over and across a minor avenue. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. This is related to the projects going on on First Hill with Swedish Hospital. As you may recall, we granted an early vacation back in August. This is the same project but different aspect of it. This ordinance would allow them to move forward with construction of a pedestrian skybridge. They worked closely with the community to make a number of investments public benefit on that behalf, and the communities responded very supportive of the project. I'll just mention that there's another agenda. Item number 20 is a resolution. That's the beginning of a similar project, but it's an underground pedestrian tunnel

. I'll talk about that in a second. Thank you. Are there any further comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. HERBOLD Hi. Johnson Suarez. O'Brien So on. BAGSHAW Burgess.

Gonzales President Harrow high nine in favor and unopposed. Bill pass and share with Senate. Agenda item number 16. Agenda item 16. Constable 118813. Relating to utility permits and regulations, the committee recommends the bill pass. House Member O'Brien Thank you. So this this ordinance, the description is a little brief. What this is about is the how this starts. The Department of Transportation regulates when third parties, utility companies or telecom companies typically can cut into the right away, cut into the roadway, usually for locating and relocating utilities. There's a set of regulations that folks follow. This update would put more strict restrictions on when and how folks do that. So specifically after a new road has been paved, it would say that instead of having to wait three years as the current rule before you can make cuts in a new road, you now have to wait five years. The goal there is to maintain the the new condition of that roadway as long as possible and still allow some flexibility to do the work in the roadway. Of course, with that comes an obligation on the city to coordinate with utilities and for them to coordinate with us on all the projects they are anticipating, so that when we are in repaving the road, that's the optimal time to be in to the ground and and do the replacement work. This also sets forward and excuse me, a process for an ongoing update to this process that the Department of Transportation can do through director's rules. Thank you, councilmember brian. Any further comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the Bill. Herbold II Johnson. Suarez O'Brien. Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess. Gonzales. President Harrell I nine in favor nine opposed. The bill passed in with Senate next session item please. Agenda Item two Click File 314 25 Full subdivision application of Kris Jolly to subdivide one parcel of land into 16 parcels of land located 720 two Third Avenue North. Councilmember Johnson If it pleases the Council President, I would suggest that maybe we also read the item three into the record since these two items are related. Please do so. Agenda Item three Council Bill 11857 appropriate excuse me approving and confirming the plat the Valley Street Townhomes in the portions of southwest quarter of Northwest Quarter, a section 30 township 25, North Range four, east W.M. and King County, Washington. Councilmember Johnson, thank you. Council President So this action that we're going to take today is related to a small piece of land in the Uptown Queen Anne neighborhood. For those who aren't familiar, this is about a half a block north of the Mercer Street garage. The applicant is asking for a subdivision of a site that would facilitate 16 sales of townhomes that are under construction right now and a requirement that w

e take today's two actions. The clerk file, which would place on file on the council bill, which we would adopt procedurally for us to do this, the city generally does three things . First, the Department of Construction and Inspections Massdot and other city and county departments charged with providing services. Review the preliminary plat and make recommendations to the city hearings. Examiner seconds the hearings. Examiner holds an open record public hearing reviews the preliminary plat and issues a decision and consistent with state law approval by the hearings. Examiner constitutes authorization to develop the improvements shown on the preliminary plat and then finally after those improvements have been made, as does the Department of Construction and Inspections and the Council review, the final plan to determine whether the improvements are consistent with the preliminary plat and any conditions imposed by the hearings. Examiner This final step is necessary for the individual lots to be certified for sale. If the individual lots are below a certain threshold, I believe the threshold is ten. It is reviewed administratively by the Department of Construction and inspections, but if it's larger than ten, it's required to be forwarded to the full council for action. So with that, I would recommend the Council put a vote to put the clerk file on file and approve council bill 118857 with a do pass recommendation and happy to answer any questions quick. Thanks, Councilman Johnson. Come back shortly. Thank you. Councilmember Johnson, when will the public in uptown have an opportunity to comment. On this and to know whether or not there are going to be ten units or subdivision? What do you expect? Again, this action that we're taking. Today were approved subdivision of a site already under development and already under construction. And effectively the developer has purchased a couple of parcels of land. I believe it's too and asked to subdivide that into 16. And if we were to take action today it would approve that plat of 16 townhomes that would then come up for sale sometime in the near future. Does the public have a chance to comment on. This or as is? I believe that the public has already had opportunities to comment, otherwise the site wouldn't already be under construction. Okay. Any further comments or questions. So we have both a clerk file and a bill. So we'll take them individually. I will move to pass Clark file to file Kirk file 314285. Second. Any further comments? Those in favor of filing the file please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the

file is placed on file. I will now move to pass Council Bill 118857 for the comments. Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez i. Herbold Johnson Suarez, I. O'Brien, Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess, President Harrell. I nine in favor and opposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. I will conclude our business for the day. Is there any further

business coming for the council hearing? Then everyone have a great day and will stand adjourned. I will say that we were meeting immediately for the Seattle Parks District Board, so we will be here at 230 . Is that a good time for us? That's why I just do now know this. I think Seattle Channel just needs a couple of minutes, so I'll give us 2 minutes. 2 minutes. We'll stay in our seats, change chairs, and we'll start with our parks board meeting with stand adjourned right now. Thank you. Agenda item 35 Clerk File 314 362. City Council changes to the 2017 through 2018 proposed budget and the 2017 through 2022 proposed capital improvement program. The committee recommends the file be placed on file. Agenda Item 36 Council 118 849 Adopting a budget, including capital improvement program and position modifications. The committee recommends the bill pass as amended with the July two report with councilmembers Burgess backchannel Harrell, Herbert Juarez, Johnson, Gonzalez and O'Brien in favor and council members who want to opposed. Agenda Item 37 Resolution 317 19 Endorsing new budget and position modifications for the City of Seattle for 2018. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted with a divided report with councilmembers Burgess backchannel Harold Herbold, Juarez, Johnson, Gonzales and O'Brien in favor and council members so want opposed. Okay, so let me explain what we'll do here. So let's do the clerk file first and will file will read a file that. And then before we actually vote on budget items 36 and 37, I will open up the mic for open mic night here as they say in another life or were last chair Burgess to lead us off and then council members may want to bring attention to parts of the budget that they like to speak on. And then after comments, we will vote on items 36 and 37. Okay. So first, let's just do the file. Let's see. Those in favor of filing the clerk file, and I'm referring to a united number 35 vote i. I those opposed vote no. The motion carries the file as placed on file. And Councilman Burgess, I'm going to turn to you to talk about it. You're is number 36 and 37 in general, and you have the floor. Sir. Thank you very much. And I want to start by thanking my colleagues for the process. Over the last couple of months, I thought it went well and we were very successful in doing our balancing package sooner and with more transparency compared to previous years. I just want to speak for a couple of moments on section of the budget that I am most proud of for the city of Seattle. And that is our focus and emphasis on our children. Ages birth through five. I just passed out a continuum of care that kind of graphically shows what these investments look like. And it begins early in pregnancy with the Nurse Family Partnership. This is a home visitation program designed for low income families, families that are having their first child. Seattle is one of only a few major cities in the United States that fully funds this prog

ram. And it has amazing results in terms of improving pregnancy and making life outcomes better for those families and especially those children. The Parent Child Home Program serves children who are ages two and three. This is also a home visitation program focused on literacy. We know from research done here in Seattle that looked at children involved in the parent child home program compared to their peers who were not involved, that these kids are 50% more likely to be ready for kindergarten than their peers, and they significantly outperform their peers when they reach grade three in reading and in math achievement. As a result of the \$500,000 that Mayor Murry included in his budget to expand the parent child home program, and also the \$1 million that Seattle is being awarded from the King County Best Starts for Kids program and continued funding from United Way. Every child in Seattle that lives below the federal poverty level and wants to participate in this program beginning next year will be able to do so. Also in this budget, we are funding the book literacy program. This is a program that is designed to help kindergartners, first graders and second graders battle that summer slump in reading. And each spring, a free book fair is held in all of our Title one schools. That's 19 of our elementary schools in Seattle. And these kids get to choose up to 12 books to take home and read during the summer. These books are age appropriate and are designed to boost literacy skills. I think Seattle can be very proud of how we have focused on these all critical these critical years, birth to five, because we know that kids that go through these programs have a much, much better chance of having a fair and strong start when they enter kindergarten. And this is important because. 40% of Seattle's low income kids do not enter kindergarten ready to learn. This means that 60% of them are falling behind before they've

even started. And these programs are designed to counter that and make sure that they have a better start. I also want to thank some individuals who have been particularly helpful this year as we developed the budget. In addition to my colleagues and their legislative aides who were actively involved throughout this process, I want to thank by name members of our central staff. Who worked long hours. Because I was often here late into the night with them and over the weekends finalizing this package. So thank you to each of the following individuals. Kirsten aerostat patty wiegman. Dan Etre. Asha Venkataraman. Calvin Chao. Eric Sunde. Patricia Lee. Peter Lindsay. Tony Kilduff. Kilo Freeman. Alan Lee Ali. Penalty Amici. Brian Goodnight. Eric McConaghy. Lesh Watson. And Tracey Ratcliffe, and also to our deputy city clerks, Amelia Sanchez and Jody Schwinn, who were with us through many of the Budget Committee meetings. Thank you, too, to all of your assistance. Thanks. Thank you. Chair Burgess. Council members, I know you have a lot to say. So

you're seeing who's next. So I'll. I'll outwait you. All right. Okay. Let's vote. I'm just kidding. Councilmember Bagshaw steps up. Thank you. So this year, I really appreciate the work that we have done together. All my council colleagues. And my goal was to focus on homelessness and to really do a laser focus on that, to improve the lives of people who need our support. So we accomplished that in multiple ways in this budget. And I want to acknowledge that that starting with a real collaborative effort within our city departments and now moving beyond that to working with our county and with the state as well to implement the Pathways Home recommendations. And I want to acknowledge and thank the Mayor's office as well for working closely with me and with my staff, because as Barb Poppy had recommended to us in September, we must move urgently and we have to work decisively to make sure that we're housing as many people as we can. And my Human Services goals for this budget included a better meeting the individual individualized needs of people who are living unsheltered. To invest in programs that have demonstrated success. To move more families inside. And using our housing and landlord liaison programs to expand our low barrier 24 hour shelters that will help create stability for people to improve access to the private market, housing and our faith based institutions to provide sure spaces and stability for people. And also to work with our providers to leverage resources and to provide lockers on site and to coordinate programs with King County in the state for people who are suffering from mental illness and drug addiction. I want to make every tool available to address this crisis of homelessness. And while we are building new affordable housing through our Harlow process and with our recent levy, we recognize that families and individuals outside can't wait another three years to get inside housing. So even though that we've got 3000 people outside that were counted last year and we're trying to get people inside as fast as we can, I want us to be encouraging alternatives that we really have not yet stepped up to, including modulus, increasing the improved unreinforced masonry buildings and money to go into Ezra's and even the tiny homes. They may not be the end all, be all for people, but they will get people out of the mud and something we can do fast and low cost. Obviously it's not the final answer, but I think that we can move and help people move up on faster. And I'm clearly grateful to people who voted for the housing levy in August will have more money that we can help people who are homeless now. But once again, we have got to be thinking broadly and what we can do faster. And I want to comment on the bonding capacity, the 29 million. There was a rather targeted editorial this morning in one of our local newspapers, and I want to acknowledge this is not doing more of the same. This is not adding on to the housing levy. We're rea

lly focused here on the immediate problems, immediate problems for people who are still outside, providing additional resources for people who have mental illness or are drug addicted at this point. We have our road map and I think Pathways Home is great. I'm really grateful for the Bridging the Gap two Pathways Home, which we worked on with our mayor's office. But we really have got to be doing what once again, we heard Barb, Poppy, tell us, which is we got to move urgently and decisively. And on that frame, I want to encourage our mayor and the departments to come together, as we have talked about, to have a real multi department disciplinary team that's going to help us move forward with, again, getting people into shelters to move forward with our new sanctioned encampments, to get the 24 seven shelters open, the navigation center, the lockers that we have funded this this budget cycle. There are so many things that we know we can do. We now have the resources to do it. We just have to have the dedication to move forward fast. I also

want to acknowledge my colleagues on a number of things and say specific thank you to my colleagues. I again, I want to express the thanks to our central staff who worked so hard. But I also individually want to say thank you, Councilmember Harrell, for the work that you and particularly Jennifer Samuels and your. Office is done around restorative justice. Councilmember O'Brien, you and I have worked on this as well. Councilmember Harrell, your 13th year promise. I appreciate the help with that. And just again, making things better for our people in our city. Councilmember Herbold. You're in ingenuity on many things during this budget cycle. I just want you to know I'm very grateful for that. And it was. Kind of a serendipity. I ran into Nick Licata last week and he was trying to take credit, saying he taught you everything you know. And I said, You definitely learned a lot from him, but, you know, a lot on your own. And I'm very respectful for what you've brought to this budget. Councilmember Suarez Yeah, you've just been a delight to work with on parks and I appreciate what you've done around the 130th Street. So you're going to have your own sound transit location there, but also the North Seattle Human Services Summit securing more support for affordable housing in Northgate. I really appreciate that. Councilmember Johnson, your commitment and assisting the residents of the university trailer park to find new places and it was a small but mighty step in the right direction and all the work that you have done. Also on the C3, it's going to make a big difference for our city. Councilmember Gonzalez, your advocacy for the survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Very important. Thank you for that. Thanks for working with me around what we've done to implement the protocols in 1491 and House Bill 1840. So we've got that. Councilmember So want for your dedication to build 1000 affordable homes with

in our community. I appreciate your support on that. And it's something that I have wanted to do. It's a number that we chose a number of years ago, so I'm excited about seeing it happen this year. And Council Member Burgess Ah Budget Chair, thank you so much for ushering us through all these measures, particularly in supporting your childhood education. I'm very respectful of that and your thoughtfulness, collegiality, and I think this has been one of the best budget processes I've seen to date. So I appreciate that. And I also want to say special thanks to my own staff, Lily, Allison, Albert and Amy in my office that who closely coordinated with all the other council officers and our colleagues. So appreciate what we've done here. And again, I've really tried to keep my focus solely on the homelessness human services funds for this budget cycle and appreciate all that we got done. Thank you, Councilmember Katsuhiko Gonzalez. Thank you. I believe that the city council has crafted done a very good job of crafting a creative, innovative and bold budget for 2017 and 2018 that is truly reflective of Seattle's values of equity and opportunity. This budget was my first budget cycle as a councilmember, as it was for at least three other folks who are sitting up here with me today. And for me, my priorities included investments around public safety, housing, paid family leave and support for immigrants, refugees, non-English speakers, LGBTQ youth and seniors and survivors of domestic and sexual assault. I wanted to just take a moment to highlight a few items that are reflected in this year's budget that I was proud to champion on behalf of community. The first is in the area of public safety, where we issued a statement of legislative intent, making sure that residents of South Park and Chinatown International District have the resources they need to spur community driven public safety improvements for South Park. This will mean that next year there will be a creation of a special task force for that community to provide the city with concrete policy recommendations that will improve overall public safety and livability of that neighborhood and for the Chinatown International District. It means that we will be funding a public safety coordinator, and it also means that we will be funding public safety surveys that are culturally and linguistically competent for the residents and workers in that particular neighborhood. And it also means that we renew our commitment to make sure that we preserve the Danny Wu Park and Garden by investing \$400,000 over the next two years in improvements to that green space in the Chinatown International District around housing. I'm really proud that this budget reflects a \$100,000 investment to fund an affordable housing needs assessment analysis for LGBTQ seniors. And it also allocates resources for development of a homeless youth housing project to ensure some of our most vulnerable neighbors have access to stable housin

g and the services they need. In addition, also incredible, incredibly proud of the fact that this budget funds the Home and Hope Program, which will dedicate \$400,000 over a period of two years to transform vacant or underutilized tax exempt sites owned by public agencies and nonprofit organizations into well-located, quality, affordable housing and mixed use public benefit

development projects. The Home and Hope program will pave the way for developing enough sites to produce an additional 1500 units of affordable housing over the next five years. Also proud of the budget reflecting the city's priorities around paid family leave. In particular, this budget includes an add to the Seattle Department of Human Resources, which would add a paid family leave coordinator to help our city employees navigate benefits that are available to them when there is a birth of a child or a family member becomes ill. This budget also reflects an additional \$300,000 over the next two years to ensure that immigrants and refugees have assistance in becoming new Americans by increasing the funding for the Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs. Citizenship Workshops. These workshops will help eligible immigrants to naturalize and further integrate into our democracy by registering to vote and hopefully by also exercising the right to vote. And of course, in these times, this particular investment, my hope is, will have a very significant impact on helping our immigrant and refugee community. Lastly, this budget reflects a \$1.134 million investment over a two year period and mobile advocates for survivors of domestic and sexual violence and illegal navigator for the King County Courthouse. These budget actions will allocate funds to directly assist survivors of domestic and sexual violence through the labyrinth of the legal and social services system, which can be very confusing and burdensome in an already stressful and uncertain moment for survivors. So as a whole, I truly believe that this budget demonstrates that we have taken bold and creative action towards investing in our community by prioritizing the needs of working families and underrepresented communities. I want to thank all of those that participated in this year's budget process by either meeting with me or my staff or attending public comment or sending us a note via email or in mail. Huge thank you to my own staff who were also experiencing the city budget process for the first time and to council central staff and budget share Tim Burgess for running a very good, transparent process that was incredibly organized and I can only imagine the countless amount of hours that you all spent on helping put together such a good budget process, which is particularly appreciated for a rookie like me. So I want to thank you all for all the work that you did and for. You're all my colleagues for being engaged during the process. Thank you, Councilmember Gonzales. Councilmember Johnson. Thanks. Like my col

league also, my first was a process, too. And just want to highlight a couple of things that I think were some central points for me through this budget process. I come into this with a background in urban planning and policy, and I really was looking at this in sort of four main ways. The first of which is how do we foster community through our budgeting process? And there are a lot of different ways that we did that. But I want to call out a couple of things that I think are really critically important to fostering community funding for additional lights for our parks and recreation departments to light athletic fields, which is critically important as our school district changes Bell Times. We are going to see more kids on those fields later in the evenings, and I think that that's going to be a really great way for us to continue to foster community. Advancing funding for equitable development initiative projects I think is going to be critical to allow many different organizations who currently call Seattle home to put more brick and mortar behind those goals and objectives. Funding for Arts Organizations. Capital funding for many large and small arts organizations who I think are really critical for the health and well-being of our city and continue to make us economically competitive, I think is going to be really great, as well as a really wonderful small project around activation of King Street, which I think is going to be a really wonderful addition to our community. That element of fostering community, I think is critical. We also, I think, put a strong emphasis on making the city more affordable. We did that in a couple of different ways. I know my colleague, Councilmember Herbold, is going to talk about the bonding capacity for more affordable housing, which I think is important. We also put some money into relocation assistance for folks in a soon to closed trailer park in the university. It's called the University Trailer Park. It's just off of Lake City in Councilmember Suarez's district. I think that's going to be really important, as well as putting money into the creation of affordable housing on city owned land or publicly owned land. We've got some money in the budget for really advancing feasibility work for those projects, as well as funding specifically for Northgate, which I know Councilmember Wahls will talk about as well. Transportation choices, an expansion of the public safety. And our public right away is critical to me. And many of my colleagues put projects in the budget to advance public safety on roadways in their districts, and there are so many that it's too many to call out. But I'm really grateful for the backing that many of my colleagues put towards making our roadways safer for everybody, especially Councilmember O'Brien for the work on advancing funding for the bike master plan

projects. I think that that's going to be really critical as we continue to try to make our streets safer for everybody. An

d Councilmember Burgess, really the call out for my old mentor, Don Shoup, and the work they've done on parking benefit districts. I'm really grateful to you for continuing to keep that project alive. Finally supporting kids and families. Councilmember Burgess, you did a good job of outlining many of the programs, and I know you'll talk Council President Harrell about the 13th year program, but a couple of small things that I think are really important for us. We put some money into that child care mitigation fund, which we've talked about a lot this morning. And I also want to say a big thank you to my colleagues for their investment in the backpack programs for kids, which over the next couple of years will ensure that every kid who needs it goes home over the weekends with a backpack full of food so they can come back on Monday ready to learn. Many of those kids don't have access to food over the weekends, not only just for them, but for their siblings and other family members. And that's a critical investment in human services that I think will really bear good dividends for us in the long run. Finally, I just want to say thank you to many of my colleagues who during this budget process, worked so hard to invest and of course, that are values that reflect a commitment to equity and access. Support for infrastructure for our growing community kept a vigilant focus on the creation of affordable housing, who improved pedestrian and bike safety on public rights of way and so meaningfully invested in our next generation. I think that that's very well reflected in our budget. Finally, a big thanks to Jerry Morris and my office, who always made me sound smarter than I actually am, who is always working so hard behind the scenes to connect up constituents values with what we see in our budget. And I'm really grateful to her for her work. Thank you. Katherine Johnson. Councilmember Herbold, I was going to call on you if you didn't have your hand up, so thank you. You know, one of the things that we heard from folks around the move to district elections and district representation is how is budget going to work? Is it going to just be everybody fighting? For their district. And I think what we've seen this year in the budget process is this is really a great time for us all to work together to make sure that our. Priorities. Are supported. And it's an opportunity for us to support one another in being successful in meeting those priorities. That's how I've approached this budget. I've approached it both at looking at what some of the needs are for my district, as well as for the things that I have oversight for under my civil rights, utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee, as well as some really important housing and human services issues as it relates specifically to District One budget proposals. We did a number of different things. Councilmember Gonzalez mentioned her leadership in getting the South Park public safety effort identified

in the budget to create a task force to formulate and report to come the Council recommendations regarding public safety in South Park. We also funded the South Park Family Service Center to support Health and Human Services, a leadership program and an education program in South Park. We funded the continuation of the West Seattle Bridge studies to continue work begun by prior City Councilmember Tom Rasmussen by adding \$100,000 to complete two bridge studies for the corridor to improve safety, safety, incident management and traffic flow. We clarified that the the CIP, the Capital Improvement Project, would allocate \$1.5 million for street streetlight improvements and utility pole relocations recommended by community members as integral to the revised design for the Fauntleroy Boulevard project. And we also created an age friendly community innovation fund that will support grant programs for groups in each of the seven council districts to apply for up to \$25,000 each for programs and services based on improving the lives of an aging population. And finally, we supported a statement of legislative intent for a start that requests that they work with the Port of Seattle of Federal Railway Administration and railway companies doing business at Terminal five to extend the existing quiet zone from Terminal five to the Dale Ridgeway Marginal Way intersection. As it relates specifically to items in that fall, under my committee bailiwick, we funded hearing loops for the Boards and commissions room to ensure accessibility for those with hearing disabilities. That is a an important civil rights issue. We also funded another civil rights issue. We funded employment and housing bias testing to allow the Office of Civil Rights to conduct approximately 210 employment and housing tests to proactively enforce the city's anti-discrimination laws. And economic development issue is the funding of the Legacy Business Study to determine the scope and definition of a future Seattle Legacy Business Program to preserve businesses that contribute to the city's unique culture and character that are at

risk of being lost. Councilmember Johnson mentioned the King Street Station proposal. And then as far as labor issues go, not only did we support the mayor's recommendation to make the Office of Labor Standards its own standalone department, but we also included funding for an additional investigator dedicated specifically to directed investigations to allow for proactive labor law enforcement. And then finally, the Green Pathways Resolution to establish a position on the workforce entry and Employment Pathways inter-departmental team to identify how city internships, apprenticeships, youth employment, workplace investment and job training can lead to career paths. As it relates to the final focus of mine during the budget deliberations, the Housing Human Services items, we restored transitional housing funding in 2017 for 18 homelessness programs serving veterans, youth

, domestic violence survivors and immigrant refugee families. We included funding not only to enforce new local rental housing regulations, but also to ask the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections to develop a new proposal for a public facing landlord tenant resource center. And we also created. A brand new pilot to contract with the King County Department of Public Defense for. SIEGEL Civil legal services related to housing evictions for indigent defendants who the Office for Public Defense is already representing on a criminal issue. Often we find that people who have not yet been even found guilty of any any crime. These folks are at risk of losing their housing during the course of their their defense. And then finally, the passage of a \$29 million housing bond proposal would not have been possible without the support of my colleagues on the council, the public. Councilmember Sawant. In putting forward the thousand homes proposal. The many individuals and groups who have contacted our office in a plea for more housing resources to address our homelessness. State of emergency. Realizing that we both need to build today to meet the existing need. But that building today is less expensive than building it. Future costs. And these funds will continue to benefit the community for the length of the bond payment under future regulatory agreements. In the other the other thing that's, I think, important to to keep in mind is that we have not yet settled on a particular project or projects . I think the there are there are many different options that we can pursue. And I look forward to working both with the Office of Housing, the mayor's office, the the city budget office, as well as council members on identifying how we want to roll this out. Whether or not we want to look at a single project or or many projects, I think some of the things that we've talked about in budget can range from the funding for the Hopes and Homes Project, specifically identifying ways of funding the development of new housing on publicly owned land. But whatever we choose, I hope we choose something that is both cost effective and an expedient. The need is is great. And my my hope is that we don't just simply look at funding the sort of bricks and mortar type of new development proposals that this this particular proposal has been compared to. And I think that's really that's really it. The the my closing bit is to thank the folks in my office who have toiled on these budget ads. Andre, Alex and Noel and Jean have worked very hard as well as all the work that has been done by central staff to make this great budget possible. Thank you. Councilmember Herbert cut somewhere else. Thank you. Before we begin, enlist the things that we were successful in as our way is first of all, to thank my colleagues. This was our first budget and boy, was it a session and I learned a lot. I want to thank Chair Burgess for making it a very understandable process and central sta

ff for all the support that they gave us in doing this budget for the first time. I did learn a lot about the other districts and what their needs and what their concerns for, and I'm kind of echoing what Councilmember Herbal two shared . It gave me an opportunity to learn more in depth about just the needs of the community themselves, and I appreciated that. As usual are obviously for me, it's an honor to represent the city of Seattle and to serve the needs of my district, which of course, you all know is District five. So in this budget, we advocated for a broad range of proposals, including improvements in human services, construction of sidewalks and community planning initiatives, including including shelter for the unhoused district. Five residents near Lake City Planning and Design work for the future Bitter Lake Reservoir Park. We're hoping to cap that Bitter Lake reservoir and make that a park. They've been working on that for almost ten years. The establishment of literary sources Ready to work program in Lake City because we know that language is often an obstacle to employment. Also, the service navigators at the Food Banks and Funding North Helpline, which is our only food bank in D5 and serves hundreds of people. And with the loss of another other food bank in Green Lake, it's been our queen. Yeah, it's been difficult. But anyway,

the sidewalk construction in Meadowbrook neighborhood, the planning for additional affordable housing in Northgate in which we secured \$90,000. I want to thank Speaker Cha was working with our office in Councilmember. Gonzales, his office to focus in on homes anywhere between 12 and 1500 homes and focus on transit oriented housing and transit oriented development. When our Northgate like Northgate Light Rail comes in, hopefully before 2021, and also implementing the recommendations from the upcoming NorCal Human Services Summit. It's the first time ever there's ever been such a summit in the North, and I want to thank the mayor's office for that and funding that also the additional events and performances to activate our parks, and that would be citywide and one we're very proud of as the low barrier services for survivors of commercial and sexual exploitation. A new Aurora at the Aurora Commons. I also want to thank my staff. They've been phenomenal. Like I said, this was very interesting for all of us. Brendel, Mercedes, Sabrina, artistic director and Tiler all work tirelessly with central staff. Mercedes says that we got 93% of what we asked for, which tells me I didn't ask for enough. So next year I'll ask for more. I have to say this, though it has been a real pleasure and an honor to work with my colleagues and I really enjoyed working with each one of you. So thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Whereas Councilmember Swann. Thank you, President Harrell. I also wanted to start by echoing my colleagues thanks to all the central staff members led by casinos did Ericsson who did incredible work. I also t

hank our Summer Burgesses office for all the work that they put in to make this Budget Committee work. I also want to thank all my staff, but especially Ted Worden, who's done a lot of work nonstop to make sure that all the work that we are doing with the people's budget movement goes forward. I wanted to clarify that this agenda item items, the two items are items 36 and 37 are items that are referring to the budget as a whole, not the amendments passed by the City Council. And these are this is the budget as a whole for the city of Seattle over the next couple of years. I intend to vote no on this budget, consistent with my commitment to a people's budget that could urgently use the city's resources to raise the quality of life for the hundreds of thousands of people in this city. The previous votes that we have taken throughout the budget process have amended the mayor's proposed budget in many important ways that I support and in some cases have fought for. And in a moment, I want to speak to those victories. However, it needs to be noted that all the amendments, despite all the self-congratulatory words, are only on the margins. Unfortunately, in the budget as a whole remains overwhelmingly the same business as usual budget that has failed to meet the needs of regular people in our city year after year. This year's budget, like last year's, failed to seriously prioritize ending homelessness. This year's budget, just like last year's, fails to seriously prioritize ending the housing affordability crisis. This budget, like in the past, invests an approach that to public safety that continues to put the bulk of the city's money in locking people up instead of investing in our communities to prevent crime in the first place. And this budget, like in the past, fundamentally depend on taxing poor and working class people to regressive tax mechanisms instead of taxing the super rich and big business. There is really no excuse to so thoroughly fail to meet human need in a city with such immense wealth and therefore as a representative of working people in this city. I cannot support this budget. Almost 50 years ago, Martin Luther King Jr said, and I quote, If our nation can spend 35 billion a year to fight an unjust, evil war in Vietnam and \$20 billion to put a man on the moon, it can spend billions of dollars to put God's children on there to feed right here on Earth. His words from 1967 are, if anything, more meaningful today in a city where a single billionaire is financing his own spaceships while thousands of people have been driven into homelessness, have overflowed the shelters and are living on the streets. While I cannot support the budget as a whole, I do want to acknowledge the progress that the people's budget movement and the Coalition to build 1000 homes have made. Over the last month we restored the funding to the lead program, which is an alternative to incarcerating people that the mayor cut from his budget. We want more funding for

programs serving survivors of domestic violence. Funding for food for kids and increased shelter. Hours for homeless people. And as I mentioned earlier, we ended the corporate tax break council gave to big banks doing international investment management services in 2009. And we have generated \$2 million per year now to help pay for social programs. We are finally one the funding for the equitable development projects. And thanks to cast member O'Brien for leading on that. And we want many other things that will have a real impact on people's lives. Most importantly, we won

\$29 million for affordable housing. I thank all the activists of the Build 1000 Homes coalition to make this possible. We should be crystal clear. The only reason we won those \$29 million was because of the power of that coalition in building a movement and in fighting for the full \$160 million previously planned for the police bunker in the north. While 29 million is only 18% of 160 million. And we should ask the question, why did the council not have the political will to fund the whole project? It would be a mistake to underestimate how important this victory is. \$29 million is a lot of money, and it is going to support the most burning need we have in Seattle to date. It will mean about at least more 200 more affordable units. That means if you look at it from human terms, almost 200 families with a home and it will be all the difference to them. And it is \$29 million that the Democratic political establishment of this city did everything in their power to stop us from winning. The mayor's office released multiple memos opposing it. Councilmember Burgess wrote an op ed against it, and the Seattle Times editorial board wrote two editorials against it, including one today. Not only did we win 29 million for affordable housing, we did so with seven yes votes. Those of you in the Thousand Homes Coalition who have been calling council offices during marches and standouts, speaking in public and joining rallies, putting up posters, moving endorsements in organizations and community groups you're a part of, and coming to coalition meetings. You know how hard fought for these seven votes were. Council members voted yes because they felt the pressure of the moment movement. But it has to be noted that only Councilmember O'Brien and I were willing to go against the establishment that is wanting to dig its heels in to resolve money to rebuild the north precinct, which in my view, is completely unnecessary. Ah, the note that we have to make for our movement is that the outcomes in politics depend on the balance of power between our movement and the level of opposition from the establishment. So a sober reflection is that a stronger movement could have forced more council members into prioritizing housing over the bunker. But we should also also note our victory that the movement was strong enough to force the establishment to do something they had sworn to never do, which is use bon

ds for housing. And this is not a small thing. It's a \$29 million worth of bonds for everyone out there that wonders if it is even possible to fight Trump and his racist, sexist right wing agenda. We should take heart from victories such as these. When we build a mass and united movement, we can win things that seemed unimaginable a couple of months ago. That is how we won \$15 an hour, and that is how we won these \$29 million. That is how we can defeat Wall Street interest and also Trump's agenda. So once again, thank you to all the dedicated activists in the people's budget movement and the Thousand Homes Coalition. You have demonstrated how movements can win victories. I raised this because as I vote no on the budget as a whole, it is very important we lose we not lose sight of what we have won through our movement. I will vote no on the budget by voting no on this item and the next agenda item. Thank you, Councilwoman Swatch. Councilmember O'Brien. Colleagues, you've all said a lot of great things and I agree with a lot of it and I am ready to vote yes, man. Okay. Well, leadership these days, the brevity. I mean, if I see a speech, I would like to just say a few words, but I won't be nearly as brief as is. Councilmember O'Brien. One thing about a budget process, any budget process is it largely also tells you what you can't afford. And that's a bad part about a budget. But it also doesn't prevent you from trying to do the best you could. And I hope that this council years from now will not be judged by the mistakes you've made or what you didn't see, but really by what you tried to do. And I have to tell you, this is far from business as usual. There are unprecedented and uninvestigated areas that this particular budget aggressively tries to invest in. And I want to say to the advocates for the community centers as an example, this is not the end of anything. We have supplemental budgets. We have legislation from the council. We have our superintendent of parks here watching us deliberate in this particular budget. As an example, we are investing \$1.5 million in the 13th year Promise Scholarship program, which means kids with GPAs at a25 to 6 to 7 GPA, which we know are falling through the cracks. They're not getting in the greatest schools because for whatever reason, they don't have a38 GPA. We are investing in that demographic and saying there's hope and we're trying to get you on a better path. We're investing \$6.5 million in an equitable development implementation plan that goes to the Rainier Beach Innovation District, a multicultural community center, a Southeast Economic Opportunity Center, the William Groves Center for Culture. Innovation, Little Saigon Landmark Project. These are real investments in communities that have largely been overlooked by the powers that be. We are investing \$1,000,000 in unprecedented educational opportunities, a high school innovation pilot program, a summer learning expansion. Realizing these kids drop of

f, sometimes it right after high school and during the summer or during high school, during the summer experienced a summer melt program. And a summer melt is not a it's not a cheese sandwich or anything. The summer melt program recognizes that a lot of kids actually get accepted to schools and then they fail to show up. They fail to show up because they get intimidated. They have other problems. And the drop off, particularly on underrepresented groups, is very, very significant. So we're investing \$100,000 to identifying these kids and finding out why they are dropping off. We have \$200,000 in to 2017 and \$1.8 million in 2018 for a community service officer. CSO Program. You may recall why CSOs, the ERA, the very bloody civil rights era that the CSOs were invented, we recognize, is that in public safety we have to have people coming from the communities that they serve. We have to there's no excuse for it not to be. And so in addition to looking and reevaluating how we recruit police officers and firefighters, we are creating or recreating this community service position, which is, again, intended to be a liaison, if you will, people from the community helping us better serve the community. This pre filing diversion efforts that we're doing, 407,000 in 2017 and over 660,000, 2018. What what that's about is when a kid, like many of the kids that I grew up with, become knuckleheads. And they do something stupid. They have an arrest record on their on their record or they are prosecuted with idiotic crimes. They are around the wrong people at the wrong time. And we're recognizing that through our judges, through our prosecutors, through our law department, through things we have control over there. We can help change lives and rebuild many of these youth. The \$29 million for long term city bonds that many of us, I think, were rightfully critical in terms of this being unprecedented. However, we stepped up and said, you know, and I said, sometimes when there's a crisis, you may do things perhaps that are traditionally unwise or imprudent, but often the right thing to do. So I think this is an outstanding budget. And I want to thank Councilmember Burgess for and Kirsten, I don't know if it came from from Kirsten Aristotle or Councilmember Burgess. I don't really care. The work was outstanding. And I want to thank you both because it was a transparent process. You worked incredibly hard and I won't do what Councilmember Burgess did was go through all the names of central staff, but I will recognize Jennifer Samuels visiting Jeremy Rock and Chase Monroe from my staff because they worked feverishly as well, trying to make sure that we got some things that we felt pretty passionate about. I also want to thank the mayor, the mayor and his department heads, because quite candidly, they put forth some investments in this budget that really gave us, I think, a good template to work from, not to in a sense, in a preposition, but that's exactly what they did.

And I think that they worked again collaboratively prior to the budget process, talking to many of my colleagues, figuring out figuring this out before it had gotten to us and Ben Nobles and others, I want to thank you for that. And I'm not going to recognize many department heads, but I want to tell you, Dwayne Chappelle in our Education Department, I think is a is a superstar. And again, working with this educational summit, looking at our deficiencies and coming up with new ideas on how to address the the disparity in education, I think was phenomenal. So I'm excited about this budget. I think we did the hard work in the in the easy work, as you're saying, is deficient. The hard work is finding out how we could think better to serve people better. And this is not the end. This is the beginning of implementation. And we're going to have many opportunities next year to improve on these investments. So I can't thank my colleagues enough. And I think I, I said all the comments that I want to say. And so I think we are ready to vote. So it's been introduced. It's been described. I will make sure I don't see any hands fly up. And having said that, please call the role on Council Bill 118849. Herbold Hi. Johnson Suarez. O'Brien Hi. Sergeant No. Bagshaw Hi. Burgess. Gonzalez I President Harrell All right. Eight in favor. One opposed. The bill passed and the chair will sign it in this next resolution. Be endorsing our 2018 budget. Are any comments on the resolution those in favor of adopting resolution vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. No. Motion carries the resolutions, adopt and chair assignment. And this is a time where we clap among ourselves. Good work, colleagues. Thank you very much. We shall have a little business to do. Let's see. We don't have any other resolutions to adopt at. But, uh, Chair Burgess, I think you have a matter on other business you may want to address. Yes, I'd like to. I move to rescind my absence on December 16. It's been moved in segment that council member Burgess's absence from December 16 be rescinded. All those in favor say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. Any further business come before the council? Councilmember Herbold? Yes. I'm asking to be excused from the November 28th full council meeting. What date was that again? I'm sorry. November 28, November 20th. Got it. And it's

been to those in favor of excuse, Councilmember Herbold, for November 28th. Say, I, I opposed. The ayes have it. She is excused for 1128. Any other council member. So what? Unfortunately, I can't remember if I've already asked, but I don't know what the procedure is. If I'm just try it again, it'll be covered. Give me the date. Okay. I also asked to be excused from November 28 for Council. Of over 20. Seconds. It's been taken, it's been moved and seconded that council members shouldn't be excused from November 28th. All those in favor say I oppose. The ayes have it. She is excused. Any other business? Okay, with that, we will just let you know we

going to move into the Parks District, so we're going to keep the cameras rolling. So I'm going to adjourn this meeting and we're just going to not get up. We're going to proceed with our Parks District proceeding so the full council stands adjourned and we are going to now convene as a parks. The bill passes in the chair with signage. Get the clerk second. Catch her breath. And Wall Street Council. Rather agenda items 16 and 17. The short title of those two pieces, please. Agenda Item 16 Constable 118 850 Relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation, the committee recommends the bill pass agenda item 17 Council Bill 118 844 relating to the Smith Cove Project and the Capital Fund in the Department of Parks and Recreation. The committee recommends the bill pass. Any comments from the chair? No. Please call the roll on council. Bill 118850. That's agenda item number 16. Herbold. Johnson. Whereas O'Brien. Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess. Gonzales and President Harrell nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passes the chair will sign it. Please call the roll on Constable 118844. Herbold by Johnson Suarez O'Brien by Sergeant Bakeshop Burgess Gonzalez President Harrell nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed and chair will sign it. Please read agenda items 18 through 20. The short title, please. Cancel a18 799 relating to sales excuse me CEO like satellite department. The committee recommends the bill pass councilmember suarez. Thank you i'm sitting in for councilmember so want today this council bill authorize the city light to sell a small 20 foot thick strip of surplus property in the Snohomish County to the adjacent property owner city light will receive full market value \$163,000. The Energy Environment Committee held a public hearing last Tuesday and there was no opposition from the public. The committee recommends passage of the bill. Thank you, councilman. Words are there any further comments? Get another one. Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Maurice O'Brien Bagshaw Burgess. Gonzalez Herbold. Johnson. President Harrell High eight in favor not. Opposed bill passed in shared senate please read agenda item number 26. Council Bill 118 879 related to the city department declaring a surplus and authorizing the General Manager and chief executive officer of the City Department to partially release three easements for electrical service in King County, Washington and ratifying confirm research in prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember, whereas. This Council bill authorizes City Light to release amusements. Every time City Light stretches a power line across someone's yard, deliver power to their house, it requires an easement. And if that power line moves, the easement is released. The council bill releases three unneeded easements. The Energy Environment Committee held a legally required public hearing last Tuesday, and while there were comments, there was no opposition to this bill from the public

. The committee recommends passage of this bill. Thank you very much in the comments. Mr. President, I have about 100 questions on this one. I'm really sorry. I know you have. No. I know we are moving along, trying to slow down now that you know, we're not going to wonky town. Okay. So we will save our cross-examination of later. And I was asked to call the rule on the passage of the bill. Whereas. Oh 20 we just. Oh, I thought you going to do the short bill. Okay. Colleges. Oh, we're voting yes. See? Through a rhythm up there. So let's. Let's have a clean room. That's supposed to go. This week. Please call the room. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. SUAREZ Yes. O'BRIEN Hi. Bakeshop. Burgess Gonzalez, I Herbold Johnson, President Harrell. All right. Seven in favor and unopposed. Thank you. Agenda item number 27, please. Agenda item 27 Council vote 118880 0 million two. Satellite Department Authorizing and directing. The General Manager and chief executive officer of satellite to execute a interlocal agreement with Kalispell Tribe of Indians. The committee recommends the bill pass. He knew he had to leave. So he will be missing the remainder of this. And we wish him well on his personal obligation. Please read. Agenda item number six into the record. Agenda item six. Constable 118889. Authorizing Director of Finance Administrative Services to execute an amendment that extends a modified, decentralized agreement between the City of Seattle and KPBS, as it were. Central Building LLC, a Delaware

limited liability company for office space. The the city leases on 810 third Avenue and ratified confirming search and prayer as the committee recommends the bill passed. Because my. BURGESS thank you. This is a simple ordinance that authorizes the lease for the Office of Labor Standards. There currently in the central building at 810 Third Avenue, just a couple of blocks from here. But as you all know, colleagues, we increase their staff from 11 full time equivalent to 23 beginning this year. So they need more space in this lease will accommodate their use through October 2025. Thank you. Any further comments, Councilmember Herbold? Just a slight addition before former Councilman Villacorta leaves. The creation of the Office of Labor Standards as its own office was another one of Councilmember Lakatos brainchild. And I don't know if there's general awareness that during this year's budget process, we took them out from being a division of the Office of Civil Rights, and they're now their own standalone department. Thank you. Excellent comments. Without any further comments, please call the role on the passage of the bill. Suzanne Burgess. Il. Gonzalez Herbold Il. Suarez O'Brien, President Harrell seven in favor and unopposed. Will pass and share with Senate. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda Item seven Appointment 533. Appointment of Stephens Treasurers as members landmarks Preservation Board for a Term two August 15, 2018. The Committe

e recommends the appointment be confirmed. Agenda item number 15 into the record. Agenda item 15 Resolution 317 37 Requesting Congress to allocate funding to adequately address the maintenance needs of the national park system. Councilmember Suarez. Thank you. I want to thank my fellow council members who co-sponsored this resolution. With me, Councilmember Sawant, Councilmember Johnson and Councilmember President Harrell. The National Park Service is dedicated to educating the public about America's natural, cultural and historical resources. And we have seen the Park Service employees maintain this dedication in the face of pressure to abandon that important charge. The national parks managed 410 significantly nationally. Significant sites that spent 84 million acres. And most precious to Seattle are the two most visited parks national parks, Mount Rainier and Olympic National Park. In a time where little is considered sacred and we take up the fight here to recognize the importance of protecting lands and water elsewhere, it is now when we must call on our leadership to protect our lands and water here at home be resolved by us. The City Council that we strongly encourage Congress to address the funding needs for the parks system, to address the deferred maintenance and protect the continued existence of these lands across the country and here in our great state of Washington. Thank you. Thank you. Any further comments? Nobody has anything to say. That's great. I'll just. I'll just make one. Thank you for staying to the. Yeah. Just going to thank those guys. And it's not in District five, just so you all know. I'll move. I will move to adopt resolution 31737. It's been moving. Asked that the resolution be adopted, are there any further comments? Those in favor of adopting the resolution please vote. I. I. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries the resolutions adopted. The chair will sign it. Is there any further business coming for the Council? Harry now. Thanks, everyone. Have a great day. And we stand adjourned. Please read the next agenda item. It should be. Agenda item number four. Agenda item four, Resolution 317 33 requesting evacuation of residential displacement as it relates to increases in development capacity in certain areas, and declaring the Council's intent to consider strategies to mitigate any loss of subsidized, affordable units in naturally occurring affordable units resulting from an increase in development capacity. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. This resolution requests that the Office of Planning and Community Development complete an evaluation of residential development as it relates to the proposal being developed to increase development capacity in certain areas, otherwise known as the city wide reason work that is to implement the mandatory housing affordability programs. I'll be offering a substitute version of resolution 31733 that incorporates some technical changes, some of the recommendations of the executi

ve, and a new section that reaffirms a commitment to manage future growth of the city in a manner that continues to encourage racial and social equity and minimizes potential disproportionate impact of future development on marginalized populations. The displacement risk analysis that was done as part of the University District Mandatory Housing Affordability Rezone was for our purposes of more fully mitigating displacement risks, not sufficient. The analysis, as required by this resolution, will provide the City Council information that could inform future policy decisions related to mitigating loss of subsidized, affordable housing units in naturally occurring affordable units

resulting from an increase in development capacity. So I will move to amend Resolution 31733 by substituting version five for version two. Thank you. We're just voting on the amendment. It's been moved in second and to amend the resolution by substituting version five for version two, all those in favor of the amendment, both i. I opposed. The ayes have it. Council member Herbert. Continue. That's all for me. Okay. So are there any further comments on the amended resolution? Briefly, sir. Councilwoman Johnson. I just want to say how timely this resolution is, is as was alluded to in public comment today, the city draft environmental impact statement is under way, is ongoing right now with the planning department. And so this framework that we're adopting today helps to inform the planning department as they continue to do their displacement risk analysis. And so very timely, something that will look forward to seeing as implementation through the citywide zoning changes. Thank you for bringing it forward, Councilman. Excellent. So I'll move to adopt resolution 31733 as amended. Second those in favor of adopting the resolution as a minute, please vote i i those opposed vote no. The motion carries the resolution as adopted as amended, and the chair will sign it. Please read agenda item number five into the record. The report of the Energy Environment Committee and item ten Constable 1189 12 relating to the satellite department and the Department of Parks Recreation superseding Section seven of Ordinance 124 917 and transferring jurisdiction of the former Dulwich substation from the City Light Department to the Department of Parks and Recreation for Open Space Park Immigration Purposes Committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. Council members. So on. Thank you, Britain Brian. This council constable transfers of former substation property in the deluge neighborhood of Seattle from City Light to the Parks Department. Under state law, public utilities are financially distinct from the city, and so the property had to be sold at fair market value. In this case, the property was not part of Park's strategic plan, but the community wanted to maintain it as a greenspace. So the Delbridge Neighborhoods Development Association raised the money by winning grants to pa

y for it, and that menu is attached to the Council bill. I want to thank Dale Rich Neighborhoods Development Association for their work on behalf of their community and also thanks to City Light staff who as usual, have made sure to give the community the time they need to make the whole thing work. They went through a transparent process. My office also visited the property with the community members back in 2014, which is also a reflection of the careful way that City Light staff approached the disposition of property of this kind. And the committee recommends for council pass the bill. Thank you. Council members want any further comments? Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. I just want to say a few words. This project is in my district, District one. No, this is a project that our committee members have been working on for quite some time. I actually was on a community tour last week when this was being heard in committee. I want to thank the Parks Department for their funding contribution as well as King County for theirs as well. The work that community members and our neighborhood district associations specifically I want to call out Willie Brown is fantastic in the vision for this property is really exciting as well. Not only will they be using the space for a natural wetland which will detail storm water runoff, alleviating flooding of neighborhood yards and driveways, but it will also provide a bio filtration of stormwater runoff before it enters Longfellow Creek. And then DDA will partner with Seattle Tilth and Nature Consortium and staff and students from Louisa Boren stem k through eight school to develop and manage the remaining part of the property as a permanent culture food forest. And this is really important for this community because Delbridge is a food desert. The land management system contains aspects of the native habitat with edible forest gardening and a children's garden will link classroom and field experience to educate local youth in environmental science and stewardship and atmosphere. So this is just a fantastic project. It's been a long time coming and thanks to Councilmember Swann as well for shepherding this legislation through her committee. Thank you for those comments. Councilmember Horrible. Any further comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Marez O'Brien. All right. So I beg Sean Burgess. Gonzalez Purple. Johnson President Harrell. All right. Nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and Cheryl signed it. Please read the report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Energy Committee. Three for the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee and Item 11 Council Bill 118903 Relating to Seattle Public Utilities repealing Section five of Ordinance 125111 and amending Section 21.70 6.0 42. For code to correct a technical technical error committee recommend Civil Pass Custom Herbold. Thank you very much. Are there any further comments, those in favor of c

confirming the appointments vote? I. I those of those opposed vote. No. Motion carries and the appointments are confirmed. These are either part of the Gender Equity Safe Communities and New Americans Committee. The Report of the Gender Equity So Communities and New Americans Committee General 12 Cancel 118904 relating to appropriations for the Seattle Information Technology Department and many audience 125207, which adopted the 2017 budget, lifting a proviso in ratifying confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thanks very much, Councilmember Gonzalez. Thank you. Council Bill 118904 effectively lifts a budget proviso that was documented in Green Sheet 2071b1 2017 concerning some additional need for a community engagement prior to the release of funds for the Seattle Police Department to move forward with its procurement and operation of a department wide program related to body worn video, commonly referred to as body cameras. Just really quickly, as a refresher around what the conditions of the proviso were that that were imposed upon the department, I just wanted to run through the four components that were documented in that 2017 proviso that were approved by this body. In our last budget cycle, the proviso had four parts to be completed by February 1st of 2017 by the Seattle Police Department. In conjunction with and in consultation with the Community Police Commission, one SPD had to reconvene. The Stakeholder Work Group formed the prior year 2005. And excuse me, 2016 ents and they needed to seek out their advice regarding any outstanding issues or community concerns related to body worn camera protocols and policies to speed in consultation with the stakeholder work group and Council needed to develop a detailed action plan for community engagement on body worn video by December 2nd, 2016, that included a plan for regularly sharing with my committee a status update on community engagement efforts. Three. Speedy needed to submit to the Council a final report that summarized the results of the Department's community outreach that would describe how the draft body worn video policy would be responsive to community input and the operational needs of the department. And the report also needed to identify any unresolved questions or issues related to the body worn video policy and implementation protocols. And lastly, the Department was required to document how it would continue to engage and seek the advice of the stakeholder work group on the use and deployment of body worn video equipment in a sustainable manner well into the future of the deployment of this new technology into our community. So before us today is and before my committee last week was a consideration of whether or not the 127 page report submitted by the police department to full council in my committee was effectively in compliance with those four different criteria that were articulated in the 2007 2017 proviso. After deliberation, the committee

de determined that the the the requirements of that proviso were met. I do want to note that we heard in public comment both at committee and here today and have received some email correspondence related to what the what I think could be confusion as to what the proviso was intended to do versus what it wasn't intended to do. And I just want to be really clear that the proviso clearly was a requirement and a directive to the police department to engage in additional community outreach, which I think at the end result had been approximately two years worth of community engagement. I'm not saying that it was an entire two years worth of community engagement. It was certainly in fits and starts, I would say. But the proviso was not intended to relitigate the issue as to whether the city should or should not pursue the body worn video program. And I wanted to be really clear, is the drafter in the generator of that proviso that the intent of the proviso was to make sure that as as the city moves towards deployment of body worn cameras into our community, that it was being done so in a manner that was informed by impacted communities. So that that, I think, is what the actual intent was. And I just wanted to say that given that the the committee recommends that the full council approve the ordinance lifting the body worn video proviso and before I end my comments in hand and answer any questions or open up the floor for others to add their comments , I just wanted to add that in public comment. Again, both in committee and here, we've heard a lot about about whether or not body cameras are desired within our community. And I just wanted to point out to a report that was issued just last year that was commissioned by the Federal Monitor, by the city of Seattle, to take a look at not just community confidence, particularly within communities of color, but also looked at where people were at in terms of their receptiveness to wanting body cameras here. And I'll just read the final conclusion from the report which says, quote, Seattleites overwhelmingly want to see body cameras on their officers. This is almost universally popular, 92% support, 5% oppose like it was in 2015, in which

89% support, 7% oppose. It's again impossible to find a statistically significant population in this city who supports this by any less than 80%. This is similar to the 87% of people who think it's a good idea nationally, according to Pew Research's December 2014 poll. Close quote. So I think the challenge before the department and the challenge before this council is to thread the needle and strike that balance as much as we can between operational needs and legitimate, reasonable policy concerns that have been expressed by a variety of stakeholders, including the department. And I think that right now what we have before us is, is a policy that has that striving to do that it is currently being considered by the. It will monitor and I believe will have a result or reaction

from the federal monitor in early March. So with that being said, I just wanted to lay that out and assure folks who have concerns that this is an iterative process, that we will continue to look at the implementation and deployment of this particular technology in our community, and that that will be done in a transparent way, primarily by virtue of having quarterly reports in my committee. And I've gotten assurances from the department that to the extent that there are increases in use of force in the field after the point for deployment, that there will be an opportunity to revisit this and consider suspending the program. Thank you. Councilmember Gonzalez. Any further comments? Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. Councilmember Gonzales, I appreciate your work on this in the Dow lining and where we are today. I'm going to be voting against this and I want to just walk through where my concerns stem from. So be clear on that. I think it starts from the general concern that I think folks share is the balance between these cameras. Are they going to be used for surveillance or are they going to be used for police accountability? And there's no doubt that a camera could be used for both. But how we set up a policy that ensures that the predominant preponderance of the work done here is to achieve the police accountability outcomes that I believe we're all working for and to be careful that the surveillance aspects of it, to the extent that they exist, are done in a way that are consistent with our commitment, ongoing commitment to privacy. I do believe that the the the folks in charge at the police department are trying really hard to get this right. It's a challenging it's a challenging effort to balance this. And yet when I look at where we are today, I feel like there's some work that needs to be done before we proceed to a full deployment citywide. I want to say that I trust our police department, that they're intense and all my work with them, I believe that their intent is outstanding. But that said, I don't believe it's appropriate to pass policies based on my personal trust with the people who happen to be in charge at the moment. I think it's critically important that we have policies that hold up under any set of people that are occupying different positions. And specifically, my concern is around the amount of discretion that officers, I believe, will continue to have. In light of the report that came out. And what that discretion may mean. I believe folks have seen the New York Times article that talked in detail about what's happening here in our city around police body cameras from I believe it's from last October. There's a data piece in there that it's important to repeat. I know folks here have heard it, but when referring to a study by Ariel and Sutherland, it found that police use of force actually went up by an astonishing 71% when officers to turn on their camera, to turn their cameras on or off at will and went down by 37% only

when they recorded nearly every interaction with public from start to finish. That's one data point, but it's a pretty big data point with a pretty big spread of outcomes depending on how this can be implemented. And so when I look at the I'm specifically looking at attachment F to the report and under Section five, where will Seattle fall following that? Is it a place, a system where they're intended to record every interaction or when they can turn them on and off at will? And it's hard for me to tell, frankly, when I'm looking under Section five, see discretion in recording. It starts off by saying that employee is acting in good faith. To exercise discretion in this policy will not be subject to discipline for the decision to record or not record. That's a pretty big caveat that I think carves out, like, hey, as long as you're trying, we're going to give you a fair amount of leeway. And that feels like it's pretty broad. Then when we look at some of the areas where folks have discretion, there may be an odd circumstance. I'm looking at five F here. There may be limited circumstances when respect for an individual's privacy or dignity outweighs the need to record an event when skipping to the bottom. When an employee believes such a circumstance exists. Employee may deactivate the body worn camera. I won't go into detail to repeating this, but there's numerous places where there's a lot of discretion, and it's hard for me to figure out how we will enforce those rules and say, was it appropriate use of discretion or not? And then we come back to the caveat,

well, as long as they're acting in good faith, we're not going to discipline them. It feels like I worry that we are going too far in the direction of the of the study where folks, police officers, will have a significant amount of discretion to turn on and off the cameras at will. So my one issue is with the Seattle Police Department, not, again, their intent. I believe they're trying very hard on a very challenging thing, on a challenging issue. But I'd like to see more work around that. I also have concerns about other levels of government and how that interacts with our ability to implement a law that if it were just up to Seattle, I think we could do much better. Specifically around states, public records, disclosure rules. We've heard that there is an effort, an ongoing effort to change these. But that's an effort that's out of our control. I mean, we will certainly weigh in on that and lobby and have in the past. It's not clear to me that we're significantly closer to resolving that, and there's no certainty that we will resolve it in a way that meets our needs. I appreciate that. In the the police department's response to the ACLU's letter, they highlight that if things don't go the direction we want them to go, that they would certainly be opening to revisit this. But I think that ultimately highlights the uncertainty around it. And finally, setting this, the police department in th

e state aside, I have serious concerns about federal government's use of data, concerns that frankly, even two weeks ago, I don't know that I would have felt as strongly about we will be collecting immense amounts of data on people in our community. And I don't see any way at the moment how we can shield the federal government from having unfettered access to that one way or the other. And when we have a federal government that is doing things like having immigration agents, board domestic airlines to check IDs of everyone on board, it causes me grave concern about what this amount of data on people in our city being well, not willingly handed over, being made available because we have no alternative to the federal government does. And again, the urgency of moving forward on accountability is important to me, but weighed against these other factors. My preference would be to not deploy body camera citywide at this time and take a little more time to both see what evolves at the state and federal government and work on our policies internally to see if we can do a better job to eliminate some of that discretion. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Bryant. Any further comments? Council members. Back then customer accounts from the question, but yours are just questions. Okay. We'd like to answer it now or later. Okay. Customers want. Thank you, President Harrow. I wanted to thank the. Public Defenders Association, the ACLU, the NAACP and the Council on American-Islamic Relations of Washington State for not only testifying, but also specifically talking to the NAACP and the ACLU for engaging with my office as we sought clarification of many of these questions that were emerging as Councilmember O'BRIEN You know, one went over many of them. I think the council members who are advocating for this particular ordinance have cited the support for BODYCAMS and the consent decree and made the case that it's an important part of police accountability reforms. But that is the question that emerges in my mind. Will these cameras be used for police accountability, or will they be used to increase warrantless surveillance of all our communities, particularly our immigrant and black communities who are systematically targeted by law enforcement agencies around the country. I think John Gardner, own of the ACLU, posed that question quite well in his email to council last Wednesday. He said, and I quote, A policy geared towards surveillance and prosecutions looks very different from one geared towards accountability. We should not ignore data that suggests rolling out cameras with the wrong rules may lead to an increase in violence and may decrease community trust in law enforcement at a time when the trust is particularly fragile. It is for this reason that simply rolling out cameras with the stated intent to adjust the policy on the fly is not a cost free decision. And Gordon and Gordon Brown had a really good quote that was in The New York Times about the some

of the information we have. So what policy has the SBT put in place for the deployment of body cams? Well, the fact that discretion for turning the cameras on and off and control over what happens with the footage is fundamentally in control of the speed. Makes it clear to me that this policy cannot, despite intent, be primarily designed to be a tool for accountability. For accountability. There is to be some other independent agency whose mission is accountability of the speed and who are empowered to make those decisions. Otherwise, it's simply a case of the fox guarding the henhouse. Brian Massey, the chief operations officer of the LAPD, was here year, sent this letter. To all council members except for me objecting to the ACLU opposition to their body cam policy. My office will get into the serious failure of communication from a city department or city council

member leader. But for today, I would like to focus on the substance of his letter. Brian Maxey admits, quote, The policy does not allow officers discretion to turn the cameras on and off under specific circumstances, but is not nearly as nefarious as the ACLU letter suggests, unquote. I have to ask, how can this be an effective accountability tool if officers have that discretion in the first place? He goes on to concede that, quote, The federal government can request and receive data from the department, unquote, but justifies this by saying that, quote, the speedy currently audio and video records the same sort of events that the current body worn cameras policy instructs officers to capture. The department has almost a petabyte of ICB information, unquote. And by the way, what is a better bite? I don't know. And I think I know a lot about that stuff, but I don't know what a petabyte is. But I would like to quote Sean Garner own again, who said that as to privacy, body cameras record far more video in far more places, including the interior of buildings than in-car videos. So it is disingenuous to suggest that simply because SBT currently audio and video records the same sort of events, the body cameras would also have the same rules apply. Also additionally in the the newest letter from the ACLU talks about a specific concern, I think that should be highlighted. The potential result is that body camera footage, combined with the availability of that footage to the federal government and with facial recognition searches could compromise an individual's immigration status in direct contravention to our city's status as a welcoming city. For example, day laborers often gather in the parking lot of Home Depot in West Seattle, which is located next to the Speedy West Precinct, with officers wearing body cameras. Recordings showing the faces of those individuals would be open for the federal government to run facial recognition searches, possibly triggering deportation actions. I don't think these these concerns should be taken lightly, especially at a time when Trump is a Donald Trum

p has made it very clear his administration is going to systematically go after a whole host of immigrants, not just as he claims, you know, criminal immigrants with criminal records. I think this is of a great concern. And I think that given all of the concerns that have been raised by the various organizations, I will have to vote no on this legislation. Thank you. Council members want. Any further comments from any of my cast cast members? QUESTION And Councilmember Gonzales, maybe you can address this because I was with you in the committee last week after the committee, Reverend Walden, someone who we all know and has been very engaged in the CPC, said to me that she felt that we had not addressed how we were going to protect people in domestic violence situations, that their faces, if the cameras are on, could be a problem. I wonder if that's something that you can address if right now if we could ask for clarification at another time. So I appreciate hearing a little bit because I really want to make sure that people are protected in those situations and that they can call and feel that they will their privacy will be protected and retained throughout. If if. Go ahead. If it's okay with Councilmember Banks, I'll answer that question in my comments if that's acceptable. Thank you. Councilmembers speak now. Yes, thank you. So body worn video is another step toward greater transparency of policing in Seattle. And as Councilmember Gonzales has accurately relayed, our action today lifts a proviso that allows these cameras to be distributed to more officers. Beyond the initial pilot, which was conducted last year in the East Precinct and then the equipping of our downtown bicycle officers at the beginning of this year. But a video and audio recording is not new to the police department. It goes back 12 years. In December of 2005, the police department first began using in-car videos, often referred to as dash cam videos. And they were deployed then in 2006. And today, all uniformed, deficient divisions of Speedy are equipped with the in-car video systems for recording, video and audio. The patrol officers. Traffic officers. Gang Unit. SWAT team. The only uniform. Unit that does not have the in-car video systems or motorcycle traffic officers. The in-car video system or dashcam videos are required to be turned on by officers any time an officer takes law enforcement action, including street stops like Terry stops on the street. Any time they arrive at a location of a dispatched call. And once they turn them on, the in-car video cannot be turned off according to a state statute. If an officer has not manually turned on the in-car video system, it automatically comes on when the officer activates their emergency lights or their siren. In addition to in-car video systems, our detectives commonly record interviews with witnesses and crime suspects. Now I want to address this issue of discretion. And it's interesting when we read selectively from the

policy that that guides the use of body worn videos, it's it's actually quite explicit. Section five B lists when employees are expected to use the body worn videos. Dispatched calls are very similar to the

in-car video system. Traffic in Terry stops, same as in car video. On view infractions and criminal activity. Same as in car video. Arrests and seizures. Same as in car video searches and inventories of vehicles, persons or premises. Sometimes that's the same as in-car video. Sometimes it's not. Transportation of individuals in their cars. Vehicle pursuits or chasing of criminal suspects. And questioning of victims, suspects and witnesses unless the individual does not want to be recorded. But even if an individual tells an officer, I don't want you to use your body worn video to record me, the officer cannot turn off their in-car video, so the audio from that is still going to be recorded. And if they're within visual range of the in-car video system, that will be video recorded as well. Officers do have some limited discretion. They can turn off their body worn videos in bathrooms inside of jails. Interiors of medical, mental health counseling or therapeutic facilities. Unless they're engaged in a direct law enforcement purpose, such as viewing a crime in progress, they're also required to ask consent before they record inside of a private residence. If a person denies consent, they still have to notify that person that the audio is still going to be recorded because of the in-car video system that will be running. Even though the video may not be available. They're also allowed to protect the privacy and dignity of individuals. And it lists in the section that Councilmember O'Brien read it. It explains where officers may be able to make that kind of a discretionary call. At natural death scenes. When they're giving a death notification. Child assault victims or sexual assault victims? Cultural or religious objections to being recorded. And where use of the body worn video would impede or limit the cooperation of victims or witnesses. It's been suggested that. We shouldn't approve this continued expansion of. Body worn videos because it is not limited just to police officer accountability that it could be used for collection of evidence. This is an issue that the Washington legislature considered last year in 2016 and soundly rejected any notion that these videos could only be used for officer discretion and could not be used as evidence of criminal activity. If we were to pursue a policy that would say we could only use these videos for officer accountability, we would be saying to our police officers, we can use this body worn evidence against you if you engage in misconduct, but we cannot use it against the individual who may assault you. And that's just a crazy idea. So I think we should continue with the. Distribution of the body worn videos. It is sound policing policy. It is supported by the American Civil Liberties Union nationally.

It is supported by police reform advocates across our country. And it's used in literally hundreds and hundreds of police departments around the United States, including 40 or 50 right here in Washington State. Thank you, Councilman Burgess. Excuse me. Any further comments from any of my colleagues? Well, I guess I'll just say a few. And that is the very simple issue in front of us, is whether the terms of the proviso have been listed. As Councilmember Gonzalez pointed out, number one, have convened a stakeholder group of the number two developed a title Action Plan for Community Engagement. Have they issued a final report summarizing that work? And it was indeed a lengthy report. And have they documented how they will continue to engage and seek the advice of a stakeholder workgroups? And I think under undisputedly my mind, they have complied with the letter of that proviso, and I'm certainly supporting the lifting of the proviso for those reasons. It's always sort of a natural. I suppose. Inclination to get caught up in the pros and the cons of body cameras to begin with. And I respect the opinions that we heard from some of those opposing today and certainly not new objections and very respectful objections. But in 2017, I think we are living in a country and in a city where video technology has changed the landscape of this country. That had it not been for video recordings throughout this country, we would not be having probably probably the intense both demonstrations and intense focus on what is happening to particularly African-Americans. But many people who have unfortunately suffered at the. At the hands of police officers. In 2016, over 250 African-Americans were killed by police officers. Not not all unjustified, but these are staggering numbers when you look at what's happening without body cameras. Look at our criminal justice system. We have a lot of data that would support. And I have all of the citations that. African-Americans are clearly arrested, as we know, at six times the rate of white people in our country, that a black person is 3.7 times likely to be arrested for marijuana possession, when in fact the usage in these groups between blacks and whites are the same. African-American drivers are about 31% more likely to be pulled over than a white driver. Black drivers are three times more likely than white drivers to be searched during a traffic stop. That is our criminal justice system in this country. And while I'm not suggesting that. Body cameras will do away with this institutionalized. Injustice. What I am suggesting is that there's already a record of

what's happening out there in the field. The record is what an officer records on his or her report. What I am personally looking for, and I've been looking for since 2010, when I discovered the advent of body of camera technology, is objective evidence and a record, if you will, of what's happening. And this concern that the ACLU expressed that violence would go would c

ould possibly go up. Is completely inconsistent with the statistics where body cameras are put in place. We have over 50 cities in the state where body cameras are already in place. We have over a thousand police departments in this country where body cameras are in place. A study in Rialto, California, which is a very statistically valid study that was done and very in-depth study, clearly showed that the use of force. Against people dealing with the police had gone down 60%. People tend to act differently and often times more responsibly when they know they are being recorded. And this argument that the cameras must be on at all times, and we are concerned that officers have discretion to turn them off, and therefore the answer is to keep them off. That to me is entirely inconsistent. That. The office. We already know that officers have incredible discretion in what they're already doing. And again, we have countless examples in this country that justice would not seen even closely the light of day had it not been for body cameras. And so while certainly it is not the end all to be all in terms of the issues dealing with us, I think it provides one more tool, again, to let us evaluate what's happening in the field such that we can learn. And together the police department is a learning organization and the city is a learning organization can learn from the deployment of this technology. And as I said earlier, we're sort of getting behind this. Technology is evolving. These policies will change. And again, to me, we have to begin the deployment such that we can learn and improve and modify the policies. Last. I'd also say that. Council bill rather House Bill 2362 there was an Olympia very recently, you know, which deals with of course, to the costs associated with archiving and the costs associated with public disclosure request had several other aspects. On the use of body cams as well. And there was a lot of talk in Olympia about that process. And I'll just read one letter that was written by Reverend Walden and cosigned by many organizations, including the representatives from the Philip Randolph Institute Seattle chapter from Partner for Youth Achievement, Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church and others Mothers for Police Accountability. But they clearly said in this letter that. That people of color were involved in the process of drafting House Bill 2362 and that the city of Seattle had already convened a process. I got to tell you, I attended on March. On March on January 19th, I believe it was the African-American Police Advisory Council, January 19th, where this matter was discussed. I've had debates at the University of Washington. I've had legislative districts where they've endorsed use of body cams. As Councilmember Gonzales said, there were several polls or or surveys taken where this is overwhelmingly supported by the public. So I think it's time to actually deploy it. The technology continues to grow the community on modifying t

he policies as we see. But again, this sort of endless process of that, we seem to get stalled. I think it's time to move on. Okay. Well, let's wrap up. I think we're trying to vote. Please call the role on the passage of the Bill O'Brien. I know it's. You got a record. I know. Thank you. So aren't they. Hi, Burgess. Hi, Gonzalez. Johnson. Whereas I. President Herrell I. Five in favor, two opposed. Thank you. The bill passed and Cheryl signed it. Please read the next agenda item. Bill passed and chair of the Senate Please read the report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee. The Report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee and Item one Council 118 921 Relating to renters establishing the Seattle Renters Commission representing the interests of renters located in Seattle to advise and make recommendations to the Mayor and City Council and public policy matters of importance to renters citywide amending Section 3.35. 330 of the Seattle Ms. of Code and adding new Chapter 3.65 consisting of Section 3.60 5.0. 10.0, 15.0, 30.0 40.0 58.0 60 of Seattle. Mr. CODE. The committee recommends the bill passed as amended. And. BURGESS, thank you very much. This ordinance, which passed unanimously out of committee, establishes the Seattle Renters Commission to represent the interests of renters who live in Seattle. About 54% of Seattle households are occupied by renters. The purpose of the commission is to advise the Mayor and City Council on Public Policy matters of importance to renters and especially all of our renter protection, landlord protection laws and others. But also beyond that to what renters care about citywide. And that is things like transit. Rotation, public health and safety parks and open space education and other topics that renters in our city engage on. The commission will be comprised of 15 members, six appointed by the mayor, six appointed by

the city council, two appointed by the commission and the final member young adult appointed through the Get Engaged program, which is a city YMCA program. The Commission will be staffed through the Department of Neighborhoods and assuming this passes and the mayor signs it, which I believe he will, outreach about the commission and applications for individuals who would like to be appointed to the commission will begin in April. We hope that we can complete that in May or early June and the Commission can start meeting early this summer. There's been a lot of talk about the renter's commissioner and whether we need the renters commissioner or don't need the renters commission. Some have suggested that this is an anti landlord move. That's certainly not the case. We just want to give renters a formal voice here at City Hall. And as I said last week in discussing this, renters need landlords and landlords need renters. And so if this commission can help bridge that relationship, then that'll be a positive move for our city. So council members Herbold, O

O'Brien and Suarez have joined me in sponsoring this legislation and we urge its adoption. Thank you very much for the comments, COUNCILMEMBER. Whereas. Thank you. Before I begin, I do want to have a special thank you to Zack DeWolf for his leadership and boldness, not only for the residents of Capitol Hill and the community and all the all the projects that he works on, but also taking on a big project for all the residents of Seattle. Again, as we say in Indian Country, my hands are up to you. Thank you. I just want to point out that the demographics of our city have changed a lot over the years. I think it's important to note. In my district alone, we now have 49% renters and 51% homeowners. And I believe that those people should have a voice. It's important that renters are, recognize and are engaged in the city process and certainly in the decisions. City commissions are a way of establishing a clear commitment to engage with communities who have a stake in the work of the city. Similarly to the new Community Involvement Commission, I believe this new commission will broaden the city's ability to increase and deepen the contributions of citizens to our legislative decisions. I was grateful to co-sponsor this legislation and I'm happy to vote in favor of today. Thank you. Thank you. Because member O'Brien. Councilmember Suarez said everything I was going to say much more elegantly. But thank you all so much for your advocacy. Councilmember Burgess, thanks for your leadership in your work on this. Getting the details right matters a lot and I'm thrilled to be moving forward and can't wait to work with you all. Very much. Councilmember Burgess like to close us out? Yes. Special thank you to Sarah day of my staff who kind of led the. Yes, she's getting a plan. That could have been a standing. Ovation. Sarah Sarah led the process, worked with the city departments, the law department, the community advocates. This was truly a grassroots effort that started up on Capitol Hill and will now benefit the entire city of Seattle. Thank you, Sarah, for your good work. Thank you, Sarah. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez. I verbal Johnson. Suarez, I. O'Brien. All right. So what I. Burgess President. Harrell all. Right. Eight in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and show sign it please read again item number two it's. And when you do come come down here to express your opinion, we do welcome that. But again, if you do get a chance to speak, I do apologize. Please call the first. Such an item. The report of the full council agenda item one Constable 118 940 relating to land use and zoning amending the official land use map to reason certain land in downtown South Lake Union and adjacent see zones. Thank you. Councilmember Johnson. Thank you. Council President Harold. So we have the mandatory housing affordability legislation in front of us today that will enact these changes in downtown in South Lake Union. I want to talk for a minute ab

out how we got to this point. Council established a voluntary incentive zoning program in 2001 and several years ago began discussing changes about how we could produce more affordable housing. And Councilmember O'Brien was a leader in that discussion. I want to thank him for that work. Following on that, the Council adopted a resolution in 2014 that talked about our set of objectives associated with the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda. And one of the most critical components of that was the agreement to make changes to our voluntary program. Our voluntary program was working, but we recognized that it wasn't enough to get us to the affordable housing targets that we had. So we set a set of targets, 6000 new units in the next ten years. And we built out a framework that is what we're adopting today. We're in the downtown and South Lake neighborhoods. Over the next ten years, we are set out to build 2100 units of affordable housing, both in downtown South Lake Union and in other parts of the city. This is the equivalent of the 2016 housing levy that voters adopted last August. It's a significant investment in affordable housing in

our city and amounts to one third of the target of affordable housing units we want to develop in the next ten years. There's a couple of critical differences between our voluntary program and this mandatory program that we would adopt today, I hope. The first is that the mandatory program is just that it's mandatory. The voluntary program only applied to a certain percentage of new development capacity above the base development that existed in the city. This program applies to all new development and also does not eliminate the incentive zoning program, but also requires incentive zoning to stay in effect. So an instance, we're asking developers to participate in both of those programs, the incentive program and the mandatory program. The program performance and payment requirements are required on the entirety of the building, and it has a deeper level of affordability that as many folks mentioned during public testimony. We're focused in this program, folks making 60% of area median income. That's an individual making about 35 or \$40,000 a year or a family of four making about \$55,000 a year as a fifth generation Seattle. I've watched a lot of my cousins and relatives who are working in tech or working in finance be able to continue to afford to live in the city. But my little cousins, like me, who worked in the nonprofit sector before this or working in an education system, are continuing to be priced out. This program is intended to generate income restricted units for 75 years, targeted at our population, a population that has not been served by the incentive zone program or is or served by the lot of the investments that we make with our offers of housing, housing levy dollars. I know that there are a lot of concerns that have been addressed today about the program amounts. 75% of the neighborhoods in

downtown and Salt Lake Union are going to pay 4% or more. There's a couple of neighborhoods that are around the 2% area. There's a lot of concerns from we've heard expressed from the community about trying to incentivize more residential buildings downtown. We believe that the set aside for in particularly those two little sections of downtown that are in the 2.1 or 2.9%, we'll do a lot to incentivize more residential development in those neighborhoods, whereas if we change the fees dramatically in those neighborhoods, it would incentivize the market to build more commercial development as opposed to housing. And those housing developments is what we've heard from Belltown, from downtown residents that they want to see more of in this neighborhood. I think the legislation, if we don't get it right, we've got an opportunity here in June of 2018 to come back around and take a look at those numbers and revise them. But I've also heard from a lot of folks that the numbers in San Francisco or New York or Boston and other places are higher. When you take a look at those programs. Those programs are not as broad geographically as the program that we're hoping to implement as part of our citywide zoning changes next year. They offer oftentimes a much larger zone capacity increase than what a lot of neighborhoods that I talked to would be interested in accepting. And when you actually go look on the ground where they're not building the affordable housing, they're oftentimes seen as an impediment to construction of affordable housing. Ask any activist in the San Francisco neighborhood if they're 15 to 25% requirements or building the affordable housing that they're looking for. And the answer is no. So I believe that this is a really important first start for us today. We've got four amendments that we're going to consider. But I wanted to lead off with our opening statements and then happy to answer questions that will get into the details of the amendments. Thank you. Councilman Johnson there any questions? We'll move into some amendments and any questions for my colleagues. I don't see any hands flying up. So why don't you take us through the First Amendment you have? Great. So amendment number one is an amendment that adds findings of fact to the request of. A lot of parliament to the bill. These findings generally document the city's process and how we've met the requirements in the revised code of Washington. And generally they recite the background and history reference the framework legislation that we adopted last summer to establish these programs and describe the city's policy basis for the reason and implementation of the program. So I'd encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment and would move for its adoption. So it's been second, it has been moved in second. And the First Amendment that comes from Johnson described it anywhere. Any question about the First Amendment, all those in favor of the amendment as described. But I, I opp

osed and have it. So we have that First Amendment comes from Johnson. Like to move us through the second one. Yes. Thank you, sir. The Second Amendment is something that's unanimously supported by councilmembers Herbold, O'Brien and myself. It relates to two issues that we heard a lot from community during the course of public testimony on this topic. The first is family size units.

We heard a lot from a growing population of families that are living in downtown and South Lake Union in Belltown, that they like to see the construction of much more affordable housing for families. The market isn't building that housing right now. We've got a very small percentage of the marketplace that is building two bedroom units or larger. So this allows this amendment would allow additional height above the maximum height limits. If a building is building ten family sized units, units with three bedrooms or more, that would be included in the development and that would also have access to accessible outdoor space, which is a critical thing for a lot of families living downtown. The second element of this amendment is to implement a residential transportation management program. Our city requires the developers of commercial buildings to work with the folks in the building to reduce the number of drive alone folks in the building. This amendment would ask residential buildings to do the same and incentivize those developments to do things like build in car, share parking spaces inside the development, work with their residents for all the cards and distribution of other ways that we can incentivize folks who are living in those buildings to get out of their cars and live car less or car free. These two elements are really consistent with the policy objectives that we heard during the course of our outreach and public testimony. Again, they're supported by all the members of the committee, and I urge my colleagues adoption of amendment to and would move for its adoption. Sorry. There is a second. It has been second. So I'll refer to the Second Amendment as the Second Amendment relative to family size units and transportation management programs. All those in favor of Amendment two. Say I. I opposed. The ayes have it. So we have a Third Amendment. And I think Councilmember Herbold will present that. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. Amendment three A would require that the Office of Planning and Community Development and the Seattle Department of Construction, INS and Inspections, in consultation with the Construction Codes Advisory Board report to the Council by September 30th, 2017 on the use of lot sub areas for the purposes of the application of development standards in the light land use code. The purpose of this amendment is to address a concerns that were raised by a change that council made recently in the SDI, the Seattle Department Construction Inspections Omnibus Bill as relates specifically to assumed lot size. We had played earlier with the idea of s

triking the assumed lot language from this bill, but determined that it would not actually affect the the change that was desired. And so for that reason, we worked with SDI and adjusted the amendment based on their suggestions. Thank you. I'd like to second that amendment has been moved. And second, Councilmember Herbold amendment regarding the assumed lot reporting requirements. All those in favor of the amendment vote i. I oppose. The ayes have it. The Third Amendment has passed. We have a Fourth Amendment. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. So the underlying policy purpose of this amendment is threefold to one, to have a consistent policy approach for the MHRA program across the entire city, to use that consistent policy approach to realize a modest increase in affordable housing fees and thus leverage significant additional housing dollars from other funders. And also to address a political criticism of the MHRA program that property owners and developers in South Lake Union in downtown a high cost area, should not have a lesser requirement from property owners and developers elsewhere in the city. In doing so, I believe this will help us as well in our future city wide MHRA program deliberations recently in the University District and proposed in the future for all citywide MHRA reasons. The MHRA program proposes to capture a portion of the value conveyed through the increase in development capacity based on a target level of performance in the form of an affordable housing obligation placed on developers. This is not the approach proposed for the South Lake Union and Downtown MH, a R program for MHR in South Lake Union. In Downtown, the grand bargain proposes to base MHR affordable housing obligations on a 2013 formula for an incentive zoning program that at the time, also like we proposed to do today, was not based upon the value of the upper zones made much larger up zones, much larger up zones. In that case, in 2013, the city could have adopted a program that would have required 20% of units at 80% of AMI, and developers would have still had a 6.8% return on investment. Ultimately, the Council went with the option that the Council went with only required 5% of units at 80% of r of a rate of return with of 9.2%. I don't propose to correct that decision from 2013. With my amendment. I only propose that we do not compound the issue by also failing to base our MHRA affordable housing obligations on the value of the 10 to 50 foot up zones. We granted today's actions. Some argue we have an obligation to make this exception in South Lake Union because of an agreement made in 2015, the grand bargain. An agreement to do an agreement to which neither the public nor this council was a party. Yet even within the grand

bargain, it says it's understood that during the course of conducting the necessary analysis and drafting of legislation, some of the terms may be modified. But now we're told we don't mean those terms, the terms about size of the a

ffordable housing obligations. Someone said to me rhetorically this weekend, why even have a city council if the mayor major policy issues in this law are essentially settled in a non legislative process? For this reason I worked with city central staff to identify an option that bases the payment and performance requirements on the value of the proposed 2017 up zones of 10 to 50 feet. The amendment would. Apply a fat flat. Payment requirement of \$14.75 and a performance requirement of 5% across all zones. The operative assumptions of this amendment are a 5% vacancy rate, a 5.25% capitalization rate. Assumed rent of \$3.04 per square foot. These assumptions are very conservative, according to Dupree and Scott, for buildings built since 2010 and downtown in South Lake Union. The average vacancy rate is 4%. The current cap rates are approximately 4% and the average rent is. \$3.25 per square foot. This modest increase in payment and performance requirements helps us to further address our affordable housing crisis and use the private investment of developers to leverage significant additional affordable housing. Dollars, all while. Providing an economic incentive for developers. Remember that for every \$1 we get from private developers, we leverage other housing resources. Over 20 years, it would generate approximately 1.3 million more each year, and developer fees that could be matched with matching dollars equaling as much as a total of 3.9 million more each year, or approximately 350 units over the course of 20 years. This amendment also ensures a more consistent policy framework across the entire MSA affordable housing program so that we can tell the public that in all places the program applies. We are considering the value of the additional development capacity that the city is granting and turning it into affordable housing. He get? Councilmember Herbold has made a motion relative to the performance and payment requirements just to keep it alive. Is there a second? Second? Okay. So it's been moved in second. We have a live amendment on for Councilmember Johnson. Would you like to have the microphone? Yes, sir. Thank you very much. Councilmember Herbold and I have had a lot of really good discussions about a whole lot of different topics. And this among them, I think, has been some of our most fruitful. You know, I am going to ask my colleagues, as you know, Councilmember Herbold, to vote against this amendment for a couple of reasons. The first of which is, I think that we have an obligation as set up in the framework to try to meet that goal of 6000 units of affordable housing as presented. What has been sent to us as part of an overall goal and objective that we believe is going to generate 2100 units of affordable housing ? I don't believe that we've had the time and energy to really rigorously analyze that 5% requirement and the impact that it may have on the near-term actions of affordable housing, as I mentioned before. There's a couple

of instances where we think that flip to 5% would have a negative impact on the building of residential and may result in a flip to commercial, which may make it difficult for us to see more housing, particularly in downtown and south of Canyon. The second is, you know, I think one of my primary goals for this program is to capitalize on what some have called sort of the fourth quarter of development that we're in right now. There's a lot of folks that I talked to when I'm out at the farmer's market that are saying, how come it's taken us so long to get to this point? How come we haven't implemented this mandatory housing affordability program right now while we're in such a boom time for the city? And my objective here is to try to set the rates in such a way that we make sure that we maximize the investments in affordable housing. But we also find a way to get developers that are already grandfathered in under the current zoning changes to opt in to this program. I get concerned that if we don't set the numbers at the right level, we won't see those developers 20, 30, 40, 50 or so that are already currently in the permitting pipeline that aren't required to build any affordable housing that if we set the numbers too high, they will not build any affordable housing. I believe that the numbers that we've set as part of this legislation give us the best opportunity to have development that's currently in the pipeline, opt in, and that those developers are going to generate millions, if not tens of millions of dollars that we can use today to build affordable housing today. And I believe that those affordable housing units that we need today are better than the ones that we may that may result in the future if we got if we got your amendment adopted. I, I also just want to say I really appreciate the thoughtfulness and approach that you've taken to this. One of the things I've really enjoyed about working with you is you have a

very data driven approach, but we also have a nice way to talk to each other without ever making this about personal rhetoric or personal attacks. And I really, really welcome that. This is a policy debate there. As someone said in public comment, there are lots of different ways you can come to different conclusions. I really respect the work that you've done on this. I just have come to a different conclusion and ask my colleagues to vote no. Work hard for that. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Johnson. Would any of my colleagues like to make any make any comments before we vote? Okay, so we have an amendment on the performance and payment request, excuse me, by Councilmember Herbold. I believe. Councilmember Swan. Oh, I'm sorry. It comes from Russia. I didn't see that. Thank you. Has the floor. I appreciate Councilmember Hubbell's comments. We live in a region where the two richest people in the world live side by side with thousands of people who have no homes at all. And we live in a city that is growing wealthier by the

week as working people keep getting pushed out. It would be farcical if it was not such a tragedy. And the response from the mayor and the majority of the council, frankly, could not fall farther short of the real needs of the situation. And that is no accident. The mayor invited for profit developers into his hall committee and gave them a veto over any recommendation. So the mayor saw the measures that could make any real difference, like fighting for rent control were not allowed to see the light of day in the so-called grand bargain. Today's discussion on the mandatory housing affordability in Salt Lake Union and downtown epitomizes that inadequacy in the neighborhoods where property owners and developers are making the most profit. Where affordable housing is becoming an endangered species. The current proposal legislation would require less affordable housing than anywhere else in the city. And as Councilmember Herbold points out, perhaps even less so than the status quo. The current proposal to only require 2.1% affordability for development along the waterfront is pitiful. After taxpayers, after taxpayers spend hundreds of millions to beautify the waterfront park and billions to move the viaduct underground, all to elevate property values. We are then requiring only 2.1% affordable housing in what is sure to become some of the most valuable real estate in the city and a windfall for some very lucky people. That is the power that big business has in City Hall. They take literally billions of dollars of our tax money, give us back a handful of affordable units, and the politicians expect us to thank them. I want to be clear. I want every affordable housing unit possible and we should get the units today that today's legislation will produce. But we cannot treat it like it's anywhere near sufficient. Councilmember Johnson said that we don't know what the negative aspects of increasing the affordability to 5% will be. I can tell you I'm not a real estate economist, but I am an economist and I think it is somewhat of a voodoo economics thing to say. Well, it's going to create some negative impact on. And on and on the other side. There is no suspense about the negative effects of the lack of affordability. We are living that every single day. At the very least, council members should support Councilmember Herbold amendment to increase that 2.1% to 5% affordable housing. That also, as many of you have said, is not enough. But it is more affordable housing and we should fight for every unit that is available. I will vote yes on this amendment. I join all my fellow activists in condemning the sweeps of our homeless community members. And I urge that our movement hold elected officials accountable, remember their votes on affordable housing when they come back to campaign for their reelections. And I thank all the small business owners who also support increasing affordability. Thank you, Councilmember Swann. Are there any other comments from any

of my colleagues before we take it to a vote? Okay. Hang. We have an amendment on the table. All those in favor of Councilmember Herbert's amendment vote. Yes. And raise your hand. Yes. All those opposed. Vote no and raise your hands now. So the amendment fails. So we still have a bill that's been amended three times. Are there any comments about the amended bill as a whole? Councilwoman Johnson, if I may just take us on briefly. I just want to say a couple of quick things about the bill. You know, we have set a goal in the city of reducing our carbon footprint and being carbon neutral by 2050. One of the best ways we can do that is by building dense housing, by our jobcentres building denser housing, particularly income, restricted dense housing by our transit centers and in job centers like downtown. And so that is one of the best things that we can do to reduce our environmental footprint. We have a goal of building out more family size units in this city in particular. This legislation took a really strong look at that and provided a lot more opportunities for us to build more family size units in downtown. This legislation helped to end decades of infighting between the labor community, the business community, affordable housing community

and for profit housing community in a way that's going to result in 6000 units of income, restricted, affordable housing all throughout the city. We know study after study has shown that income restricted, affordable housing is one of the best tools we can use to reduce gentrification and keep our city more affordable. This program has a deeper level of affordability than any other program that we've adopted in the past. At 60% of area median income, this provides a significant amount of affordable housing for those folks who are increasingly being priced out of the city. And finally, I want to say how much I appreciate the fact that there are so many folks that are developments that are in the pipeline right now. And I want to call on those developers to work collaboratively with my office and with the rest of the city to opt in to this program and generate millions, if not tens of millions of dollars today for the affordable housing that we know we need today. Thank you very much for your time. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Johnson, I believe Councilmember Burgess would like to say some more. Thank you. I want to thank Councilmember Johnson for the thorough work. I'm not on your committee, but I've read all of the briefing memos from central staff and from you and from Councilmember Herbold. So thank you. I also want to just remind ourselves that this legislation that we're about to pass today really does set the city on a new path and a new course of requiring all construction in the city, whether it's commercial or residential, to contribute to affordable housing. We've never had a mandatory program like this that will soon be adopted citywide. And the the the other the other issue that I think is

important is that the individuals who have negotiated with the council and the mayor over the last couple of years are not the nefarious individuals that have been described. So, for example, many of our nonprofit housing developers in the city, like the Housing Development Consortium, campus housing, Capitol Hill Housing Bellwether, Plymouth Housing Interim Community Development Association, these are the folks that are actually building affordable housing in our city, and they stand in strong support of this legislation. And so do labor unions in our city. We had the executive director of the King County Labor Council here today testifying in favor of this legislation. I know there's other labor reps who are still present with us this afternoon and then organizations like Sightline and the Urbanist who cover these kind of issues. Again, very supportive of where this legislation is going. And I think Mayor Murray and the council and all of Seattle can be proud of this legislation that we're going to adopt today. Thank you. Before we call on the vote, I sure want to give a housekeeping item. We're going to vote on the amended legislation. And then unless there's objection, it's been brought to my attention that one of the reasons why we're hearing a lot of testimony about the sweeps and. What just mean regarding sweeps is because is there some action tomorrow that affects some people, I think even in this room. So what I'm going to propose after this piece of legislation is that we hear from three people that I believe are here that either live under the bridge in West Seattle or some areas around them and asked that they come. So I'm going to hold just a short public testimony just on that issue. If you are a resident or it affects you so we can hear from you for the action tomorrow. George. Scroll up. Our person that we've asked to be in charge for the city on this issue has suggested this as well. And we want to make sure we hear from them. So we're going to vote. And then I'm just going to entertain some public testimony. Then we move back into the agenda. I like it unless there's some objection. So we have an amended bill here. Council bill 118940. So I'll move for the passage of the amended bill. Is there a second? Thank you. Please call the roll on the passage of the amended Bill Johnson II. Whereas I O'Brien, Sergeant Bagshaw, Burgess, Gonzalez, I Herbold II. President Harrell, I in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed and chair will sign it. So before we move to the next agenda item, I've been told, and I'm not sure there are some individuals here that wanted to testify that are affected by some of the action. Tomorrow, I guess, is scheduled to be tomorrow that I've been told about. Is there anyone here? Yes, please. Would you just for the record, identify yourself and please, please share some words with us. Let's get the mic working. Now it's off. Now we just turned off. There we go. Is it on? It is very. Good. Hi. My na

me is Rebecca Massey. And I'm homeless. I live in an encampment under the Seattle Bridge. And I've been there for eight months. There was a suite before. While I was there three months, there was a sweep I was asked to remove without. I was asked to be removed without notice. I was given three days to move. I moved. The whole encampment moved. Then eventually everyone came back because we really had nowhere else to go. And so in total, I've been under the bridge living continuously for eight months. And the housing solution for homeless is great. It's a long term

solution. It's an eventual solution. And there's people under the bridge in my community that have been on the waiting list for housing for years that would like to be eventually into housing. But they're on a waiting list. They're under the bridge living because they don't they're on a list and they haven't been able to provide housing to these people. But right now, housing is and isn't an immediate option for me because there's not a housing being offered to me because I'm facing an emergency situation. There's a sweep tomorrow. We're being told that tomorrow at 9:00, if we don't get all of our vehicles and our tents and all of our possessions off of the property, our possessions will be removed and our vehicles will be towed and impounded. And they're offering people, a few individuals, places to go. But most of our individuals that live there are not being offered another place to go. They're just being told you have to leave here. And they're not following their protocol, the city's protocol to give us a notice. There's been no posted notice and no protocols followed about following that protocol because they're citing the there was a fire and they're citing that as an excuse to remote remove us immediately. We want to continue to be part of a community because housing we not everyone can be removed to housing by tomorrow. I mean, that's just we can't do that. And we want to be offered another place to go. We want an option. A viable option for us. And we're not being given that. And we need an immediate solution for everyone in my community by tomorrow, because we're being asked to leave and we're not being offered another place to go. Thank you. Thank you. Bruce. She couldn't have said it better. The only thing that I would add to that is this process that you guys are going through in terms of this place in these communities, the hardest part is not having a place to go is being told to move along and ask and move along the wire. I'm you know, obviously, I went through the same thing when I left North Dakota and came here and thought I was going to find compassion and people that care. And I'm still looking for those people. You know, the programs, the way they're written, they don't really help the community that that is under there right now. And they're just being very procedural and not even respecting their own their own policy that's been established, which I have a copy o

f and have gone over it several times and see exactly which part of this process we're in. And so we're reaching out to the community and asking that you participate in the dinner that we're going to have this evening and and maybe in a show of solidarity, be there tomorrow so that you can witness how the process happens. Please send your assistance there or whoever to participate. Thank you. Thanks very much. Well. Thank you for coming down and sharing. So we will move back in to our agenda item and thank you for that information. Please read agenda item number two into the record. Agenda item to cancel 118 942 and many audience one to 5 to 48 to modify the effective date of certain sections of that ordinance. Councilmember Johnson. Thank you. This is a small bill that's come straight to full council in February. We had adopted a periodic state mandated update of our environmental critical areas regulations. But certain sections of that ordinance relate to Seattle Shoreline Management Program, which has yet to be updated. But as part of the work plan for the Department of Construction and Inspections this year to be reviewed by the Department of Ecology, this bill postpones the effective date of those portions related to the Shoreline Management Program to allow for a review by the Department of Ecology in coordination with our Seattle Department of Construction Inspections. In the parlance of Olympia, this is a good little bill. I hope you'll vote for it. Thank you very much. Are there any questions about this small little bill? I will move to pass counts bill 118942. So there's oh, please call a role on the passage of the bill Johnson. I was O'Brien. Sergeant Bagshaw. Burgess Gonzalez. I. Herbold. I. President Harrell. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed and chair with signage. Please call the next agenda item into the record. Agenda item three Resolution 317 41 Retiring, introduced and referred council bills, resolution clerk files and appointments that have received no further action. The Report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee Agenda Item one Council Bill 118972 An ordinance relating to city employment, commonly referred to as the first quarter 2017 Employment Ordinance. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. This legislation seeks to designate nine positions as exempt from the civil service. The work to be performed by the positions is consistent with the exemption criteria set forth in the Seattle Municipal Code. Any cost increases for the effective departments will be funded through the existing budget authority. Are there any questions or comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez I. Herbold. JOHNSON Whereas I. O'Brien. I want. Bagshaw. Hi, Burgess. Hi, Aden. Favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please reading. Please read items two, three, four and five. Agenda Items two and three. Agenda item appointments 638 and 639. T

he appointments of Todd Toshio Snyder and Bill Stockman as members. Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee for terms to December 31st, 2017. Agenda Item four Appointment 680 The reappointment of Matt Hanna as member Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority Council for a term to June 30th 2020, an The Report of the Affordable. Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee Agenda Item two Council Bill 118968 An Ordinance relating to the use of Federal Home Investment Partnerships Program funds amending the 2013 Consolidated Plan Annual Action Plan to reallocate funds out of the homebuyer activities into rental housing activities. The committee recommends the bill pass because. Barron Burgess. Thank you. This legislation amends the 2013 consolidated plan to move \$220,015 from homebuyer assistance activities and \$495,000 of accumulated underspend to the rental, housing preservation and development activity, the consolidated plans and the Annual Action Plan submitted by the City to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development govern the Federal Home Investment Partnership funds that the city receives. Changes of greater than \$15,000 are considered substantial amendments and must be formally approved by the Council. Thank you, Council Members. Any further comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the Bill Herbold II. Johnson, I. O'Brian. Sergeant Bagshaw Burgess. High. President Harrow. Seven In favor and unopposed. Bill passes and chair of Senate. Please read agenda item number three. If you could short that title a little bit, that'd be great. Agenda item three Council Bill 118973 An Ordinance Relating to Historic Preservation. The committee recommends the bill pass. Agenda Item 12 Council Bill 119011 An ordinance relating to the Department of Transportation. The committee recommends a bill pass this round. Brian. Thank you. So this is a property that we are is being granted back to the city from Seattle Housing Authority in 2000 for 2000 for the city owned stairway on Southwest Grand Street was vacated in connection with the Seattle Housing Authorities High Point Redevelopment Project. We basically handed over the parcel to Seattle Housing Authority for them to maintain and have responsibility for the they have done that through now through this through today. But FHA no longer has the funding to maintain that stairway. So they are granting it back to the city for it to be part of our portfolio. Councilmember Herbold mentioned the desire to go walk those stairs. I don't know if you managed to do that between then and now. My interest is primarily the sea acquisition. We convey it whether or not the stairs are still maintained to the the condition that there currently are. Yeah. And we asked that question at committee and we're told that the the condition of the facility is up to the standards of what the city would be maintaining it to. But I have not seen it personally. Triggered any further comments. Please call the r

ule on the passage of the Bill Gonzalez. I herbold. I. Johnson I was i. O'Brien High. Extra. Burgess President Herrell Rite Aid in favor and unopposed passage senate. Please read the next gen item in the short title. Agenda Item 11 Council Bill 119009 An ordinance relating to the permission granted to Fremont, accompanied by ordinance 121706 to use and occupy a portion of Fremont Avenue North under the Fremont Bridge North approach, lying north of the Lake Washington ship canal and south of the former Burlington Northern Main Line. Right of way. The committee recommends the bill pass. Brian Councilmember Biggs, I just come in there. We're having fun today. Yes. This is some of the exciting parts of the transportation work this relates to if you're familiar with where Adobe in. Google are adjacent to the Fremont Bridge on the north side of the bridge and where the Burkman Trail Press is under the Fremont Bridge. It's a parcel underneath the bridge approach there. As I mentioned earlier, this this same work came before the council a few years back. For some variety of reasons. The council approved it at the time, but the legislation was never or what we authorized never actually was filed in the appropriate way before it expired. I believe it had to do with an attorney that was working for Fremont Company that retired, and it got buried in a piece of paper, in a stack of paper that no one else picked up. What specifically is happening is the city owns the right of way under the approach there. If you go on the Berkman, you'll see that there's actually parking down there, which is operated by Fremont Bridge Company through my company. Fremont DOT Company owns properties adjacent to that and the city requires easement to get to its property. So there was a trade that was made where Fremont, our company, would allow the city to have access to our property through their property in exchange for Fremont, our company being allowed to operate the parking underneath that. As I mentioned, this was agreed to a number of years ago, but it was never finalized. And so this will take this up once again and hopefully will get finalized appropriately. Very good. Any questions, please? Got the roll

on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez Herbold High Johnson whereas O'Brian High Bagshaw Burgess I President Harrell Aiden Favorite Unopposed. Person Chair Assignment. Please read the next gen item in the short title. Agenda items 27 330 Constable 118 981 Ruling 26 only in many Chapter 23.32 Statements of Coda Pages 112 and 113 Official Land Use Map Theresa Land and 23 and cherry note of the 23 Union Jackson Residential Urban Village. The committee recommends the Bill Pass Council Bill one one 8982 relating to land use and zoning. Committee recommends the bill pass as amended. Council Bill 118 983 relating to land use zoning. The committee recommends that the bill pass agenda item 30 Resolution 317 52 recognizing the extensive efforts of the central area community to creat

e a 23rd Avenue Action Plan Urban Design Framework, the committee recommends the resolution be adopted as amended. OC will vote on them separately, but you can address them all jointly if you like. Councilman Johnson. If that's the preference of the chair, I'm happy to do so. So there are three council bills and one resolution now in front of us this afternoon, Council Bill 118981 would implement our mandatory housing affordability framework at 23rd and cherry 118982 would implement the same program of 2013 Union and 118983 would implement the same program at 2013 . Jackson The companion resolution 31752 outlines several of the things that we heard during public comment on this proposed set of bills and really, as we've done with several of other land issues, allows for us to make some commitments to community that are outside the scope of the land use code. These three individual council bills implemented at Cherry Union and Jackson as a total are really important to me. They come upon the heels of several years of really incredible work by the ACT and our Planning Department to really allow for a place where all Seattleites can call home. In this neighborhood, there's access to good jobs and vibrant local businesses, great transportation choices so that folks don't need to invest in a car and really great access to parks and open space so that people can live healthier and happy lives close to our natural environment. I want to take a special moment just to say thank you to many of the community members who have now departed, but who showed up both today and at several of our committee meetings, as well as our public hearing. The priorities identified by the Action Team and the Urban Design Framework affirm long standing community priorities in a neighborhood plan that is really unprecedented and we hope is a model that we're going to be able to build off of. As we continue our work around implementation of our mandatory housing affordability program. The engagement of residents and business owners in the Central District was really unprecedented. The work the Capitol Hill housing that Africa town that the Lake Union Partners are demonstrating in this neighborhood to build out new models of creating affordable housing is also unprecedented. That that last project, the Midtown Center project that was referenced in our public comment will create over 100 units of affordable housing through a very innovative partnership, both of a 30% and below area median income and the 60% as well. And for all those folks who said the developers were never going to choose to build affordable housing on site, it's a great example where a developer's planning to do just that today. We really celebrate the pieces of the legislation that go beyond zoning, though, as well to create a more pedestrian oriented business district, opportunities for more affordable housing and community space. Opportunities for more affordable commercial space. We highlight in the compani

on resolution how critical it is to surplus city owned property, property directly to community through community land trusts and to the development of design guidelines and the proposed expansion of our design review boards to allow for a greater influence over the development just in the neighborhood itself, along with the new district and downtown South Lake Union observance. This is one of the early zoning changes we've made with the citywide zones to follow next year. And as we bring those forward, I hope that the city can continue to use the Central District as a really great example of the values that we can bring to the table as a city to implement our mandatory housing affordability program. There are several other things that I think are really important for us to continue to work on. Much of the city several years ago set up a partnership with the financial institutions in our city to allow for residents to get higher mortgage rates through what we call location efficient mortgages. Most lenders won't lend to you at above 3030 5% a loan to value ratio for your income. We are we allowed folks to borrow at a higher rate up to 40%. If you could show that you are buying a house or a condo in a transit rich environment, recognizing that you wouldn't need to spend as much on transportation costs and you could spend more on housing costs. We

need to develop similar ownership models in the Central District that allow for longtime residents folks who've been there for 30, 40, 50, 60 years to be able to work with a set of preferred vendors here in the city. On financing that would allow them to work with preferred developers in the community who could then take their existing properties, redevelop them for them to be able to live in and own and to do affirmative marketing to bring back folks who've been displaced from the Central District. Those kinds of innovative partnerships are the kind of things that take us time, but I think are really going to be important for us to make sure that we follow on top of this legislation. Important steps that I think will result in not only a city that welcomes folks who are moving here, but a city who will ultimately welcome back those who have been displaced as well. So that concludes the sort of opening remarks. I'm happy to talk through any more details of the legislation that folks might like, but would defer to questions as they come in. Thank you very much, Councilman Johnson. Any further questions? I'll just make a closing comment. I want to thank you for your leadership in really going the extra mile for community outreach, community input, taking this level of urban planning to the level you have. So I want to thank you for your outreach. I want to thank members of the community for protecting the communities that you are protecting and serving. So thank you very much for that as well, and it'll be my pleasure in supporting this legislation. Any further comments? Okay. We're going to vote on t

these individually, so please call the roll on the passage of Council Bill 118981. Herbold Johnson. All right. So on. Make. Hi, Burgess. Hi, Gonzalez. President Arrow seven in favor. An unopposed bill passed in show us. Please read. Please call the roll on an item number 28. HERBOLD Hi. JOHNSON All right, Sergeant, I make sure Burgess. GONZALEZ President. Harrell All right. Seven in favor. Nine opposed the bill passed in the Senate. And please call the roll on council. Bill 118983. HERBOLD Hi. JOHNSON All right, so want. Bagshaw Burgess Gonzalez, President Harrell seven in favor and unopposed. Bill passed in the Senate. And then we have a resolution that Councilmember Johnson described. Did you have any further comments on a resolution? Councilmember Herbold has been working on a substitute that I'd like to ask her to speak, to. Cast her vote. I'll speak to the changes if you want to speak to the the broader elements in the resolution that are great. Okay. So I move to amend resolution 31752 by substituting substituting version five for version four and the changes included in the substitute rather than having to vote on each member singly. Councilmember Johnson singled signaled this morning that he would be fine to move them in a single amendment by using the substitute resolution and Amendment one basically make some changes to the recitals by acknowledging the history of redlining and segregation and the impact that this has had on the African-American community. Amendment two recognizes that the program is an affordable housing program, but not sufficient to fully address displacement and identifies that the city plans to develop additional strategies to address direct economic and cultural displacement. Amendment three as the city will work with businesses and community to establish micro-businesses as well as small, local and culturally relevant businesses that the word micro has been inserted. And then the amendment for s, p. S DCI and OPD to include guidelines in its in its design guideline guidelines to support specifically the creation of spaces that are attractive and functional for minority and locally owned businesses and promotes public safety in the design of buildings in privately owned public open space . These four amendments are amendments that Andre Kessler in my office has worked closely with every town on, and I would welcome your support. I'm happy to second them. Okay, let's vote on the amendment first. It was moved and seconded all those in favor of basically substituting version five for version four, please vote I. I oppose the ayes have it. So we have a substitute, a version with council member Herbold amendments. Any further comments? Councilmember Johnson I would just add, you know, there are there is a lot of really good work that we do, but I'm particularly proud of the companion resolution here. Not only do we really call out the changes that have been happening in the Central District over the last several year

s, but we also double down on our commitment as a city to continue to work with the community to address not just the issues of displacement and gentrification around housing, but also around commercial affordability, around transfer of public land to a community land trust option on working around design guidelines. And as I mentioned before, the expansion of and potential creation of an eighth design review board just to focus on the Central District itself, to work with community organizations to support older adults aging in the central areas, as was discussed during public

comment. As somebody who represents a lot of the 0 to 5 community as well. We spent a lot of time talking about how we can support kids who are growing up and living nearby the Central District. Continued support for community driven projects like the William GROSS Cultural Innovation Center through the Equitable Development Initiative, and then continue to are going to continue to do our work with African town and other stakeholders to identify new strategies, including the potential formation of an African town innovation district. So there's a lot of really good work in here that we commit ourselves as a city to do. And I really look forward to continued collaboration with members of the action team and members of the community who have been so engaged with us in this process today. Thank you for those comments and any further comments. Those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended, please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries the resolutions adopt and Cheryl, sign it. Please read the report of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee. And you could read the short title if you'd like. The Report of the Park Status on our Libraries and Waterfront Committee Agenda Item 22 Cancel 1190 21 Relating to the reconstruction of Alaskan Way and the construction of Elliott Way. Surface Street improvements necessary as part of the State of Washington State, Route 99 Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Program. The committee recommends the bill pass. Council and back shall be filling in for council member suarez. Thank you very much. As I mentioned this morning, we have been negotiating with washington. It's what is known as escort washington department of transportation and the contract will be entered into regarding the amount of money that washed out will pay the city of Seattle Department of Transportation as. We reconstruct the roads after the viaduct comes down, washed up, we'll be paying SDR \$153 million for the work that will be coordinated by escort. And this will make sure that the funds will be adequate to get the work done. And this is in addition to funds the State has already provided for planning and design along the water waterfront in our committee recommends Dubus. Very good. Any further comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Herbold I. Johnson But Sergeant I. Bagshaw I. Burgess Gonzalez, I. President Harrell, I. Seven in

favor and unopposed. The bill passed and chair of Senate Please read the report of the Planning, Land Use and Zoning Committee. Item 23 and 24. The Report of the Planning, Planning and Zoning Committee Agenda Items 23 and 24 Clerk File 314 349. Application Capital Housing Trees on property located at 2320. East Union Street for Neighborhood Commercial two with a 40 foot height limit and a rear commercial two with a 40 foot height limit and pedestrian designation to neighborhood commercial. Bill passed and chair of the Senate Please read Agenda Item number two. Agenda item to cancel Bill 118 984. Lean to the Senate Office for Civil Rights amending Section 3.14 point 927 Mr. Code to increase the membership of the Seattle Human Rights Commission, the Seattle Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Queer Commission and Seattle Commission for People with Disabilities and Change the appointment authority for these and the Seattle Women's Commissions Committee recommends the bill pass. Legislation was held July 10th, 2017. Senator Herbold, thank you. First off, I want to thank the commissioners for coming today to share in their own words why this legislation is so important to them. I don't have a whole lot more to add because they did such a great job in keeping with my philosophy that folks on the ground doing the work are the best advocates for why the work is so important. The changes to the commissions have been proposed by the four commissioners, the four commissions that came together and made this proposal jointly to to the Council. And I, in my role as chair the committee, want to do everything I can to to help them do their work. I respect and recognize the fact that this is these are four very important volunteer bodies. And by expanding the size of their commission, many of the tasks that they do well, they will then be able to share that work with a larger group of people, which will make them both more effective and more focused as well. So there have been some concerns I've heard from folks about that, this by expanding the commission that this will somehow create some sort of a budget impact. This is actually just the opposite. This is so that they don't have to rely on Office of Civil Rights staff to do some of this work so that they can they can do the bulk of the work themselves. The bill would expand to all four commissions, to 21 members and allow the commissioners 2.4 of the 21 Council point eight, the mayor 0.8. And there was one additional get engaged appointment. Thank you, guys. I'm sorry I heard any further comments. Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you. I especially want to say thank you to our Women's Commission who are here today and LGBTQ. But also the Disabilities Commission is one that hasn't had the attention. And I want to thank you for coming. I completely concur with you about

getting somebody who is experiencing blindness or deafness on that commission. And I hope you circle my office at Sally Dot Bagshaw. I'm very in

terested in talking to you about what we can do. The work you are promoting is consistent with the age friendly city. Something I really want to see us move forward faster on. So I look forward to talking to you. Thank you for the comments. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Herbold, i. Johnson. I. So aren't I. Bagshaw. Hi. Burgess. Hi. Gonzales. President Arroyo, seven in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chair of the Senate has read the report of the Oak Cliff on the floor. Please read the report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee and just three, but read the short title and shortly after. And when we get to it as well, please. The Affordable The Report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee Agenda Item three Council 1190 24 Relating to funding for housing and community development programs. Can we recommend the bill passes amended? The Affordable The Report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee Agenda Item three Council 1190 24 Relating to funding for housing and community development programs. Can we recommend the bill passes amended? Katzmann Burgess. Thank you. This legislation adopts our 2017 Annual Action Plan for the 2014 to 2017 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development. This is a technical requirement that the city submit this plan to the federal government, which will then unlock approximately \$15 million in funds to flow to the city of Seattle to be used for our home investment partnerships. CDBG Money. This is used for low and moderate income people, businesses and neighborhoods around the city, and this legislation authorizes the city to accept these federal funds. Thank you. Any further comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the Bill. Herbold i Jonathan Swan. I Bagshaw, Shaun Burgess Gonzalez President Harrell seven in favor and unopposed. The bill passed the chair assign it tonight a number for. I'd like to move to pass Constable 119053. It's been moved and second of the bill. Pass it. Any comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the Bill O'Brien. I spoke to. Burgess. Gonzalez Johnson. I was Herbold. Hi. President Harrell. I aid in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please read the report of the full council. To be part of the full council agenda. Item one Resolution 317634 related to the redevelopment of Katrina into a first class state of the Art, Multipurpose Entertainment and Sports Center at Seattle Center supporting the City of Seattle negotiation with Oak View Group, LLC regarding the possible redevelopment operation of the Arena at Seattle Center and requesting that the Mayor to negotiate a memorandum of understanding with OPG for the City Council's consideration and action. Councilmember Juarez I believe Councilmember Herbold has a substitute motion to make. I move to amend Resolution 31765 by substituting version two for version one B. Second. And moved in second to make a sub

stitution and customer service. Do you want to explain what we're doing here, please? Yes, absolutely. So the substitute adds three new sets of language. The first is to add a recital to recognize the council's letter of June 26 and adds it as an attachment. Also, together with that, central staff included recommending a recital that actually refers to the letter. The second set of amendments actually incorporates two edits to memorialize and recognize in two separate places the work that Councilmember Suarez has spearheaded for an independent council consultant for Financial Review. The first edit adds a recital with language from the consultant funding request and the second notes Council's intent to review that council consultant work in Section two . And then the third amended language is to Section one. And it says specifically, in order for the council to potentially carry out review by the end of the year. The intent is to add context to this section regarding what the Council needs in order to have a chance to fulfill the goal of taking final action by the end of the year, as referenced in Section four. Very good, Councilmember. Whereas we know this is a friendly manner and amendment, I take it. Would you like to say any more just about the amendment? I have no comment to the amendment, but I certainly can speak to the resolution. Okay. And just to sort of clarify the record, this is resolution 31764. I don't know if it's read correctly. I'm sorry, six five. My bad. Okay. So we're six four. So any questions? Just on the amendment piece. Okay. All those in favor of substituting version two for version one B, say I. I opposed the ayes have it. So now we have a new version in Council member. Whereas would you like to speak to that? Thank you. In regards to resolution 316 for this resolution, as we discussed this morning, is to memorialize the agreements and benchmarks we've already laid out in the last four meetings of this year. I want to thank Councilmember Bagshaw and Councilmember Harrell for co-sponsoring

this resolution with me. This resolution expresses our commitment to review the MCU that is sent to us in any other documents or legal issues that would be would remain in the purview of the legislative branch. It would maintain authority to prove all subsequent agreements, and we will be ensuring the motion meets our expectations, especially those as laid out in the RFP . I want to thank Councilmember Herbold, Gonzales and Johnson for raising many important and substantive questions and issues. And I also want to thank Councilmember Burgess for his words regarding our duty, our fiduciary duty, and our due diligence in any documents that come from the executive regarding these type of agreements. Always want to end is that more input is always better and I remain committed to this process and working with my colleagues. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman warns any further comments on the amended resolution from any of my colleagues? Okay

. I think we'll be ready to vote. So I move to adopt resolution 31764, second and second. Those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended. Vote i, i. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries resin. Solution is adopted as amended and the chair will sign it. Thank you. And then please read the next gen item number two. Please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the resolutions that and Cheryl sign it very much. Okay, let's go back in order here and please read the first agenda item. The second agenda item, rather. The report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods in Finance Committee and Item one Council Bill 1190 42 relating to the Department of Finance, Administrative Services, authorizing Director, Department, Finance and Administrative Services, or the director designee to grant two easements to the State of Washington over and under a portion of real property known as Fire Station 22 and authorizing Director of the Department of Finance, Administration Services or the Directors Designee to acquire accepted record on behalf of the City of sale to easements from the State of Washington over a portion of state right away. And to place the property rights granted to the city under the jurisdiction of the department, finance Administrative Services Committee recommends bill passed . Thank you. Catherine Burgess. Thank you. This ordinance relates to Fire Station 22, which is located at I, No. One East Roanoke Street, adjacent to Interstate five and the Highway 520. The station design allows the fire vehicles to pour into the equipment bays rather than backing into them. So the footprint is larger than it had been. And this design necessitates two easements across Washington State Freeway right of way. As part of the city's master use permit for Fire Station 22, it's required that the city abstain, obtain permanent property rights across the state right of way which the state is granting. The legislation authorizes the Director of SRS to accept to access easements to the city from the state. The ordinance also authorizes the director of FASB to grant two easements from the city to the state of Washington over a portion of the fire station 22 property. The first easement is for ingress and egress to provide vehicle access to an adjacent Washington State patrol facility. And the second is a subterranean easement to allow construction of a retaining wall as part of the new state. Route five. 20 projects. The retaining wall will not affect the fire station. So that's what this legislation does. Think it comes from Burgess. Any comments or questions or concerns? If not, please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Sergeant Major Burgess Herbold. Johnson. Suarez O'Brien. President Harrell II eight in favor not opposed the. Bill passed and chair of the Senate please read items two through ten into the record. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. A report of the Gender Equity, Safe Communities and New Americans Committee

. Report of the Gender Equity Safe Communities in New Americans Committee Agenda Item 7/10 of a1190 73 relating to Public Defense Legal Services and authorizing an interlocal agreement with King County for Public Defense. Legal Service Committee recommends the bill passes amended. This legislation authorizes the city to enter into an interlocal agreement with the King County Department of Public Defense to provide public defense legal services in Seattle Municipal Courts. The current Interlocal agreement expires on December 31st, 2017. The term of this new proposed Interlocal agreement is January 1st, 2018 through December 31st, 2022, with an option of extending by mutual agreement for up to a total of ten additional years through December of 2032. This legislation is necessary since public defense services are a constitutional requirement and a requirement of Chapter 10.101. Our CW the committee recommends that the full council adopt this council bill, and we'd appreciate your support. Are there any comments on cable the please call the role on the passage of the bill. Burgess Johnson Maurice O'Brien so on John Gonzalez seven in favor and unopposed. If the bill passes and the chair will sign it. Okay. Agenda Items eight through

12 short titles. Agenda item six. Resolution 3177. Amending procedures for the evaluation and re-use and disposal of city real property to update certain portions of the procedures and expedite the disposition of properties for affordable housing development consistent with the recommendations of housing affordability and Living Livability Agenda Advisory Committee adopted by the Council in Resolution 316 22, the committee recommends a resolution be adopted as amended. Customer Herbold. Thank you. This resolution would amend the city's surplus property disposition policies to prioritize the use of surplus city properties, specifically for the development of affordable housing, and to expedite the disposition of these properties for affordable housing. Properties are eligible for the shorter review time. If the Office of Housing has proposed a property be transferred to an entity for the development of affordable housing. This is consistent with the recommendations of the House Committee. I do have an amendment to Appendix F that I distributed councilmembers earlier today. It's specifically the form that is contained in Appendix F of attachment A called the Excess Property Proposed Use Form. And so I moved to amend Appendix F of attachment a. Second. That's been moved in second and that attachment A be amended. Did you want to speak more to it comes I heard. Well, if I could, I think it would be good for folks who might have missed the email from the greenspace Seattle Greenspaces Coalition today. This specific amendment would address the, as I said, the property review process determination form. It's a it's a form that's used in the surplus property disposition process. And the original language that passed out of commit

tee is the sentence is there strong community support for one or more of the proposed options? The email that we received today from the Seattle Greenspaces Coalition expressed a strong and longstanding interest in the use of surplus city properties. They concur with our goals to expedite the use of these properties for housing purposes. But they raised a concern about the language because the language is on the current FASB form covers not only support for options, but also allows for any position, for instance, neutral or negative, and therefore allows for a wider range of constituent comment rather than just sort of a binary binary. We support it. The amendment would restore the language currently used by IFRS in the form with one change. It would replace the word citizens with individuals and so it would read have individuals, community groups and other interested parties contacted the city regarding any of the proposed options. This amendment would in no way affect the prioritization of affordable housing. The primary goal of the legislation or the abbreviated timeline for review of affordable housing is a separate issue altogether and a separate a separate fact revision to question to question two that passed in committee would remain as as as passed by the committee members. The amendment was run by the Department of Finance and Administrative Services and they are fine with with the changes proposed. Very good things for that. Nation. So we're going to take the amendment first. Any other comments on the amendment that's been moved in Second Amendment attached in a. Is a minute by substituting opinion appendix f all those in favor say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. So now we have a resolution that has been amended. Does you want to say any other words on the overall resolution? Again. Are you just to restate that this is consistent with the recommendation of the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda Committee, looking at ways that we can use existing property within city ownership for housing and expediting the ability to do so, which the city has already has a really good track record over the last two years as compared to previous years. This can just speed speed that up further. Very good. Any further comments? Okay. Those in favor of adopting the resolution as a minute, please vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries and the resolution as amended is adopted and chair will sign it. Please read item seven and eight into the record. Thank you. Inspirational. Thank you very much. Okay. We'll move back into our order and please read the report of the Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee. And you can read the short titles where you believe appropriate. The report The Affordable Housing Neighborhoods and Finance Committee Jeanette and one Constable 118034 Wellington City Schools Contracting Practices Committee recommends will pass as amended. Councilmember Herbold, Thank you. Council Bill 11 9054 requires

departments seeking council authorization for consultant and services contracts to notify the chair of the appropriate committee, the Council President and the City Clerk within 30 days of determining to procure or amend such contract, the requesting department shall submit a written summary of the proposed or amended scope of the contract the estimated total cost in the annual

cost of the contract or amendment, and the planned time for transmittal of legislation. Very good. There are any questions. Please call the rule on the passage of the Bill. Johnson for Brian. The one I make sure Gonzales I Herbold II President Harrell II seven in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and Cheryl signing. Please read agenda item number two. Bill passed chair of Senate Please read Schneider Number five. Agenda Item five Constable 1190798 Latest Seattle Preservation Development Authority recommends the bill pass. Herbold. Council Bill 1197 eight makes the same process changes as in Council Bill 11 9078. But for the historic Seattle Preservation Development Authority, also a public corporation that can't operate outside of Seattle with consent. The Historic Preservation, Historic Seattle Preservation Development Authority's participation in other cities is in a Preservation Action Fund, and the attachment to the ordinance specifies 35 different cities and areas in unincorporated King County that the director can now enter into agreements with without further council Action for Non Preservation Action Fund cities, ones that are not listed as an attachment to the ordinance, it makes the same changes. The previous bill that I discussed allowing the OCR to enter into an agreement after a council resolution rather than an ordinance. Very good. Any comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Johnson, I. O'Brien Sergeant Bagshaw. Gonzales, I. Herbold Hi. President Harrell. I seven in favor an unopposed. Bill passed and chair of the Senate. Agenda item number six. And in further discussion. All those in favor of the resolution please signify by saying I by an imposed resolution is adopted. Congratulations. Will the clerk please read the committee report of the Education, Equity and Governance Committee Agenda Item number ten. Three Public Education, Equity and Governance Committee Agenda Item ten Council 1190 90 Relating to cable television authorizing married and married designee to approve the transfer of control subject to conditions of waived Division one LLC authorizing the mayor or the designee each execute a cable franchise transfer of controlling interest consent agreement for the purpose of implementing and administering the transfer. Ratifying Confirming certain prior acts committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Gonzalez. Thank you. So I am covering for Council President Harrell as Vice Chair of the Education, Equity and Governance Committee. Council Bill 1190906 approval of a transfer of the renewed cable franchise agreement between the

City of Seattle and Wave Division one LLC to radiate the city's Office of Cable Communications conducted an analysis of the proposed transfer, and the FCC recommends the council approved the transfer subject to certain conditions contained in a consent agreement. The Education, Equity and Governance Committee recommends the full Council adopt this Council bill consistent with prior Council actions to approve the substantive franchise agreement. Any further comments, colleagues? I'd move adoption of Council Bill 11909. Oh. Second. Oh. No. No comments. Okay. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Whereas O'Brian. All right. So what? Picture Gonzales. I purple high Johnson. Seven in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes and the juror will sign it. Agenda item number 11. Agenda item 11 Council 1190 79. Related to the city of Seattle's Maple Leaf Radio Transmitter Facility, authorizing the Director of Finance and Administrative Services to execute a license agreement with King County for its use of the radio transmitter site at Maple Leaf Reservoir for the new regional Puget Sound Emergency Radio Network, and declaring a portion of the The bill passed and chair of Senate please read items 13 through 15 into record and a short title please. Agenda Item 13 Constable 119108 relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation, the committee recommends the Bill Pass Agenda and 14 Council Bill 11910 to relate to the drainage and wastewater system of the city of Seattle. The committee recommends that all pass and Agenda 15 Council Bill 119103 lead to the drainage and wastewater systems of the City of Seattle. Committee recommends the bill pass. Very good. And proceed. Councilman Herbert. Nothing to add. Okay. Please call the roll on, Constable 1191085. Whereas. O'Brien Sergeant Bagshaw. Gonzales, I. Harris. Talley. Herbold. II. President Harrell II. Nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chose. Sign it, please call the roll on council. 119102. Johnson. Suarez. O'Brien. Sergeant Bagshaw. Gonzales, I. Harris. Talley. Herbold, i. President Harrell. Nine in favor. Nine A post. Will pass can show. Sign it. Please call the roll on the passage of council. Bill 119103. JOHNSON Whereas. O'BRIEN Sergeant Bagshaw. GONZALEZ Hi. HARRIS Talley. HERBOLD Hi. President Harrell, I. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed in show senate. Please read item 16 through 21 in the short title. Okay. So we're going to move to 37 and 38. Please read those items into the record. Agenda Item 37 Council 119117 Relating to Levy Your Property Taxes Committee Recommend Civil Pass. Agenda Item 38 Cancel 119118.

Authorizes levy of regular property taxes for the city sale for collection 2018. The committee recommends the bill pass. Customer herbals. Do you have anything to say on those? No, we're ready to go on those. Pretty perfunctory on this part. Please call the roll on counts. Bill 119117. Johnson Whereas. O'Brien, I saw what I. Bakeshop. Gonza

les, I. Harris. Talley. Herbold. High President era high nine in favor. An unopposed bill passed and chair of Senate. Please call the rule on the passage of Council. Bill 119118. Johnson. Suarez. O'Brien. Salon. Bakeshop. Gonzales, I. Harris. Talley. Herbold. All right. President Harrell. All right. Nine in favor. Nine opposed. Okay. The Bill Parsons chair will sign it. We're going to move to adoption of other resolutions. And we amended our agenda for the day to adhere to resolution. So I'm going to ask to the clerk call the resolution 31781. The bill passed and Cheryl sign it please rate items 23 through 28 together in the short title. Cancel 119 132 relating to the financing of certain general government programs. Can we recommend the bill pass as amended? Agenda Item 24 Cancel 119 129 relating to the financing of tax administration system improvements and regulatory license systems in the Department of Finance Administrative Services. The committee recommends the bill passes amended agenda item 25 Cancel 119 134 relating to the financing of 2018 activities evaluating effects of a sweetened beverage tax. The committee recommends the bill pass. Very good. I'm going to proceed. I'm sorry. I stopped at 25. 25. Very good. I mean, I. Appreciate you may proceed. Thank you very much. We're voting on item. Agenda item number 23. Please call the roll on council 119132 Johnson. Whereas O'Brien. Hi, Sergeant Bagshaw. Gonzalez. Hi there is Tally I Herbold. Hi, President Herald. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passed and chair of assignment please read the roll on Constable 119129. Johnson Suarez O'Brien Sergeant Bagshaw Gonzales I Harris Talley Herbold II President Harrell II nine in favor nine opposed. Bill Parsons show sign it, please call the roll on council Bill 119134. Johnson. Suarez. O'Brien. Sergeant Bagshaw Gonzalez. Harris Talley. Herbold. Hi, President Harrell. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passed in show senate. Please read login items 26, 27 and 28. Bill passed in show sign please read. Agenda item number 22. And for the record, the short term. Agenda item 22 cancel 119 135 amending ordinance 1252 and two relating to the Finance of Equitable Development Implementation Plan Projects Committee recommends the bill pass. Concerning Herbold. I don't have any comments, but perhaps Councilmember O'Brien might have a comment. I believe this is related to the development implementation. Plan piece. I think and agenda item 33 is the one I'm. Okay. So we are just wondering if you wanted to grandstand a little bit on it. You're pushing. It. Are you good? Okay. He's good. Councilmember Branch. Good. All right. This is part of his leadership council. That's leadership right there. So he just gets the work done. Doesn't worry about the credit. Okay. Please call the roll on council. Bill 119135 JOHNSON Whereas O'Brien, Sergeant Bagshaw Gonzalez I hear his tally I Herbold I President Harrell I nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passed

and Cheryl sign it please rate items 23 through 28 together in the short title. The report at the Select Committee on Civic Arenas Agenda Item 12 Constable 119088 Relating to query and authorizing the merit executed memoranda of Understanding with Oak View Group LLC regarding the redevelopment of Key Arena into a world class, multi-purpose sports and entertainment arena and sales center, including its design, construction, lease financing and future operation exempting the redevelopment of future operation of the arena for the requirements of Chapter 20.47 Asset Code and ratify and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Very good. So sort of a housekeeping item. What I'll do generally is describe the the basic legislation sort of on a higher level. And then I know Councilmember Suarez, the co-chair, and sort of I'll say the leading chair in this effort will I think you may have some comments on the amendment. I'll do it. I'll do the comments and then I'll do the substitution. Okay. And then I believe Councilmember O'Brien and maybe some others like to say a few words. So let me just talk about the base legislation. And indeed, I want to thank everyone that came out to testify on what could be, I think some very exciting, I'll say, traction for the city. I think it's one of the strongest arena agreements in the council in the country. And, you know, we set out earlier about protecting our taxpayers and protecting our city from unnecessary risk. And all along, while I've looked at this particular deal, that's been my goal in in in a nutshell, the current project cost estimated around 600 million in all costs and potential cost overruns of construction and arena operations are the responsibility of the Oak View Group. And I think we made we've made that clear all along. At the end of the day, we should have

a state of the art civic arena and that can attract musical events and in in those kinds of activities , as well as entertainment and sports events. And we think that the new arena design will certainly be ready for NBA and NHL teams. It's not contingent upon it, but certainly puts us, I think, in a driver's seat to attract that kind of activity. Redevelopment construction is estimated to begin at the end of 2018 for an opening in October of 2020, which I think is critically important as the community benefits agreement with community organizations as part of this deal to foster both equity and social justice and provide benefit to communities that will be affected by this arena. And I think that's a very significant part of what we're trying to do in this. This would entail programs for youth and arts and sports and music and cultural events. There's 20 million in in-kind or cash to nonprofit organizations, including \$10 million dedicated to youth care. And we know the outstanding work that youth care does and the lives that they are changing, particularly for youth that need guidance and need to get on a better

track. And so we're we're real impressed with that kind of work. You know. Part of our deal when we get very busy are to make sure that we have the resources to hire folks to protect our interests are as a city, our interests as a for residents, for for everyone that sort of needs a look under the stones to make sure there's no subtle language that can hurt our city. To that end, we hired David Abrams, who worked with the mayor and the council. His company is Inner Circle Sports. He's a consultant, provides sort of expert financial advice to the city. Another piece of that is our hiring of David Stone, who was our financial consultant who worked only for the city council. And of course, the city hired Karl Hirsch as sort of a city consultant to really stay on top of athletic events. A word about the NBA, if you really for those do it. And I have a few folks who really study the developments in the NBA. The current CBA runs to around 2023 to 2024 with a mutual opt out after 2020, 20, 20, 20, 22 to 2023. And NBA would likely to consider expansions right during that 2022 period. We all know the NBA has 30 teams right now and they could expand at 32. And you may recall that there weren't a lot of happy people in 2006 when Howard Schultz, who was the majority owner of the Sonics, sold to Clay Bennett from Oklahoma for that time it was 350 million. So certainly the stakes have changed. But I say that history to simply make this point that we are we've attracted a lot of capital just to the city to put us. In a position to both attract hockey and NBA. And there's no guarantees in this world on this these kinds of deals. But we brought significant resources to the city, structured a partnership agreement. I think that will work and protect our taxpayers. And I certainly will be supporting this legislation. And one note about the Soto Street issues, and we heard some testimony there, you may recall in 2016, the street vacation did not pass. That was a tough fight for vote. We're moving forward. That MLB we signed actually expired yesterday. I think it was. And we still have, I think, a good relationship with those those particular groups. And the line is always open. So nothing precludes ongoing conversations with Mr. Hansen or the folks. But this particular deal on its merits, and that's really critical on its merits, is a great deal for the city, at least in my humble opinion. Having said that, the one that was driving this, I want to recognize and relinquish the to and that will be Councilmember Juarez councilmember words. You have the floor. Thank you, council president for all of you who are here today. Thank you very much for being here. I know it's been a long, a long year. Some of us started working on this in October of 2016 and has been with us for about 14 months, which is probably longer than my last relationship. Let me just start with this. I have some some basic words I want to put out there about and frame these issues, and then I will mov

e to amend it with the the substitution memo that we worked out, and then I'll have more words to say after that. But I just want to be clear, because we we've had in the last nine months, we've had eight meetings and we've had a resolution and we've had a council letter and we've had many stakeholder groups. And I'll go through that list, that litany in a moment. I want to thank all of labor that showed up here today. I really want to thank you for being there. Seattle Storm, thank you so much. The Port, thank you so much. And all the business and all the Sonics fans. Of course, at the originally at the November 16 select committee meeting on Arenas, we had 13 amendments and we came to agree on seven of those, meaning that we built consensus and we voted on them and we agreed upon them. And then we had six amendments that we ended up changing, and those were the amendments and changes that we wanted renegotiated with our central staff director, Kirsten, our staff at our legal counsel, our outside experts who the President just mentioned, FASB, CBO, myself, Council President Harrell and of course, Councilmember Bagshaw representing

District Number seven. We all successfully renegotiated all six of those amendments. And so what we have before us today is a substitute MCU to be attached to Council Bill 119088 so I'm going to withhold the rest of my comments until I make an official motion. So I move to amend Council Bill 119088 Attachment one by substituting version two for version one. So this is on the amendment only. Thank you, Councilmember. Whereas those in favor of substitution of the amendment, as stated by Councilmember Juarez, please vote i. I opposed. The ayes have it. So we have a substituted version and councilman words. Would you like to rest it to see if there are any other comments and then come back? We can do a two A's, I understand. Is there any I. I was ready to launch into my discussion, but if. How would you like to do it? Well, I'll tell you that I believe the base legislation is there. You could continue talking to any of my colleagues, have any comments to make on the base legislation or any ideas or thoughts, and that would be your time to make it, I guess. Remember what I. Do have comments on the base legislation, but I would like to resolve. Them. Okay, very good. So did you want me to just go forward then with what I was going to call on? Johnson. Okay, you're on. Is that is that a bobblehead on your in front of your. Yes, ma'am, it is. Where's my sales star bobblehead? Okay. So I'm going to launch into some some some important issues. And I'm going to ask the community to bear with me, because some of us have been dealing with this for a very long time. And it's important to acknowledge the people that have worked hard and over these last 14 months. On October 27th, 2016, then-Mayor Murray announced his intention to issue a RFP for to renovate key arena. Over the next several months. The executive would put together a t

eam of people led by Brian Surratt, who's in the back of the room at the Office of Economic Development. This team included representatives from sales center ops, SSI, alphabet soup here Eastport, Department of Neighborhoods, Arts Law, the mayor's office and representatives from Council in the Legislative Department. That would be yours truly. Council President Harrell and Councilmember Bagshaw representing District Number Seven. Right from the beginning, council's voice was included. I can assure you of that. I had my first meeting with OED on November 23rd, 2016, to discuss the elements and deliverables of a potential RFP. Needless to say, I spent Thanksgiving and Christmas break with the red pen going through RFP and making sure when I spoke to my constituents and my colleagues on the floor that the issues that were of concern to them were baked right into the RFP. I was able to work with Director Armstead to provide direct feedback to the language of the RFP to make sure that council's priorities not only would be baked in according to transportation, but all the other issues. I want to thank Councilmember Herbert for her insight into labor and the issues that she thought should be highlighted. Councilmember Gonzales On the race and social justice issues. Councilmember should Johnson and O'Brien on the transportation issues and much, much more. There's a lot more there, but I'm not going to go on and on. The RFP was released on January 11th, 2017, and on February 20th February 2017, the Select Committee on Civic Arenas was announced. Council president, in his wisdom, decided that it would be better, and I agreed that myself. Council President Harrell and Councilmember Bagshaw, representing District seven, would attack this project as diligently with all the integrity in it, with all the speed due that this city needed and wanted since the Sonics had left. I do want to point out we do have Seattle Storm and that is a phenomenal team again. With that, I really want to thank our central staff director, Kirsten R for all her work, including down itr their work in representing the Council on both the initial negotiating team and in the subsequent negotiations to finalize the menu in front of us today. This has been a labor of love. Person has balanced the priorities of nine council members has been absolutely critical to the success of this project and did it all while doing the budget. I cannot think of anyone who has worked as hard and as closely with me whose professional integrity I would never, ever question. I want to acknowledge Robert Nelmes, the director of the Seattle Center, and Jill Query. Dr.. No, I'm sorry, Mr. NELMS. Director Nelms has been great to work with. He's always been a phenomenal advocate for what is best for Seattle Center and all the tenant organizations on the campus and in particular Seattle Storm. I would also again like to say thank you, Brian Surratt, for being a director and offering your leadership and bringing us

together. I know we didn't always get along, but we got it done and I appreciate that. Even when I said bad words together with all the components of this project, for us to deliver it to my to my, to my colleagues and we we gave you a deadline back in July. We asked that the executive transmit

to us an M.O. you on September 12th, and you did just that. I also want to thank the hard work of Carl Stickle. Carl, thank you very much for answering all our my dumb questions and well, I don't know Councilmember get back. Backchannels questions were dumb, but she had a lot of them as well. I want to thank the work of our consultants, as you heard the president say, David Stone, Carl Hirsch, David Abrams were phenomenal. Their expertize has been a great value to support counsel through this process. We have relied on their expertize, their professional integrity, their financial analysis, market conditions, and all the difficulties of Reimagining Seattle Center. And let me tell you, folks, it was no easy task. I also want to thank before I think my colleagues in particular and I need to read this list off because it's important. I've been living and breathing these and with these individuals in these groups for a long time. And I think what the public doesn't know behind the scenes is who these people are that actually roll up their sleeves, get out the spreadsheets, make us go through our exercise, ask all of our questions, and provide the document and do the due diligence. Ben Noble from the from the city budget office. Ben, thank you so much. Greg Nava legal. His analysis and superb legal advice has been phenomenal in Greg's. Try on a chair. I can see him sitting right there. Just in case we need him. I want to thank the staff from DCI Nathan Torkelson, or PKD, Sam Safir. Asafa Escort Scott Scooby. I would say that Scooby. I call him Scooby. That's why I'm saying that. And departure of neighborhoods, Kathleen Island. All of them provided essential feedback on the EMU particular thanks to council member Bagshaw and her staff, Lily and Alberta. Thank you so much. Working with my staff, it really was helpful obviously. And of course, Council Member Herrell. I want to thank Vin for the work that he did. A particular shout out to my staff. Ms.. Mercedes Elizalde. There she is in the back. Mercedes and I would have been attached to this for 13, 14 months, weekends, nights. This woman works the floor, gets the amendments, does the research. Another really big thank you. And I hope she's watching Shayna. We hired Shayna in Sept in January and her only job was to do all the research at the archives down here in Seattle, in City Hall and at the University of Washington. She pulled up all the op ed pieces, the original legislation, the ordinances, the letters from Congress to state, the city from the 1958 to 1962 for the World's Fair, because it was important for us to see the long term vision of what our civic leaders were thinking about in 1950 859. And belie

ve me, that actually shaped a lot of our opinion about the isn't just about bringing back the Sonics. It's about a regional asset. And as I want to quote, Maggie, if some of you remember whoever Senator McGee was called, Seattle Center in the World's Fair and the Space Needle in the footprint, a jewel, the jewel of our city. And that's what we led with. We have two phenomenal groups. I'm going to duplicate a few names because they do show up a few times, but they had been phenomenal. The two groups that we work with their guidance, their comments, their assistance, their perseverance, their negotiating first. The first community group, Deborah Fastow from Uptown Alliance, Ali Garrett from Tabor 100. Nicole Grant, thank you very much. From Labor. Todd Humphrey. Megan Jasper. Jan Levy. Jill Nishi. The bill said this. Ron Rico, Quantum Drago. Ethan Stoll. Lenny Wilkins. Councilmember back and I had an opportunity to have lunch with the famous Mr. Wilkins and learned a lot about history and wisdom and what a team means. But not just the team, the whole spirit of the city coming together, and also his phenomenal support, of course, for Seattle Storm. The second group has been and will continue to lead the community involvement process in the execution of this development. Their guiding principles are an attachment to the legislation. I want to thank Monte Anderson, John Barr, Robert Cardona, Andrea Capone, Evan Clifford, Brian Curry, Deborah Foster again. Allie Grant again. Nicole Grant again Michael McQuaid, Brian Robertson, Sarah Wilkie and Jane Slutsky. I could actually give you a lot more names and people in groups, but I won't. We could be here all for another 3 hours if I did that. But I do want to add one more thing before I finish. I want to thank the Seattle storm. In the letter, I had a chance to exchange some messages with Jenny. And thank you for the little lady that was here that read this yellow storm letter. I think the thing that was I found the most most poignant in her letter when it comes to the Seattle storm, because people always just talk about the Sonics. Even though they left us in their letter, they said something to me that really spoke to me about having a new arena and thanking us and being supportive because that they deserve to work and play basketball in an upgraded arena where the technology is state of the art, and where we have a building that keeps out the rain when we don't give consideration to other kind of sports, when it's only about male sports, we don't look at the other type of people that contribute to the city. In sports, I think you're missing out. And I also want to thank Seattle Storm because they have worked with us

on the relocation efforts and also mitigating the franchise losses for those two years and have been very, very open and honest and good about how we can all work together to move them and take care of them while we go through this. If this gets past today, this change, I want to thank my

council colleagues for their input throughout the process. Those of you who provided me in input, your comments, your drafts, your concerns during the RFP phase and our letter to the Executive in June and throughout the review process to identify the needed amendments to the menu, including the August resolution that passed unanimously, where we were very clear in our intent and resolve to build a world class arena for not only the city of Seattle, but for everyone in the state of Washington. This is such an amazing opportunity. Such an investment of this magnitude into the call center has not been seen since the days before the World's Fair in 1962. We see now how this is igniting a new age of female led sports with the young. Women of Washington Wild. That's the girls hockey team who consistently came to public comment to support this project. And as and as I shared our discussions with Seattle Storm today. If council votes to approve this MSU it'll be the first step of many more to come over the next year. Council will be viewing several documents, as I shared before the development agreement, the lease agreement, the SEAL Integration Agreement, the EGIS, the Transportation Mobility Action Plan, the Community Benefits Agreement. With more work to come, I look forward to groundbreaking and grand opening. And I should add that working with OPG has been a pleasure. I've been a lawyer for 31 years and I've built many things and negotiated many things. I am proud that OPG gave \$20 million to our community fund, that OPG agreed to MJ, that they gave 1% for the arts, that they of the 20,000,010 will go to youth care, that OPG has agreed to relocate and paid for the skate the skate park. And I could go on and on. But all of that is within the ordinance and it's within the 50 page menu, which I think has seven attachments, if I'm correct. And so let me just end on this note. We work really hard on this. We made sure, I made sure Mercedes made sure, Councilor Bagshaw made sure President Harrell made sure that my colleagues not only had the benefit of all the material briefings, private briefings. We even went as far to make each council member a notebook. I was ready to just show up at their house on a Saturday and go through it again. And I'll tell you why not. Because I'm in the pocket of big business or corporation or the NHL. It's because I believe in this. And this, I believe, is the best thing for the city of Seattle, whoever you cheer for. But more importantly, what I am really proud of are the seven objectives that we hammered out that is in the menu, that it's a world class arena at little or no cost to the taxpayers, and it embodies all the values of Seattle. So with that, I hope today that the MQ passes. Thank you. Thank you. Well done, Casper. And worse. I had to cancel our. Thank you. Thank you to Councilmember Warrens for making note of the commitments in this agreement related to Labor. I wanted to just give a little bit

of specific detail about those commitments. Not only are we going to ensure that the worker retention rates of of workers at the key arena now are observed, but that we are also going to see inclusive proposals for labor peace agreements. But also really importantly is the adherence of this project to priority hire. Last year the mayor issued an executive order saying that we should seek to ensure that public private partnerships also adhere to priority hire. That is not the law right now. That is something that we seek to do, but it's something that is enshrined in this particular MRU and I think that is a really good model for the city. This may be one of the biggest projects in the pipeline with the capacity to secure a career ladder, opportunities benefiting large numbers of Seattle workers. I also wanted to give a nod to the the arts issues that this agreement addresses. And thank you, Councilmember Suarez, for shepherding those issues, specifically ensuring that Pottery Northwest is is treated fairly in their relocation. I look forward in the future to seeing a definition on what relocation costs include, particularly concern about the compensation of revenue that's lost during this transition. Also very appreciative of the commitments in this agreement to work collaboratively with the arts tenants in ensuring that what is now a theater district can can also coexist peacefully and thrive with with these arts uses. And then finally, really appreciate how this agreement makes commitments to work with each Viera, Cerf and Kxip on the development of a future outdoor concert site. Thank you. Thank you. Kathryn Herbold. I think I had Kathryn Mesquita and I think Councilmember O'Brien reaching for the mic. So it was like Councilmember O'Brien to go first or. I have an amendment and so I can put it out there. But if you wanted to speak before that. Why don't we go catch him skate and then catch from Brian Cashman, a skater. You have the floor. Well, thank you so much. Thank you to my colleagues and I'm so excited. I jumped for the

mic. I apologize for jumping in a rhythm. It's the. Rhythm. I just want to say a huge amount of appreciation for all of the work that went into this. Especially to Councilmember Suarez, Councilmember Bagshaw and President Harrell also for the incredible work that a Councilmember Herbal just outlined in terms of labor protections. I will be voting yes for this provision today. And yes. And in terms of the effort to create not just a sports arena, but a thriving arts and cultural campus for our community. This is truly, I think, a win for our community. I think that there's strong financial protections. I think that there are strong protections for those who are working on this project to continue to engage with our community organizations and with our neighborhood associations and to make sure that there's strong worker protections. And I'm incredibly honored to be able to work side by side with those in the labor communi

ty who have been working on this. Executive Secretary Nicole Grant is here along with the broader labor community who I know has been working on this to make sure that there is not just strong, good union jobs, but that there is labor peace agreements, that we have efforts that will hire locally and that will hire people of color and those who are in most need of jobs that are good living wage jobs and strong protections, strong union protections. I think that there's many things that the city has done to learn from your example when you work to transition the zoo and transition the aquarium to make sure that we had protections for the workers who were there. And I know we can learn from those experiences to make sure that we maintain good living wage jobs and that we keep workers whole in the process. And so when the arena reopens up and I know it's going to be an expedited timeline, thanks to the commitment from this council and of the commitment from all of you, I know that we're going to be able to have good living wage jobs while we construct and then when we're done constructing. And so I applaud all the parties that were involved in this process. I think that the strong financial protections and sideboards are incredible. And from my perspective, this is level setting. When you think about how arenas will be built in other cities around the country, this sets the stage for holding developers accountable, making sure that labor protections are included, and that the community view and the community lens is included from the beginning. So thank you for all your work on that. And there's so many things I want to say just about the tenants that are going to be there. I'm excited about protecting those who are involved in our arts and culture and those who are also involved in growing the next generation of our sports community. And yes, it's bringing back the Sonics. Yes, it's making sure that we can have a hockey league, but it's also making sure that those who are there right now with the storm and with the Washington Female Hockey Association continue to have a strong place to thrive and grow and to grow. Our next generation, I talked to the folks at the skate Like a Girl this morning, and I look forward to working with you and working with them to make sure that there is a place that's equitable and accessible for these young women to make sure that they have a place to play, both structured play and non structure plays. I think what we're investing in in the arena. So I'm definitely interested in hearing more about ways that we continue to improve this process. As you heard, this is step one, and I think that we're going to be continuing to look to make sure we're good stewards of the public dollar, that we're mitigating for impact on transit and transportation, and that we're lifting up our industries and making sure that our workers are invested in. And so to that end, I'm looking forward to working with you. Let's get this built. It's

good for our city. It's good for jobs. It's good for a thriving Seattle. And I'm so proud of the work that you all have done. Thank you. Councilmember Skater. Okay, a little pivot on hearing from colleagues. Councilmember Swan, I believe you have some comments you'd like to make. Thank you, Brandon Harrell. I agree with Councilmember Suarez on her comments about the hard work that has been put into this legislation from central staff. And I know councilmember was specifically mentioned, goes nose down and done it. I really wanted to second that that that a lot of hard work has gone into it. I also agree with Councilmember Waters that she herself made her office very available to all council officers. So I think that there has been you know, in my mind, there is no there's no cause for complaint on that. And I do have some critical comments to make. So I just wanted to make sure that everybody understand that my critical comments reflect political differences, not in any way of failing to communicate, because I think that was done in a in a very full manner. However, the political substance of legislation matters is not merely about hard work. I do intend to vote yes on this, Emmylou, because. I think that on the balance, it is better for the city than nothing. However, I also want to be clear that whether or not one thinks this is a great deal, as

many for the city, as many have said, that's a subjective assessment. It is based on what standard you want to hold the city to. So in my view, it is a total exaggeration to say that this is the best possible deal and a great deal and so on. And I will explain my comments. First of all, for some reasons why I will be voting yes. I am glad that this AMAJU has managed to win the support of workers and the labor unions that represent them. As you know, the concerns raised by the dockworkers and other unions about the SODO arena were decisive in my decision to vote against that in the past. And the support of trade unions is an important part of my yes vote today. As a member of the labor movement myself, that is important to me. I am also glad that the city will ultimately avoid losing revenue in this milieu. The city has vital things to invest its limited funds on housing, addressing homelessness, equitable development and other vital services. And I really would appeal to the labor movement to show as much presence and activism as they have shown on aspects like the Arena project to also for them to show that on housing and homelessness issues, these are important issues. These are issues that are important for workers. These are, in my view, issues for the labor movement. So I look forward to seeing as much or more presence of labor on those issues and not just on the arena. Finally, I'm glad that there is the opportunity to possibly bring Seattle a men's basketball team in addition to the storm, and maybe to bring Seattle a hockey team. I know things were better with Sonics fans when we voted no ag

ainst it, and at that time I said, I'm not against sports. I'm very pro sports. Although I would not be surprised if the NBA strings Seattle along for years and uses the prospect of moving a team to Key Arena as a threat to extract concessions from other cities. And in general, as I've said before, I think it is an outrage that professional sports league dominated by billionaires, are allowed to operate as legal cartels that can deny entire cities the opportunity to have a team. I also want to be clear that even though this Emmylou is better than nothing, in my view, is far from a great deal. The city is agreeing to give ovg a massive and that's and capital letters massive tax break for decades as business in key arena increases over the next decades, the city is agreeing to give back half of all the increased tax revenue. This is only half of the increase and not half of all their taxes. So again, mathematically speaking, the city will not be losing money. From the city standpoint, it will not be losing money, will not be negative. But we also need to be clear as a whole, this is a massive tax break that cities would never give to ordinary citizens like you and me. When was the last time you or I got that kind of tax break? And keep in mind, this is in the context of Washington having the most regressive tax system in the nation, because OPG is a very large business and has lots of money. This is how big business operates. They are they have the power to leverage that money, that wealth, and they are doing so. They are leveraging that money to extract from the city tax breaks. And this sort of thing happens at every level of our government. It is part of a system where wealth is equal to power, and that power is used to shift even more money towards the wealthy. We are seeing that same thing happening at the federal level. And by the way, the Sodo arena, NYU, you also contained massive tax break for big business. Imagine if governments would make deals with the regular workers, giving us back half our taxes when we get raises. This is another example of how unequal our society is. So I will be clear. I will be voting yes in favor of this, Emmylou, because it does benefit the city as a whole. But I will not be calling it a great deal for the city because it's not regular people. But OPG has big business that is poised to reap the huge profits. Thank you. Councilmember should. What thank you very much comes from Brian. You have the floor, sir. Thank you. So I have an amendment that you all should have in front of you. It would amend Council Bill 119088, attachment one, Section one B under the section term and exclusivity by deleting the last sentence clause which reads and to the city, shall not provide financial support, benefits or incentives open parentheses other than those that are generally available to any potential developer. Close parentheses with respect to the construction of any live entertainment venue with a capacity of more than 15,

000 seats within the jurisdictional jurisdictional boundaries of the city of Seattle. See if there's a second for that amendment, and then I can speak to it. Calling for a second chance. Memories to watch your brother hang in there. So, okay, we have a motion on the second. One of the principles for me when we started this conversation over a year ago was specifically around exclusivity and open to the idea of an agreement with OPG or anybody else that wanted to contribute to an arena remodel. But it was important to me that we not give them an exclusive deal. This section, at least my read of it, talks about, has about exclusivity, has two parts. The first says that the city shall not

negotiate with any person or entity other than ovg, or it's designing or permitted signing regarding renovation or redevelopment of the arena, or solicit or entertain bids or proposals to do so. Now that makes sense to me as we're working on an agreement for that arena, that they would be the only ones that would do the work in the arena. But to extend that exclusivity for not just the term of the menu, but also the term of the entire lease agreement, that we wouldn't make any deals with anyone else in the city for arenas. Over 15,000 seats, I think ties our hands in a way and becomes problematic for me. One example is certainly the obvious one, which is around the SODO arena. And what kind of deals would we enter into there? What concerns me more is the reality that we're facing with this agreement in regards to a potential monopoly of large music venues by Live Nation in our market. I've heard a lot from folks in the music industry that have concerns about the monopoly of the music industry by a couple of players in in our city, Live Nation. If this goes forward, we control the arena and we control White River Amphitheater, which is a venue that I think seats about 16,000. And the music venue at the Gorge, which seats about 27,000, holds about 27,000 folks. The major music venues in town will be controlled by one and one entity. And I think that is a big problem, big problem for the citizens of Seattle, and I think a big problem for folks, especially in the music industry, to have to go through the single player. Now, there's no proposal to build major another major music venue in Seattle right now. And I want to be clear that if someone came up with a proposal to do something else for music or other entertainment that the tax credits we're giving away, I wouldn't want to give away lately, but I would want to retain the flexibility to enter into agreements like this. If someone over the course of the next 44 years decides that they wanted to do so, make an investment like this, I guess I'll leave it at that and see if there are any questions or comments on the. Very good, I'm sure to generate a few comments. Thank you, Councilmember Brian, for stating it very clearly. Councilmember, where is it you want to respond? Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember O'Brien, fo

r your comments. I do have five points I want to make about the exclusivity clause, starting with the fact that as a lawyer for 31 years, building casinos and hotels and hospitals and police stations and golf courses, this is a common term. It's a common agreement. It's a common restriction. It doesn't tie our hands. It actually protects us. On November 16th, 18 days ago, this exact amendment was in front of us and this committee unanimously denied it. Indeed, they we voted five zero that we would not change it with the same comments and concerns in exchange. And I bring it up now. Today, nothing has changed. And we have the exact same amendment in front of us. This amendment, the exclusivity term, I'm sorry, has no impact on any street vacation or the Soto Street vacation. This does not bar any group from seeking a street vacation. Like I said, this provision protects us and I guess the common sense responses. Why would we not have one? Why would we allow another arena or venue to be built that would compete against us? We are if we sign and go forward with this milieu with with ovg, it isn't them versus us. If Ovg makes money, we make money. At the end of the day, it isn't \$650 million that Ovg is putting into this project. It comes out to 1.2 billion. So again, I'm hoping and I. Customer Brian, thank you for talking with me this morning. It isn't just that I've been working on this for 13 months. I did this for a living for many years. And so I just want to reiterate that at some point as chair of this committee, that I would be given some deference, some understanding that I know what I'm talking about, and I would not have agreed to it if I didn't believe it is a it's an important and it's a critical component in an MCU to have an exclusivity clause. It's like when you put in an. Non-compete clause or non-disclosure agreement. It isn't there to take away or tie the hands of any type of sports or economic development. It merely says that not only are we obviously protecting their interests, but they're protecting our financial interest as well. Remember, if a business comes in and puts \$1.3 billion into a project, they expect to make that money back, as well as making sure that we have a revenue stream. And we also come out in the in the black on this. So with that, I will leave it at that. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you. Councilmember O'Brien, I'm not going to support this for three reasons. And the first of which is that we had this in front of us just two weeks ago and we voted it down. And I haven't talked with you about this. Haven't seen any reason why we would reconsider it. The second reason is I'm not clear why you would want to eliminate this clause, because what you would effectively do is to allow special financial support and benefits to go to another private developer. I'm not sure what you have in mind there, but it's certainly not something I want to support. And lastly, just procedurally, and I

know this is something that we have brought up. We have repeatedly asked if there is an amendment, would you tell us beforehand? I went to office last week and I asked everybody, is there a concern? Do you have anything that you want to bring up? We heard nothing from you until 1138 this morning. And I just have to say that we are trying to bring some discipline and frankly, some cordiality among our colleagues. And I just don't think that's right. And I'm not going to support this amendment. Before a council member responds. They seem reaching for the mic. In fairness, accounts from Brian, at least in my conversations with him, he has during a very complex budget time, he made it very clear that he was under-resourced and he was struggling with having a good, strong, comprehensive understanding of this. And we've had many conversations. And again, in fairness to Councilmember Brian, he did comply with the time deadlines to get this within 2 hours of the deadline in order to get it on the docket. I'm not supporting the amendment as well for different reasons. Perhaps not that I have disagreed with the criticisms that I've heard. But my concern is, number one, I actually appreciate him bringing the issue up that if we are either consciously or unconsciously creating a monopoly for a company like Live Nation in the entertainment venue, that that's always monopolies do not work. That is a restraint of trade. And there's all kinds of issues that come along with that. The language in the existing exhibit that I am comfortable with says that we would give financial support, benefits or incentives. It says. Other than those that are generally available to any potential developer. So in other words, we will deal with developers as we deal with developers and negotiate with them on what it takes to negotiate an arrangement. But make no mistake about this, that we are dealing with a private entity. They have a rate of return that they are trying to achieve. We have a rate of return we are trying to achieve. And I thought they were they are well within their rights to ask for this kind of exclusivity language, which I understand from the experts that we've hired, that this is nothing to be alarmed about. In fact, this is sort of I don't say standard language, but this is not something that should hurt us in the long run. But I think his policy points are actually the least well-received by me that we need to concern ourselves with whether we are creating some kind of monopoly and whether that is good policy. So my bottom line is I'm still comfortable with the language, and I think that this does not prohibit us from talking to developers, from talking to the Soto group and having discussions as they arise. But but this is actually solid language. Councilmember O'Brien, you you have the I know you have a response you'd like to make. Oh, I'm sorry. Let's let's go to Councilmember Herbold and Councilmember Brown. Thank you. I'm really sympathetic with the moti

vation for this amendment. I myself had developed amendment last week, and that gets to some of the issues here. I took a different approach than Councilmember O'Brien took and maintained the exclusivity clause and upped the capacity, because I don't actually see this as this let this language itself creating a monopoly except for venues that are of a certain size. And so I was interested in increasing the number of seats to 20,000 seat venues. But I was told I couldn't bring that amendment forward. And I had intended, if I could bring it forward, I intended to make sure that we checked with Ovg to see whether or not that was an amendment that was amenable. Because I'm sensitive to the fact that there are negotiations that have been going on as we have been making changes here on this council. And I wouldn't want to make a change that was was basically non-negotiable. And that's that's right where I am right now with this particular amendment as as drafted. I don't know how it would be received by our partner. And that that concerns me. I again, I don't think that the exclusivity clause as it is drafted actually does create a a monopoly for 1a1 set of interests. I think it does allow for a development of another facility, another large facility. But I do have questions of whether or not it is the size facility that our music community is seeking. So that that's sort of where my question is simply striking out the clause altogether. I just I have concerns about the impact on on the agreement with our partner on this by by doing so. If I had more information, I might feel differently. Thank you, Councilman Herbert. Councilmember O'Brien, would you like to make any comments or any customers want as a comment? I would select. One. I do wrap up because I can address some of the concerns. Okay. If you're going to wrap up, so cuts from what you like some comments. This is on the amendment, I take it? Yeah. Thank you. We have a live amendment that's been moved in second. So first I want to be clear. I mean, as a socialist, I'm totally opposed to using public money to subsidize private arenas or big business in general. That goes without saying. However, I think we should also be very clear that Oleg's motivation in seeking this exclusivity clause is not in any way common with me as a socialist. They are asking for this exclusivity clause because they want a guarantee of a monopoly on this sort of

space as a business for sporting and for arena sized concerts. I am against subsidizing big business. But. But I'm also against giving a contract to any one big business that gives them the power over what sort of contract a city can do in the future for the next 55 years. For example, over the past few years, the city has lost a lot of revenue opportunities because it gave empty exclusive rights to all alcohol sales in all of Seattle center for decades. OPG is, of course, well within their legal rights to ask for this clause. The city is well within its rights

to refuse this clause. And I think we also have to point out there is an insidious component to all of this, which is the false equivalency between big business and whose interests the city should be representing. It's like saying, Well, OPG is one entity, the city is one entity. There all is that all an equal playing field? It's merely a business negotiation that is extremely misleading. This is a city, a country and a world that is deeply unequal. And in my view, the city of Seattle should be hugely prioritizing the interests of regular people, not big business. This is not an equal playing field in any way. This is reminiscent to me of the letter that most of this council and many other elected officials wrote to Amazon, apologizing to them that maybe they felt unwelcome. I think we have to be very clear which side we should be on. It is not a new, politically neutral territory. I will be voting yes on this amendment because I do not support giving OPG a veto on the city's future decisions for the next half century. And, you know, the city should have the right and it should be principled enough to say that public money will not be used to subsidize big business. But we don't need already to do that and already. So it only should not have any power over the city's decisions. Thank you.

Councilmember Swann, I believe Councilman Brown is going to wrap up on the amendment. So I may try to touch on a couple of the concerns my colleagues raised. I'll go in chronological order, as I recall. Councilmember Juarez, I appreciate you highlighting the history here and highlighting specifically the concern that the city would not want to do anything that would undermine itself going forward. And I agree that any agreement to partner with a new arena proposal anywhere else in the city would be one we want to take lightly. We would want to consider the impacts on our existing investment at Key Arena, but I do think we would want to have the flexibility to make the decision at that time about what's in the best interest of the city of Seattle. And I worry that this exclusivity clause would tie our hands and not allow us that ability if an opportunity came forward at some point in the next, you know, 40 plus years. Customer base, I apologize for not meeting your timeline. I do always try to be as upfront with folks on this. Unfortunately, because of the commitment I had made almost a year ago, I was unable to be at the committee meeting. I mean, it was scheduled after I had made that commitment on November 16th. I was under the impression that there was going to possibly be another committee meeting on November 27th, which I was able to attend. But that meeting got canceled. And so my only opportunity to bring an amendment forward where I could actually speak to it myself and make my case was today. And so, so here I am. I can kind of see where the votes are. So I recognize what's going to happen there. I also, Councilmember Herbold, I appreciate your differe

nt approach. I do firmly believe that this isn't the type of agreement where we go to the other party and ask if it's okay. I think we have a bottom line to and we can say no, this is a non-negotiable thing for us, which for me, this one is which is why I want to put this language in now. And if OPG says, well, we cannot proceed at this point with that and it's a deal breaker, then you know, we can have that conversation. But I don't think I need to ask their permission for changes that I think here in the best interests of Seattle. Finally, Council President Harrell, I really appreciate your comments there. And when I do read this language, it's it's vague and I'll speak to that and. I think there's it could mean different things to different people, but I'll speak to that after we take the vote on the amendment and talk about the final bill. Okay, very good. So we have an amendment that is basically stated by Council, Brian, to delete the term and exclusivity language at the end. I think we all got a grasp on that. So I'm just going to ask for a not only a voice vote, but raise your hand as well. So it's been moved. And Second Councilmember O'Brien's amendment's been moved. And second and all those in favor of his amendment, please vote yes and raise your hand. Yes, yes. Okay. All of the polls say no and raise your hand. Oh, no. No. So the amendment fails. So so now we have the still is an amended legislation because Councilmember Juarez had made a substitution. So we're we now have the Bass legislation. So we will I don't need a motion for this. I could just do a roll call when it's time to to vote. Yeah, we'll move it in a minute. So, you know, I want to make sure everyone has said what they want to say before we vote. So. Council Member

Yes, we're on the Bass. Council Member Back. Thank you. I'm very optimistic today that we are making way to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in an asset that is one of the most prominent assets we have in our city and certainly historically relevant. And I know we've heard some comments about what the city is giving up. We're also getting \$600 million that is invested in an asset that needs some love. And let's just be frank and I do want to acknowledge the work. I mean, Mercedes in the background has been the understated person and Kushner aerostat Ben Noble in the back. But Councilmember Suarez you have done an amazing job of bringing us through this and with Council President Harrell, this has been no small feat and we have been working on lots of things through the budget. But you laid out a plan. You worked on the RFP. We got proposals. You helped identify the pros and cons of all of those. We worked through the summer. You worked all the way through the fall on this. I do not want to understate how important it is. And that said, we've acknowledged Brian Surratt, who's still hiding in the back. Robert Nelms, I don't know if Robert is here. Thank you. That's Master Robert's Robert Nelms, but also o

ur friends from uptown. I see that Debbie Fastow is back there and Cooper was here earlier. I know that. Mike McQuade, thank you so much. On our Belltown friends, it has mattered so much to have you all here in the port. Stephanie Bowman, thank you. You are a star. Lindsay Wolpert, thank you for putting your positions out there and for also saying that you're going to assist with the transportation, whether it's \$5 million to help the mobility plan or help us with the monorail, it is going to be a big difference. I also want to acknowledge what the city is getting besides having \$600 million that's going to be invested in our neighborhoods and the arena. There's going to be \$40 million coming in as a transportation payment. We know that the city will match that and more over the next number of months and years. The baseline rent we have acknowledged. But I really want to say thank you to Tim, Luigi and to Francesca you. Thank you. And Lance Lopes, thank you for reaching out to our community. It's made such a huge difference because I know that coming in from Los Angeles or New York City, somebody would say, Well, you don't know Seattle well. You have worked hard to get to know us, and I'm really respectful of that. And I just want you to know how much I appreciate the work that you've done, and particularly around youth care, our friends from Youth Care, you make such a difference in our community and having some of not only those of you who are working at youth care, but some of your students who have been here, it's going to make a big difference. And we all are focusing on how our community can be a better place to live. And I think this is going to really help us. The value to Seattle Center is huge. The work that you're going to be doing, not just in the arena, but helping us with bringing together the tenants in Seattle Center, whether it's Pottery Northwest people have talked about that skate like a girl the storm. I'm sorry that our storm friends left because sometimes we hear people say, oh, we need to have a world class basketball team, or we got one, and we may very well have another. And one thing I haven't heard said is, do you all realize that this year is the 100th anniversary? This is the 100 year anniversary of the Seattle metropolitans who won the Stanley Cup. So I just want to say thank you. Thank you to those of you from from our good friends, from the hockey teams, because you've been here meeting after meeting. And it's been great to see you, not just our friends from the Sonics, but to have our friends from hockey as well. And I want to acknowledge this the sense of the Seattle integration, our school district, many of you know, just a week ago we signed a memorandum of understanding with the Seattle Public Schools doing work not just on the memorial. And potentially another school asset there. And it makes such a difference to be bringing the community around what we can do. The Mobility Action Plan, Debbie FRAUSTO is here

and I can see her smiling and sort of that Jiminy Cricket on my shoulder for the last year is that we have to have a mobility action plan that moves people to and from Seattle Center that doesn't compromise how people get around in uptown Belltown and South Lake Union. So I just want to acknowledge her and Alan Hart via architects are going to be helping us with that and already mentioned has been the equity for workers. Councilmember Herbold I know that this has been something so important to you and of course our new Councilmember Mosqueda having labor harmony. The priority hires the apprenticeship programs. This is going to revolutionize how our people are working and both during the time we're constructing and afterwards when we actually have them on site. And I think the business and economic development in the neighborhood is going to be tremendously impactful. Nicole Grant, are you still here or did she leave? So from. Nicole Grant. Marty Anderson Dale Bridle spoke ILWU. Thank you for being here. Also Andrea and

Bess from Stagehands. Thank you. I think some of you have already gone, but really appreciate the work that you've done and being here and talking to us about how important this project is to you. So I'm all for this in huge contrast to 18 months ago when there was a lot of sadness in this room. I think we're going to see a great deal of support here up on the dais, but also a great support going forward. So many thanks to all of you who have come. Thank you. Councilmember Bagshaw. Okay, I see Councilmember Johnson, the tallest one up here, getting ready to say a few words. So, Senator Johnson, you have the floor, sir, just briefly. Thank you. Council President Harrell. You know, when we started on this process, I think one of the things that I really tried to watch out for is the danger of what happens sometimes in public private partnerships. And when they go bad is when the public sector has to take on all the risk and the private sector gets to pocket all the profits. And that is not what we have here. This is a true partnership where we are sharing in the risk, but also sharing the reward. I'd like to thank Councilmember Suarez and Brian Serrano and many folks here at the city who made this possible. I'd also like to thank the folks at Oak View for really working hard to be good neighbors and good partners with us. Much has been made of the work around labor harmony and protections for workers, but also the work that we did to make sure that the intentionality of the Seattle Center as an arts and cultural district is preserved as part of the growth and redevelopment of ARENA. You know that the OPG group continues to commit to the mandatory housing affordability payments, that they will commit to that \$10 million of funding for youth care, as well as an additional \$10 million in funding and the \$40 million transportation funds. These are all really important commitments, I think, about being a good neighbor and understanding t

he impact that you have on your community. We've set very high expectations for this project and we expect it to deliver. But this is just one of the many opportunities that the council has for reviewing the work. You know, I've asked questions in previous committees and will continue to ask questions about issues like the historic preservation tax credit, which is currently 10% of the argues financial plans as we get into implementation documents. If that tax credit is removed, as it is contemplated right now by the folks in Congress, I'll be looking to our private sector partners to how they're going to fill that gap as we get into the environmental impact statements and we talk about what the, you know, Sunday after Thanksgiving, really big transportation impact day of the potential of a basketball hockey game, along with the work of the ballet for a matinee and an evening performance, as well as Black Nativity and all the other things that happen on Seattle Center on that first Sunday of Thanksgiving. You know, what does that really mean for our transportation mitigation plan and how do we analyze those things through an environmental impact statement? Those are going to be important elements as we move forward. And the implementation documents that I'll be watching for. And Councilmember wise, you alluded to my little bobblehead. So after the last vote, you know, I will confess at six foot three of being one of the shorter of my cousins. And my little brother played basketball at the University of Washington for a couple of years. And I've had a cousin who played overseas. And when I got to see him and his friends and my cousins, I hear more about the Sonics and hockey than I do just about anything else. And I had a good friend. Give me that bobblehead after the last vote and said, Don't lose the faith. Keep up the work and make sure that you stay committed to bringing professional hockey and professional basketball to the city of Seattle. And I'm proud to be here today and taking this vote. And I hope that it is just another step for us in bringing those professional teams back to the city. Councilmember wise, the kids wouldn't let me bring my storm swag with me today. That's how important it is to them. So I don't have my little sort of supporting dolls that I hope that I would have. But Hannah was having too much fun playing with that on the bus this morning, and I couldn't part with that four year old's commitment to her storm dolls. So thank you, everybody, for being here today. Thanks to all the hard work for the city staff. Looking forward to voting yes. Very good. Thank you, Councilman Johnson. If I don't see any more folks grabbing the mic, I'm going to ask Councilmember Councilmember Brand, you want to say a closing word, please? I if I had the choice, my preference today would be to abstain from voting for this. I believe that there's been a lot of hard work put into this. But when the city is going to invest potentially 614 milli

on in tax revenues, it will forgo and give to the Ovg group to do this work. I think it's critically important that we make sure that we're doing this right. And I am not convinced in looking at them or view that we're quite there yet. One little example is the amendment that I proposed earlier.

There's a parenthetical in there that says we can't provide financial support other than those that are generally available to any potential developer that is fairly high level language. In a memo you and I understand its purpose as a placeholder, it's not clear to me that if providing if providing \$600 million of tax benefits to another project would be considered, what we generally want are generally available, or if that would be an exception, that would be prohibited by this. And the distinction between where we are today as an emotive issue and where we'll all 20 billion a number of months for signing transaction documents I expect to get to a level of specificity will be clearer what we're actually signing on to at that point. As I mentioned, my preference would be to abstain today and wait to see what those transaction documents look like. But our council rules prohibit abstentions on the full council, and so I have to choose to vote yes or no. And so I will be voting no on this. But I want to let the folks know that are continue to negotiate this, that I hope to be in a place when the transaction documents are ready, that I feel confident in voting yes on those documents when they're here. Baroness. Thank you, Councilman Brown. Councilmember Wurst. Thank you. I'll wrap it up. Before I make the motion, I want to just say a few comments. Since we took a vote in May of 2016, it's been a long road, particularly for my female colleagues. The irony here today is that the women, not just the women, all the men in my colleagues, put in the hard work to get this done. The end of the day, I didn't get a bobblehead. I got called names and a bunch of awful other things. And I think some people thought, well, because that happened, that somehow some of us would be punitive and vindictive. But in fact, you know that saying if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen, that just made us more emboldened to do the right thing and do our homework and show up and read everything and make sure everybody had everything in front of them with the whole time. US Our rally was Councilmember Bagshaw. Councilmember Gonzales. Councilmember Humboldt was to make sure that our colleagues had all the information that we wanted to have a partnership we wanted to, but also understanding the clear lines between the executive and the legislative branch that we would work with the executive branch. I never started this job with an us or them attitude that the executive is somehow on the seventh floor doing something evil and they're going to send something downstairs that's bad and my job is to take it apart. That's not how I do business. So with that, I think I'm going to I'll

I leave it at that and I'll go ahead, make a motion, please. Do I move that council? I'm sorry, I move that council pass council bill 119088 as amended. And second, please call a role on the passage of the amended bill. O'Brien. No salon. I. BAGSHAW High. Johnson. Whereas I herbold ii mosquera i. President Harrell I seven in favor one opposed. Excellent. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. And thank all of you for your rich comments and discussion. Is there any further business coming for the Council? Councilmember Swan Thank you, President. I move to be excused from the full council meeting on December 11, 2017. And secondly, the customers want to be excused from the Council on December 11, 2017. All those in favor say I, I oppose. The ayes have it. Any further business going for the council? If not, we stand adjourned and everyone have a great day. Agenda item two. Quick file 314 343. Application of the West Seattle Church Nazarene Tourism Property located at 5911 42nd Avenue southwest from single family family 5000 to arise one Multifamily Residential. The committee recommends that the full council grant the application as conditioned. Thank you very much. This is a quasi judicial matter. I'll relinquish the floor to Councilmember Johnson. It comes from our herbal. Did you want to comment that you want to make first before Councilmember Johnson addresses the legislation? I can do it after that. Some comments about the legislation as well. So maybe do both after you introduce legislation. That's okay. That's fine. Comes from Johnson. You have the floor, sir. This is one of those issues where, again, the council sits as a panel of judges as opposed to here as legislators. This is an application of a church in Seattle to rezone their property from single family to something that would effectively allow them to build small townhouses. The bill came out of committee with our support and I would encourage my colleagues to put the clerk file on file and then pass the corresponding council bill after the fact. Very good. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. I abstained in committee. There were some materials that were part of the public record that were not electronically available, nor had they been provided. They were in Central Staff's office, and I wanted to to review those materials. I abstained, rather than taking up the chair's offer to hold the vote. The council had 90 days to act once they received the file from the hearing examiner it was received by the Council on September 26. So if we had delayed the vote, that may have had a negative impact on the process or risk the council being able to act before the new year with the 11th being the last full council of the year.

That said, after abstaining, I was tagged on Facebook by some folks who were displeased with my decision to abstain and I explained why I abstained. And that has triggered a requirement for me to disclose an ex parte communication on a quasi judicial topic. I did not com

ment on the merits of the case itself. I was only discussing the the process. So for that reason, I'm I don't need to abstain from voting at full council, which I intend to do. But I do need to read this statement of disclosure of that ex parte communication. On November 27th, the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee recommended approval of the proposed contract rezone with conditions. 459 1142 42nd Avenue Southwest Clerk File 3143432 for council abstained from the vote because I wish to review the record more fully. On November 28th, I read statements posted in opposition to the Please decision regarding the reason posted on social media site. These communications expressed criticism of Council Central Staff's representation of the applicant's objection to the application of the provisions of mandatory housing affordability as a condition of the rezone. Doubts regarding Plus's understanding of the issue. Derision of the Plug's decision making process on the matter, and disapproval of my abstention from the vote on the recommendation. I responded to these posted comments with a post on the same social media site explaining my abstention and provided a hyperlink to the online information regarding the rezone application. Attached to this written statement is the screen capture of the posted comments described above. That said, I have read the materials that I wished to read. Specifically, I was interested in reading the comments in support of the reason, but in opposition to the application of the mandatory housing affordability requirements that come with this particular reason. And I wanted to hear what the community organization gave as its basis for opposing the MHRA requirements. And the argument that they provided was they did not feel the city should use the MHRA requirements because the developer was was granting a. Additional open space over and above what they what they were required. In the end of the day, the program requires a affordability, obligation and contribution from the developer. I'm pleased that there's also an open space obligation, but the open space obligation does not fulfill this city council's requirements for affordable housing. Very good. Thank you. Okay, this is a clear file. Any further comments in this Clarke file from my left or my right? I think we're okay. Councilman, just. Are we ready to proceed? Okay. Those in favor of granting the application as conditions to please vote i ii. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries with the applications granted as conditioned and the chair was signed the findings, conclusions and decision of the City Council. Please read agenda item number three and we read the short title, please. Agenda item to cancel bill 119161. A approving correction to the properties in development agreement approved by ordinance 1 to 5 394 for property located at 1203 East Spruce Street and accepting and corrected to death. Councilmember Johnson. It's a small technical change on a contract reason

that we did and first of all, capital and are. Very good. Any questions on that? Please call the roll on. I'm sorry. We have a substitution. We do have a substitution. Okay. I apologize for that. Councilmember Johnson do you have a. So I'm I'm going to go off book here and look at our clock and make sure that I get that terms right. But I would move to substitute the corrected puta for the one that was incorrect. How about that, Amelia? How do you do that? Pretty close. That's Exhibit A, I think. And you'll substitute the executive property development agreement for an executed one. Is there a second? Second? Can you second this? Okay. I made it then. I think you made it. Okay. Got a second? All those in favor of the substitution, please. What? I buy, all those opposed. Okay, we have an amended piece of legislation. And can I call now? Call the roll on the passage of that bill. On the amended bill. Thanks. John Gonzalez. Herbal. Hi, Johnson. Hi. Mr. O'Brien. Hi, President Harrell. Hi. Seven in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please read the report of the planning, land use and Zoning Committee Action Item number three. Agenda Item 25 Resolution 317 88 relating to the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority, affirming the Mayor's Execution report. Any agreement with sound transit to implement light rail extension between Ballard and West Seattle is approved by regional voters under Sound Transit three. The committee recommends a resolution be adopted. Councilmember O'Brien So this resolution is another agreement between the city and sound transit. This relates specifically to what was approved in Sound Transit three, specifically the extension of light rail to the communities of Ballard and West Seattle and the neighborhoods it will pass through. This is kind of a landmark legislation in that we're working well in advance of construction documents to get the city in the in sound transit agency into alignment. As you may recall and understand, Transit three, there was a lot of

excitement about light rail and everyone wanted to see light rail come quicker to their neighborhoods. And so part of the attempt to streamline the process and move more swiftly in what is certainly a long time frame because this is a complex project, is making sure that the city and the agency are aligned in how we proceed with things like permitting and planning. I believe on this one, Councilmember Herbold has an amendment to add a little bit of language of rehearsal. Thank you. I do have an amendment and it is an amendment to section 2.41 in attachment A of the park partnering agreement. I think what I'll do is I'll move it weight for a second and then explain what it does. That's okay. I'll second. All right. Thank you. And so basically what this portion of the partnership agreement relates to instances in which there might be a conflict between the sound transit project or an existing or proposed City of Seattle Transportation project

. And as it as it reads currently, it talks about wanting to resolve conflicts as early and as possible in order to reduce risk to the sound transit project development and delivery. And because I have one such project in my district where there is a conflict between what might be a future sound transit alignment and a long planned project that SDR is carrying out. It got me thinking about sort of in real life, what we should be seeking to do in trying to reduce risks, and that we should not just be seeking to reduce risks in the sound transit project, but that we need to make sure that part of our lens is to reduce risk in the city projects as well . And so this language allows us to to sort of reminds us to think about that as well when we are working to reduce those conflicts. Very good. The amendment has been moved. And second, Councilmember Johnson, as. Your designee to the Zone Transit Board, I had a check in with sound transit staff and they are perfectly okay with this amendment. Thank you. Glad to hear any other questions. Um. Let's see. Well, we'll just vote on the amendment first. So all those in favor of the amendment, please vote I. I oppose. The ayes have it. So the resolution is amended. Any further comments? All those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended. Please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries. The resolution is adopted. The chair will sign it. Please read the next agenda item. I i those opposed vote no. So the motion carries the petition is granted as condition chair was signed the conditions of the City Council. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item 24 Resolution 317 84 Approving the alignment station locations and maintenance base location for San Trans and Central Link University Link Northgate Link Extension Eastlink and Lynnwood Link Extension Light rail lines in the City of Seattle and superseding the alignment station locations and maintenance base location approved in resolution 31465. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Very good cast member, Brian. Thank you. So a few moments ago we made the change to the in arriving agreement around Lynnwood Link extension. This resolution will replace the resolution that was passed in 2013 and effectively updated to the current alignment station location and other information. So that is consistent with the plan for the project. Very good. And in question on this resolution comes from Johnson. And in the absence of Councilmember Suarez, I feel compelled to say that this document does include specific location for the 103 Street Station, though it does not specifically call for the timeline of that station. That station is included in the supporting documents. So it was a question she had asked at a council briefing a couple of weeks ago and just wanted to make sure that that was on the record. Very good. Excellent. So those in favor of adopting the resolution please vote i. I, those oppose vote no. The resolution is adopted. The c

hair will sign it. Please read agenda item number 25. Bill passed and chose Senate move on the committee reports. You can read the first item and you can read the short title to please. The report of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee agenda item one Council Bill 119154 An ordinance granting Pier 54 LLC permission to maintain and operate a pedestrian walkway and a covered patio, including benches, tables, food preparation and serving areas, outdoor lighting, pedestrian deck pilings and other related apron structures in the public place on the north side of Madison Street, west of Alaskan Way, for a ten year term renewable for two successive ten year terms. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. I think folks are generally familiar with the Rivers Fish Bar down on the waterfront from related sites, some of the property outdoors there, specifically the areas where a lot of us feed French fries to seagulls is actually public right away and the previous term permit has expired. And so this would create a new term permit for ten years that could be renewed for 2 to 10 year extensions beyond that for a total of 30 years. Similar to other permits, this has gone through the process of evaluating the cost of that and the city will be compensated for the lease terms of that. Very good. Any questions or

comments? Please call the roll on the passage of the Bill Gonzalez. HERBOLD Hi. Johnson Whereas McKenna, I. O'Brien Hi. Sergeant Bagshaw President Harrow High nine in favor and unopposed. Passenger of Senate. Please read a June item number, the next edition item, and you can read a short time as well. Very good. Any comments? Those in favor of confirming the appointment. Please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the appointment is confirmed. Please read the part of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. The report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. Agenda Item six Council Bill 119169 An ordinance relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation authorizing the acquisition of real property, commonly known as 50 104 Southwest Orleans Street, and authorizing acceptance and reporting of the deed for open space, park and recreation purposes. The committee recommends the bill pass. Because I'm a herbold. Thank you. So this is something that is, as we've heard, a long time in the making. Former Councilmember Tom Rasmussen worked on this issue for a couple of years before I joined the council. In fact, my first visit to this particular property was before I took office in mid-December. The tour that was organized by Councilmember Rasmussen staff member also included the Southwest Historic Society and it included for Terra because at the time the Parks Department was not interested in pursuing the purchase of the property, but for Terra was interested in perhaps offering an interim solution and holding on to the property for a p

eriod of time and perhaps at a later date transferring it to parks. Happily, the Parks Department, through the persistence of many, many people who've joined us today, changed their mind. And the thanks goes to many people both inside and outside City Hall. I want to thank, first and foremost, Bruce Statler. I think, you know, he said it best when I visited him at his home when he realized the value of the property to the public and in making what is truly more of a donation than a property acquisition and in keeping in tradition with the history of the park, which was initially a donation in 40 I'm sorry, 1908 by Ferdinand Schmitz for the enjoyment of the public. And, you know, Mr. Statler is offering this piece of property to the city for well under half of its value. And he did so because he realized what the future would hold for that piece of property should he sell it. And he was very concerned that the property would be be redeveloped for use as a as a McMansion, thus depriving the general public from the enjoyment of the park. And not only was the is the acquisition helping stop something that is not desirable for for that park entrance, but it actually is adding something, I think that's really important to future generations for enjoyment of the park and potentially looking at a new access trail in the future so that there will be more ways for more people to to enjoy the park. I also want to thank Councilmember Rasmussen for his persistence. I've kind of seen this as one of several legacy projects that the councilmember has had, and I've really enjoyed working with you. It's been a great help to me in pushing this forward to to point to to your efforts and your commitment on this throughout the process. I also want to want to thank for Tara. Thank thank Vicki Schmitz and thank the Southwest Historical Association. And in particular, we've got Jeff McCord here with us today. But your predecessor, Clay Eales, was a great advocate for this project as well. Many thanks as well to park superintendent Hazel Segarra, Anthony RMR Parks, staff Chip Nevins, Tracey Ratcliffe and Mike Fong, who was in the mayor's office at the time and is back in the mayor's office again. Those folks all helped a great deal. The life estate option will allow Mr. Statler to continue to live in his home, and in return the city will acquire the land at a reduced rate and at that time in the future will become officially part of Niche Park. Thank you. Very good. Any further comments or questions can send back show. Thank you. I just want to acknowledge Councilmember Rasmussen, former councilmember said like working with you and I'm glad you're back. Bruce, thank you for your generosity. And I loved the article about you yesterday front page of Seattle Times and to read about Scout and Nellie and I'm sure that they'll continue to have a great home. And this park I think it's 53 acres. It's a stunning pedestrian area in the middle of West Seattle. And you're contributi

ng more to that. Thank you very much. Very good. Okay. We're ready to vote. Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Gonzales i. Herbold, i. Johnson Whereas macheda i. O'BRIEN So want to make sure. President Harrell hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passenger would sign it. Very good. The next such an item and the short title. Agenda Item seven Council Bill 119140. An ordinance authorizing the general manager and chief executive officer of Seattle Public Utilities to enter into agreements with the Port of Seattle and BP West Coast Products, LLC for the purposes

of satisfying utility related conditions for the Port Street vacation petition for its Terminal 18 redevelopment project. Agenda Item seven Council Bill 119140. An ordinance authorizing the general manager and chief executive officer of Seattle Public Utilities to enter into agreements with the Port of Seattle and BP West Coast Products, LLC for the purposes of satisfying utility related conditions for the Port Street vacation petition for its Terminal 18 redevelopment project. The committee recommends the bill passes amended. Because of our Herbold. Thank you. Way back in 1998, the Port of Seattle petitioned Seattle Public Utilities to vacate certain streets for the expansion of the port's Terminal 18 facility. This year, the city and the port entered into the Harbor Island Redevelopment Agreement. The agreement included construction, relocation, transfer and abandonment plans for port and city owned water, storm drainage and sewer facilities, as well as a final infrastructure ownership scheme. It also included an environmental and safety agreement. These easements with the port will satisfy the utility related conditions for the street vacation petition, and the delay from 1998 was due to a combination of factors such as project staff turnover, a complicated location with many, many landowners and port tenants past record keeping and work priorities in the future. Escort will bring final street vacation legislation to the council sometime later this year. Very good. Any questions or comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez Herbold, i. Johnson, Maurice Mesquita, I. O'Brien Sergeant High President Harrell, nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passed in show Senate. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda Item eight Council. Bill 119165. An ordinance relating to Seattle Public Utilities declaring certain real property rights to be surplus to the city's municipal utility needs. The committee recommends the bill pass. hearing examiner. We got a few lawyers up here, so we'll send a few opinions your way. And congratulations to you, sir. Okay. Please read the next agenda item into the record. The report The Housing, Health, Energy and Workers Rights Committee Agenda Item to cancel 0119 187 Relating to the City Department authorizing the acceptance of the statutory authority deed for the Hanson property in scheduled county Washington, placing said land under

the jurisdiction of the City Lights Department, ratifying confirmed research and prior acts. Committee recommends the bill passed. Thank you. Council Member Mosquito. Thank you, Mr. President. Council Bill 119187 authorizes the General Manager of City Light to accept on behalf of the city a deed to property in the Skagit Valley for the purposes of preserving habitat for salmon in the river. This is part of the city lights ongoing environmental stewardship of the ecosystem in the area. Very good. Are there any questions or comments on this legislation? There should be a very complex technical question we should ask you. There should be some level of hazing going on with cancer risk. I think we're going to let her off the hook. Okay. Please call the role on the passage of the Bill. O'Brien. By. Sergeant Major Gonzalez. Purple. Hi Johnson Macheda I President Harrell. High. Eight in favor and unopposed. The bill passed and the chair will sign it. We read items three through seven please. Agenda items three through seven appointments eight, 92, three, 95 and 902 reappointment. So Diane Henry, Catherine Mercado, Michael J. Hudson Bressler, Elizabeth Rankin and Dan Bernard as members Burk Gilman Place Preservation Development Authority Council for Term two December 31st, 2020. Bill passed show assignment please read a matter number seven. Agenda item seven cancel 119 190 really into the central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority authorizing execution of an amendment number seven to the Construction Services Agreement between the San Transit and the City of Seattle relating to the University Link, North Link and East Link projects and ratifying confirming Sergeant Prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Johnson. I mean. O'BRIEN I'm sorry. I'm I'm seeing your name and to me, hits to the head. I can't remember. Johnson could speak to a well, no doubt this would be a the Seventh Amendment to the construction service agreement that the city of Seattle has with sound transit. The various phases of light rail projects that have been implemented in the city require coordination between the city and sound transit. And the the the closer the coordination, the more efficient we can be at delivering the, the light rail system that we know that our citizens want. This specific amendment relates to the extension of light rail from what will be from the North Gate Station up to Lynnwood Transit Center was referred to as the Lynnwood Link portion of the alignment and will deal with construction implications within the city of Seattle as it heads north from Northgate. Very good. Any further comments? Please call the role on the passage of the bill. I O'Brien. I want to make sure. Gonzales. I. Herbold ii. Johnson. Whereas I. President Harrell. I nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passed in short of saying please read the next agenda item. Agenda Item to cancel book 119 186 Transferring jurisdiction over real property located at Mercy Street a

nd Second Avenue from the Seattle Center Department to the Office of Housing, the committee recommends the bill pass. Cast member worse. Thank you. This is a item that we've been working on for well over a year, effectually known as the K BLOCK. This is a transfer of land at Mercer and second, from Seattle Center to Office of Housing to facilitate the development of affordable housing on the city's surplus land. The property is known as as I shared as the K BLOCK. In addition to this bill today, we also pass ordinance 125406 that established an agreement to develop the rest of the cable up with a mixed use housing development that will include public open space. This new affordable housing site will be developed through an RFP process led by the Office of Housing. The RFP and the RFP process is set to continue from March through August. The Office of Housing will later return to council with legislation to dispose of the property for the development chosen through the RFP evaluation. The committee recommends passage of the bill, but would also note that the committee recommend AH. The Committee recognizes via the Uptown Arts and Culture Coalition that this is directly situated or located in the city's center theater district. And this housing unit, this is this project is expected to create 70 to 80 units of housing. And again, the committee recommends passage of the bill. Thank you very much. Any further comments? Councilmember Skeeter. Thank you, Mr. President. And I want to thank the chair who shepherded this through. As a resident of Lower Queenan and somebody who visits Uptown often I see the need for housing. I understand from the Office of Housing that there are currently zero units of housing that are set aside for folks experiencing homelessness in Uptown. I think that there is definitely a need for permanent housing and I know that our neighbors who are experiencing homelessness in the area very much need this site. It's an unmet need and I think that the case that gives us the opportunity to potentially begin filling this need. I also understand, as Councilmember Suarez alluded to, that the Arts and Culture Coalition is very interested in how we identify additional housing for those who are artists in our community to also have affordable housing. I also agree that this is an unmet need throughout our city. So as we move forward, as we implement the recommendation, as you see in the ordinance in front of us, I think we it's it's incumbent upon us to continue to look for more opportunities for folks who are at 60% AML who are artists in our community to be able to have affordable housing as well. And I'll be looking at this project in conjunction with Councilmember Suarez and the council here to make sure that we move forward and monitor the site, make sure that it's meeting the highest unmet need, and look forward to continuing to see rapid expansion of housing throughout our city just like this. Excellent. Thank you for those comments

. No further comments. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Macheda I. O'Brien. Hi. Sergeant Bagshaw. Gonzales, i. Herbold, i. Johnson. Suarez, President Harrell. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read items three, three, five into the record. Great. The bill passed and sure was silent. Thank all of you for your advocacy and your fight. Please read the next gen item into the record, please. The Report of the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee Agenda Item three Clerk File 314358. The application of Brooke five LLC to rezoning approximately 14,000 square foot site located at 1600 Dexter Avenue North from neighborhood commercial three with pedestrian designation and a 40 foot height limit to neighborhood commercial three with a pedestrian designation, a 75 foot height limit and the image suffix. The committee recommends a full council grant. The application is conditioned. And believe Councilmember O'Brien will speak to this. I'll be brief. We discussed this in committee, this item and the next agenda item, which is a council bill which will have the executed properties and development agreement. Lay out the specific conditions for this change. I just want folks to know that this change refers in the property use and development agreement, or puta refers to a very specific design that's been submitted through the ask for a master use permit, and that that project alone will be what moves forward if we approve these changes. Very good. Thank you for filling in for Katherine Johnson. Any further comments? At this point, I will move to accept and file Clark file 314390. Those in favor of accepting and filing the Kirk file please vote. I would say. To. The right number. 314390 is what I said. That is not right member then I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Those in favor. Let me do that. Over those in favor of filing clerk file three one, four, three, five, eight. Please say I. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries. And just for clarification, Clark filed 314358 is accepted and filed. Please read the next agenda item. Council Member Yes. I am going to be signing off. Okay. Thank you, President Harrell for letting me vote. Thank you very much. Have a great day. Thank you. Thank you. Thank. Okay. Thank you very much. Have a great day. Thank

you. Thank you. Thank. Okay. We could pursue the report of the full council agenda item to Council Bill 119194 An Ordinance relating to land use and Zoning Amending Chapter 23.32 of the Seattle Municipal Code at page 90 of the official land use map to rezone property located at 1600 Dexter Avenue North from neighborhood commercial three with a pedestrian designation and a 40 foot height limit to neighborhood commercial three with a best pedestrian designation, a 75 foot height limit and the image suffix introduced February 12, 2018. Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. So this agenda item goes hand in hand with the previous one, the clerk file. This bill would make t

he changes as described. Before we proceed, though, I would like to move to amend the Council Bill 11919 for Exhibit B by substituting the executed property use and development agreement to replace the on executed property use and Development Agreement that was part of the original file. Their second those in favor of the substitution as stated by Councilman O'Brien. Please say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. We have a substitution. Thank you. And I have nothing further to comment on unless folks have questions for the amended bill. Any further questions? If not? I'll move to accept and file for file 31439. No, Constable. I'm sorry. Please. Read the. Please read. Read the. The call. The role on the passage of the amend the substituted bill. Sergeant Herbold. I. Whereas Mosquera I. O'Brien High President Herrell High six in favor and unopposed. Thank you very much. Please read the next agenda item. Any comments? Those in favor of accepting and filing the clerk file please vote i ii i. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the clerk file is accepted and formally filed. Let's see, we have the agenda item switch here. So we're going to move to the report of the planning land use and Zoning Committee. My notes are correct. My notes are not correct. We are in fact. Let me move to just one sec. We're going to move to what I just read the next section item. This based on our amended schedule. The report of the Finance and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item eight Council Bill 119195. An ordinance relating to city owned real property located at 1933 Minor Avenue authorizing the sale of property for fair market value through renegotiated sale authorizing the Director of the Department of Finance Administrative Services to execute all necessary documents to accomplish such property sale and designating how proceeds from the sale shall be distributed. The committee recommends the bill passes amended. Okay. So this item is going to be on the property sale on the the com property in the next item that has not been read into the record would be the appropriations bill. So my apologies for misstating the agenda item. So this counts bill 119195 authorizes the sale of the communications shop property. This located at 1933 Minor Avenue in the Dennie Triangle to the adjacent owner Crescent Development. And the property is a one story 3788 square square feet on about 14,405 square feet of land in the city and crescent develop development have agreed to a proposal proposed sale price of \$11 million plus \$2 million paid in advance as an MHRA prepayment. Should the developer opt into the major and in committee? Based on the discussion and the astuteness of council members, the legislation was amended to clarify that the \$2 million MJ prepayment was a minimum payment and not a cap. And this legislation passed out of committee 7 to 0. So that's this council bill. Item number two, are there any further comments or questions on this, this bill? If not, please cal

I the role on the passage of the bill. Sergeant Bagshaw High. Herbold, I. Whereas I Moschella. I. O'Bryan. I. President Harrell I seven in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed and show sign it. Please read the next item to the record. Unopposed bill passed and chair of Senate. Please read the report of the Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities Committee. The Report of the Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities Committee Agenda Item one Council 1019 185 Relation to the Department of Parks Recreation authorizing acquisition of real property coming known as 3656 34th Avenue South authorizing acceptance and recording of the deed for open space park recreation purposes, authorizing acquisition by condemnation, ratifying and affirming certain prior acts . The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank very much, councilmember suarez. Thank you. I really do got this. Thank you. No technical difficulties down here. Let's see. This bill authorizes the Department of Parks and Recreation, as I shared this morning in the Clark two, shared to complete a property acquisition at 34th Avenue South by condemnation. This would expand the size of the current bank site in North Rainier in the North Rainier Urban Village hub. If the department is able to acquire this additional parcel, it will expand the size of the park to 1.4 acres, will allow for more amenities to be included in the park and improves sightlines and street frontage to increase the feeling of safety and inclusion in the

community. The committee recommends passage of the bill. Thank you very much. Any comments? If not, please call the rule on the passing passage of the Bill. Johnson Juarez Mosquito I O'Brien Gonzalez Herbal High President Harrell. I. Seven in favor and unopposed. The bill passed and chair of the Senate please read the report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee and you can go items two and three. The Report of the Planning and Zoning Committee Agenda Item 12 Resolution 31807 relating to the Seattle Comprehensive Plan. Revising the procedures and the criteria for consideration of proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan as part of the annual docket and repealing resolutions 31402 and 31117. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Concerning Johnson or my colleagues with a rundown of what the docket and process is, because I know you all know it well, but this resolution does three main things and modifies the schedule for the annual amendments cycle. It modifies some of the docket setting criteria to be more consistent with the current nomenclature of organizations like the Puget Sound Regional Council. And it establishes that we will take a hiatus from the darkening process this year. Happy to answer questions of Focus Avenue, but encourage your support. Or get any further comments. Cancer herbal. Thank you. I just want to speak to some public comment that I received after the committee d

iscussion. There's still some concern that that this hiatus from accepting amendments from the public will impact the ability of council members to bring forward amendments that members of the public might bring to us. Just want to clarify that there is a members of the public talking process, but separate from that, there's a councilmember docking process and that councilmember docking process by which we will have the opportunity to propose our own amendments and amendments that members of the public convince us to bring forward. We will still be having that correct. Yes, ma'am. The the formal doctoring process through the public is a much longer process, as you know, Councilmember Herbold. But as the council reviews the comprehensive plan only once per year, it's our opportunity to make those annual changes. This year, we'll be making them knock on wood in conjunction with the implementation of our mandatory housing affordability program. That will be the time at which council members can propose changes through our own personal offices and would encourage any members of the public to bring those issues forward and encourage council members to work with central staff in the development of those, but also ask that you run them through the Planning Commission, who traditionally reviews those items to be added to the comprehensive plan for their review, as well as the Office of Planning Community Development, too. Thank you. Very good. Any further comments? Not those in. Those in favor of adopting the resolution. Please vote i i those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Please read the short title of the report for the Sustainability and Transportation Committee. Three per the Housing, Health, Energy and Workers Rights Committee Agenda Item 11 Council 119 236 Relating to low income housing modifying the 2016 Housing Levy Acquisition and Preservation Program described as an Ordinance 1250 28 amended administrative and financial planning for the 2016 Housing Levy and the housing funding policies for the 2016 housing levy and other funding sources , each as adopted by ordinance 125308 amending Ordinance 125 493, which amended the 2018 Budget by revising budget summary level proposed statements authorizing the Director of Housing to use 2016 housing levy funds to acquire options and ratifying confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill passed. Council Member Skater. Thank you, Mr. President. And Council Bill 119236 passed unanimously out of the Housing, Health, Energy and Workers Rights Committee. This legislation amends the housing funding policies which allow for strategic acquisition and including acquiring options by the Office of Housing for Future Affordable Housing Development. So to break that down, that means that the Office of Housing is able to use the Acquisition and Preservation Program resources to purchase property and secure it for critical, long term, affo

rdable housing development opportunities. Most immediately, as you heard, that this amendment will be able to help facilitate the acquisition of two Seattle satellite owned substations by the Office of Housing for Future Affordable Housing Development. I think we all know that this is a critical, important step for us to take in an effort to make sure that there's more affordable housing options. It accomplishes multiple goals. First, increasing affordable housing locations with a near major transit investments throughout our city, and those investments that are expected to come online soon. Number two, increasing access to neighborhoods with little to no existing affordable housing

options. Number three, promoting anti displacement and stabilization goals. And fourth, pursuing site assembly that leverages existing public property. This all means that when we see a piece of property, a piece of real estate that's on the market, we can act with urgency to make sure that the city can acquire it. This quickness is needed to make sure that we acquire properties that are often too quick to go in this hot market. They go quickly and we want to make sure that the city has every tool in its tool belt to be a competitor and get those pieces of property in hand. At the same time, we want to make sure that all parcels of publicly owned land stay in publicly owned hands. This will help us be more equipped to make sure that we are both developing and preserving housing to meet our community's needs, especially for low income and moderate income families. As I mentioned this morning, I think this is an incredible addition to the work that we will be talking about later this evening in the conversation around the progressive tax and in the conversations that are ongoing around expanding MJ throughout the city. I want to thank the Office of Housing for working with our office, specifically Michael Maddox, and for Central Staff's work to bring this legislation forward. Thank you to Tracy and for all the work that's gone into this. I think this is a great tool. It might not sound very exciting acquisition of financing, but it's a really critical tool for our efforts to make sure that there's affordable housing and affordable land throughout the city. Thank you very much for the comments. Caspar Herbold. I just wanted to thank Councilmember Musgrave for bringing forward this amendment. I too have a Seattle City Light substation in my district that community members in the Highland Park area are very, very interested in the Office of Housing acquiring for the development of housing. But because of the zoning in the neighborhood, it is considered to be a site for increased zoning capacity under MSA. But even under that increased zoning, because of the the size of the parcel, there was some concern that it might not pencil out if a low income housing provider had to pay for the site acquisition as well . So I'm hopeful that now that we can bring some different assu

mptions to what the development costs will be for this particular location, the do more station, that this could be a site that the Office of Housing could look at in the future. Thank you. Okay, good. I think we're ready to vote, so please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Johnson. Whereas macheda I. O'Brien I want I. Make sure I. Gonzalez, I. Herbold hi. President Harrell. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please read the report. The Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee. The Report The Sustainability Transportation Committee Agenda Items nine 311 Resolution 31839 Adopting Revised Street Vacation Policies for the City of Seattle. Committee Recommends the resolution be adopted. Council Bill 119 234 Lane to Seattle Design Commission Committee Recommends the bill passes amended council bill 119 237 Related Landing Zoning Committee recommends a bill pass. OC will vote on them individually. But Councilman Brian. Perhaps you could describe them sort of collectively. You bet. So this is a resolution that updates our street vacation policies and the two ordinances that are necessary to make our code consistent with the resolution. This was coming before council originally, two weeks ago. But we heard from folks in the maritime industry that they wanted an opportunity to look at that a little more thoroughly. And in the intervening two weeks, I've come up with some additional language which I think strengthens the resolution. And so we've adopted that. And so what I'd like to do before I talk in depth about it is to amend Resolution 31809 Exhibit A by substituting version two for version one. Their second has been moved in second to amend the resolution, as stated by Councilmember Bryan. All those in favor of the amendment. Please vote i. I opposed. The ayes have it. It is amended. Thank you all for that. The the attachment or sorry. Exhibit Ayes has some stronger language. Now, the talk specifically about free mobility and the importance of the maritime and maritime sector of our economy and making sure that, as we do consider certifications, they were fully considering those concerns. I want to just talk at a high level about why we're changing these vacation certification policies. There is a number of pieces that we're going to change in there, and I'll touch on a few of them, starting with recognizing the city's core goals of race and social equity, an analysis of street vacation petitions and public benefit proposals that also includes new sections on the Public Trust Doctrine and the city's process for reviewing street vacations. Acknowledges three new public trust functions of the right away free speech, right to assembly and land use in urban form. And this new policy provides additional guidance regarding analysis of impacts to the public trust functions of street vacations. It requires an early community outreach process and provides for an early council forum or briefing. The new direction provide

s for different processes depending on whether a project is determined to be complex or simple street vacation. It recognizes that street vacation impacts may be felt in an area broader than just the immediate neighborhood, so the benefits could be more citywide in certain circumstances. It clarifies a relationship between the required steps in the land use review process and the street vacation review process considers on and off site public benefits as being equivalent. It recognizes an option for additional factors in proposed public benefit package reviews, such as the existence of an equitable development agreement, which we'll get to in a moment between the petitioner and community groups, and allows for long term or permanent commitment to carry out programmatic benefits as opposed to just capital benefits as part of the public benefit package. Very good. Councilmember O'Brien my Reynolds talked about. Did you want to describe the other components at all? So what we're going to do, what I propose we do is we'll have a vote on the resolution, which is what changes the policies, and then we'll consider the two ordinances. The first ordinance clarifies the role that the Design Commission plays. The Design Commission has always or has been playing a role in street vacations for a number of years, but it's actually not been codified. And so this will just clarify that role and make sure it's defined inconsistently with the policies we're passing. And the second ordinance also clarifies the role that design review will play and at what point in the process the design review would be considered? Very good. So we're going to vote on the resolution first. All those in support of the those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended. Please vote i. I those opposed vote no. The motion carries in the amended resolution is adopted and the share was sign it. And if there are no other comments, I suggest we just go to a vote on the two council bills. That's okay with colleagues. Not to be. I think one of my notes suggested that one of the council bills was going to be amended, that that is not going to be met. Okay. Very good. Okay. So any other questions on the bills? If not, please call the role on the passage of the bill. Salon. Hi, Bagshaw. Hi. Gonzalez Herbold. Hi. Johnson For us was Kerry O'Brien. Hi, President Herrell I nine in favor and unopposed. This bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please call the rule on the next bill, please. So, Aunt Bakeshop. Gonzalez I. Herbold I. Johnson Suarez. Mesquita, I. O'Brien, President Herrell. Hi. Nine In favor and unopposed. Bill passing share of Senate. Please read the next agenda item. Bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please read the first committee report. The report Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee and Item one Constable one one 9 to 60 relate to civil legal and aid services authorizing an amendment to the interim agreement for public defense services with King Cou

nty previously authorized under Ordinance 1254 11 to carry out a program for civil legal services for indigent clients, according to the terms of Resolution 31802. The committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. So this piece of legislation authorizes the director of the City Budget Office to amend the in the inner local agreement with King County to expand legal civil legal services for indigent misdemeanors in Seattle Municipal Court to allow movement of this pilot project into its second phase. The second phase of this pilot project will allow for direct representation on civil cases. This this approval needs to go not only to our council, but also to the King County Council as a bit of background. You may recall in 2016, the council approved through the budget process this civil legal aid pilot. Again, it's a two phase pilot. And in the first phase, it allowed for the hiring of three civil legal aid attorneys referred to as the collateral consequences attorneys through the King County Department of Public Defense. These civil legal aid attorneys help prevent people from experiencing what we call collateral consequences, such as losing housing, public benefits, there's driver's license, the professional technical licenses, as well as addressing other civil issues that come up in the course of a legal defense for an unrelated charge. If the sort of the basis behind this is a more holistic approach of civil legal defense, with the understanding that if rehabilitation is the goal of our criminal justice system, we need to directly address the unintended consequences of interactions with that system. Homelessness and unemployment should not result from a misdemeanor when it's completely unrelated to the offense that a person allegedly committed. We received a report from the King County Department of Public Defense earlier this year, and just some highlights of the 293 cases that received civil legal aid. Again, these aren't cases where there was direct representation. Simply there was consultation with subject matter experts in in these particular civil legal areas of law. But just some highlights from that report. One resident of a tiny home face loss of her housing if she remained in custody for more than 30 days on a theft charge. The collateral consequences attorney advised the defense attorney and the prosecutor, who agreed to a lesser charge and sentence so that the client could keep her

home. Another example is numerous clients were advised about appealing license suspensions and assisted in securing temporary or limited licenses because maintaining the right to drive has afforded breadwinners and parents the ability to continue providing for their families. And then finally, one client who was driving in his car with all of his possessions had his car impounded following a DUI. By working with the impound lot in licensed client's family, the Collateral Consequences attorney was able to get the client's possession

s secured prior to the car being put up for auction. So these are just some of the the examples of the broad types of cases that we'll now in the second phase, be able to. Allow. A direct representation. Thank you. Casper Herbold, any further comments? And that please call the role on the pastor the Bill Bank. John Gonzalez Herbold II Johnson, Muscatine O'Brien, SWAT President Harrell guy eight and favorite unopposed. Thank you. The bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please read agenda item number two the short title. The bill passing the chair of the Senate. Please read. Agenda item number three, the short title, please. The short. Time. Thank you. The Report of the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee. Three Council Bill 119269. An ordinance. Relating to land. Use and zoning. The committee recommends the bill. Pass as amended. Castro and Johnson. That certainly was a little too short. Thank you, Judy. So as I mentioned at the briefing table this morning, there are two amendments for this bill. This bill is referred to commonly as our omnibus bill, where we make technical corrections to the city's land use code. So happy to talk about the best legislation, but there are two amendments. I'll talk about them briefly. The First Amendment would change the effective date for the design review program. We had originally received legislation that called for an effective date of October 1st. The strikes that from the legislation, kids with the current effective date of July 1st, that will be Amendment one amendment to make some technical changes to the downtown office core two zone. And that's amendment number two. Happy to answer questions or if you'd like me to council president, just move straight to the amendment section if there is no further discussion on the best legislation. So seeing none, I'd move Amendment one to Council Bill 119269 Sections 91 and 93 is presented on Amendment 1/2. It's a moved in. Second Amendment one has been moved in second and any further discussion. All those in favor of amendment number one, please. What I. I know. The ayes have it. Amendment two. I would also propose to move Amendment two, which would amend Council Bill 119269, Section 44 as presented. And that's again referring to some technical changes to heights in the downtown office. Core two. First Amendment number two, as described by comes from Ron Johnson. Has been properly moved. And second and all those in favor of amendment number two, please vote I I opposed. No, the ayes have it. So amendment amendments one and two have passed comes from Johnson. I have no further thoughts on this and would ask for your support of the passage of Council Bill 119269 as amended. Moved and seconded any further comments on the amended 119269. Council member Haroon. Said He saw me and I was in costume or herbal. Thank you. I just want to thank the Chair Johnson for bringing forward an amendment that I had in my absence from the Bylaws Committee. The amendment removed a cha

nge brought forth by the department to exempt rowhouse development that's less than 15,000 square feet from design review. And I just thought this was an important thing to not include in the omnibus, because the Council had very recently made some changes to design review the previous fall, and this changes more of a policy decision than a technical change. And I do not feel it should be part of the omnibus legislation. We wanted to see actually a little bit more experience with the changes that the Council had made last year to the design review process. Very good. Thank you, Councilman Herbert. Any other comments? Okay. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. 119269 as amended. Whereas Macheda. I. O'Brien Sergeant, I beg you. Gonzalez, I. Herbold. Johnson, President. Harrell, I. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read. Agenda item number four The short title. All the appointments are confirmed and the no votes on certain ones are registered. Thank you very much. Adoption of other resolutions. Please read the resolution. Adoption of other resolutions. Resolution three 2022 affirming the human right to family unity and expressing opposition to the Trump administration practices separating and or detaining migrant families seeking asylum asylum at the US Mexico border and strong concerns about the Trump administration's. Lack of family. Reunification plans for over 2300 children and their parents or guardians and ongoing detention camps at the US-Mexico border in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the applicable international human

rights framework. Catherine Gonzalez Thank you, Council President. It's my pleasure to bring resolution 318 2 to 2 full council today. As I mentioned in my communications with the with all of you in your offices last week, this is a resolution intended to take a position on the policy that is currently at play under the Trump administration, whereby ICE agents are literally taking children out of their parents arms and putting them in sometimes in cages, in detention camps, and oftentimes up to thousands of miles away from their parents. With no clear plan on how the federal government intends to reunify these children to their parents. There have been media reports and stories, and I'm sure all of us have been following about how in some instances it's the children that have been taken from their parents, have no clear identification or tie back to where they were taken from or whom they were taken from. And it is becoming increasingly unclear as to how that reunification is going to occur. And although we saw last week that that the Trump administration issued an executive order supposedly changing course in policy in this area, that executive order actually does nothing to change the situation, that there is a zero tolerance policy that will now, instead of separating families, will result in jailing families in detention centers toge

ther for up to 20, 20 days based on a California Court of Appeals opinion that restricts the detention of children for no more than 20 days. That is a ruling that the Department of Justice under Trump is challenging with the hope, I'm assuming, of them being able to jail children for longer than 20 days in these particular situation. So the the resolution is quite simple. I want to thank Van Nguyen in my office for taking the charge on drafting it very quickly in consultation with some of the folks who make up part of the coalition and are actively planning for the June 30th Day of Action event. And I just want to spend a few minutes walking through some of the commitments that we are, in some instances reaffirming and new ones that we are taking on through this resolution, which has the concurrence of the mayor who went down to Tornillo, Texas, last week, along with other U.S. mayors and councilmembers from across the country, to stand stand in solidarity with those those families and those kids. So this resolution states our support for the Washington for Washington state Attorney General Bob Ferguson's lawsuit that he just announced on June 21st against the Trump administration zero tolerance policy for separation of immigrant children from their parents during US-Mexico border crossings. It also reaffirms our commitment through our city attorney's office to continue using legal avenues at our disposal, to resist efforts to impose upon the city any immigration, spending or funding policy that violates the U.S. Constitution or the laws of the United States. The City of Seattle commits to continuing to protect the rights guaranteed to the city and its people by the U.S. Constitution. And we also reaffirm our commitment and support to the immigrant community and to immigrant families and individuals through appropriate strategies in conjunction with community based organizations and local immigrant serving, community based organizations. In particular, it affirms the mayor's recent directive to city departments entitled City of Seattle Protocol and Federal Immigration Enforcement, which directs all city department directors and staff to refer any request for information from the U.S. to. Of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs Enforcement to the mayor's legal counsel for addressing those particular issues. This is something that I had worked on with Mayor Durkan early on in the year after the Department of Licensing disclosure issue happened at the Washington state level. And she issued a mayoral directive. And we now recognize in this resolution that that is an ongoing expectation in this context. The resolution also recognizes that building resiliency and supporting empowerment of immigrant and refugee communities is just an essential immigrant defense strategy to increase family unity across the country and here in our city. And the resolution requests that our Office of Immigrant Refugee Affairs continue to work on identifying addition

al opportunities and resources to support organizing and resiliency building that will be led by the local immigrant community and that will seek beyond that, we will continue to seek the ongoing collaboration partnership of King County to build a regional resilience strategy. The resolution also supports the June 30th National Day of Action. There will be actions here in the city of Seattle as well, and this is an opportunity for us to, on the front end, support those efforts. And I again have been in communication with folks on the coalition and have offered my office's support and an opportunity to engage with other council members and their offices in the event that you all are interested in. Also helping out with that, with that day of action here in the city of Seattle, the resolution also requests that the residents of the city of Seattle pay close attention to the un-American and harmful policies coming out of this administration as it relates to the constant,

constant dissemination of misinformation about immigrants and refugees that are being pushed out through mainstream media and otherwise by the White House, characterizing these as silly and refugee seekers, as criminals who are dangerous to us as residents here in this country. And we will be working really hard in our office to continue to push out accurate information and accurate stories about what is actually happening down at the US-Mexico border. The resolution also encourages Seattle residents to, if they are able financially support legal aid, resiliency and rapid response focused organizations in Seattle. There are many organizations here who are just working around the clock right now to help families that have been separated and who find themselves detained in our region at the Federal Detention Center in SeaTac in particular. And just want to call out the work of One America Northwest Immigrant Rights Project, the ACLU Foundation, Kids in Need of Defense, Collective Legal Pueblo and Washington Immigrant Solidarity Network. As some reputable organizations who are doing amazing resiliency and organizing work in this space and providing much needed legal aid to these families that have been separated. And then lastly, this resolution takes a position on behalf of the City of Seattle whereby we support the recent bills introduced in Congress. It's Senate Bill 3036 and House Bill 6135, otherwise known as the Keep Families Together Act. And we encourage folks in our city to reach out to their congressional representatives in support of those two bills. And the City of Seattle will be working with the Office of Intergovernmental Relations to send a joint letter to Washington's congressional delegation, also expressing our support of those of that particular particular act. And this morning in briefing, we heard from Leslie Posner over at home tonight are our lobbyists at the federal level about Senator Patty Murray and Senator Maria Cantwell's effort to get a hearing on the

issues in the Senate Judiciary Committee. And this resolution, sure, our support expresses our support for that hearing to occur. Thank you, Councilman Gonzales. Any other comments from any of her colleagues? Cats from Swan. I'm supporting this resolution because it is essential for local governments to take a stand against the horrendous and inhumane treatment of immigrant and refugee families at the border. We need to add our voice to those of the immigrant rights and social justice organizations and activists fighting to build a movement to end an immigration policy clearly designed for cruelty. In particular, I wanted to congratulate the courageous activists in Portland who shut down the local ICE facility with an Occupy style direct action and spread the demand to abolish ICE. ICE is an extremely undemocratic and inhumane security force, which for decades has operated with a mandate to pull families apart, drag people out of their beds in the dead of night, pull workers from their jobs and imprison them in inhumane facilities like the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma. Many progressive Democratic politicians are energetically opposing Trump's latest attack on immigrants. But we know this will not be enough. Trump's horrific policies can only be stopped by building fighting mass movements, something the Democratic Party has consistently failed to lead on. But that is not an accident. Just as an example, last Friday, the Seattle Times published an article titled Senator Patty Murray got campaign money from a company running Tacoma center where undocumented immigrants are held. This article talks about how she has received in as far as Washington state is concerned. Patty Murray is the biggest beneficiary of private prison campaign cash, and her 2016 reelection campaign received \$7,500 from private prison operators, including 5000 from the Florida based Political Action Committee for the GEO Group, the nation's largest private prison firm, which also operates the Northwest Detention Center in Tacoma, which holds undocumented immigrants facing deportations by ICE. And it holds it owns 140 other such facilities nationally. The center, as you know, has been the center of a protest, hunger strikes and lawsuits, all led by activists and detainees themselves. So I think this is an example that shows that there is no substitute for working people of all identities, for for us to be organizing united movements independent of both the corporate parties, to successfully fight and defeat Trump's agenda and to demand an end to the seizure, detention, deportation and criminalization of immigrant working people and their families, and for taxing the rich and big business to fight for jobs, afford affordable housing and health care for all. But this example of Patty Murray also shows that we cannot rely on politicians. And unless we build our own movement, build our own political representation that do not take money either from big business or from spe

cifically from these types of big businesses. I support this resolution, but most importantly, in order to build a movement, I hope to see Seattle's working people, immigrant and otherwise, at the demonstration for immigrant rights on June 30th, this Saturday, 10 a.m. at the Federal Building.

Thanks very much, Councilman Sean. Any further comments from Skeeter? Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. Many of us have talked about how under this day and age, we will be judged throughout history on how we stand up for our most vulnerable and the actions that we take and the laws that we passed to push back illegal and immoral acts. The resolution that Councilmember Gonzalez has put before us is exactly the type of action that we need to make sure that we don't pass the buck, point the finger, or wait for somebody else to right the wrongs that are being committed by this administration as the world looks at us. They will look for those who are showing what it looks like to resist from the local to the national level. And I think Washington state, with the community that we have, with the faith and immigrant rights leaders that we have, with the elected leaders who are standing up and fighting back and showing how we will change laws, object to any immoral and illegal act like the attorney general has done. And to stand in solidarity like this resolution has done by Councilmember Gonzalez are part of the path that will help shape our attempt to right the wrongs created by this administration. My husband has been at the border for the last week covering the illegal acts of ripping families apart. As many immigrant attorneys and community members who've been in our Sea-Tac detention and those who've been to the border to witness this corrupt interpretation of the law. We have a responsibility to show what it looks like, to make sure that we're responding to the cries of immigrant children who are being ripped away from their families, and to not just say that an executive order has been passed. So everything must be okay now. As Councilmember Gonzales said, things are not okay. This cannot be the norm. We cannot be numb to the cries of children who are at the border who are at risk of never seeing their parents again. So as we stand up as a community, whether it's standing in solidarity with the immigrants in our own community, like we talked about with my own meal feel they'll Pando tomorrow who has their own immigration case or we hear from the community members that are reaching out to each one of our officers or we think about our own experience. As I know, Councilmember Gonzalez has often mentioned her own roots as an immigrant as well. I think that what we hear on this council are saying is that we want to stand in solidarity with every immigrant, every refugee, every attorney who's spent their time making sure that they can reunite families with the community that's calling for action from the local to the national level. This is just one step among

many that I know we will take as this council to stand up and right the wrongs of this administration. So thank you. Thank you. Katherine Skeeter. Any further comments from my colleagues? I'll just I'll just close this out. On this resolution, I want to thank everybody for their support. And I'm very confident that we'll pass this unanimously today. And I want to thank Councilor Mosquito for her insightful remarks. You know, this has been a really it's always been hard to be the other in this in this country. And, you know, this is the first time in my life that I've had to live through administration like this one that is hellbent on making sure that he dehumanizes immigrants from all nations, but particularly focused on on immigrants lately from south of the border, from here. And for me, it's very personal, given my own family story. But I really appreciate the city being able to come together to take a position that really continues to support a lot of the organizing and momentum building that I have personally been a part of and and will continue to be a part of regardless of what my title is in the world. And so I just want to really thank all of the advocates who helped me think through the concepts in this resolution. And more importantly, I want to just thank them for continuing to do the work that they're doing. And part of the reason Chambers is and not Fuller today is because I'm being respectful of their requests to allow them to organize for what really matters. And that's not to show up at full council today. It's to continue to deliver the services and to continue to build the immigrant rights movement outside of City Hall. And that's exactly what they're doing right now. So I want to just thank them for all the work that they're doing and for all the tears that they are shedding. You know, I'm shedding those tears along with them. I think we all are. This is a moral crisis of historical proportions that is staring us down right now in this country. And we have to band together. Get past rhetoric, get past the politics, and recognize that when when people's human rights are being fundamentally destroyed by by our federal government and by others, we have to be willing to stand together to fight back. And that's that's what I hope we can do moving forward. Thank you, Councilman Gonzales. Okay. I moved to adopt resolution 31822 or a second. Second has been moved in second and the resolution to be adopted. Those in favor of adopting the resolution, please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the resolution is adopted. The chair will sign it. Other business. I will move to rescind the July 2nd

City Council excused absences for council members Bagshaw, Herbold, Mesquita and O'Brien because the meeting has been council as their second. All those in favor of that recession. Please vote i. I opposed. The ayes have it. And is there any further business to come for the council? Oh. 5 minutes. We are going to re

convene as a parks commissioner here in 5 minutes or district commission 5 minutes. And with that, we stand adjourned. And everyone, have a great afternoon or at least a five minute break. The Report of the Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities Committee Agenda Item five Council 119 299 Relating to the Department of Parks Recreation Authorizing Superintendent Parks Recreation to execute, amended and restated lease between the City of Seattle and Estella running incorporation to Occupy and use a portion of Building 11 Orange Magnuson Park for general office purposes and supersede the requirements of Ordinance 118 477. For the purposes of this ordinance, the committee recommends the bill passed. Thank you very much, Councilmember Wurst. Thank you. I'll wait till everyone calms down so we can hear. Thank you. Okay, so this is Marcel. It's a lease agreement. Updated Magnuson Park and Building 11 a wausau was found in 2007. The Seattle based athletic apparel company for women and by women. As a wimpy business, they will be a great addition to the park. They have a history of community contributions, including providing bras to young women to encourage physical activity during adolescence. They have provided bras for free, low income girls across the region and internationally. Recently in Ethiopia, they'll be paying market rate rent for the space in Building 11. This is a five year lease with option for two extensions. The committee recommends the full council pass legislation. Which any questions or comments? Councilmember Johnson It's. An incredible organization, not very well known, but the first athletic apparel company to be able to design a fully functioning hijab for an Olympic athlete. So Nike got a lot of press for that a couple of years after them, but they were the first ones to actually do it was all just great work. Wow. Great group. Any further comments before we vote that? Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. By John Gonzalez Johnson whereas I must get to see what? President Harrell I went in favor not. Oppose the bill passed and share with Senate. Please read the next agenda item. Such an item into the record. The report The Housing, Health, Energy and Workers Rights Committee Agenda item to Constable one one 9 to 86 relating to employment in Seattle. Establishing Labor standards for domestic workers. Establishing a domestic Worker Standards Board. Prescribing Remedies and enforcement procedures. Amending Section 6.208.0 27 Code and adding a new Chapter 14.23 to Seattle. Ms. Codes Committee recommends the bill passes amended. Okay. And before we relinquish the chair to the Micron accounts from a skater. Don't start the party without me. So we're not going to start house party without me. So because I am a skater. You had the floor. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm very excited about this piece of legislation in front of us. Before I begin my remarks. May we please entertain a round of applause for these incre

dible workers, employer advocacy groups who turned out to support. This piece of legislation before you, Mr. President, truly comes from a collaborative effort that was rooted in community, rooted in the experience of domestic workers who came forward and bravely shared their stories like they've done today. This conversation did not begin here in Seattle. In fact, I remember six years ago sitting with Hilary Stern on behalf of Casa Latina at the time and National Employment Law Project and so many others asking, what could we do at the state level? Because eight other states, Mr. President, have put into law the ability to protect domestic workers and where we haven't made strides at the state level, we knew we could make strides here in Seattle building. Building on the legacy of advocates and educators and activists like those that we heard about today, building on the years of leadership that Seattle has exemplified and standing up for the most vulnerable workers, workers who are often left out, not included, intentionally excluded because of racist or sexist reasons. We here in Seattle have shown leadership. And today, because of your work, we are showing leadership again today. A year ago, I sat down with domestic workers and pledged to them that we would pass the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights. Eight months ago, I signed a declaration, along with Councilmember Gonzalez and Councilmember Herbold and the mayor's office, to pass the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights in this year. Today's piece of legislation comes after four in community listening sessions that were held on the weekends and evenings so that you could be at the table. It comes after eight times, Mr. President, eight times of having domestic workers on our committee agenda. And today's work is only possible because employers, through hiring entities

and workers from the Domestic Workers Coalition, came together to identify the first steps, the foundation for which we can build upon. Historically, this population has been left out, and today is just a first step towards moving forward on the priorities you have identified. This bill is a result of months of meetings with you, with domestic workers, with hiring entities, with the community at large, with experts across the nation to identify ways that we can lift this population out of the gray market and apply basic labor protections. Folks across the country have been looking at the ways in which we're not only applying labor standards, but maybe more importantly, creating a board, a table for domestic workers and hiring entities to set out to recognize that this is not a one size fits all policy solution, that this is an opportunity for us to constantly engage and to create policy together that will lift up workers, improve standards, and actually improve the lives of families and our community. And let's remember who domestic workers are, as you so eloquently heard today, Mr. President. Domestic workers are more likely to be w

omen, people of color, immigrants. They've been excluded from our national labor protections. They've been isolated in nature in many situations due to their work environment. And the reality is, their work makes the work of this city possible. They care for our kiddos as nannies. They care for our elders as caretakers. They clean our homes and they clean our yards. Mr. President. And they've been left out of labor laws. But today we pass some basic protections to make sure that those who are caring for our most vulnerable and caring for our homes are truly cared for. This piece of legislation is remarkable, and that brought together ideas from hiring entities and domestic workers, national experts and local communities, and identified ways in which we can push forward hard conversations, identify low hanging fruit policies, and elevate the voice of workers by creating a board. This work is because of all of the effort, time and commitment you've put into this. And we will, as you heard, continue to add add to this so that we can do more. As Tai sang about today, this work is truly about how we extend basic protections to those who've been historically left out. And if I may, Mr. President, there's about five elements I'd like to highlight, please. The first that's most important is that we're expanding basic protections to access minimum wage for all domestic workers. We've defined domestic workers as truly those who engage in the act of domestic work. So whether you're an independent contractor and you own your own business or you're an individual who cleans ten houses a day, or you care for one or two families a week, every domestic worker now has the right to at least earn the minimum wage, if not more. And this gives a table to move from. We've extended the right to have access to basic rest and meal break protections because you are caring for our most vulnerable, you are caring for our homes and the right to have a rest or a meal break should be extended to every worker, no matter your workplace, no matter your type of work, because you need rest so you can take care of our most vulnerable. There is a document that's being handed out right now because a lot of folks have asked us to provide clarification on how rest and meal breaks can be provided. I want to thank the Office of Labor Standards for the two page memo that's being passed around, which really says it is very simple. If you work more than 4 hours, you are entitled to a ten minute break. If you are working an eight hour day, you ought to have an uninterrupted meal break. Those are basic protections that we've applied to the labor force overall. And now you have a right to that type of leave so that you can get the rest you need. We have included privacy protections because as you may have heard today, or if you participated in those eight committee hearings that we had, you heard time and time again that many domestic workers had their documents withheld, their original passport

s, their visas, their work permits. And that is not acceptable. It creates a sort of indentured servitude, if you will, where people can't leave. They can't feel like they can leave the house without fear of retaliation because they need those documents. We have now protected your ability to keep those original documents and assumes that if you were retaliated against for speaking up and it's based on your documentation status, we will protect you and your status because right now especially, we must stand up for our most vulnerable workers, regardless of documentation. And we've done that in this legislation. To our friends who have said that we we know that workers are more protected when there is a document in front of them which outlines their rights. This Domestic Bill of Rights provides a model notice of rights that the Office of Labor Standards is going to provide and make available to all workers and hiring entities. So there is a basis to build from and we know that you will continue to look at that at the board, which will consider additional protections so that you have written documentation of your rights under the law. And lastly, Mr. President, we also

want to underscore the importance, importance of constantly centering policy decisions based on the lived experience. And that is why I am so incredibly proud to have this legislation in front of you, which reflects your ask. You asked us to create a board so that we could have ongoing dialog, so that there could be hiring entities and domestic workers and a community partner who come together to constantly evaluate how we can do more things like making sure that we're applying innovative solutions to basic protections that are already under state law, like overtime and paid sick leave. I want to see retirement and health care. These are some really important protections that we need to apply to all domestic workers and recognize the unique nature of someone who cleans homes or takes care of our loved ones or cleans cleans our yards or takes care of our kiddos. We have to apply this in a thoughtful way, and I know that the board is going to prioritize that. And as other provisions in the law. We also want to make sure that we have ongoing feedback and we have required the ability to get those reports not only to the board. We don't want a document that's going to sit on the shelves. We want action. So it puts into the piece of legislation a requirement that we respond to the board's requests and recommendations in a timely fashion so that true policy change is being made and documents are not just sitting on shelves. We've already waited far too long. These issues have been sitting on the back burner for decades. Now we are taking the first steps and we will continue to do so with your voice at the center. I also want to say, Mr. President, we have a memo here from council member Herbold, who chairs our committee that has oversight over the Office of Civil Rights. And with her leaders

hip and working with us in partnership, she wanted me to read a statement, if I might. Mr. President. Please. Councilmember Herbold was unfortunately unable to be with us here today, but she asked us to share this memo, this memo that I just handed out, which commits to developing legislation with stakeholders in the collaborative process and collaborative process that we have already engaged to make sure that we are ending discrimination, ending sexual harassment, and ending exploitation of domestic workers. Councilmember Herbold is committed to developing a companion ordinance that will be heard in committee on the on Tuesday, August 14th, and that will include domestic workers and hiring entities and talk about how we can extend basic protections against discrimination and amend the Seattle Municipal Code to make sure that we are fulfilling our values, that no worker, regardless of workplace, should ever experience discrimination or harassment or sexual assault. And with you, we will be amending this piece of legislation in her committee so that the Seattle Fair Employment practices are extended to every domestic worker. Mr. President, if I may, I also have a statement from council member O'Brien who couldn't be here today, and then I'll say my closing comments. Absolutely. This is a message from council member O'Brien, who also participated with us in a listening session in the North End. He says, I'm sorry, I cannot be at the council meeting today to vote in support of the domestic workers ordinance. I want to appreciate all of the work that has been put in thus far to get to this historic moment. Thank you, Councilmember Mosqueda and your staff for your leadership, as well as Patricia Lee from central staff who is back there with us today and the law department for getting us to this point. I want to thank the employers who come out to support domestic workers who recognized the interconnectedness and interdependence of our lives and dignity. And most significantly, he says, I want to thank the organizations and individual domestic workers who've worked hard to get us here today, who have shared their stories with us, who continue to organize, who continue to demand respect on the job and in community. I admire your courage, your strength, and I will continue to work with you every single day to make other work possible, because your work makes our work possible. Thank you, Mr. President. Congresswoman Waters, the floor is yours. Thank you, sir. Thank you. Council President. First of all, I want to say. That as the chair, the vice chair of the Housing, Health, Energy. Workers Rights Committee, the her committee working with council member Teresa Mascara, has been a real joy. As you know, in the last six months. She has worked tirelessly, eight committee hearings in which we attended and went over drafts and comments and implemented, incorporating changes and concerns. And one of the things that I find most rewarding about this job is when y

ou work with somebody, you can have legislation. But sometimes at the core of it, what you're seeing in Councilmember Mascara is humanity, concern, care about protecting people who work hard, who take care of our children, who take care of our elderly, who take care of our disabled, who take care of our homes. And having someone so articulate who believes in fighting for labor and workers has been a wonderful, has been a joy, has been an education. And I also want to say,

because we don't we don't say this enough to each other, that I appreciate her not only. As a colleague. And as a representative to bring issues, as she was saying, the great economy and the people who mainly are affected by this type of when we don't have these protections, or mainly women of color who are immigrants, who don't speak English, and we deal with these issues all the time. No. Is this a. Perfect piece. Of legislation? No. Do we have a board where we're moving forward? Absolutely. And we're going to finally. Have a voice. On it. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to say that we're going to have a very, very energetic, excited voice on city council that I'm going to take leadership from and have learned much from so far today. I will be supporting this very important piece of legislation. Thank you. Councilman Mosquito. Thank you. Best and back. Show. Thank you. Councilmember and skater, I've said this at our committee meetings last week. I'm just truly grateful for your leadership, but also just the spirit with which you brought to this legislation. We've been working for nearly eight months, and I also want to acknowledge all the people who participated. Meeting after meeting, you came to the listening sessions. You came and talked with us. You gave us your stories. And I want to acknowledge the fact that as Councilmember Mosquito, your leadership, I've appreciated so much, but also the fact that we know that every worker deserves respect. You have stood up and shown us that time after time. And I want just to appreciate you individually, personally and my colleague, Councilmember Muscat. And of course, I'm supporting this. So thank you very much. Thank you, Councilman Baxter. Customers want. Thank you. Thank you, President Harrell. Thank you to all the workers who not only came today but have organized and spoken out about the conditions faced by domestic workers. Most of all, thanks to the domestic workers themselves, because it takes courage to talk about your own conditions. Those conditions are a clear example of why workers need unions and other worker organizations and their own political organizations because workers with their own organizations have the power to stop the abuses that occur. I especially wanted to thank organizations like Casa Latina who are organizing some of the most work. For organizing workers who face oppression on many levels as workers, as immigrants, as women, as people of color, not to mention the conditions that are faced by the non document

ed among us. I will of course be voting yes on this bill and I fully support the rights for workers, domestic workers rights that it contains. As a worker myself, as a union member, myself, and as a socialist, this is extremely important. Workers power is in our unity, and domestic workers are too often isolated in each home that they work in. One of the good things from such legislation is that your voice comes out into the forefront, and there's a potential for your voice as domestic workers to be united with the voice of other workers who may not face your conditions specifically, but who need to be united with you both for your sake and for their sake. Because when we stand together, we stand stronger. As I mentioned, I'm supporting this bill today, but we should also be clear about what rights it provides and what issues have not been addressed yet. This bill makes clear that domestic workers, including those classified as independent contractors, may not be paid less than Seattle's minimum wage and must be guaranteed the federally mandated breaks available to other workers. These rights are fundamental, and while many domestic workers classified as workers, are already legally entitled to these rights, it is important to make sure that workers being classified as independent contractors don't fall into a loophole. This bill also makes it clear that workers cannot legally be retaliated against for demanding their rights. And most importantly, it prohibits taking domestic workers, passports or other documentation. Although enforcement of that needs to be followed up on and that will need domestic workers to continue fighting for themselves beyond today's step in the right direction. Also, as domestic workers Maria Luisa and the sister from Honduras, whose name unfortunately I didn't catch, and workers like Robin Rose and Elijah Blagg, who are here to speak today, dozens of workers, domestic workers are informing my office and I'm sure others are. Domestic workers themselves know that there are many things that need to be done beyond this bill. One of the things is, and this is something that my office discussed with other council members, but also I'm hearing more from nannies throughout the city. This bill does not protect domestic workers facing sexual harassment, and that is going to be addressed and other forms of discrimination which we know happens too often. And I thank the senator from Honduras for sharing, sharing that story. That was obviously just a terrible experience. And I wanted all the workers to know that my office is at the ready to do whatever is required to help enact that legislation. Another issue that needs to be addressed urgently is the lack of retirement accounts for domestic workers. Maria Luisa mentioned that and we have heard this from other workers.

Personally and also in previous public comment testimonies. A domestic worker who was hired as an independent contractor pays six Social Security taxes, and then they

pay the employer's share of the Social Security taxes, also because they are an independent contractor. And then if they are undocumented, they cannot even collect Social Security when they retire. For many, that means a family becomes the only, literally the only safety net for all the domestic workers. Future legislation will need to address this. Domestic workers being classified as independent contractors as one of the issues the nanny that spoke to our office highlighted precisely because of the tax issue. Ideally, domestic workers should be categorized as workers, not independent contractors. But at the very least, the domestic workers that are categorized as contractors should be paid extra by the employer to cover the employer's share of the Social Security taxes. This can amount to hundreds or thousands of dollars a year. The that minimum wage workers will need to find to pay the IRS every April. Future legislation does need to address that. And not only I should mention for domestic workers, but this is also relevant for Uber and Lyft drivers and other workers who are defined as independent contractors but work and live on the margins. Another issue my office has heard during the listening sessions and then again over the weekend, is the importance of guaranteed hours. Domestic workers currently have to worry about suddenly losing hours if their employer goes on vacation or something like that. When you live paycheck to paycheck, losing a week's wages can mean not making a rent. Some domestic workers have contracts with their employers that guarantees being paid for a minimum number of work hours. But many do not have contracts, and many of you correctly said we need contracts for all domestic workers. And so I think that is something that we should be addressing. Future legislation should be taking up all of these issues, which is providing contract to domestic workers, guaranteed hours, paid time off. Double taxation, protections for independent contractors, sexual harassment, retirement, and other discrimination protections. These are the sort of workplace protections that are built into any union contract. But any union member would also tell you that nothing is automatic, and winning those union contracts requires organization and struggle. That is why I appeal to all the workers here today that while it is really positive that the board is being set up, if we want to see the full result and win full rights, then you as workers should be actively engaged and involved and at the forefront of the struggle for your own rights as you all fight to expand your rights. My office is fully at your disposal. Let us build a strong movement to win the substantive rights so that it is not put off told to the future. And so I wanted to once again thank all the domestic workers who have shown incredible courage to speak out and get organized. Your workers will make it easier for other workers to see that they too can have an impact. I vote yes o

n this Domestic Workers Bill of Rights, and I look forward to fighting alongside you all to expand those rights. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember miscarriage like a closed debate. Sure. Wow. We have taken the first step. We are about to vote on a second. I just want to reiterate a few pieces. Tuesday, the 14th of August, is when council member Herbold will have the draft in front of us to extend protections for protected classes and including sexual harassment protections, which we would have done in this piece of legislation. But the title was too tight, so that's why we have a trailer bill. So our work continues. Yeah. I want to thank our council colleagues, all of the amendments that folks brought to our attention. Any concerns, questions, ideas. We have incorporated those with the 11 amendments that we passed in our committee last Thursday. So thank you all for your engagement in this process as well. Thanks. Also specifically, I want to call out Casa Latina who brought to light the issues around health. Yeah. Who who brought to light the issues around independent contractors and the importance of protecting those who've created their own business, and the ability for folks to be able to maintain their business that they've grown. We want to keep that perspective in mind as we move forward. I just want to say thank you. Honestly, I do have a few. Thank you, Mr. President. And I know you warned against that because we could always leave someone out. But if I may, Mr. President, I'd like to continue with our. Thank you. I'd like to thank again Casa Latina. Who? Working Washington. Working Washington. SEIU 775 National Domestic Workers Alliance for the We Dream and Black Coalition. And 21 progress as well. Thank you all for all of your work. I'm going to try to go through these next ones relatively quickly, Mr. President, to the employers, the individuals who hire domestic workers, the hiring entities. You came to the table and recognize that we can only level the playing field. We can only highlight those employers who've done the right thing. If we truly create policies and statutes that lift

up those hiring entities and make sure that everyone is playing by the rules. Thank you. Seattle Nanny Network Hand in Hand. April Lane. Thank you to Emily Dills, Jessica Renner, Theresa Hollis, Hannah Littman. And I also look forward to working with the Seattle area nannies who are bringing forward ideas as well. Can we give them a huge round of applause? To the advocates and experts. Thank you so much. I see some of you in the audience. Thanks to National Employment Law Project Moms Rising Center for American Progress, National Domestic Workers Lands Again and Image Catalog. Thank you guys so much for all of your work. Mr. President, our work here would not be possible without the work of those who make Seattle City Hall run. So thanks to our internal staff for the hard work that they put into making sure that we got the details right, Patricia Lee,

who you heard earlier, she is in central staff back there. Thank you for your various drafts and all of your research on this. Also on central staff, Dan Etre and Patty Winger, wingman from the council, central staff and Ashley Harrison, who runs the operations, couldn't do this without her help. I appreciate Deanna, Joseph and Stephanie from the communications group who did a lot of intense work with us in community to come to the community lesson listening sessions. As you heard, we've been working with the Office of Civil Rights to make sure that we can get the protected class legislation right. Thanks to Lauren Athon from her team at the Office of Civil Rights for making sure that we got the discrimination pieces right in this current piece and will be working with her on the follow up piece of legislation. Thanks to everyone at the Central Budget Office, the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, the Office of Economic Development. I also want to say a special thanks to Councilmember Gonzalez and your team. Brianna Thomas provided a huge leadership role at the very beginning of this. And thank you for your leadership as well, Councilmember. I appreciate so much my committee colleagues who have been participating in those committee meetings. Councilmember Suarez and Councilmember Bagshaw, I thank you for your ongoing engagement on this issue. And truly this was a collaborative effort with the folks in the mayor's office. Adrian Thompson, thank you for all of your work and months of research, thanks to your team, including Anthony, and thank you to the mayor herself for her level of engagement and support for this piece of legislation. We appreciate it. We also want to thank all of your council staff who attended the listening sessions for being there from north, south, east, west when we had conversations and community. Thanks for your thoughtfulness and continuing to push us to make sure that we have the details right. Lastly, Mr. President, not lastly. Second to last, I want to thank my staff, my staff, including Aretha Bass, Sue Friday, Cuevas, Michael Maddox, and Sage Perry, who's at the back. And who is chief of staff. Longtime labor advocate, huge leader in the community, really shepherded this process through. So a huge appreciation for all of your work on this. And finally, just want to underscore lastly and most importantly, thank you to the workers who have been able to come forward to share your stories with us, to elevate your voice to incredibly, you know, come to the table day after day. This has been truly your work product. So we want to thank you for sharing your stories, being willing to talk about stories of intimidation and harassment, telling us when you've made one, two or \$3 an hour and demanding a change. Always pushing forward and continuing the conversation and creating a voice for you to continue to be at the table. We could not do this work without you. I am proud that because of your leadership, we are again

leading on cutting edge Labor policies. We will be the first city in the nation to today, pass the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights. Seize that bureau. Q comes from a skater, and with that I think we are prepared to vote. Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. By John Gonzalez. Hi. Johnson Suarez Macheda. Hi. President Harrell. Hi. Seven in favor and unopposed bill passes. So Simon. Well done. Please read items three and four together. Bill passed the senate. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item six Constable 119 316 Relating to the Human Rights Code and many Section eight or other subsidiary program ministry orders to the definition of person clarifying the difference between reasonable accommodation and reasonable modification. Broadening coverage of unfair practices relating to reasonable accommodations and reasonable modifications to any person. And in many section 14.80 8.0 29.0 fortieths Transfer Code Committee recommends the bill passes. Amended. Castro and Herbold. Thank you. This issue was brought to my attention after litigation and a decision from the Court of Appeals for the state of Washington. In this case, the Seattle Housing Authority voucher recipient requested a change in her voucher from a studio apartment to a one bedroom apartment as a disability related accommodation. In this case, FHA

was not the landlord. The FHA was only the voucher administrator. The court decided, based on a plain reading of the language in the Seattle Municipal Code, in the statutory context, supporting the legislative intent to cover only the landlord tenant relationship. It did not apply to FHA in its role as a voucher administrator. The court noted in its decision that if the city wishes to extend the unfair practice requirement to include a requirement that Section eight program administrators like FHA making a reasonable accommodation when requested, it can amend the SC accordingly. This legislation is in direct response to the case and does so does amend the settlement code to allow the city to enforce the obligation for reasonable accommodation in instances where a provider is the the housing and the housing voucher administrator, not the actual landlord. Very good. Any questions or comments that please call the role on the part of the Bill Herbold II? Johnson Whereas I was I. O'BRIEN So on think President Harrell eight in favor and unopposed. Bill passenger Cheryl Simon. Please read the next agenda item the short title. That's about 119309 relating to preparations for the Office for Civil Rights in many areas 125493, which amended the 2018 budget and lifting a proviso imposed on the Office for Civil Rights for funding a comprehensive, community based Youth Diversion. Program by Green Sheet. 97 one B1. The committee recommends the bill pass. HERBOLD Thank you. So during the 2018 budget deliberations, you may recall that the council passed Green Sheet 90 71b1, adding \$100,000 to the Office of four Civil Rights to fund

a comprehensive youth diversion program. This program development is led by community passageways and passageways, works with a consortium of community leaders and youth directly involved with and impacted by the criminal, legal and other justice systems. The Green Sheet imposed a proviso on these funds to be lifted once the City Council approved the proposed spending plan submitted to the Office of Civil Rights at our committee meeting on July 24th. We heard more about community passageways in the work of the consortium, reviewed the proposed spending plan and deliverables, and voted to lift the proviso. Very good. Any questions on this legislation that please call the role on the passage of the bill. For Bolt II. Johnson. Suarez, mosquera. I o'brien. I want I make sure President Harrell it in favor and unopposed. Bill passed the senate. Please read the next agenda item. The report of the Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities. Communities Committee January three Cancel 1193 15 million to the Department of Parks and Recreation authorizing acquisition of real property coming. As. 920 Randolph Avenue Committee recommends the bill pass. Kasper in back shop. Thank you. So this is known as Madrona Ravine and this legislation would authorize the acquisition of the property at 9 to 0 Randolph Avenue. In our last Parks Committee, we had much discussion about this. It would add about 11,000 plus square feet onto a ravine that will just be open public access to the park within this Madrona Ravine area. The budget for the project includes funds that will acquire the property, demolish the building, is on site, remediate the land to incorporate it into the existing underdeveloped parkland. The total project budget is 995,000 and the committee recommends that we authorize the acquisition of this property. Thank you very much. Any questions or comments? If not, please call the rule on the passage of the bill Johnson. Whereas Macheda I O'Brien. I. So aren't I make sure hi Gonzales. I verbal hi president Hiro hi eight in favor and opposed. The bill passed in show senate. Please read the next agenda item the short title. Agenda item for constable 119 321 relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation amending ordinance 125 493 The committee recommends the bill. The report The Housing, Health, Energy and Workers Rights Committee Agenda Item seven Council Bill 119 319 related to the City Department's Advanced Metering Infrastructure Program, adding a new section 21.40. 9.0 95 to the ceremony. Speaker Committee recommends the bill pass. Casper. Mesquita. Thank you, Mr. Chair. First, I want to say thank you to our friends at the ACLU. The folks at ACLU, specifically Shanker and Orion, has been working to make sure that we put into place advanced meter infrastructure technology that protects the data of all consumers. Councilmember O'Brien has been working on this for a while, and I want to thank the folks at Seattle City Light and the Office of

the Attorneys, the city attorneys as well. We have been able to craft legislation that I think accomplishes the following. We want to make sure that an AI led technology is implemented in a way to make sure that we can monitor energy efficiency and improve the collection of actual data so that our bills reflect the actual usage and that we can identify ways to improve energy efficiency over the long haul. What we know is that because of Councilmember Brian and the previous council

here, there has been policies put into place in rules that do protect consumer data. What this legislation does is it codifies our commitment to making sure that all data is truly protected, that we as a city and our subcontractors don't share, disclose or make available consumer data in a way that would be inappropriate. We want to make sure that every customer, every resident in Seattle feels comfortable using the AMI technology and for those who don't. This legislation also sets limits on the fees associated with opting out, making it clear that they can be no more than the cost of actually reading the alternative meter. So that I think that we create a little bit more parity here. Again, I think that this is important for us as we get into new areas where we're using technology in different ways, where we're collecting data that we haven't collected in the past. We need to step up and make sure that our contracts and our commitment to protect data reflect each other. So I'm really excited about the type of commitments this will put in place for contracts in the future. We also want to make sure that the customers feel that we have responded to their concerns with urgency, and I think that this legislation does that. So I appreciate the past steps that Seattle City has made, and I really hope that the Council will adopt this resolution or sorry, adopt this ordinance today to codify these rules into statute. Again, I want to thank Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you to your staff, especially Lakeisha Farmer, who's been working with us on this. And I look forward to working with you all to make sure that we implement these councilmember action. Councilmembers have been very helpful as well in our committee as we talked about this issue multiple times over the last few months. So thank you to all of you for your collaboration and for helping us to find the right path forward on AMI protections. Thank you. Customers get any comments? Councilmember Yeah. Thank you. I want to go right back at Councilmember Mosquito. I really appreciated the time you've spent on this and bringing Seattle City Light to the table. But also, I think importantly, a number of our I would consider them to be some of the loyal opposition around privacy that they wanted to make sure that we were not going in and getting data from people's homes and businesses that they felt was personal. And the fact that we had ACLU involved in the conversations and that at our last meeting, I asked one of the speak

ers directly. Are you supporting this legislation as is? And the answer was yes. So thank you so much for the work that you've done in pulling this together. Thank you. Q Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you for your comments, Councilman Muscat. I appreciate the recognition, but I want to say that to get it to this point required a lot of work, and it was just a lot of back and forth on nuances of working with attorneys in the department. And I want to give credit to the city attorney's office and Seattle, see the light for them showing up for those conversations. But I know you and your team put a lot of time into getting it here, and I'm grateful to get the chance to work with you on this. I'm really proud of this legislation and thank you for doing that. Very good. Just like we got a couple of votes and the other was okay, please call the roll on the passage of the bill. JOHNSON Macheda I. O'BRIEN Hi, Sergeant Bakeshop. Gonzales Hi, Herbold. President Harrell. Hi. Eight in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chair of the Senate. Please read agenda item number eight. Agenda Item eight Appointment of Perdita about House Member 2016 Housing Levy Oversight Committee for Term. Agenda item 11 Resolution 318 30 Building to the Move Seattle Levy Establishing Principles for developing a revised work plan for MOVE Seattle Levee Projects to ensure transparency, accountability and thoughtful community outreach, the committee recommends the resolution be adopted as amended. Councilmember O'Brien, you may introduce I'm aware there may be an amendment to this, so I'll turn the floor to Councilmember O'Brien to introduce it. Sounds great. So as folks are aware, the a couple of things have changed since the vote passed the move Seattle levee. One is we have a new federal administration and as a result, we are concerned about not being able to get the same type of federal matching grants for transit projects that we originally had hoped for when we passed it. We've also seen a lot of construction in this town driving up price for construction, and so the costs of some projects have increased. This is a cause. Seattle Department of Transportation need to step back and do a deep evaluation of the levee projects that were proposed in the nine year levee when voters passed it and evaluate if they had if they need to make any changes that add to meet the current budget. But this resolution does is it establishes some principles for the department transportation. As they evaluate those changes and the requests following those principles, they come back to us by a committee meeting in early December with what any recommendation, any recommended changes they want to make to that plan. So we have a chance to review that and see how it goes forward. We had good discussion in committee, made a few changes to this legislation, but ready to move forward. And Councilmember

Herbold discussed a change that would help coordinate with Seattle Public Utilities. The amendment wasn't

ripe in committee, but it is. Right now. So I'll turn it over to Councilman Herbold. Thank you. So much. To get us started, I move to amend Resolution 31, 83 zero by adding a new subsection one H, a new Section three and Re numbering the section numbers accordingly as presented in the distributed amendment. Second. Thank you. So this amendment asks escort to coordinate with SPU to take into consideration the impact on SPU projects and ask for an initial assessment by December 1st and a final report no longer, no later than March 1st, 2019. This is because one of the questions that was asked during briefings this morning is why? Why focus on SPU? What about the other departments? Well, we learned through the strategic business plan discussions earlier this year that that these. Projects. That are associated with the levy are a significant cost driver of rate increases. And largely, it's because these kinds of projects, because they're underground, they are very expensive. And so there's 150. Million in must do projects associated with SPU. Related to levee projects and another 49 million in what they call opportunity projects. It just makes sense to do them while the streets are open to do the Levy project. And so it's I think it's really important for this. Council to have a more. Clear understanding not only how. SPU projects will be affected by the new prioritization of of MOVE Levy projects. But also how those changes might affect SPU customer rates. Very good. We're going to vote on just the amendment. Any other comments about the amendment pertaining to the SVU piece? Okay. So we're going to vote on the amendment first. All those in favor of the amendment, please vote. I oppose. The ayes have it. So, Councilman Brandies, you want to say anything on the amendment based legislation? Any other closing remarks on the legislation and the resolution? I'm sorry. That's former skater. I know everybody wants to get out of here. I just want to say thanks to Councilmember O'Brien for his leadership on this. I'm hoping that as we reset the Seattle or move Seattle investments, that we are going to be able to do so in a way that truly prioritizes improving safety and flow for all users, but particularly in light of the conversations that you have helped to lead in the last few months here, that we are specifically focused on pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders, and that we evaluate where projects may have been put on hold like the streetcar, how we can make sure that we're expediting opportunities to get people moving throughout the city. And I look forward to the report back and seeing a path forward to make sure that our invested investments in transit are meeting our values of both environmental protection and transit mobility. So I'm looking forward to working with you on that. I thought of a few amendments at the last minute where I, I think that those would better be reserved for another day. So I'd love to work with you on those. And, Mr. Pres

ident, I wasn't going to do this earlier, but I'm gonna do it now. I just want to say thank you to all of our staff. It's been an intense week as we all worked on various resolutions and prepared for our normal council activities. So I just want to take a quick moment to say thank you to my staff, especially Michael Maddox and Sage, who worked on the EMT and shoebox issues. And also to Patricia Lee, who I didn't get a chance to thank earlier from central staff who worked on the EMT resolution specifically. It's been a long week and we're closing it up so I won't take any more time, but to say thank you to the good sponsor of this legislation. Thanks for mentioning those great folks. We appreciate. That. And it's been a long week and it's only 430 on Monday. So. Yes. Councilmember Gonzalez, thank you. I just wanted to ask a question on this, since I didn't have the benefit of attending the Sustainability and Transportation Committee where this resolution was discussed. And I had just a sidebar conversation with Councilmember Herbold about the implications on the budget, which were about budget process, which we're about to undergo, and how the resolution interplays with any decisions that we may be considering during the budget related to transportation investments via the Muse Move. Seattle Levy And perhaps you can just highlight that for us before we we called us for a vote. So there's a lot of things moving here and I'll I'll take a just a couple minutes to walk through some the various parts. So there's a levy oversight committee that's been in place since the levy was passed and since the department announced that they were going to be evaluating all the different pieces of this levy, that Levy Oversight Committee has met, I think, a couple of times a month, and I'm part of that to go through a bunch of the programs. I think there are I can remember about 30 different programs that are part of the levy. 22 of those my number is not quite right, but about most of them are on track even when we've done some high level analysis to kind of meet the objectives. But their aid programs, they wanted to take

a deeper dive out. And so they've gone with the oversight committee into a deep dive on all of those. Now, the Oversight Committee includes members of the pedestrian advisory board, the Bicycle Advisory Board and the Transit Advisory Board. And those advisory boards all went into deep dives on pieces of the levy. Look at their programs. The Levy Oversight Committee is having another meeting at the end of the next week or the following week where they will make a final set of kind of recommendations in a letter that we will be receiving from them in addition to this resolution. And then the motor boards will all receive in September, my committee will receive on behalf of the Motor Board's updated implementation plans for the Transit Master Plan, the bike master plan and the pedestrian master plan in September. And those are the five year implemen

tation plans that we entered. We redo every single year to add an additional year at the end, but also show what are the priorities. And those plans will be very integrated with the investments in Seattle and other city investments in the transportation projects that are moving forward. This this resolution was largely designed just to lay out a framework as they're working through this. And to be clear, a lot of this work has already been done on how we want the department to make its final evaluation and select how they're going to prioritize which set of projects. There are some places where they've been able to figure out creative ways that we can still build, you know, the sidewalk blocks that we had proposed. We're going to kind of change some of maybe some of the sequencing of it, but we can still meet it. There's some places specifically around transit where they're probably going to say, we can't do the full. The scope of everything we wanted to do. But here's how we're going to. Here's what we think we can do in the sequencing of it. And this resolution is intended to say, look, when you when you look at, for instance, transit, we really want to prioritize speed and reliability of transit operations as you're making those investments. So keep that in mind as you set your priorities. But there will be future opportunities, including the implementation plan updates, which will come to us about a month from now. And then we'll come back with a final set of recommendations that will be driven by budget. Of course, that will be post-budget in December to talk about that, too. I appreciate that additional detail. As we head into the budget season, I just am reminded that oftentimes we receive many notes of advocacy and advocating from members of the community, particularly those who are very interested in seeing the fall in robust implementation of the city's commitment to Vision Zero. And I just want to make sure that we are taking into consideration the realities in trying to figure out how to thread the needle in this area with the move Seattle Levy that that in some instances is the appropriate revenue source for the things that folks are asking us to support in the budget process and the move Seattle Levy is one of the few dedicated revenue streams of revenue that we have to be able to meet some of the transportation issues that I think a lot of us hear from our constituents. So I would appreciate continuing to have an opportunity to engage, to sort of figure out how we're going to piece all that together as we head into the budget. Thank you. Very good. Okay. Any further comments? If not those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended, please vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries and the resolution is adopted. Cheryl, sign it. Is there any further business giving for the council? Yeah, there is. Agenda item 12. Item 12. Oh my. There is. Am I brothers? Please read agenda item number 12. Agenda item four Council

Vote 1193 ten Relating to the City Seattle's Volunteer Deferred Compensation Plan amending Section 2.5 of the Deferred Compensation Plan to clarify existing immunity from liability for offering certain investment options. The committee recommends the bill passed. Good. Thank you. Colleagues, this is one of the simplest ones we're going to have in front of us today. This ordinance amends something that's already in our law, but it will, by adding a phrase from the selection of the investment options offered under the plan, provide a level of immunity from liability right here. Oh, my gosh. Thank you. Thank you. Colleagues, they're going to do some work there. Some work. Here. I'm sure everybody heard that. So I'm going to move forward. We just heard that this is an easy part. I think. Can we please report that? Rebecca Sharp. All right. Absolutely. This council will 119310 would provide a level of protection for members of our 457, which is our voluntary savings portion and investment options for city employees. This is consistent with what other cities have done. It just provides a level of immunity for the board members. And it should they select socially responsible funds into which people can choose to invest. So that's what this does. And I recommend that we move forward with its adoption. Very good. Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments on this bill? If not, please call the rule on the passage of the bill. I. Whereas

she said, I. I'm sorry. Sorry. Let's get to I. O'Brien. All right. Sergeant. BEGALA Hi. Gonzales Hi. Herbold. President Harrell. Seven in favor. Nine opposed the bill passed in show Senate. Please read agenda item number five. Agenda item five Council vote 1193 12. Really into the city employment adopting 2018 City Requisition List Committee recommends the bill pass. Agenda items 22 and 23. Quick file 314 366 Full unit unit two lot subdivision application of marc process to subdivide one parcel into 12 unit lots at 3050 61st Avenue Southwest Council 119334 Approving and confirming the plot of Elk 12 in portions of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section ten, township 24, north range three , east in King County, Washington. Castro. Johnson Thank you. This is one of those occasional land use topics that come straight to full council based on the Seattle Municipal Code requirements for us to take action within a specific time frame. So here we are taking action with these two pieces of legislation to allow the final subdivision of a property just a couple of blocks from car in District one. The property has been reviewed by the Department of Transportation, the Department of Construction and Inspections and central staff. It's consistent with the hearings, examiner's recommendations on this project, which was completed in November of 2017. And the plan is actually that these actions essentially facilitate the conversion of a single family parcel to 12 unit lots for sale or lease of 12 rowhouses that

are under construction. Then this final action allows for those 12 units to actually be listed and on the market. Happy to answer questions, but I'm not seeing any. So with that I'll just move to place the clerk file on file. Second. Any further questions on this? First, we'll do the Clark file. Any further questions is being moved. And second that the application be filed. Those in favor of filing the application. Please will I. Hi. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries. The application is filed. And as you need to speak on the the council bill as well. Or should. We. The Council bill does, does the real work here. And so the Clark file allows for us to proceed and the council bill is the final action. So those are related documents. There's nothing left for me to add. Or get any further questions or comments. I'll move to pass counts. Bill 119334. It's been moved in second of the bill pass please call the roll on the passage of the bill. O'Brien Baxter Herbold Johnson Suarez President Harrell. I. Six in favor and unopposed. The bill passed and the chair will sign it. Please read the next report. The bill passed in show senate. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item 21 cancel 12 one one 9 to 18 relating to surveillance technology implementation amending ordinance 125376 and Chapter 14.18 of this yet year must because the committee recommends the bill passed as amended. So essentially my pleasure to present this Council bill which amends the surveillance ordinance which was passed by the Council in 2017. I'll talk a little bit more about the history during my latter part of my remarks. Just some background, though. The 2017 surveillance ordinance outlined requirements that included, number one, that surveillance technology get reviewed, reviewed and approved by the city council before acquisition. And that, of course, is an important aspect of the legislation that two counts of review and approve via an ordinance for retroactive technologies and three, reporting about surveillance, technology use and community impact. The chief technology officer now is required to compile a master list of surveillance technology technologies in use by city departments. And during this process, 28 technologies were identified in four departments City Light, the Department of Transportation, the Seattle Fire Department, and the Seattle Police Department. So what does this bill do? And I got to tell you, you'll see, as I describe it, there are a lot of positive fingerprints, excuse the pun, on this particular piece of legislation, because a lot of people were very interested in making sure both technologies use effectively and efficiently, but privacy interests were protected. Number one, it creates a community service surveillance working group. And this group will advise the city council and executive on matters of surveillance technology. From a community perspective, that's the bottom line directive that we're asking to be achieved from that group. T

he working group would provide a privacy and civil liberties impact assessment, or I'll just call it an impact assessment for each surveillance impact report, and we'll get that. Know that acronym, the SBIR or Sir will be part of our vernacular because that's what has created a surveillance impact report, which is a report that documents and identifies how surveillance technologies will be used, how data will be securely stored, retained and accessed and audited by departments. And of course, that is our commitment to transparency. The impact assessment would be included with any CAIR submitted to the City Council for ordinance approval. And thus far there are a total of 28 hours and the working group would be afforded. The way that ordinance works is they be afforded

no less than six weeks to prepare this impact assessment. And if the working group does not prepare the assessment before the transmittal of the are, the working group would ask the Council for a two week extension that would be granted because we want them to do that kind of work at that level. The working group consists of seven members, four appointed by the mayor and three appointed by the City Council, and we'll have that achieved by December of 2018. Thanks to the leadership of Councilmember O'Brien and others. We sort of looked at how this will sort of roll out, since this is a work in progress. And I want to again think, I think toward the closing remarks. A lot of people really push the city, as they should, on what to do and how to how to respond when all of the work is not given, when to in terms of the the review process of existing technology. So what we came up with is the departments would begin submitting to the city council these hours, no later than January 31st, 2019. All 28 must be submitted to the Council by March 1st, 2020. The first annual equity impact assessment, which is again is an assessment looking at how it affects particularly communities of color underrepresented communities. Are communities particularly vulnerable to the misuse of technology and equity? Impact assessment will be filed beginning September 15, 2019, and continuing by no later than September 15th, each year after thereafter. And that was sort of a a. Timeline sort of negotiated between the departments and council. O'Brien and myself looking at we need to give them some time given their limited limitation of resources, but we don't want to wait and have any surprises, so we want to see it as is developed. We thought that that kind of process made sense. I have some amendments that will actually describe these changes in a formal manner, but that's sort of where we arrived, and I think that was good policy. The first annual surveillance usage review will be filed no later than will be filed January 2020 and covers activities through the end of 2018. Usage reviews in subsequent years shall be filed in September and cover the data and activities of the previous year. Standing back f

rom the legislation a little bit, I believe that the city has demonstrated a commitment to the privacy and security of the public's personal and people's personal information, trying to strike the right balance. You may recall that again in March of 2013, this council or a council, I should say, passed it council bill 117730, which required, again, city departments to obtain council approval prior to acquiring certain surveillance equipment and that and required council review and approval of department data protocols. And that was sort of a shift in how things, of course, had been done historically. In February of 2015, Council Council passed Resolution 31570, adopting six privacy principles, guiding the actions the city will take when collecting and using information from the public. In the fall of 2015, the privacy tool kit was distributed to city departments to incorporate the privacy principles into daily departmental departmental operations. July, July 2017. The city hired Ginger Armbruster as the city's chief privacy officer. The chief privacy officer will help the city implement and enforce practices that manage data in accordance with our privacy principles. In 2017, under the leadership of Councilmember Gonzalez, a Council bill passed the council passed council bill 118930, which updated the definition of surveillance technologies and the requirements that I stated earlier, requiring this kind of sort of stringent review and assessment as we review these technologies. A few, few things I'll do at the end, but I did want to make sure that I amended first. But before I do that, I sort of talked about the amendments embedded in the legislation. I'll walk through the formal amendments, but did any of my comments colleagues, first of all, are all of you awake, number one? But number two, did Councilman Bryan or anyone else want to say anything about this? Yes, the council president, Harold. First, I want to say thanks to you for your collaboration in this. This is a long and thorough process and just, you know, reiterate that what we are trying to do here in Seattle around surveillance and transparency of the public is really pioneering work. And so it's not something where we can just pick it up and see what other jurisdictions have done. And so we've had a lot of iterations back and forth and work with some community members who've been working closely on this and really happy with where we are today, especially with the three minor amendments that have come through today. And I'm excited to pass this. So thanks for your leadership on this. Thank very much. I want to shout some things, too, and that is Greg Doss on Central Staff. Thank you for working so feverishly on this. And Kate Garvin, the mayor's office and of course, my colleague, Councilmember Bryant, and many of you participated in this discussions. And I want to thank Shankar and Michel from the ACLU. They were truly, in my opinion, protecting the interests of the public in Giova

nna Hudson, thank you for your work and your testimony as well today. We deeply appreciate that and we look forward to partnering through this this emerging issue that many cities will contend with. And I think we're on the cutting edge of how it should be done the right way. So having said that, I got to walk you through the amendments. And so I'm going to first bear with me here. I would like to. Move. Amendment one. Just one sec here. I'd like to move to amend counts bill 1192 and eight by adding three new sentences as presented on Amendment one. And those three new sentences I sort of described it basically talked about the dates of service being submitted to the Council by March one, 2020, and the other descriptions and the deadlines. You've been passed out and emailed the version that it was just the dates that I talked about that were sort of negotiated. So I'll describe that as Amendment 1/2. Okay. Any questions on that? All those in favor of Amendment one, please say I. I opposed the ayes have it. And on amendment number two. Which was, again, the it was a date insertion that Councilmember Brian and myself and others worked out dealing with the first annual impact statements. Just some language. I just read the language. When reviewing technologies that do not have SARS, the department shall look to existing documents and policies to address the requirements of Section 14.18 .050 and whenever possible, provide the information requested for each retroactivity. Technology in their or trying to achieve is making sure that even if a formal ESA is not developed, we get everything we can to make sure that it's included in the equity impact assessment. And we thought that was a good policy. So that's amendment number two. Is there a second questions? All those in favor of amendment number two, please say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. And last amendment number three is just a technical change. There were some things the center staff, I believe they were just some words were replacing a few words statement with assessment approval with consideration of statement assessment again or they were just technical changes as all. So I propose amendment number three to the council bills are second all those in favor of amendment number three say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. Okay. So that's the amended bill with those three amendments. So I will ask that the clerk call the roll on the passage of the amended bill. GONZALES I. HERBOLD High. JOHNSON Whereas. O'BRIEN All right. So aren't I. Lakeshore President Herrell. I didn't favor and unopposed. The bill passed. Chair of the Senate. Please read the next report. The short title, please. Bill Passenger Assignment. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item 23 cancel 119332. Relating to license only in many section 23.40 1.0 ten of the of for code to approve the 2018 South Lake Union Neighborhood Design Guidelines Committee recommends the bill pass. Castro and Johnson. The Pledge Committee is also upbeat

to bring you this other key new neighborhood design guidelines. These design guidelines have been in development by community for the last several years. Strong community support for this. We do have to make one small technical substitute amendment, which clarifies that a depiction of streets and the public realm in the proposed design guidelines does not supersede as Dot's requirements for right away improvements. But this is one of those items where we have been fortunate enough to have several members of the public come and talk about the good work of Jim Holmes and the Office of Planning and Community Development, who shepherded these design guidelines through the neighborhood process and happy to have your support for that today. So I'd move to pass countable 119332. But I also have an amendment, so maybe I'll wait for a second and then talk about that amendment. So the we're talking just about the amendment, which is the attachment one, I believe, but there's been moved in second on the amendment. So is there much to say about the amendments? I would just ask to for adoption to amend attachment one to council bill 119332 to modify the description of the public realm map on page 12 of the attachment. And it's been secured. And so any questions about the amendment? Are those in favor of the amendment as described by Councilman Johnson? Please say I oppose the ayes have it. And any more to say about the Bass legislation as a minute, Councilman Johnson. Just strongly support your yes vote. Okay. Any further questions or comments? If not, please call the rule on the passage of the amended bill. Zollars I Herbold. Hi Johnson. Whereas I O'Brien I want I make sure. President Harrell high eight in favor and unopposed. Bill Pass and Chair of Senate. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item six Council Vote 119 348 Related Historic Preservation Imposing Controls upon the Halt Hall, a landmark designated by the Land Risk Preservation Boards Committee, recommends a bill passed. This rare picture. Thank you very much. And Hall hall is in the you district is 711 northeast 43rd. It was actually moved the building was built in 1928 and they moved it from where I-5 is now over to where it is located on 43rd Street. This would be designated

for the control features for the building exterior. The owner of the building was with us at our committee meeting and we would like to move forward with this landmark designation and move adoption of Council Bill 119348. Any comments on this bill? Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Gonzalez I. Herbold Hi. Johnson I was I. O'Brien I. Want I. To make sure President Herrell I Adan favor an unopposed. Bill passed and chair senate. Please read the next agenda item. The short title. Yeah, let's step on that. Please read the next agenda item. The report on the Sustainability and Transportation Committee Agenda Item for Council Bill 119 329 relating to employment in Seattle required certain employers to offer

employees the opportunity to use pretax earnings to purchase commuter benefits other than parking in accordance with federal law. Adding new Chapter 14.32 code and amending Sections 3.15 .00 and 6.208.0 24. Code Can we recommend civil bill as amended? Thank you, Councilmember O'Brien. Q I want to take a minute just to explain what this legislation would do, but I want to start by apologizing to Mr. Wasserman in the North Seattle Industrial Association. The first they I learned about it was in a newspaper article today. We've been discussing this legislation for over a year. And last year in the budget we reached out and we funded Seattle to do work to engage business folks, and they've been doing that with a lot of folks. And Mr. Weisman, I since I heard you, I've asked my staff to connect. Q Seattle, I actually see Nick Franklin with Seattle's in the audience, and I will make sure you can physically chat today to do some of hours work to your members to to make sure they understand it. I will also talk. So this legislation, what it does is it takes advantage of a piece of the Internal Revenue Service Code that allows businesses, allows the sorry employees to have transit passes deducted from their payroll pretax. The effect of that means is they get essentially the tax deduction for both their Social Security and Medicare and also their federal income tax from the costs of that pass. The result is that for a minimum wage worker who's in a 20 to 25% tax bracket, who's currently buying \$100 a month transit pass 1200 dollars a year would save over \$300 a year through this mechanism. Employers also get savings because the employer is no longer have to pay their payroll tax for that amount that's deducted. So on a similar similarly positioned employee employer would save close to \$90 a year on that one employee who's taking advantage of it. This is one of those rare opportunities where I believe we have a win win win. The first win being for employees who get to save money on their transit. The second win being for employers who get to save some of their tax liability. And the third being for all of us, because when we make it easier, more cost effective for people to have access to transit passes and we reduce congestion and pollution and give people access to the mobility that they need. And in the process of this, I want to applaud Seattle for their ongoing work to reach out to both business owners and organizations that work with business leaders. Myself and staff have also met with a number of those folks. Obviously not everybody, but we will continue to do that work. One of the things we heard was folks wanted to make sure they had enough timeline to implement this. So in committee we extended the deadlines. This law we're passing it today will not take effect, meaning it will not be implemented for businesses to have the requirement to offer this their employees until January 1st of 2020. So a little over 12 months. And then we've put in anoth

er year of of what I call a grace period where we won't do any enforcement. It'll just be education. And if employees says, Hey, I wasn't notified that I have this right until January 1st of 2021. We've seen similar laws enacted in other cities around the country. New York City is one of those. In the first eight months of their implementation, they had eight complaints where businesses weren't doing what they were required. All eight of those complaints were resolved by simply educating the business and explaining how they could do that. And so I feel very confident in both what's been happening elsewhere and in the communication with local businesses that this is something that folks will be able to do without any significant burden, and that to the extent there is a burden, it should be more than offset by the tax savings to them. Again, we have another year and change to work with folks before this will be in effect. And I look forward to working with businesses and organizations who are just hearing about this and in the coming year to make sure folks are aware of how this will be implemented. And I want to just say that I'm open to in that process, if folks say, hey, there's a very unique concern we have in our business or in our industry where this may not work well, that we can always come back and make changes to that at that time. You concern, Brian. Any further questions on this bill? Councilmember Johnson. Just a couple of brief comments. I was just looking at the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics, which I know you guys all know off

the top of your head. But for those of you who aren't tracking that, you know, the average person is spending a little bit under \$10,000 a year in their transportation cost. This is part of their household expenditures. And we all know how critically important it is in a city that is becoming less and less affordable by the day, to give people more transportation choices, gives them more economic freedom. And I think that that's the intention here. We have a significant portion. We're still working on the statistics and the data, but a significant portion of Seattle's employers who are not required to offer transit benefits to their employees. This gives a pathway for those employees to get access to those benefits and will only prove good dividends for us who try every day to show up to the office to make sure that folks can get to work safely, easily, and reduce their household expenses. Oh, by the way, also being good for the environment, too. So I think this is a good bill. We heard from the Office of Labor Standards about their plans for enforcement and their plans to keep us in the loop if they do think that it will cost additional money in order for them to do more enforcement. So I'm proud to support this one today. Thank very much, Councilwoman Johnson. Councilman Herbo, thank you. I'm just taking a look at the fiscal note related to this legislation. And the fiscal note states that the legis

lation anticipates that the Seattle Department of Transportation will assist in education and outreach as part of the department's ongoing commute trip reduction program. And I'm thinking that it might make sense. To. To think about ways that the Office of Labor Standards can help in the education piece, because I think they have they have ways of engaging with employers because we often rely on their work to do the education piece for for new labor laws that the that the city establishes. And they might have deeper tentacles out into the employer community than the. Commute trip. Reduction program. So I think that might be something that we want to talk about. Thank you, Councilman Herbold. Any further comments? We're ready to move forward. Heritage comes from a brand like The Closet. Thank you, Councilman Harold. I appreciate that idea. And I know one of the things we anticipate is in the the signage requirements, the posters that go up, that this will be added in the future. As to one of those other requirements and I think a robust dialog with Office Labor standards and to help figure out how we make sure that word gets out to be on folks who typically think about computer production. I also want to just say thanks to some of the advocates. The folks at the Trans Writers Union have been key in the work, in the research, to make sure that employer employees who work at smaller employers, where the vast majority of us all work, often don't have access to the same types of transit benefits that those who work at the larger employers. And so your research on this and your advocacy on this has really helped get us to where we are today. So thank you to the Transit Writers Union and so many other transit advocates who've been part of this throughout throughout the work. Thank you. Okay. Please call the roll on the passage of the Bill. Herbold II Johnson Suarez. Macheda O'Brien, Swan Bagshaw, Gonzales, President Harrell. I nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and shows sign it. Please read the next agenda item. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Please read the next agenda item. Please click 5314409 Memorandum of Understanding and Memorandum of Agreement Incorporated into the Collective Bargaining Agreement referenced in Council 119368. Appendix Appendix of Attachment one. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. I want to give credit to my staff, to Aldrich for recognizing that this was legislation that was brought forward to us that referred to other agreements that were incorporated by merit of voting on this legislation but weren't actually included in the legislation. I don't recall seeing that before. And so I thought it was really important after checking with the law department, that those were actually public documents, that they be included as part of the legislative record. I believe that they are important not only for transparency, but for public understanding of everything that the contract entails. Some of those ag

reements, I think, date back to 1992. I asked for and received the agreements. It's very awkward that we're being asked to vote on legislation that doesn't include all the relevant items. And I think it's also important to note that the inspector general's letter noted that five of the milieux that could have potential impacts on inspector general operations and that the OIG will track these issues. And so I request your support in approving this class clerk file. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold. Any comments from any of my colleagues on the Clark File? Thanks for sharing that with us this morning as well. Okay. I will move to file clerk file 314409. Second moved and seconded the clerk file be filed. Any further comments? Those in favor of filing the clerk file please vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The clerk file is placed on file. Please read the next agenda item. Thank you. Any

other comments? Those in favor of filing the clerk file. 314408. Please vote i. I. Those oppose vote no. The clerk file is filed. Please read agenda items 37 and 38 and the short title to please. 37 and 38. Constable 11937d relating to the levy your property taxes committee recommend civil pass cancel bill 119 371 authorizing the levy of regular property taxes by the solicitor for collection in 2019. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you very much. Any comments on either these council bills, these property tax issues? Okay. Please call the roll on council bill 119370. Gonzalez I. Herbold, i. Johnson Whereas mosquera i. O'Brien Hi, Sergeant Bagshaw. President Harrell I nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passes in show signage and please call the roll on the passage of council bill 119371. Gonzalez I. Herbold, I. Johnson Suarez Mosquito. Hi. O'Brien Sergeant Bagshaw, President Herald. Hi. Nine In favor and unopposed. The bill passes and then show signage. I think we've gotten through all of our subset of items. Did I deprive anyone of an opportunity to speak during the budget and any other matters, and has any further business come up with the council council members to watch? Thank you, President Hall. I asked to be excused from city council meeting on Monday, November 26th and Monday, December 3rd. What was the last one? I'm sorry. Customers from. November 26th. On December 3rd. December 3rd. Gotcha. Gotcha. It's been moved in second and the council members won't be excused on 1126 and 12 three. Any comments? All those in favor say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. She's excused. Councilmember Gonzalez. I move to be excused on Monday, December 3rd, and Monday, December 10th. Second. It's been moved in a second. That comes from Kazaa B excuse 12 three and 1210. Any comments? All those in favor say I. I opposed. The ayes have it. She's excused on the third and the 10th. Any other business go for the council. And just a little privilege here. Again, there's been many thanks to the center staff for all they've done in our own south. I just want to go say tha

nk you. Thank you. Thank you. We were we'll take a five minute break and then we'll go put our Parks Commission hats on in 5 minutes or that we stand adjourned and they're going to have a great afternoon. Agenda item three Clerk File 314346. Application of the University of Washington to prepare a new major institution master plan for the University of Washington Seattle campus at 4015 Avenue. Northeast Project Number 3023261 Type four. The committee recommends the application be granted as conditioned. It is basically the filing of the file clerk. The clerk file. Councilman Johnson, you want to say any more. About it now? I just moved to Grant as conditioned clerk file three one, four, three, four, six. So let me say it a little different way. Thank you. Those in favor of granting the application. Please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries, the application is granted. And the chair was saying the findings, conclusions and decision of the city council. So please call the next next agenda item into the record. Let's go forth through six please. Agenda items, four through six appointments 1194 through 1196, three appointments of David L, David A Goldberg, Richard E Mohler and Julio Sanchez as members Seattle Planning Commission for terms to April 15th, 2021 2021. The committee recommends the appointments be confirmed. Bill passes and chair of the Senate. Please read agenda item number three. You can shorten the title if you like. Agenda item three Council Bill 119425 An ordinance authorizing in 2018 acceptance of funding from non city sources. The committee recommends the bill pass. Okay. Cast member. We believe we'll have an amendment at some point. Yes, we do. And I will look forward to talking about that and try to address it a little bit before we get there. So this fourth grant acceptance ordinance authorizes our city departments to accept 45 grants that total approximately \$12 million from external sources to support a range of purposes, as well as a \$25 million loan for the Seattle Public Utilities ship canal water quality projects. We have in our materials in front of us a long list of those grants and the various loans. There's also one item here that was a concern to the committee, and we reached out to Councilmember Gonzales, his office. This is a grant from ICE, from the Immigrations and Customs Enforcement. All of us sort of sat up straight when we saw this. What it is, is a reimbursement to Seattle Police Department. Again, it's a reimbursement for overtime that's associated with investigations related to narcotics, money and other contraband at ports and borders. There is no nexus in this grant to immigration. It is a pass through. What? When I asked further questions from CBO, our Budget Office, the majority of reimbursable hours for the Homeland Security Investigations Task Force were spent on narcotics related criminal investigations. As coordination and cooperation with this task force is limited to the investiga

tion of criminal activities and never involved immigration enforcement. All task force activities are conducted in compliance with CPD policy 6.020, which says that SPD employees will not initiate, maintain or participate in any police action based on the individual's immigration status. So I want to say thank you to central staff and thank you to our Budget Office for confirming that. And with that, I'm going to entertain the amendment. I believe. Customer. Herbold Thank you. I would like to propose an amendment that does two items. The first is related to what I raised as a concern in council briefings this morning, and that's an amendment to make clear that in the Lohmann Beach Seawall Removal Project that the city will consider potential mitigation measures associated with concerns about impacts about the removal of the city's seawall wall and whether or not that might impact the condition of the private seawalls abutting the city seawall. The second item was identified this morning completely unrelated to that issue. It's just a small technical error correcting a reference to the fourth quarter supplemental in the bill. They're second a second them. Okay. So any questions on the basically a substitute version? Councilmember Gonzales. Thank you. Council President I know. Question I just want to remark that I'm going to vote in favor of this amendment, but I will I intend to vote no on the underlying bill. And before we call the underlying bill up for a vote, I'd like to have an opportunity to say. Very good. Okay. So we have an amendment in front of us right now, which is basically substituting version two for version D, one C, as my notes would suggest. Okay. Any questions on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment. Please vote. I oppose. The ayes have it. So now I have an amended piece of legislation as you want to speak to it. Councilman. Back shore. Or. No, I know. I'm I'm finished. Something that we just need to move forward with to accept these grants. But I respect that Councilmember Gonzalez has something she'd like to say. Very good, Councilman Gonzales. Thank you. I will make this really quick. It's very rare that I would vote no to reject money that is coming to us. But I feel really strongly that I can't vote in favor of accepting a grant from from ICE, which is the overarching agency that does engage in immigration enforcement, that leads to the incarceration and detention and inhumane practice of deporting and separating families in our country. And while I recognize that there are values added in terms of Homeland Security Investigations Unit to the issues related to public safety that are really important, I think that I still continue to have a lot of concerns about how HCA bleeds into some areas of immigration enforcement . And in fact, if you go to their Web page and look at their different divisions that they have, one includes a description of what is referred to as the Joint Intelligence Operation Center, whic

h again is housed under H as I and as part of the overarching work of this particular division of ICE that squarely focuses on, quote , partnering with ICE to vigilantly enforce the nation's immigrant immigration and customs laws. Given my very strong position on continuing to be a welcoming city and on my ongoing concerns that while I recognize that US PD feels that they need to partner in limited circumstances with HSA, I cannot support ongoing partnership until I know more about the full breadth of how our department engages with HSA and have continued to have questions about that now and have had questions about that partnership in the past and just cannot accept it, can't vote yes in favor of these particular this particular grant. Okay. Any other comments? If not, please call the role on the passage of Council 119425 as amended. O'BRIEN Make sure I. GONZALEZ No. HERBOLD No. JOHNSON. All right. President Herrell I. Three in favor, two opposed. Therefore in favor to oppose. Or so the bill passes. Fails. If the bill fails and chair will not sign. So. Okay. So how many knows how many yeses to. Support or to. Show that's not a you. Know. So get Deborah on the phone. Well, is there a way to amend the bill to strip out that one thing and consider that at a later date? Yeah. So what I'll have to do is not do anything on the fly, and we'll move to the next agenda item and we'll figure out what our. Okay. So I could make a motion to reconsider. Okay. So I've been told by the clerk, thank you for that, that I can make a motion to reconsider it on a date certain and that date certain to be January 7th. And if the motion passes, the bill still failed today, but we have the right to reconsider it on the seventh. Okay, so I'll make the motion and I'll explain it again. Can we just talk about that other option that was mentioned rather than just bringing it back, bringing it back without. Concern or worse? No, bringing about without that grant acceptance. So I was half listening to that since I was blindside. So what was the other suggestion that I didn't catch? Amending the legislation. Or amending the legislation just to pull out the. That was like 95,000 or something like that. I see. The bill failed. So. So I'll ask the clerk. Can we. The bill failed. How do I amend a failed bill. When folks would have to move to reconsider and. So we could reconsider it today? Yeah. Just one of the issues. Will we have time to go through the legal process as we would

for any amendment? Okay. Very good for you and your A-game today, Joe. So we're going to what what's. What we could do is move to reconsider to the end of today's agenda. And perhaps law can give us that some input on whether we can pull that piece out of it. It's as simple as that. So we also we also have a good. Course of action. Well, that's not that that's not process. Okay. So let. Me ask a quick. Question. Yes, you may. Does the removal of this particular grant impact the title of the bill as introd

uced? I don't know. I haven't read the bill in total. Well, I don't know either, but I would think not, but. Well, let me. Why are you asking? Well, because the title includes a reference to grants being accepted by the Seattle Police Department. If this is the only grant being accepted by the Seattle. So. Then that would be a bill title change and could not be reconsidered and amended version of it cannot be reconsidered today. We do have other grants by the Seattle Police Department that are being that are included in this. So there's one. Can you talk into the microphone to the audience? I know we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. We've got nine grants so that if we remove the 90,000 from the police department, there's still would be eight. That would be included for the police department. Council President. Yes. I would maybe suggest we suspend the rules and let central staff come to the microphone just to give us some clarity for a second. And then that will help us decide on clarity. Clarity on what? Councilmember O'Brien. To your question about could we amend the bill today to remove that both the technical question and is there simply enough time to do that? But we need to put it off at. Know if that's something central staff can answer. That was my point, Ari, but that's fine. Why don't we why don't we suspend the rules just a little and put and if there's if you are, I'm going to move to suspend the rules to here unless there's any objection. If you come to the microphone and if you still need some time, that would help us. And perhaps you should consider this motion to reconsider toward the end of the meeting. So go ahead and always identify yourself. Thank you. Hello. I'm Eric, son of your council central staff adjusting to my new location. So there are other grants, as indicated, that are being awarded or would be approved in this ordinance. The removal of the one item is something that that technically, I believe we could accomplish within a relatively short time frame. I don't know exactly how long you expect the remainder of the meetings business to take, but I. But. There's interest on the part of the council I will go and begin working on on a different version. It's a matter of a mission which is easier than a matter of additions. Well, okay, any other questions? So what we'll try to do? Well, I'm going to suggest a motion to reconsider by the end of the meeting. If we are not finished and I'll look at what our options are, whether we'll consider it another day. I don't know if it's so time sensitive. We can't do it in January. I just don't know. And the acceptance of months, perhaps it is. I would just say that the Budget Office has suggested that we need this money to spend before the end of the year from grants. And I would recommend that we move forward. And to the extent that we can just withdraw that \$90,000. Grant, I. Wasn't suggesting we don't do that. I would just suggesting that if we don't have it finishe

d by the end of this agenda, we just can't sit here and look at each other for 20 minutes. And so I was going to say, let's revisit it then. And perhaps you could find the my guess would be dealing with the federal government that two or three weeks is going to make a huge amount of difference. But just clarify it if we have to do. It today might be closed for a week. So I just want to add that the this the particular funding that I am taking issue with that is a grant from HSA, but that's a reimbursement. Those dollars have already been spent. But I think that council members have expressed concern about either spending or reimbursement of the other items that are listed in the summary that are attached to the Council bill, which again, I don't oppose those other grant acceptances. I just have issue with this one. So so if I may, what I believe Councilmember Bagshaw was speaking to is that, you know, there are a number of appropriations in the supplemental ordinance that you just acted on that are backed by other grants. And so today, I think the question is not necessarily so much of the amount of time that is available to the city, to the council to approve the acceptance of the grants eventually. But the appropriations that are in the fourth quarter supplemental that are backed by those grants are contingent upon the acceptance of the grants. And so what would be the issue potentially is not having those appropriations for the 2018 budget in 2018. On the other items. I don't understand what you just said. Actually, I do. And so if I can try this one more time that we have a supplemental budget and the reason why Councilmember Suarez and again, thank you Councilmember Juarez for voting with us on that was that we had to

be able to pass that out today to be able to make payments before the end of 2018 . And the grants will assist us in making those payments, some as general fund and some where we're backed by these grants. So if we can today take out exclude 1.37, which is the reimbursement for the police department and be able to remove that and then vote for all of the other grants. That would be much appreciated by our CBO and the mayor's office in particular, who have signed these bills. Well-spoken. Okay. Well, at the risk of. The the night. How much money is that? \$99,000. Right. The exact amounts of the \$90,000. It may very well not be approved by our action today. Are we keeping alive the possibility to still get it through our actions if we reconsider it? Because while I respect Council Member Gonzalez's principal position on this, I may not share it if it's reimbursement for moneys that we of work we've already done. So I want to make sure that at least we could preserve I could preserve my argument to get that reimbursement, because that 9000 is going to have to come from somewhere. And I may just cut in some other central services. So the the appropriations the grant backed appropriations in the supplemental are contingent upon the

acceptance of the grants. And so so that's the first issue. But the approval of removing some of the grants and being silent on another grant would not, in and of itself constitute a rejection of that one grant. Now, I don't know enough about the background of the particular \$90,000 grant to know what time by when it must be its acceptance must be approved. There may be more time to accept that. But what? But the approving the receipt of the other grant moneys would not affect that question. Okay. Let me just just one minute. The there was one suggestion that got lost in the shuffle about ad and councilmember war on here. And I'm just going to see from a practical standpoint whether she's still following the information or not. Councilmember words, are you still on the line? She is not. So I think I lost that possibility as well. Okay. Just wanted someone to make that suggestion. So. So. Okay, so let's do this. Um, I'm going to make a motion that we reconsider. Council Bill 119425 as amended, reconsidered at the end of today's agenda during the adoption of other legislation section second. Okay. Any discussion on that? All those in favor say I. I opposed. The ayes have it. So we will reconsider the end of today's agenda. President Herrell Yes, we are reconsidering it at the end of today's agenda for the purposes of amending it or proposing an amendment to remove the 95,000 or having a vote with an additional council member on the existing. Good question. Both. That's why I stated what I was going to do during the other members was also see whether council member, whereas could be available and also see whether we can just take that out. Because what if they come back and say you just can't take it out? I don't know. So I made it vague to reconsider, to pursue all options. We're just reconsidering it. So we've got something here. What do you got? Well, let's. Can we just go two years worth of action here. So let's. Go. The president. Yes. I appreciate that clarity, and I appreciate the question. Sorry. So the grant acceptance ordinance does not require a supermajority, unlike the supplemental. That was all I want to point out. But. But it requires a majority. And she would have been very shy. So I didn't suggest we need we had 42 so it'd be five two if she'd voted in favor. It could be for three for all I know. I don't know. Might be twice. Oh, really? I'm sorry. Okay. Very good. So. Okay, so. Talk to council president because remember, I appreciate flexibility with this, and I. I appreciate the move to reconsider. There would need to be a vote again to add another council member who's not present, I believe. And so I think that's an open discussion for me. I'm I'm a little uncomfortable with us moving back and forth here on this. And so I. Well, I'm uncomfortable with not having this during the briefing discussion where we could have prepared our agenda a little better. Understood. I mean, I to be fair, I did advise Councilmember Backchannels O

ffice this morning that I was going to have this position. So I. Know. But that's just my, my, my one vote. I understand it. Okay. That's probably not possible. Not knowing the possibilities, I tried to preserve all the possibilities. So that looks like Councilman Wirtz may not be available anyway. Okay, that's a lot of fun. So let me just be clear what we're trying to do. We are going to move on with the agenda. At the end of our agenda, we will revisit Council Bill 119425 as amended. We may not vote on it, we may vote on it, but we'll just have it. We'll decide at that point. But we've preserved our right to make that decision at the end. Okay. Okay. So let's move on to agenda item number four. Okay. Agenda item for Council Bill 119429 An ordinance relating to fees charged by the Seattle Animal Shelter and amending Chapter nine point to six of the Seattle Municipal Code to make technical corrections. The committee recommends the bill pass. Agenda item six Council Bill 119418 An Ordinance relating to Historic Preservation Imposing controls upon the Japanese

Language School, a landmark designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board under Chapter 25.12 of the Seattle Municipal Code, and adding it to the table of historical landmarks contained in Chapter 25.32 of the Seattle Municipal Code. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. The Japanese language school is located at South Weller Street, just off Rainier. The three buildings of the school were built between 1912 and 1929, and the neighborhood was historically a residential area for the Seattle's immigrant and Japanese-American population. From 1900 to the end of World War Two, it currently houses the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington. And this is recommended to have the historic landmark status applied to it because of its status in the community and just the the location and the significant manner in which it has contributed to the community. Any questions or comments that I make? I'll make one comment. That is, during the discussion of the committee table, I thanked the presenters and the Japanese Language School for doing such a fascinating historical write up on both why the school was founded, the decades of work that were put into it, the role it played before and after internment. And again, it's just a fascinating read and a body of work that the community put together and look forward to supporting this. Thank you. Thank you for mentioning that. It was just especially well-written. We commented at the table and appreciated all of the investment of time and energy in it. No comments please. Called the role on the passage of the Bill. O'Brien by Bagshaw High. Gonzalez I Herbold I Johnson President Harrell I six in favor and unopposed the. Bill passed in show Senate. Please read agenda item number seven. Agenda Item number seven Council Bill 119422 An Ordinance relating to historic preservation, imposing controls upon the Idris nurse's home, a landmark design

nated by the Landmarks Preservation Board under Chapter 25.12 of the Seattle Municipal Code, and adding it to the table of historical landmarks contained in Chapter 25.32 of the Seattle Municipal Code. Bill passes in the chair will sign it. Please read the report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. The Report on Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. Agenda Item two Resolution 318 61 Recognizing the harms that evictions from housing have on tenants and marginalized communities, and describing the City Council's plan to help avoid and mitigate those harms. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted. In Councilmember Herbert's absence. Councilmember O'Brien, you have the floor. Thank you. Colleagues are going to take a few minutes to walk through some of the background of here of the work on this resolution and also highlight what comes next. I want to start by thanking Councilmember Herbold for her leadership in working on this through the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee. Back in September, we heard a report from the Seattle Women's Commission entitled Losing Home. You probably folks and you're probably familiar with that has been reported on in numerous times. The report included a review of all 1218 evictions, residential evictions, actions filed in Seattle in the year 2017. In addition, it did some studies. I also surveyed and interviewed tenants and interviewed homeless prevention providers cross rents, cross-referenced evictions with medical examiner records, and also cross-referenced with housing code violations. There are a number of findings in this report, and I want to touch on just a few of these findings. One of them was that single tenant households that faced eviction for \$100 or less in back rent. Of those, 81% of those single households were women. If you're black, there was a 4.5% sorry, 4.5 times likelihood that you would face eviction than if you were white. People of color were more likely to be evicted for smaller amounts of money than white households. Of the over 1000 evictions, 86% were for nonpayment of rent. 52% of those were for less than one month's worth of rent. Attorney's fees were charged attendance in 90% of the cases and court costs were charged and over 92% of the cases. Those charges averaged just over \$400 for attorney's fees and just under \$400 for court costs. A Federal Reserve report found that 40% of Americans could not come up with \$400 in the event of an emergency. When you listen to just these facts and there's a number of other findings, it should come as no surprise that the burden of evictions, often for very small amounts. And we didn't even go into some details of the reasons of these forward and the reality, financial reality that so many folks face, that it's clear that the eviction process in our city is broken. And it leads to a significant number of folks who go through eviction, facing home

lessness, post eviction. Only 12.5% of evicted respondents found another rental. Over 37% were completely unsheltered. 25% were living in a shelter or transitional housing, and 25% ended up staying with family or friends. If we want to address our homeless crisis, there's really no way we

can do that without also addressing the eviction crisis we're facing. This is not the first time that this council has taken up issues around eviction. Want to touch on a few of those? There was a number of statement of legislative attempts and green sheets that we passed in the past few years. Example Preventing evictions for substandard properties and creating a legal path for tenants to enforce their rights in court. We've passed green sheets, increasing coordinated funds for legal defense and tenant outreach funds. Recommended process for centralizing for obtaining assistance in one place, but without fundamental reform to the eviction process, will continue to see some of the challenges we facing. This resolution alone is not going to solve this crisis, but it lays out a path and a framework following on recommendations from the Women's Commission report that the city can take if we want to reduce this crisis. I'm going to touch on a couple of the next steps that are that we believe we can accomplish in the relatively near term, and that this resolution lays out the groundwork for us to move forward on some of those. One is to address financial hardship for tenancies piercing domestic violence, who often are held liable for damages caused by the perpetrator. We can address the lack of flexibility to avoid eviction when faced with emergencies. Hope to address high default rates for evictions arising from not understanding the eviction process or mutual termination agreements, which are often entered into in a one sided nature where the tenant doesn't understand their rights and responsibilities and what resources may be available to avoid eviction hardship for paying rent from an additional burden on top of late payments for rent, that late fees, court costs and attorney's fees compound and make it almost impossible for many folks to recover from late payment . Also, the courts generally have not have the flexibility to exercise judicial discretion to prevent evictions. We heard in public testimony today of a woman in South Carolina who was in the hospital and so was unable to make payment in our state. She would have three days to pay or vacate. And the reality that someone who was in a hospital would be able to respond to that in any meaningful way is almost nil resulting likely resulting in our system in an eviction. Whereas in other jurisdictions there's at least a path where family members or advocates can show up in court, explain the circumstances to a judge in a judge could say, under these circumstances, I'm not going to proceed with this. Rarely do we see that flexibility in our system. Colleagues, I ask for your support on this resolution. I want

to thank the Seattle Women's Commission for their work on making this happen, bringing forward and highlighting this, and recognize that there's a lot of work in front of us. And I want to thank folks in Olympia who are also taking this seriously, in large part because of the work that our Women's Commission did, to highlight some of the the circumstances that we face. This is not just, of course, in Seattle, but it's happening throughout the region. I believe Piers King in Sandwich County account for about half of the evictions in Washington State. And so we were able to address this just in the central Puget Sound region. It would go a long way to helping the people of the entire state. Thank you. Thank you, Catherine and Brian Catherine back show. Thank you. Councilmember Brian, I certainly support your work here. Thank you for you and Councilmember Herbold and Swann for the work you've done in your committee. Can you tell me when you said that you're working with Olympia, what actions are are being taken? Is there legislation that's introduced now? And who are the key sponsors? The there are multiple pieces of legislation that are in play in Olympia right now, and I am not going to be able to speak at length to the details of them. The current state law has a three day paid vacation and is there bills that would both allow 14 or 21 days? I believe Representative Macri is supporting legislation that would extend it to 21 days, but there's a Republican sponsored bill that would be 14 days. But I would suggest that that at our next briefing, when we have our offer. Office of Immigrant Relations for them to speak to the variety of bills that are down there. Senator Krueger is also working on a series of bills about eviction. I think what I will say at the high level, Councilmember Bagshaw, is what's really apparent in Olympia this year is there's bipartisan support to address this crisis around evictions. And and so regardless of what community you're coming from, people are seeing this as a real problem. And, well, I know advocates have been working on this for years. It appears that there is a higher likelihood this session that we might see some traction on it. That doesn't relieve the city from doing some work, too, because there's a role for us to play. And the legislation that Councilmember Herbold has led on this resolution, I think helps lay out those next steps, too. Very good. Any further comments? Councilmember Mosquito. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I just wanted to take a quick second to thank Councilmember Herbold and Swan O'Brien. Everybody who's had a hand in this legislation in Washington can so choose, right. We here in Seattle are embarrassingly behind

where other cities and states are in terms of the eviction policy. I also wanted to take a quick second to thank the Seattle Women's Commission, the Housing Justice Project, for all of the work that they put into the losing home report. The eviction process and the landlord

tenant law here is at best complex. And I think, as we've heard today, as truly unjust in terms of clarity, we lack clarity for landlords. We also lack clarity for tenants. And having the opportunity to clarify this, to create a more just system to work with tenants and advocates in the courts to find the path forward, not only as the process that will result for better clarification for all parties, but will help us continue the work of what we heard just two weeks ago on the Select Committee, that we need to do a much better job to provide easier and quicker assistance to prevent individuals from being evicted. If an individual calls and they said they need \$200 and they need \$400 just to get through the next few months, don't make them go through a rigorous process. Just allow them to be the best managers of their situation and help them get through that tough period so that they don't get evicted. This is what the experts are telling us from across the country, and it's what the experts on the ground level have been saying for so long. I'm really excited to work on this. We also know that this, in conjunction with additional tenant protections and building housing, is really the solution that goes hand in hand. We know that housing discrimination and risk of eviction increases when there is not enough affordable housing, when there is low vacancies, and when we don't have enough affordable units for those in need. So as we work to build additional housing, I'm really excited that we are going to be able to begin the process of legislating this intentional work around protecting our tenants. Thank you, Casper Mosquito Council members who want. Thank you, President Harrell. I would urge those of us who haven't been able to look at it yet to watch the really important testimony that was given during the public comment section of the committee last week when government was horrible, the brain injury. When we voted this resolution out of the committee and I really hope everybody will be voting yes on this resolution in preparation for the ordinances that need to come following this. Some of you may have also read the study conducted by a commission by the Seattle Women's Commission with the support of trans rights activists from the Washington Community Action Network. And of course, most importantly, the Housing Justice Project. This is you know, I don't often recommend, you know, that people read greetings, but this is actually very, very useful because it has statistical information on how bad the crisis is. And it is not a small thing. It is and it is something that is happening citywide. And we know that most people who are affected in Seattle do not even have a lawyer present. And in fact, these numbers are based on people who went to court. We know that statistically speaking, there are a lot more who didn't go to court because they don't have the resources or the time or the support social support structure to go and challenges in court.

So clearly, this is a very important issue. I'm really happy that to the people's budget movement last year we were able to win city funding for the first, first ever city funding for of eviction, you know, for for attorneys to help with renters who are facing eviction. But that is far from enough. We need much more than that. And we know also the terrible impacts of eviction, the renters. And that's where this report is also very useful. Not only do evictions affect people's health stress, I mean, people have, you know, really compelling stories of how it affects their life long held because of the stress that they go through, how it affects their children and their future housing prospects, because it follows you everywhere you go. And we also know that deadly connection now that has been established between evictions and homelessness and even death in some cases, and not all. And, you know, last but not least, a connection between race and other issues that people face, other oppression that people face, and the likelihood of being evicted, likelihood of facing homelessness. And just to look at the numbers on average, and this study shows us this in 2017, there were almost three evictions every day in Seattle and in District three, which has Capitol Hill, the Central District, many working people living in the district. Evictions happen more than once every two days. So these are just stark numbers we are looking at for a city like Seattle. And as was stated by other, you know, renters in other states actually have many rights and eviction court and Washington state is lagging like far, far behind. So obviously, I will be supporting this resolution. But most importantly, I think renters need to continue to get organized to make sure the ordinances that are developed following the resolution also get passed. And as part of organizing, I would really urge everybody who is watching this to join my office by Seattle and Tenants Union of Washington State in the number of boot camps, renters rights bootcamps that we're having. Just this past Saturday, we had

a boot camp at Vermillion and on Capitol Hill, and we had a number of renters come there not only to learn about their rights and the specific questions they had. And there's some horror stories with corporate landlords, but also how to get organized. In fact, there was a point where one of the people who was attending there said, hey, when are we going to talk about organizing? Which is, you know, very, very it's really it's really gratifying to see that renters are realizing that this is something that they need to get organized around. So just very quickly, I wanted to say that in the Central District will be having another renters rights bootcamp on Thursday, February 7th, at 630 at the Garfield Community Center. We're having two renters rights boot camps in the University District one on February 9th, which is a Saturday at 10 a.m., and on February 13th on at 6 p.m., which is a weekday.

And you can find all this information by contacting my office. And we are also hosting a special renters rights boot camp that will focus on LGBTQ questions and how LGBTQ renters can get organized. That will be on Capitol Hill on March 6th. I think I might be getting the date wrong, but it will be at the Wildrose Bar on Capitol Hill. So please join us and let's get organized. Thank you, Councilman Swann. Okay. Any further comments or questions? Okay, let's take it to a vote. Those in favor of adopting the resolution. Please vote i i those opposed vote no. The motion carries the resolutions adopted. Cheryl, sign it. That's all. If you're watching that closes for you two, particularly for you, please read the next agenda item into the record. Agenda item four cancel bill 119 456 Granting National Railroad Passenger Corporation permission to construct, maintain and operate below grade utility lines under an across South Vulgate street, east Occidental Avenue, south and west of Third Avenue South, specifying the conditions under which the permit is granted and providing for the acceptance of the permit and Conditions Committee. Recommend to Bill Pass. Because member Brian. Thank you. So that organization is also known as Amtrak and they are going to have three conduits the passenger Holgate this is for both storm water, sewer, I should say, and electrical. It will allow their facility there to use more electric power for these for the engines when they're idling, as opposed to using their diesel engines and also better treatment of stormwater and wastewater off the site. The the council passed a conceptual approval of this a few months ago. It is now been through a more thorough review with the departments and there are no conflicts. So they're back with this final action, the permit fee. There will be an annual permit fee for 2019. It's a little over \$2,000. Thank you, Councilman Bryan. Any further comments or questions? Harrington Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Johnson I Juarez. I must give up. O'Brien I want. A. Back shot. Gonzalez, I and President Harrell in favor and unopposed. Bill passed and chair of Senate. That concludes our agenda. Is there any further business coming for the council? I saw two hands, councilmember mosquito and then commercial one. Okay. Thank you, Mr. President. I have some handouts too, so I would like to pass out for my colleagues, if I might. Mr. President, I know this is a little unusual, but I wanted to make sure that folks had on the record and in had the opportunity to celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Seattle general strike . We have also our archivist from Seattle City Council, and the Ledger Department has brought down the archive materials that are outside in the lobby here for folks to take a look at. This is celebrating this week. 100 years ago began the Seattle general strike where for multiple days people came together across sectors and across industries to stand in solidarity. We

have the opportunity this week to highlight not only labor history, but everything that Labor continues to do to stand up for working families, to organize new unions and new sectors, and to make sure that more working families have the opportunity to help provide for their families, even if they're not in union jobs. And the unions have been fighting for paid family leave, paid sick leave, raising the minimum wage, doing things that support not just union workers, but also the workers at large. So as we celebrate this year in 100 year anniversary celebration of the Seattle general strike, I wanted to make sure that folks knew that in our committee this Thursday, we will have the opportunity to hear from the University of Washington labor professors and report on the state of labor from the new Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO President Brown and Executive Secretary from the Martin Luther King County Central Labor Council, Nicole Grant. This continues the tradition in my committee of having a state of Labor presentation at the beginning of every month. So we encourage folks to come if they can, on Thursday in 930 in the committee housing, health, energy and Workers Rights. I've also just mailed to the full council and will make available online as well the full list of activities happening throughout the week. For example, there is a

presentation tonight on the Seattle general strike from James Gregory, who provided a literature review of the Seattle general strike tomorrow, Wednesday, the sixth. There is a 1919 Seattle General Strike Discussion group. We will also have the opportunity to on Thursday, not only my committee but to participate in the Witness to Revolution, the story of Anna Louise Strong, a film that presents at 6 p.m. at the Museum of History and Industry. And lastly, there will be a Seattle general strike bus tour that I will be on and would love to see any of my colleagues or friends from the community there. That begins at the Seattle Labor Temple at 930 and will take us around the community and it will end with an event and celebration, additional history and more information. We can't get enough of our history as we think about organizing for the future. On Saturday at 1 p.m. at the Seattle Labor Temple on First Avenue. So I wanted to make sure folks have that. Mr. President, I'm sorry. I would have shared that this morning. I know we were all on our way into work various times due to the snow, but it's a really exciting week. And I also want to thank the archivist and Monica's team who brought down the materials for us to take a look at. Please do check it out when you have the chance. Thank you. Customer, said a customer. And whereas. I just. Remembered I need to be excused for. This coming Monday, February 11th. Before I. Went, I. Mean that before I moved that. Were there any comments on Councilmember Skater's information? She shared. I want to make sure we closed loop. Thank you, Kathryn Mosquito

for that. February seven, 937 City Hall. Got it. So Councilmember Wes is moved or has moved to be excused for February 11th. Is there a second? All those in favor say I. I oppose. The ayes have it. Thank you. That Councilmember. Where's Councilmember Swan? Thank you. I have two things to bring up. One is the the next meeting of the Human Services renters, right. An equitable development committee will be held on Tuesday, February at 6 p.m.. That is February 12th, and that is the meeting at which we will take up the resolution that is recommending an approach, an inclusive and transparent approach for the appointment of the director of the Human Services Department. So that's Tuesday, February 12. That's 6 p.m.. And if I might go ahead. That a special that's a special meeting at 6 p.m.. It is, yeah. I mean it was the regular day, but we're just moving the time because we have heard repeatedly from community members that the be after. Hours got it. And then if I might move to the next item, I would like to be excused from the City Council meeting on Monday, February 18th. Reality is it's been moved to saying that councilmembers won't be excused on February 18th. Is it a Tuesday. The Tuesday because of the three day weekend? So the 18th, right number, it'll be 19. Okay. Well, then I don't need to be. Okay, so show us. Well, we didn't move it, so. Okay, so 18th is good. Okay. Any further business cut for the council? If notwithstanding adjourn and everyone try to have a great rest of afternoon with this weather. The report of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee Agenda. Item eight Cancel 119 434 relating to appropriations to the Dolores Multimodal Module Sees Me Corridor Project Committee recommends the bill passes amended. Councilmember Bryan. Thank you. This is fairly straightforward. This is something we looked at in the budget last year and we placed a proviso on there continue the design work beyond this 30% threshold until we heard back and we wanted to ensure that they were doing good work on community engagement. We had a great report in committee. Also heard public comment from community members that they really appreciate the engagement and some of the design changes and we still have a ways to go in design to lifting the proviso allow them to get to the next phase before we proceed to a vote. I know my colleague, Councilmember Herbold, has an amendment to propose which I support, and so I handed over to her. But thank you so much. I move to amend Council Bill 11 9434, Section two, as presented on version two of Amendment one, which was distributed at this meeting. Seconded. Moved and seconded to amend Council Bill 119434 by amending Section two, just section two, correct? Yes. Are there any comments? I'll let you go ahead. Thank you. I just like to speak to the amendment very quickly. As Councilmember O'Brien said, the public has been very complimentary of Ascot efforts to do civic engagement and to address the issues, the multi

-modal issues surrounding this project. This amendment adds that the council anticipates that escort will continue to evaluate issues identified by the community and notes in its presentation to the Sustainability and Transportation Committee last week as work escort is evaluating plus specifically improvements to the 26th Avenue Greenway. It also references work that needs to be done with Seattle Public Utilities to ensure that the design complies with the stormwater code. And finally, it references the need for a funding agreement with King County Metro in advance of

seeking appropriate appropriations for project construction. That's the final piece of legislation needed and that will be coming to us during the budget process this year. Thank you. Any more comments? All right. Those in favor of the amendment vote. I rise those votes. No, the ayes have it. The motion carries and the bill is amended. And then I will move to pass Council Bill 119434 as amended. It's been moved and seconded to pass Council Bill 119434 as amended. Councilman O'Brien, do you want to. Oh, good. Okay, I like that. Oh, good. Okay, so I said it. Oh, thank you. Oh, I was looking at the wrong it was looking at the wrong note here. All right. All those in favor. I, I recall that calling for the. Oh, yeah. Thank you. Yeah. Roll call, sergeant, I. Alexa. Hi, Gonzales. Herbold. Hi. Johnson O'Brian. President Suarez. High seven in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Let's read item nine into the record. Agenda item nine Cancel 119478. Amending Ordinance 125 724, which adopted the 2018 budget, including the 2018 three 2024 Capital Improvement Program. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. All. Thank you. This ordinance makes a number of technical corrections to our adopted 2019 budget and reconciles department and the CBO financial systems as CBO launches the new system that will help us have departments talking to each other more closely. It's going to increase appropriations for the 2019 budget by \$2,073,000. 2 million of this is a technical correction. It's not like we're changing the revenue, but it applied appropriation authority consistent with the council's adoption of Green Sheet. Ten Dash. Eight Dash. 8-1. So the remaining \$73,000 appropriation increase is going to be due to an accounting correction, and it's what they call a double appropriation. 75,000 is moved or 73,000 is moved from the General Fund to the Arts and Culture Fund associated with council budget actions. And then there's a \$2,000 decrease in funding from Parks Project, which was all part of the executive's \$10 million funding swap. So we move adoption of Council Bill 119478. Very good. Any questions or comments about please call the role on the passage of the bill. Make sure. Hi Gonzalez Herbold. Johnson Suarez, Mr. O'Brien, so on. President Harrell Hi. My name favorite unopposed. Bill passed and chair of Senate. Please read the short trailer the next urgent ite

m. Very good. Any questions or comments? Okay. Those in favor of adopting the resolution. Please vote I II Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the resolutions adopted in chair. Simon, please read the report of the full City Council. Report The City Council Agenda Item 12 Resolution 318 68 relating to the City Council confirmation and reconfirmation of City Department heads, describing the steps that the City Council intends to follow, outlining materials that should be submitted to the City Council prior to and as part of the nomination. Describing general criteria that the Council intends to consider when evaluating the search process for an appointment and department head candidates and superseding Resolution 30962. Customer. I am a skater. Thank you, Mr. President. I I'd like to move to adopt resolution 31868. Second. Moved in second. Would you like to speak to it? Yes. Before I do, Mr. President, I'd like to actually amend Resolution 31868 by substituting version nine for version four B, which has been handed out. And the move to amend it as described by council members. Get any questions just on the amendment? All those in favor of the amendment, please vote. I oppose vote no. Okay. The resolution has been amended. Mr. President, I just want to double check with the clerk. Do I need to say for a. Because I said Formby. So you were substituting for virgin. Virgin here. Okay. Thank you, Mr. President. I think we did that correctly. Let me get back on my script here. I'd also like to request the council rules be suspended to allow consideration of an additional amendment to this resolution. The amendment has been distributed, but was sent after noon deadline. So this is a formality. So just one moment here. So. You know, punch drunk this time of the day. So. So should we suspend the rules? Okay, let's suspend the rules. Have no objection to have some explanation of what we're trying to do here with this resolution. And. That. I'm sorry. So just for the viewing public, the the some of the language would did not meet our 12:00 deadline. And we are suspending that rule if there's no objection to allow for the consideration of that language. That did not meet our 12:00 deadline. And so councilmember skater, perhaps you could talk about what we're trying to do with this amendment. Thank you, Mr. President. As you will see in Amendment one that's been handed out, there are literally nine additional words that we're adding. We're just including the words the city of Seattle in front of employees. And we're including language that says with other relevant information, such as. And this is just clarifying language, a small technical change that was helpful for the readers perspective. And we thought that it was a helpful amendment from the team providing feedback. Very good. Do you want me to speak to the underlying bill? Yes. Why don't you speak to. It's. It's

actually. Okay. So let's adopt the amendment first. Let's do that. Okay, let's adopt

the amendments so that the amendment has been described. All those in favor of adopting the amendment. Please vote. I, I. Those opposed vote no. Okay. The amendment is adopted. Go ahead, Councilwoman Mosquito. Thank you, Mr. President. As we discussed over the last two weeks, there's been a number of individuals that we've heard from that have come forward and really have brought up some legitimate concerns, questions, and asked us to consider the process that we're using at the city council level for considering potential nominations, thanks to council members who want for hosting a number of meetings where individuals have the chance to come forward and raise questions about process. It really underscored for a number of us on council the desire to make sure that moving forward there was a clear and robust understanding of what the council's expectations are when it comes to new nominees for leading our incredible departments. I want to reiterate what I've said over the last few weeks, that this is not a substitute or does not specifically pertain to the conversation regarding each of HST or Human Services Department. In fact, it is about a larger conversation, a desire to make sure that we have a clear and transparent process, that we clearly set out our understanding of what Council will consider and would desire to consider in evaluating nominees from the Executive for future department heads. The resolution in front of you formalizes a process and formalizes conversations that many council members in the executive expects when putting forward nominations. And it also concretize some of the desires that we've heard from Silence Breakers, from members of the labor unions who've been involved in conversations about how they want to have a seat at the table for new director discussions and includes ideas and feedback that we heard from members of the change team and other employees. As we evolve and our country evolves, we begin to understand best practices a little bit better. Traditionally, as we all know, having worked on the front line, managers are hired and they're put into place and employees are expected to serve those managers. But today, I think we're leading by example. We're showing that our best practice should include all parties at the table. It should include making sure that the manager and the selection process is inclusive of individuals who have a direct impact on the lives of individuals they serve and who they work with. The selection, confirmation and reconfirmation process that's outlined in this resolution affords the City Council and the public an opportunity to hear directly from the executive and the mayors in the future. Goals and visions for department heads as well as the desired qualifications, experiences, accomplishment, leadership concerns or other qualities that the department head needs to sort of outline for us, or that process should outline for us as the Council considers these nominations. The resolution

ion before us helps Council better understand the process that the mayor will use and the engagement sessions that will be held. And really specifically asked whether the racial equity toolkit and racial equity analysis was used and who had a seat at the table. I'm really excited that this has been drafted together. Again, I, you know, understand that our conversations are separate, but I think that the conversation that we have had in the past few months has really underscored the desire for a more transparent, inclusive and actually just a greater understanding of the background and the inclusion of folks at the table. So I'm excited that you see in front of you a few changes that came directly from council members and our community. If I may, Mr. President, I just want to read through for small changes. Please do council members get. In section one? A You will see. The amendment clarifies that this resolution outlines the council's expectations and sets forth a more collaborative process from the onset. Thank you, Council Member Herbold, for your work on that Section two highlights that we are desiring an assessment of the nominee's commitment to racial equity, as we all continue to underscore that the racial equity toolkit and our commitment to that is more than just words on a piece of paper. We want this to be a living document that we continue to see reiterated in every decision that the Council makes in Section three, and we add in a review of employee complaints resolved in the employee's favor. This is something that we really wanted to see highlighted from the Silence Breakers themselves, who said that we'd love to see if there was any concerns in the past, but also we wanted to include if any corrective action has been taken and the nominee has participated in various trainings. That would also be important. As we know, correction and corrective behavior is critical as well. In section five, we include sorry, excuse me. In Section five, we exclude the appointments and confirmations from a handful of departments. For example, Seattle Police Department, noting that we already have some processes and procedures

in place that are outlined in statute, and we have a certain procedure around those appointments that this resolution. Should not supersede. Thank you, Councilmember Gonzales, for raising that. So as you can tell, this resolution has been incredibly collaboratively drafted and right up to the last minute by including additional amendments. Thanks to all of you for your diligent work to get us amendments early. I know that we tried to include as many as possible. I want to thank Amelia for your work in helping to make sure that we had this on time. And Jeff Sims and my staff say for their work to get all the amendments in place are looking forward to concurrence on this. Thank you, Mayor. Thank you. Senator Mosquito. Any other. Quick. To your point, Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you. And Councilman Mosquito, thank you for listenin

g to everybody on this. I know you've picked up many of our recommendations and also work closely with the mayor's office. And I also acknowledged to the mayor that she wants to be able to do her work under the charter. We do our work. We got a lot to do here. But you set the tone saying what it is we're looking for. And I want to acknowledge that you have not at any point been in a position where you're telling the mayor what to do, but you're indicating that this is what we're looking at. We want to make sure that as somebody is selected, that we have an opportunity to get this information in advance. And your focus on racial equity is terrific. So thank you for all your work. Very good. Any other comments before we take the boat customers to watch. Thank you, President Harrell. I support this resolution which states expectations for an inclusive candidate surge for City of Seattle department directors in the future. It is obviously a response, as Councilmember Skinner said, to the shameful disregard the mayor showed Human Services employees and impacted communities, including vulnerable homeless community members themselves. When she nominated Jason Johnson to be the permanent director of the Human Services Department and then continued to systematically ignore the overwhelming voices that we were hearing. As a as has been acknowledged as resolution. This resolution is not about the current issue of the Human Services Director appointment and will do nothing to address that issue. And that's why it is important to point out that while this resolution is correct in many respects, it's about next time. And it does not provide an excuse for elected officials failing to represent their constituents this time. In the case of the current Human Services Director appointment, which has been quite controversial, this resolution makes many requests that I fully agree with about how the mayor should make appointments in the future. But the question that comes to mind is, does the mayor really need the council to recommend she talk to impacted communities before choosing an important department head? And that just seems obtuse on her part. If that is indeed the case, and what will council members do in the future if the mayor does not take into account the opinions of the impacted communities? Because at this moment the opinion, the views of the impacted communities are not being taken into account. So by passing this resolution, will council members do it in the future? And if they were going to do it in the future, then why don't they do it now? I mean, I have this entire logical conundrum in my brain that if council members are going to vote for this resolution for the future, then why wouldn't they do it at this moment? You know, I really think that this the community members should watch for this hypocrisy from council members who would all vote yes on this resolution about the future. And at the same time, prove that they have no interest in ac

tually following it because they are disregarding all of its principles when it becomes a concrete question, such as the Human Services Director appointment, and I should congratulate Council O'Brian and Mosquito for voting with me on the resolution that I brought forward, which said that the mayor should take this nomination back, which has been opposed by a significant proportion of the community and should really go through a search that will include race and social justice questions and include the impacted communities. So vote yes on this resolution. But ordinary people and city of Seattle employees who are watching this and who will be watching this later this week will have to speak up as courageously as the Human Services workers have spoken up in order to make sure that these resolutions are not simply in the abstract world, but are followed through by elected officials. Any of the comments on the resolution before we take a vote. Okay. So those in favor of adopting resolution 31868 as amended, please vote i. I those opposed vote no. The resolutions adopted in Charles Simon. Please read the next agenda item. For adoption of other resolutions. Agenda Item 13 Resolution 318 71 endorsing the final report and recommendations of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force. Councilmember Johnson. Final one, colleagues. This resolution

endorses about 18 months with the work that I was your designee for. The Regional Affordable Housing Task Force has some incredible statistics and incredible opportunities in there for us to contemplate room for improvement. But given that we're now on our three, I won't belabor you with those statistics and just ask you to take a read through. I will say it does set an ambitious goal of building 244,000 net new units of affordable housing by 2040, with the requisite share goal of 8800 units a year over the next five years. In order to meet our fair share of that goal, I believe that our action earlier today with mandatory housing affordability is one of the critical ways that we would continue to meet our fair share of that 8800 units per year goal. Similar resolutions are going to be adopted by the County and Sound Cities Association. What started as a sort of small but small idea to implement affordable housing targets in our comprehensive plans morphed into something bigger, bolder and better. So I encourage your support for Resolution 31871. Thank you, Catherine. Just and any comments or questions that I'll move this Catherine Mosquito. Thank you. I'm really proud to co-sponsor this with Councilmember Johnson. This resolution looks forward to future collaboration with our regional partners. We know that it's timely as well, given our conversations today on MHC. We applaud the incredible work it took to get to this point. But the boundaries of the city do not define the housing crisis in this region. And as we look for additional solutions and hopefully additional revenue as well as well, I'm looking forward t

o outlining what our local partners can do through the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations to make sure that other cities around this region pursue policy changes that achieve greater impacts by doing so in harmony with the city of Seattle. We are taking some important steps today, but in order for us to truly address this regional housing crisis, we needed a collab. We need a collaborative approach, collaborative approach to work on the solutions that can create the housing, the density and the affordability to truly create an inclusive region. Obviously, this is relying on not just funding from the state and federal partners, which at the federal level will most likely continue to not materialize. But we also need to look at smart land use, zoning and housing policies as were outlined in our legislative agenda to ensure local cities are working towards the same solution. So excited to co-sponsor this and look forward to future collaboration in our region. Thank you. Councilmember Macheda, any other comments before we take a vote? Really good. Okay. I'll have to move this. I move to adopt resolution 318716 of the resolution be adopted. Those in favor of adopting the resolution please vote. I oppose vote no. The motion carries and the resolution is adopted. The chair will sign it. Is there any further business to come before the Council? Councilmember Bagshaw. Thank you. I'd like to be excused on April 1st. Second is being moved and second that Councilmember Beck shall be excused on April 1st. Any comments? All those in favor say I opposed the ayes have it because our Sawant. I also move to be excused on April 1st. So it's been moved in segment Councilmember Swan be excused on April 1st. Any questions? All those in favor say I, I, all those opposed. No. Councilmember Swan is excused. She didn't answer. I would like to say before we adjourn, i want to thank councilmember suarez for your services. Pro-Tem president. We deeply appreciate it. And I heard you heard you were outstanding. So. Okay, it's been a long day. Everyone have a great rest of the afternoon and we stand adjourned. Thank you. Agenda item. Agenda item ten. Constable 119 479 Amending Ordinance 125 724, which adopted the 2018 budget, including the 2019 through 2024 Capital Improvement Program. The committee recommends the bill passes amended back shall. Thank you. So this council bill 119479 would reconcile the 2019 2020 adopted budget with the 2018 fourth quarter supplemental budget. The ordinance updates CIP project allocations and CIP project pages and adds new CHP projects adopted as part of the fourth quarter supplemental. And that supplemental adoption ordinance was 125739. And we recommend adoption of Council Bill 119479. Any questions or comments? Please call the rule on the passage of the Bill Bagshaw. Hi. Gonzalez Herbold. Johnson Suarez Mosqueda O'Brien. Sarwan I President Harrell nine in favor and unopposed. Bill Parson, Chair of the Senate. Please read

the next agenda item. Very good. Any further comments or questions, if not those in favor of confirming these two appointments? Please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the appointments are confirmed. Please read the report from the Sustainability and Transportation Committee. The report of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee Agenda Item five Resolution 318 73 Recognizing the community led visioning process and the recommendations found in the YOU District Station Area Mobility Plan and supporting pedestrian

focused rebuild of Northeast 43rd Street, the committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Councilmember O'Brien. Thank you. I am very excited about the imminent opening of the University District Light Rail Station and the opportunity to create a vibrant, lively transportation hub there that serves all sorts of users. And I'm really grateful to the community members who have come together to help create a vision of that. And this resolution adopts that. And I'm grateful for Councilmember Johnson's work to get us there. And so at that point, I handed over to Councilmember Johnson. Because remember Johnson, I. Don't have much more to add. We've got a lot of things that are happening in the neighborhood rather than wait, as you heard from community members, to respond to requests from a variety of different agencies, King County, Metro, Sound Transit, several different city departments, this group of folks banded together, came up with their own vision and are working really hard to make sure that each of these individual different government agencies are working hard to implement that vision as opposed to being responsive. They were proactive. I want to say thank you to all of them for four, multiple years worth of hard work. And we had a really great set of consultants that the city helped hire to help them create that vision. I want to say thanks to those folks at Makers who did a lot of that work. And as I mentioned, my chief of staff, Amy Gore, spent literally years working on this project. So we're happy to have this small resolution today to affirm the good work and look forward to its implementation. Excellent. Any further comments or questions? And I think the members of the community are coming out in support of this resolution. Those in favor of adopting the resolution, please vote i. I. Those opposed vote no. The motion carries. The resolution is adopted and Cher will sign it. Please read the next agenda item. For adoption of other resolutions and agenda item number six Resolution 318 75 Written, retiring, introduced and referred Council Bills, Resolutions, Click Files and appointments that have received no further action. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda item seven Resolution 318 76 In support of U.S. Senate Bill 726, the Personal Care Products Safety Act. Councilmember Johnson. Thanks. Just wanted to talk about this a little bit more. As I mentioned during council briefing this morning,

this is a resolution that supports a bill in front of the U.S. Senate that would do a better job of regulating the personal care industry. It's a \$70 billion a year industry, and it's regulated by approximately two pages of federal law. The that's an astounding thing to me, as we heard in public comment today on no changes to that law since the invention of the ballpoint pen. We it's been now more than 80 years since we had any action to ban chemicals from the kinds of things that we put on our bodies every day. Whereas the European Union has banned more than 1400 chemicals in the last two decades. We as individuals, you know, put probably about 100 different individual chemicals on our bodies every day. I think that it is important for us to really be knowledgeable about what those things are. And lest folks think that it's just the Beautycounter team who's here today. And thank you to my wife, Katie, for helping to organize folks today. But there are a lot of other major brands like L'Oreal Johnson and Johnson as Lauder, Revlon, Procter and Gamble, who have all supported this legislation. It's also been supported by folks like the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Women's Health Network, and a whole host of others. It's a bipartisan bill. I think it's time for us to start taking some action. And this is our little small way of demonstrating our level of support. Thank you, Councilmember Jones, for bringing this forward. Any questions or comments or concerns? And again, we want to thank members of the community for showing so strong support for this resolution. Okay. Okay. We wonder about the lipstick. On those in favor of adopting the resolution. Please vote I II. Those oppose vote no. The motion carries the resolution adopted and Cher will sign it. I'm going to first ask if there are any further business to become before the council, which may include excused absences. And then I may say a few words and or rather let Council Member John to say a few words if he'd like, given this is his last time on the dais. So is there any further business to come before the council? Bill passed in show senate. Please read the next agenda. Item three Part of the Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities Committee agenda into can support 119 1486 authorizing Department of Parks and Recreation to enter into an agreement with the Seattle Academy of Arts and Sciences to renovate the South Park Community Center site and develop an ongoing relationship in the South Park community consistent with the terms of agreement and attachment when the committee recommends the bill pass. Okay. So customer herbal. Would you like to amend it first? Well, thank you for the prompt. I would I would. Move to amend council bill. 11 9496 by substituted. By substituting version two for version one. Of the bill and substituting. Version three

for version two. Of the attachment. 1/2. Okay. Explain to us the amendments. So the. Proposed sub

stitute version two, as it relates specifically to the the bill adds. The following language to page to line 12 through 13. Saying that Department of. Parks and Rec shall submit the final draft agreement for review to the City Council's Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities Committee. The goal of this amendment is to provide Council with an opportunity to review the final agreement between Parks and the Seattle Arts and Sciences Academy. And we really appreciate that they are working together to establish this partnership. But the amendment provides an additional opportunity for council to gain a better understanding of the terms of the agreement before it's signed. The second element of the substitute relates specifically to the terms of agreement as it relates to the film field programming section, and it provides greater clarity by noting that drop in time is Rivas. Is is available. For community members generally and programming for South Park, but is explicitly noting that a. Process should be developed for field. Scheduling at the at the South Park Community Center that prioritizes South Park community members. So generally citywide. The field is available for drop in time. That does not need to be reserved. But we want to also lift up the ability of South Park residents to reserve the the field to take priority over the general community citywide. Requesting this clarity is designed specifically to distinguish between the Academy's fall and spring sports scheduling so that benefits to the South Park. Community members are explicitly provided in the agreement. Thank you, consumer Herbold. Before I turn the base legislation over to council members and vote on the amendment councilman words. Do you have anything to say about the amendment? Do not. Forget. Okay. Any questions other than council? Councilmember Herbert, you touched on this a little bit, but in our committee last week, I'm not sure that we talked about the organizations coming back and approving the additional 25 to 50 hours and so on. So do we have everybody sign off? So yeah, we have worked together on this and I discovered the items that. I had. Lifted forward. Councilmember Gonzalez can talk about the other script. Sure. And I'm happy to do that as well. Thank you. Council President So a few things that I lifted up in committee. Gosh. Was that last week already? Last week were a couple of points. One was around getting clarity around when the census would have priority on scheduling on the field. So I appreciate having an opportunity to work through the Parks Department with SAS and much thanks to Tracy Gratz Cliff from Council Central staff on shepherding this through, we were able to achieve some clarification on precisely when between August and November and again between March and the rest of this in May, we would actually see hours prioritized for SAS. So the original language only said fall and spring. And we now have defined dates by agreement with SAS

that that the intended prioritization of the field for SAS would be the last week of August to the second week of November, otherwise known as fall and the first week of March to third week in May or spring. So that's one point. The second point is that we also requested that the Department of Parks and Recreation provide us an annual report on the use of the new fields by the community and by SAS for the first two years after completion of the field. So that we can we can better understand, as policymakers, the demand for the field and where the demand is coming from. The second the third component that we were able to receive clarity on were the number of hours that would be committed to programming at the South Park Community Center or working with local schools or local nonprofits provided by SAS. So I really want to thank them for wanting to contribute back into community in this in this manner. Originally they had proposed a minimum of 25 hours. I received correspondence from folks at SAS after that committee hearing saying that that is absolutely a minimum, but they hope to be able to accomplish more and give more hours. I proposed a 50 hour minimum rather than a 25 hour minimum in the spirit of their verbal commitment that they actually wanted to do more than 25 hours. They they very quickly and graciously agreed to a 50 hour as a minimum. So that is a consensus proposal there on the minimum number of hours. I also ask them to just include a little bit more texture as to what programming they're referring to, since the language is pretty broad. And that's why we see language that specifically lists but doesn't limit it to things like soccer camps, afterschool student tutoring, mentorship programming, robotics and arts programs. It's my understanding that SAS will continue to work with the South Park community to identify what kind of programming they actually want to see in community as part of part and parcel of what flows from this public private agreement around the athletic field. So and so to answer to your question and answer your question, Casmir Bagshaw This has all been agreed to and, and I really want to thank the folks at SAS and DPR for their ongoing partnership and cooperation with

me in addressing some of the concerns that I raised in committee last week. Okay. So we're going to vote on just the amendment, which was basically a substitution of version two for version one. And so shooting version three for version two of the attachment on attachment one. So any other questions on that? Are those in favor of the amendment? Please vote I. I oppose. The ayes have it. The bill is amended. Councilmember words. We'd like to speak to the amendment. Bill. Yes, I will. Thank you. I want to give a little put this in context for the viewing public. Even though we all are familiar with District One, where Seattle, South Park is a neighborhood in Seattle that isn't just sales district number one south of Georgetown, across the dual Marsh

River, north of Tukwila. It's home to the South Park Community Center, which serves many families and youth sports from neighboring parts of Seattle, including the Seattle Academy of Arts and Sciences, a school with 6 to 12 grade students that actively participate in the athletic sports. However, the South Park community has the highest youth population of any Seattle neighborhood, yet its residents have about 1/10 of the accessible greenspace available to the average King County resident. A concept design informed by community input was finalized in Spring 2018 to install and relocate a play area and other amenities, including landscaping to mitigate negative health impacts from S.R. State Route 99, which runs next to the park area. This design is projected to be \$9.8 million. The 9.8 million. Ours is a combination of four funding sources, the majority coming from the Seattle Academy of Arts and Sciences. It includes 1.2 million from the state and county grants. 2.8 million in park district funding. 1.8 million in rent funding. And of course, the \$4 million donation from Seattle Academy of Arts and Sciences. This ordinance would allow the Department of Parks and Recreation to enter into an agreement with the Seattle Academy per the term sheet as listed in Attachment. One Enable the Seattle Academy to begin fundraising for the South Park Community Center site redevelopment. The bill was heard in the Civic Development, Public Assets and Native Communities Committee with the PASS recommendation with the expectation that members could spend an extra week before Council's final vote to clarify aspects of the agreement. The agreement is 25 years long with two five year extensions. I want to thank Councilmember Gonzalez and Herbold for strengthening it with their amendments. Councilmember Gonzalez's amendments, as you as you heard her share, I focus in on feel programing. And I want to thank Councilmember Herbert because she focused in on one of my passions, the public benefits piece that is the program expansion and provide greater access for local residents to South Park and their neighborhoods. And with that Council President Harrell, I would ask that the that the ordinance pass as amended. Thank you very much. Any closing comments or questions on the bill? Okay. If not, please call the role on the passage of the amended bill. Gonzalez. Herbold. Suarez. O'Brien. Pacheco. So on. I beg your president Harrell. High. Eight in favor on. Oppose the bill passed and of Senate please read items three through eight. The report of the Civil Rights, Utilities, Economic Development and Arts Committee Agenda Item two Council Bill 119515 An Ordinance relating to Seattle Public Utilities amending Ordinance 125475, which adopted the 2018 budget, lifting the proviso in Section eight regarding expenditure of funds appropriated in the combined sewer overflow budget control level for construction of the ship Canal Water Quality Project Storage Tunnel. The committee reco

mmends the bill pass. Gus Van Herbold, thank you. So this ordinance lifts a budget proviso that the council placed on spending on this project during last year's budget process. The Ship Canal Water Quality Project is part of a larger effort for the county and the city designed to limit the number of overflows in order to reduce contaminated water from reaching Puget Sound. This work, this project is required under a federal and state consent decree that has been placed both on the city and the county. And the Seattle Public Utilities came and briefed council in committee last week and let us know the good news that they have updated their confidence rating from 65% to 70%, which means that the project is 70% likely to cost \$570 million or less. The city's share of this project is 393 million. It is actually five major construction projects in one, and the storage tunnel is the largest part of the project, estimated at 218 million. The tunnel portion of the project is what the council placed the proviso on, and we placed the proviso on the project at the point of 100% design. So limiting the number of dollars that could be spent only up until the completion of the design phase, having them come back to council for approval and lifting the proviso before they start spending funds for the construction phase. Voting in favor of this now will allow Seattle Public Utilities to move forward with the selection of a contractor. They've gone out for bids, spent a lot of time doing outreach with the

contractor community in order to get bids that hopefully will be on time and on target. Thank you, Councilman Herbold. Any other questions or comments on this legislation that please call the role on the passage of the Bill Herbold ii. Whereas i. Macheda. I. O'Brien, i. Pacheco. I want i. Gonzalez, i. President Harrell II. Eight In favor and unopposed. The bill passed in Cheryl's Senate. So please read. Agenda items three through 21. Read them together. Women take separate votes on them, but just read them into the record and I'll pass to our Council member. Agenda item five cancel 119 530 Relating to historic preservation opposing controls upon the University of Washington Carrington Hall Committee recommends the bill pass. That's my best shot. Thank you. This ordinance will impose controls upon Farrington Hall, which is located at 4105 Memorial Drive Northeast on the UW campus. Many of us have actually had classes there or taught there, and it was built in 1902. Appearing in Hall, it's now the home to the Evans School of Public Policy. The designation will preserve the exterior of the building and the interior room volumes and skylights. On the third floor, east and west. And you may notice in some of the original photographs that it was white, and at the original it was painted white to be part of the 1906 fair. So it has now been restored to its original brick exterior and it meets the following standards for designation significant aspect of cultural, poli

tical and economic heritage on the UW campus. So we move adoption of Council Bill 119530. Very good. Any questions or comments, Councilman Pacheco? Well, I appreciate that certain elements of the building will be preserved. Will be preserved. I am very happy and ecstatic to learn to see the project move forward and that the Evans School get a new building because it was long overdue. Having spent a couple of years in that basement. Very good. You know the question of. Being better than the basement. Okay, so if not, thanks. Councilwoman Pacheco. Please call the rule on the passage of the bill. Macheda I. O'Brien. High Pacheco. I so want. I make sure I. Gonzales Herbold I. Whereas President Harrell I nine in favor and unopposed. Bill passenger senate. Please read item six and seven. Agenda Item six and seven appointments 1350 and 1351 reappointment to taste marvelous and Christopher Maquette as members Community Involvement Commission for a term to May 31st 2021. The committee recommends these appointments be confirmed. Very good. Any other questions or comments? If not those in favor of confirming the appointment. Please vote i i those opposed vote no the motion carries an appointment is confirmed. He please read the report of the Planning Land Use and Zoning Committee. Report of the Planning and Zoning Committee June 13 Council Bill 119505 Relating to land use and zoning in many sections 23.40 1.0 ten and point zero 12 of the ceiling is for code to remove the Ballard Municipal Center Master Plan Area Guidelines and to adopt the Ballard Neighborhood Design Guidelines and to delete reference to the Ballard Municipal Center Master Plan Area Guidelines. The committee recommends Vote Pass as amended. Councilman Pacheco. So this legislation adopts new design guidelines for the Bel-Air neighborhood. These new guidelines are the result of years of community work, including 24 community meetings, five open houses, online surveys and community group conversations. The Ballard Community set about to update these guidelines in response to the significant growth the neighborhood has seen in recent years, as well as the major reasons that the Council adopted recently. The new guidelines also apply to a much broader area within the neighborhood defining seven character areas and recognizing the unique design attributes and distinct features of each. I want to thank everybody from the community who took part of the time, who took the time to craft these new guidelines. Thank you. Councilman Pacheco, any questions or comments? That's from Brian. Just briefly and thank you, Councilman Pacheco, for your work on this and really want to emphasize gratitude towards community members who've been working on this for so long. Not very often that a land use decision comes before us with almost no controversy at all. But I think it speaks to a lot of really deep, deep work that's based in community outreach by some of the leaders on that. Thank you. Okay. If no other comm

ents, please call the role on the passage of the Bill O'Brien. Hi. Jacob. Hi. So I thank John Gonzales. Herbal Juarez Mosquito. Hi, President Harrell. Hi. 9 a.m. favorite unopposed. Bill passed and chair senate. Please read the next agenda item. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read the report of the City Council. Agenda item to cancel 119553 relating to city employment. Authorizing execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Seattle and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Local Union Number 77 Power Marketers Unit to be effective January 1st, 2017 to December 31st 2020 and ratifying confirming

sergeant prior acts. Great. Guzman. Thank you very much. Thank you. Colleagues, for this. This legislation was referred directly to the full council. It's being proposed by our Seattle Department of Human Resources. And normally that particular department would legislation from there would be referred through my committee. But it's coming directly here today. The legislation authorizes the execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the city of Seattle and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. That's local union number 77, called the Power Marketers Unit. It has 15 one five regular employees. And this contract will be effective January 1st through December 31st, 2020. And since it's already two and a half years behind, it will be effective retroactive. So the extended process of deliberation proposed a result of a three year process that began in 2016, and it reflects the extended negotiation, as I mentioned. So it will update wages from 2014 and it has no impact on the current budgets since it was included in our 2019 budget and funding in 2020 will be addressed by the executive first in the annual budgeting process and we recommend do pass. The comments I called myself before calling on the passage of the bill. This agenda item approves the union contract, as I said, negotiated with the city of the government and IBEW 77, who represent many Seattle City Light workers who maintain the power lines, substations and power plants to keep the lights on in Seattle on rainy, windy winter nights when a tree falls on the power lines and your power goes out. It is IBEW 77 members who go out in the storm and fix the problem. Without their work, we would have no street lights. Amazon would have no power to run their datacenters, and Nucor could not make this deal. These are really the ultimate green jobs providing carbon free power to Seattle and beyond under a good union contract. Seattle should add many more of these positions as part of a Green New Deal to add one generation to Seattle hydropower to export electricity outside the city, replacing the coal and natural gas power used in the region. These call the role of the passage of the Bill Bagshaw. Gonzalez Herbold II. Whereas. I'm sorry. You we're calling roll on the passage of the bill. Oh, sorry. I. Mosquera I O'Brien high Pac

heco I Presidents want to I in favor and oppose. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read the report of the Sustainability and Transportation Committee. Any other comments? Those in favor of confirming the appointment. Please vote. Those opposed would know the motion carries and the appointment is confirmed. Please read the report of the Finance and Neighborhoods Committee. The report at the Finance and Neighborhoods Committee to Indemnify Accountable 119552. Relating to the Yes, sir. Crescent Improvements. The committee recommends the bill pass inspection. Thank you very much. I know all of us have been here for 2 hours and 22 minutes. I'm going to try to shorten this. If you have any questions, let me know. Many of you are well aware that I have been supporting what we call the Essilor Crescent for years. We got 900,000 plus in the budget last year. So what we're doing is lifting a proviso. The Parks Department has been fabulous and we have worked very closely with our King County friends of the judges and the facilities, folks across the street in DC, the Pioneer Square Alliance down the street. Our people have come together. The money has been identified. We're going to be activating that park, adding more tables and chairs, a kiosk, better lighting, cleaning it up, continuing to limb. And I recommend that we proceed with this and lift the proviso. Any other comments? Please call our role on the passage of the bill. Thanks. Hi, Gonzales. Hi, Herbold. Why did you two get confused? She was just. I was jumping. Yeah. Jumping the gun here. Let's get to. O'Brien Pacheco. My. President silent I seven in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read the item of the Violence and Abuse Committee agenda. The bill passed in show senate. Please read the next agenda item. Agenda Item 14 Council Bill 119 534 relating to the City Life Department, excepting various easements for overhead and underground electrical rights in King County, Washington, the committee recommends the bill pass. Just remember, Skeeter. Thank you, Mr. President. Item number 14 is an ordinance that allows the acceptance of 112 easements for overhead and underground electrical rights in King County. Seattle City Light requires that the owner of a new or altered electric service provide the city of Seattle with a utility easement. Whenever city and contractors pass over under or through the property of another person, or when service equipment such as poles or vaults may be located on the property being served or the property of a third party. Seattle City Light periodically requests an ordinance be passed by City Council excepting the distribution of easements. And this is an example. Thank you, Kaspersky. Any questions or comments, please, on the role on the passage of the bill? Thanks. John Gonzalez. Herbal Juarez Macheda. I O'Brien. Pat Pacheco. So on I President Harrell. I line in favor and unopposed. Bill passed cheryl senate. Please r

lead the next agenda item. Agenda item five Resolution 31894 relating to the funding of priority projects in the 2019 three 2024 Bicycle Master Plan and Implementation Plan. Requesting that the Mayor commit to building out the bicycle masterplan, identifying funding for priority bicycle masterplan projects and the mayor's 2020 proposed Budget Committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Council Member O'Brien Thank you. One more. As we work through with these exciting issues, this go back a little brief history here back in March. Well, traditionally, about this time each year, the executive presents an implementation plan for all the motor plans, including the bike master plan. But this time last year, that was delayed because of some of the work around the Seattle levy and an ongoing interest to further engage with various stakeholders. And so we did not have an implementation plan until March of this year. At the time that information came out, there was a lot of concern among various community members that the implementation plan had missed the mark. And I really want to say I appreciate that both the mayor's office and the Department of Transportation heard those comments and took them to heart. And to me, they went out and very quickly turned around and did a I believe it had five community meetings to get stakeholder input on hearing those concerns and came back in June with a revised implementation plan that attempted to address the concerns they heard in those community meetings. And I thought they did a really good job. They were very responsive. But the reality was that even then at that point, the fiscal reality of some of the challenges around the Seattle levy was such that there are some projects that really need to be built in the next few years that are not currently in the implementation plan. But the fiscal reality being what it is and I'm looking at the chair of our budget process was about to start. Is that the only way to build those projects with the current budget would be to cancel other projects that are also important. So instead of fighting over a small pie, why don't we figure out how to make the pie a little bit bigger? And so what this resolution does is it really focuses on a couple of priority areas where we where there are currently some gaps in the network or in the region and asks that the mayor's office and the department find ways to prioritize and budget those projects. So specifically, the current implementation plan, one of its major shortcomings is that at the end of the Seattle levy, if all we built is what's in the plan right now, there will not be a connection from southeast Seattle to downtown. And if after this billion dollar levy is completed, we still are lacking a safe connection for residents who live in southeast Seattle to connect to downtown, that will have been a failure. So this calls on specifically names out some projects, three of them on Beacon Avenue South, a connection from Georgetown

to downtown, connection on Martin Luther King Jr. Way that we want to find funding for and ask the mayor to find funding for. Now, the great thing is that the budget is to be presented to us in just over a couple of weeks. And so hopefully there's an opportunity to do that. And we're talking about some other revenue sources that may come up, including a sale of the Mercer mega block, which hopefully we'll be approving in the next few weeks, too. And of course, when the budget comes to the council, we'll have opportunities to find transportation dollars and dedicate those to them in addition to southeast Seattle. It also talks about a couple of pieces of infrastructure in downtown that are important pieces of the network to make sure we have a safe downtown to a to a bike lane on Fourth Avenue and also protected bike lane on Alaskan way between Virginia Street and the Elliott Bay Trail. With that, I believe my colleagues have a couple of amendments, have a couple projects that are very consistent with those two. This one of those was presented this morning. I believe one will require suspension of the rules because it came in a little after the deadline. So the customer back show that will take second will require a suspension of rules because remember, Herbold has a First Amendment and will address first comes from Herbold. Thank you so much. I move to amend resolution 31894 Section two by adding a new subsection H entitled Georgetown South Park Trail as presented on Amendment 1/2. Can be moved in second act to add a section H Georgetown South Park Trail. Any comments or questions on that comes from Herbert? When I speak to a little more. I would thank you. I just want to give a little bit of background on this particular project. Under Council President Harrell's leadership in the budget for 2018 and in response to community requests from both of our districts in Georgetown and South Park. The council added 600,000 to the budget in 2018. For the outreach, planning and early design of the Project Starts Project website notes that the final design and construction are currently under funded, and I met with the MAX Coalition a couple of weeks ago. I received some support for this being a priority project and just want to say that South Park is called out in the recitals of the bill. So

I think it's important that we follow up with action as it relates to important projects to the South Park community. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold, and thanks for your work on this. Any other questions? We'll just take or vote on the amendment. All those in favor as have been seconded. Yes, all those in favor of the amendment as described by Councilmember her will please vote i. I opposed. The ayes have it. So that amendment passes. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold and leave to consider Councilman back shows amendment. We're going to have to suspend the rules because of the timing and if there's no objection will suspend the rules to understand council member

s back Charles amendment because we're back to the floor. Thank you very much. So do you want me to formally request that we suspend the rules now or have you just. I just. Okay, very good. So I would like to move to amend this resolution 31894 Section two by adding a new subsection, which will be I since Councilmember Herbert's amendment passed to add Vine Street and thence parenthetical Second Avenue to Thomas Street. And the reasoning behind this is similar to what we were speaking about, about making the connections we have in our proposed amendment in front of us on what is item F, a two way protected bike lane on Fourth Avenue and its main to Vine Street. And then it just ends. And as part of our nodal map, our north downtown mobility action plan, we had specified a connection up Vine Street and Taylor to connect with Thomas Street. And thanks to a number of people, I saw Gordon Philadelphia here earlier that we had a design charrette on Thomas earlier this summer that would connect Thomas Street, both on the east side, in the west side of Seattle Center. And what this proposal will do is to add about seven blocks and whether it's a greenway or whether it's a separated bike lane. But to make sure that bicycle riders coming down Fourth Avenue will have a safe and separated bike lane, but then can continue on Vine and Taylor to Thomas. And it's just on one of these safe connections. And I want to acknowledge, I think Katie Wilson has left, but the point that she was raising about Fourth Avenue is really critical as somebody who rides her bike a lot going down Fourth Avenue when it just and it becomes a very unsafe situation, particularly with all the construction going on downtown. So my goal here is to be able to connect Fourth Avenue all the way to the east side of Seattle Center and by adding the subsection I, Vine Street, Second Avenue to Thomas Street, we can accomplish that. Thank you. Kasper Back to any questions or comments on Councilmember Bag Shaw's amendment. Okay, we'll call this amendment number two. Okay. It's been moved. Is amendment number two has been described and moved and seconded by Councilman Beck. So any further questions or comments, all those in favor of amendment number two say I, I opposed the ayes have it. So amendment number two is passed. Now we have an amended resolution 31894 it councilmember O'Brien was like standing closing remarks. Good to go. Okay. Any other remarks on the base? Legislation as amended? We're good. Okay. Those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended. Please vote i. I those opposed vote no. The motion carries the resolutions adopted, and the chair will sign it. All right. It's great. Thank you. Please read the report of the Housing, Health, Energy and Workers Rights Committee. One Constable 119 561 Vacating the alley and block one wits edition on the petition of 2026 Madison Corner LLC and LMC 2026 Madison Holdings, LLC. The committee recommends the bill pass. Because O'Brien. Sayi

ng that we're three plus hours into the meeting, I'm going to try to move as swiftly as I can. Councilman, President, let me know if you want more detail. This is a parcel on the north side of Mattie's Madison Street. The council granted conceptual approval to this. Years ago, that was pre the recession. The project is now complete, has met the requirements of their street vacation. You can see on the attachment the little is between 20th and 21st Avenue and this is the action that actually grants the street vacation. I can assure you that the departments have reviewed it and everything they've done is consistent with the original intent. They've met the terms of the original street petition. Very good. Any other questions or comments? Now please call the roll on the passage of the Bill Herbold. I Juarez must get to O'Brien High. Pacheco. All right. So one big John Gonzalez. President Harrell. High. Eight in favor and unopposed. Bill passed chair of Senate. Please read the next agenda item short title. Agenda item 32 Constable 1196 ten vacating portion of the armory waiting as condemned by ordinance 67125. The committee recommends the bill pass this member. Unopposed bill passed and cheryl senate and i switched the agenda item order. So go ahead and read the next urgent item as amended. Agenda Item 21 Resolution 31905 Amending the Physical Development Management Plan for CenterPoint. The committee recommends the

resolution be adopted. Thank you. This is actually separate from what we were just voting on, but still deals with Sandpoint. And it's a cleanup ordinance. I want to say thank you to Traci Ratcliff from council central staff for making the changes consistent with the 2012 Sandpoint Overlay District, permitting development of housing that meet certain criteria to exceed the 200 dwelling unit maximum. That will allow us to move forward with the Lehigh Project. So staff discovered that this physical development management plan had not been amended since 2012. It's now consistent with the changes that are included and it will allow us to correct the legislation and to move forward with the building of the cottages. Very good. Any questions or comments? This is a resolution. Okay, those in favor. Of adopting the resolution. Please vote i i those opposed vote no. The motion carries the resolution is adopted in Cheryl sign it. Please read the next gen item. Agenda item 20 cancel bill 119 643 Relating to real property located at Mercer Street and Second Avenue North, the committee recommends the bill pass customer back. Okay. All those in favor of supporting resolution 31911. Please say I. I opposed the ayes have it. The resolution has passed and the chair will sign it. Please, please read the next agenda item into the record. Agenda item three Council Bill one one 9 to 88 relating to the city's criminal code. Council member. HERBOLD So the mayor's office is continuing to coordinate ongoing community outreach. I have reminded the mayor's office o

f the May 14th letter that the mayor wrote to us, urging us to quickly consider and pass Council Bill 11 9288, the proposed hate hate crimes law from some of the initial conversations that the mayor's office has been convening. There may be some related work that ties in with our budget. And so consequently I am moving to hold Council Bill 11 9288 to the full Council meeting on Monday, November 25th. So just one sec. So there's been a motion to hold this agenda item till November 25th. Correct. Is there a second? Second. Okay. Any comments on the whole till November 25th? All those in favor of the motion say I. I oppose. The ayes have it in this matter. Be held till November 25th. Is there any further business coming for the council? Councilmember Mosquito. Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to move to be excused beginning next Monday, October 14th through January 27th of 2020 for parental leave. This includes 12 weeks of parental leave and the two weeks of the council recess. And looking forward to joining you all again in January 2nd. That motion. And I. Am not sure I could legislate something till next year. Maybe I could just ask for a resolution through the end of this year. Why don't I do that? I think I. This is a new one here. This is history in the making. So I will just once I can pull up my schedule. December 16th is our last. December 16th is our last summer season. So I'm going to I'm going to do it till December 16th. Can I. Okay. So I could do it all the way to generate twice a. Oh. Okay. Okay. Mr. President, it was more of an announcement, apparently. Okay. That I'd like to make her aware that I will be taking an apologetic. We'll let the record reflect the fact that cast members appropriately asked for leave, for absence for her leave. And we all agree and we'll work through the logistics of line. And I just want to say I wish all our colleagues the best of luck this fall. And to folks who are not coming back, it was a true honor to work with you. So thank you very much for all the work that you've done in our in our tenure together in the two years of my tenure together with you and do wish you all the best of luck and I'll be back. Everything goes correctly for potentially a budget vote or two in mid-November. Very good. I remember. Thank you. And you know councilmember and said it's been my pleasure working with you as well over the last couple of years and I will reach out to you. And when you are prepared, I will send you a message. Say, call me back when the baby's asleep so we can talk about where we're going with this budget. And I appreciate your and your staff giving us your priorities and getting in your your first form A's. And you won't be out of the loop very far in advance. And thanks to the council colleagues for allowing me to be so vocal in the last few weeks as we've been talking about possible priorities, I wanted to make sure everybody knew the various priorities before heading out on family leave and no

guarantees about being able to come back. But appreciate that the council rules were amended in December 2017 so that the assumption would be made that if anybody wanted to use the call in option during any family leave, they had the ability to do so. So we'll let you know as soon as possible. And otherwise, I look forward to seeing you soon. Thank you, Councilmember Mosquito. And with that, we stand adjourned. And everyone, have a great rest of the day. Thank you. The bill passed and Cheryl signed it. Please read the first agenda item. You could read one into. The report of the City Council agenda item one into quick file 314 326 Full Unit Lots of division application to Michael and Vinny van line to subdivide one person to 26 unit lots at 48 or nine South Little Street

Council Bill 119 695 a property excise me approving and confirming the plan of Seattle modern living on the willow in portions of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter a section 27 township 24, north range four east in King County, Washington. Thank you very much, Councilmember Pacheco. Colleagues, this clerk. Filed an application for a subdivision of one parcel at 4912 South. Willow Street and 226 lots. The hearing examiner held a public hearing and issued preliminary approval in January 2017. Council Bill two are Council Bill 2 seconds action item is the Associated Counsel bill that approves the subdivision application of 49th well South Wall Street. Thank you very much. And Castro in particular, I understand these are related, as you describe, both the clerk file and the council bill in your short description. Yes. Okay. So both managers are ready to vote. Are there any questions on either the Clark file or the bill? Because we're going to vote on them separately. Okay, so I'll move to file Clark. File three. One, four, three, two, six. Their second. Again, those in favor of placing the Clark file on file. Please vote i. I those opposed vote no. The motion carries and the Clark file is placed on file. At this point I'll move to pass counts bill 119695. It's been moved to second and any further comments with Clark please call the roll on the passage of the Bill O'Brien. I pachinko. I. Make sure herbal I Juarez President Harrell. I. Six in favor and unopposed. Bill passes and Charles Simon Clerk Please read items three and four into the. Thank you. The second bill that we have. I'm sorry. Absolutely. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Thank you. The next bill is Council Bill 11 9732 Agenda item to Council Bill 119 732. Relating to political advertising. And qualified public communications, expanding commercial advertisers duty to maintain and provide records regarding political advertising and qualified public communications. Amending Section 2.04.0 ten and point two. Added 80 of the 74 code. The committee recommends the bill passed. Thank you. This bill relates specifically to requirements for commercial advertisers and qualified public communications. The cur

rent Seattle Municipal Code requires that commercial advertisers that provide political advertising during election maintain the names, addresses, nature and extent of the ad as well as the manner of payment. This bill enhances those requirements and applies them to all qualified public communications and defines a qualified public communication as a paid advertisement that is intended to influence legislation or influence an elected officials position on the legislation. More generally speaking to the need for this legislation, we know that only 5% of the contributions to two PACs made contributions over \$5,000, though those contributions accounted for almost 85% of the total money PACs collected in 2019. And with that, if there are other thoughts on this bill, I welcome hearing them now. Yeah, I just want to say special thanks to Council President Gonzales V Nguyen, Brianna Thomas for your work on this. We know that transparency in light win shown on the legislative process and governance is a good thing and brings the accountability to the people of our city and whom we serve. So thank you all. With that, in addition to thanks to staff, both both council staff as well as central staff want to speak that there is a third bill in the suite of bills that we are going to continue discussions on in the Council President's absence. And we'll be in touch with stakeholders on that third bill at a later date. Third, no further comments. Please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Suarez lewis, i. Morales i. Peterson i so want strauss i. President pro tem purple. Hi. Seven in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. We'll move on to adoption of other resolutions. Please read into the record. I had number three adoption of the resolutions, agenda item three, resolution 319 25 expressing the Seattle City Council's opposition to the Trump administration's escalation. All right. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Thank you. Okay. And they're back. So we're now that we have an amended agenda. We are going to go to our first item, which is the resolution that council members so want put forward. I'm sorry to amend the agenda. So we have an amended agenda. Please read the new item number one. Resolution 319 34 supporting the taxation of big business in Seattle to fund housing and essential services. Urging the Washington State Legislature to oppose any preemption and other ban on Seattle's ability to raise revenue through big businesses, taxes, or other progressive revenue sources, and requesting the Office of Intergovernmental Relations to communicate this resolution to Washington state lawmakers. Thank you, councilmember. So what you want to move? But it could be. I feel like I've made a real motivation for why it is important in terms of timing, just given the pace at which there's potentially a ban or option could appear in the bill. And so I would really urge my colleagues to vote yes on the resolution. And

just one other thing I will mention is that, as I said earlier, most of us on the council have already signed a letter that was initiated by a council member mosquito in which we are taking a clear position against preemption. But as many of us have also said, we need all tools in the toolbox. And I dread to think of what message it will send the corporate Democrats if we if this resolution does not get voted through and get a majority. Yes. Vote today, I don't know what message it will send. The message it will send will be basically that the Seattle City Council is not actually standing against preemption or ban. So I think it is historically crucial that we take the correct position and vote yes on the resolution and be consistent with the letter that most of us have already signed. And I would like to hear my colleagues on this. So now please help me out here. I thought that council members haven't had to move to adopt Resolution 31934. And did you do that? I do have to. When you do adopt it, you have to make a. Move to adopt resolution 31934. Is there a second, second, second. Okay. So now we can go. It's been moved and seconded to adopt a resolution and we'll move to discussion. Are there any comments on the actual merits of the proposed resolution from any of my colleagues? Councilmember. LEWIS Oh. Yes, thanks. Peterson No. Lewis I'm sorry. I'm so sorry. No, no, no. I actually have it written down here. Thank you. CARLSON Remember, it's. Only February, so. Yeah, go. Ahead. Thank you so much, Madam Chair. Or Madam President, pro tem. So I just wanted to make a couple of comments before we formally vote on this resolution. I want to thank Councilmember Swan for bringing it forward and totally respect the spirit in which it was introduced in which we will discuss it here today. I did just want to reiterate that on February 10th, I was one of the council members who signed the letter that we did send down to Olympia, to Representative Macri, as well as the sponsor in the Senate, Senator Kizer, expressing four key concerns. First concern, the increasing of the total revenue, because we know that while the current proposal is a good start, it does not go far enough to fully and comprehensively respond to the scale of our crisis. Second, excluding the preemption. Third, making sure we're allocating those funds to essential services and housing in a in an equitable way. Fourth, clarifying how much revenue is going to go to the Regional Homelessness Authority versus the city and the county. We sent this letter. And since that time, we've been at the table as a stakeholder regionally and as in Olympia and in Olympia and discussions in this bill. From my conversations with my delegation in the 36th, from my conversations with Representative Macri, the concerns of this Council are being heard in the halls of Olympia, and we are active participants, not passive observers. And while I adamantly believe in the good intentions behind this resolution, I a

Iso believe that the framework of our engagement based in that letter of February 10th and our follow up conversations, both as individuals and an institution through our table discussions with the Office of Intergovernmental Relations on a weekly basis has been the better approach for working out this policy with our friends than this resolution would. And I want to be clear that I have complete confidence and trust in Representative Nicole Macri, and that's part of the reason why I'll be voting no on this resolution today. The sponsor of HB 29 or seven, Representative Macri, who has managed this difficult process with grace and fortitude so far, which has not been easy. Nicole Macri is a progressive hero as the deputy director for the Downtown Emergency Service Center. She takes a backseat to nobody in her dedication and commitment to helping our neighbors experiencing homelessness, and no local politician can match her direct experience as a service provider. I just want to say that her progressive credentials are beyond reproach, and my knowing her as a friend and knowing her as a colleague, as a local leader. Her work has advanced the rights of renters, students, commuters, people experiencing homelessness. And her work at DSC has unambiguously saved lives and provided respite to people who have suffered on our streets experiencing homelessness. She is the person in the room on this. I trust her. I have her back. I'll continue to actively engage in making tonight's 97 the strongest bill possible. I don't think this resolution will help that cause at this time. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Lewis. So with that, is there any other comments before I turn it over to council members who want to make a closing statement? Okay. With that, customers who want. Closures. Well, if any other guns. I appreciate Councilmember Lewis stating what his opinion is, although I don't agree with his position. But if other council members are planning to vote no on this, I would prefer to hear your opinions. And I think you owe the public an explanation of why you will be voting no on the resolution. I think we're just going to take a vote. So I'd like you to. Have a few any closing comments, and then I'd like to go to the vote. So I, I don't agree with the council members who are planning to vote no on this resolution, because I don't think that any politician, including myself, any

politician, has some sort of lifelong hold over any kind of progressive label. You get to be called progressive only if you're absolutely fighting for a progressive agenda. And I don't I would say the person who spoke I'm sorry, I don't remember your name, but when you said that only somebody who I mean, I'm adding some words here, but only somebody who is either being completely politically naive or politically disingenuous would say that we don't actually need to use all tools in our toolbox. And to say that a representative who has who is the prime sponsor of the bill and who

has refused to say that she opposes preemption, which is which is something she needs to say, that that person is a progressive hero. I don't I want to clarify. This is not about individuals and certainly not about politicians. I have the greatest respect for every elected representative. Who at. Any time in any given day is fighting for progressive causes. And I will work with anybody who is willing to do so. But in our conversation with Representative McCrery in Olympia, when 50 of us were there, she said, she said to me, you know, you know, as a fellow progressive, our lives are hard. And the people who spoke there basically summed it up, which is that I don't think progressive politicians can complain that their lives are hard because the lives of ordinary people are a thousand times harder. And it is our duty. It is our duty to absolutely be fighting. And I've said this before, and I will say this again, if as a progressive, if somebody who claims as a progressive and your life is not hard as an elected official, then you are doing something wrong and you're feeling ordinary people. Your life better be hard because that's what it's like when you're actually fighting for ordinary people. And I don't think that anybody who vote no on this resolution can claim that they are doing everything in their power to prevent what will be if the ban passes. A historic betrayal of Seattle's and the state's working people. The ball. Thank you, Councilmember Sawant, for bringing this forward. Thank you, colleagues, for giving. Council members want the opportunity to amend the agenda and put this resolution in front of us. Thank you, Councilmember Lewis, for your comments regarding our representatives down in Olympia. And with that, I am going to take the vote those in favor of adopting the resolution. Please vote I and raise your hand. I. I. Those opposed. Vote no and raise your hand. No, no, no. Shame. The resolution fails. 225225225. And that's two thirds. That's less than okay. All right. Thank you. Okay. We will move on with the calendar. No, thank you. Yeah, no. Reaction. Joe's big band from Seattle to Spokane? No. Brandon. Dr. David Frost. Yeah. Spokane. Bill passes. All right. And the chair will sign it. So can we please please read item number four? Agenda item four Council Bill 119743. An ordinance relating to grant funds from non city sources. Authorizing the director of transportation to accept specified grants and execute related agreements for and on behalf of the city. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson. This ordinance enables the Seattle Department of Transportation to accept grant funds from sound transit as already approved at a high level from the capital improvement program CIP budget. Specifically, this will improve pedestrian access to both the current Mount Baker station and the future Judkins Park Station. It was approved unanimously by the committee and I move to approve council bill 119743. Ok

ay. Okay. Will the. Any other comments? Will the clerk call the roll on the passage of the bill? Herbold, i. Lewis, i. Morales, i. Mosquera. I. Peterson. I. Strauss. All right. Council President. Was I seven in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will saying. So let's move on to other businesses or any of the further business to come before the council. See? None. We are adjourned. Thank you, everybody. And thank. Please read the short title agenda item to Council Bill 119744 an ordinance relating to the Department of Transportation's Hazard Mitigation Program. The committee recommends the bill pass. PETERSON Thank you, President Pro Tem. So this ordinance enables the Seattle Department of Transportation to accept easements for various retaining walls along Rainier Avenue South. I move to approve Council Bill 119744. Thank you. Any comments? All right, so we have a move to have a second, second, second. It's been moved and seconded. Let's move to a vote. All those in favor of Council Bill one would actually take a vote. Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. I'm sorry. I forgot about that. We got a call out. Everyone's name from. Go ahead. Go, girl. I'll say, will the clerk call the roll on the passage of the bill? Herbold, i. Lewis, I. Morales I. Mesquita Peterson. Strauss, i. Council president. Whereas I. Seven in favor and unopposed. It passes and I'll sign it. The next item is please read item three. Agenda. Agenda item three. Council. Bill 119741. An ordinance relating to the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority authorizing execution of a funding and cooperative agreement for Northgate Station area, access improvements between sound transit and the City of Seattle, and ratifying and confirming

certain prior The motion carries, the resolution is amended and the chair will sign it under adoption of other resolutions. Madam Kirk, do you mind reading item number 15 into the record? Agenda item 15 Resolution 31936. Adopting the statements of legislative intent for the 2020 adopted budget and 2025 through 2026th May 2023, 2025 Adopted Capital Improvement Program. Are there any additional comments on this? Okay. See then, if there is no objection, I would again like to amend resolution 31935 to amend it to say instead of be resolved to delete that it's to delete the mayor concurring. Any objections? Seeing none, the resolution is amended. Are there any comments on the resolution as amended? Seeing none. All of those in favor of adopting the resolution as amended. Please would I and raise your hand. I and I oppose seeing none. The motion carries. The resolution is adopted as amended, and the chair will sign it. Are there any further items of business to come before the council? All right. So then I will also just note appreciation for the clerks for helping us stay on track here. I will be acting as President Pro tem for the next month, so I appreciate the council's flexibility as we get through the formalities here. But with that, to

day's meeting is adjourned within an hour. Have a great rest of your afternoon and Will. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Please read. Agenda item number one into the record. I'm asking that, if you wouldn't mind, if we could go back to the payment of bills, you announced that the chair would sign it, if you wouldn't mind also providing direction for the clerk to fix your signature to the bills. Madam Clerk, it would be fantastic if you could sign me in on the Bills on my behalf. Please affix my signature to the legislation and that would make it official, if you don't mind. Thank you. Moving on to item number one, the report of the Finance and. Housing Committee, General 14119752 relating to fair housing, regulating rental housing, bidding platforms, repealing a one year prohibition on use of rental housing bidding platforms, repealing section. 7.20 4.97 of the code. And adding and amending Section. 7.24 point 0/20. Columns. The Code Committee recommends the bill pass. Excellent counsel, colleagues. This is a bill that we introduced from my Office of Councilmember Mosquito about two years ago. We had an initial ordinance that asked for the Office of Housing to do an evaluation of the rent bidding platforms, and it also included a one year prohibition on the use of these platforms. The the prohibition was to provide our office with an an understanding of whether or not these platforms were in violation of our fair housing laws or to analyze how they may impact housing costs or inequities in our area. The Office of Housing needed additional time to complete the study, so we extended the prohibition for another year. In 2019, the Office of Housing has completed its report. It was sent to council last midyear last year and it found that it found that the city needed additional data to determine whether or not there was any impacts from rent bidding platforms on our Seattle Fair Housing Ordinance. And it recommended for specific actions. The piece of legislation in front of you updates our statute to make sure that we're repealing the prohibition and also includes provisions responsive to the Office of Housing Report. This includes a request that Office of Housing collect data to track whether or not meeting platforms are functioning for bidding purposes or other non bidding functions. And. And to determine whether or not the platforms are having an impact on equitable access to housing, it requests that the Office of Civil Rights conduct testing to determine if remedying platforms are in compliance with fair housing laws. It requests that if data shows that bidding platforms are having an impact on equitable access to housing, that the OCR and Office of Housing will provide recommendations on possible regulations to mitigate unintended consequences. And it encourages rent bidding platforms to post the Seattle Open Housing poster on their website. Colleagues, I would love to have your support on this. It came out of

our Finance and Housing Committee with a unanimous vote and appreciate office of how things work to provide these recommendations to us. Are there any other comments? He's hearing none. Well, the point where the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill. Council members so want. Council member Strauss. I council member Herbold. I. Councilmember Juarez. Hi. Councilmember Lewis. I council member morales. I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Council President Macheda. I. Seven in favor, then opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passage and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature? This is Councilmember Mosquito. To the legislation on my behalf. I was acting as President Pro tem. And I'm Claire could you please read items to through five together into the record. Moving on to committee reports, agenda item number one item. Please read this item into the record. Every part of the City Council agenda item one Capital 119 754 relating to employment in Seattle and many sections 14.6 18.0 ten and point 0/30

get on this account to strengthen and clarify labor standards. Requirements for paid sick and paid staff. Time for employees working in Seattle. Declaring an emergency. Establishing an immediate effective date all by a three fourths vote at the City Council. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I move to pass Council Bill 11975. If there's a second, then we can have discussion. Okay. Okay. It's been moved and seconded to pass a bill. 119754. Several colleagues. This is a bill that I have had the chance to work on with members of the community. And there's a place in my office who leads us on labor for actually a number of months prior to the outbreak of COVID 19. I want to note that Carina Bohl is on the call with us from central staff. We appreciate her being here with us as lead on labor issues. So many questions. We're happy to have Carina weigh in as well. And I'm happy to provide some context about this bill. In addition to the information I shared with you last week, we had engaged in conversations for a number of months with labor organizations and community groups and child care advocates, folks like Rachel Adler, who you may remember from these law folks that protect 17 hour city union moms, raising Martin Luther King, County Labor Council and Civic Ventures. The conversation around coronavirus actually meant that we needed to expedite the passage and consideration of the legislation in front of you. What we heard from our conversations with these stakeholders this year and early last year was that their stories repeatedly of parents and caregivers who were worried about being able to take time off if their family members childcare is closed. This is very urgent and it remains urgent, even with the executive order issued by Governor Inslee and the school board over the last few days. The conversations revolve around the fact that there are schools and early learning facilities, child care centers, daycare centers that som

etimes end up closing due to public safety or public health concerns. And those closures are not mandated by a public official. As you see in the legislation in front of you, our attempt here is to try to address that concern by removing the language requiring a closure of a school or an early learning facility, daycare center to be closed at the mandate of a public official if a child care facility or a place where a dependent goes is closed. We thought that it was really imperative that the workers who have their kiddos there are also able to access their paid and sick days. This conversation is critical now with the closures of many schools and childcare facilities who are closing out of an abundance of caution. And even when asked at the federal level, President Trump was asked to address whether or not this means that daycares are supposed to close and they had no good answer. Basically, they said, We'll need to get back to you. So in the meantime, many of our excellent childcare providers, early learning centers, small schools are closing out of an abundance of caution without a public official mandating it. We want to make sure that those parents can access their paid sick and safely. It also is really important for us to think about how this could be considered in the context of closures for deep cleaning teacher services, snow closures, issues that are broader than coronavirus. This will allow those parents to access their paid, sick and safe days when the school is closing out of those safety issues as well. This allows for parents to be able to put food on the table and not worry about losing a day's wage when their dependents place of care is closing. So I understand that we are doing as much as we can to really help with small businesses, make sure that their wages for individuals losing their jobs, make sure that there's health care and access to information. The policy in front of us today, I think, is complementary to that effort to make sure that there's peace of mind for parents. This is one small piece of the puzzle to make sure that workers can access their paid, sick and safe leave if a school closure or a childcare or early learning place of care. If the entity is closing without a public officials directive, then there's no question the parents can access that care. Credible is with us from central staff, and I believe that there's also some potential amendments to come to this bill. So before we get into potential amendments, I want to see if there's any questions from our colleagues about the legislation, the underlying legislation in front of you. Okay. Hearing none. Thank you enough for being on the line with us that you could stay on the line just in case there's additional questions about the amendments that would be very helpful. Council colleagues. If there is a sorry council colleagues, Councilmember Herbold has an amendment that I would love for her to address. Councilmember Herbold, would you like to address your

amendment? Sorry I was done. I moved to amend Council Bill 11 9754 as presented on Amendment two. And if I can have a second, I can describe it. Second. Oops. Thank you. Just go ahead. Thank you. And so what this amendment would do is it would fill some gaps that exist,

similar to the description from Council President Pro Tem Mosqueda about situations where workers can access their paid sick and safe time when a public official has closed a business. This also would fill a gap in those instances when a business has closed for health or safety related reasons. But that closure has not occurred at the behest of a public official. And so whereas Governor Inslee's order from today will cover employees of restaurants, bars, entertainment, recreational facilities and retail outlets with reduced occupancy and gathering of 50 or more people. And those individuals who work at those establishments under this order and under, excuse me, existing, paid, sick and safely laws will be able to access their paid sick and safely. But our existing paid sick and safely does not cover discretionary closures that businesses may or may decide independently of an order to close. And may potentially not cover situations where there are reduced operations but not small business closures. And so this amendment is an attempt to fill that gap, but also recognizing the impacts to to to medium and small businesses for potentially having to pay 100% of their their second safely time if they do see a need themselves for for closure. So I'm trying to balance what I think is a a fair approach to allow workers to access a bank that they already have, but also recognizing that there are there are impacts to small and moderate businesses. Another gap that this that this amendment would fail is that under current employment security department rules, employees must wait for one week before receiving unemployment benefits for a standby claim. And so employers under this amendment could use paid safe time while waiting for employment, unemployment insurance benefits for a temporary layoff. And then finally, there is. The. Federal legislation that identifies qualifying needs. This this amendment would allow employees to use paid save time for qualifying needs that are not currently covered under the proposed federal bill. H.R. 6201. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold. Other questions about Councilmember Herbold amendment. Amendment number two. This is Councilmember Peterson. I've got a question. Thank you. Cosmo Petersen, please go ahead. And for the council's reference, we have amendment number one that Councilor Petersen and I are working on as well, that we will go back to Councilmember Petersen questions on a number two. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold, thank you for this amendment and for being thoughtful about small and midsize businesses just for the for the general public. Tier three employer is that employees with 250 or more employees. That's correct. Okay. And is it your

intent that this you know, this particular ordinance, the the whereas is and the findings are focused predominantly on the current coronavirus crisis, and that certainly bringing into sharp relief how we want to take a harder look at the paid sick and safely policies that that you worked on many years ago actually to found those for the city. And is it your intent that we're understanding that this amendment would have this change be a permanent change even beyond the current crisis? Thank you. Great question. I know that council member or council president pro tem Mascara has other sort of cleanup envisioned for paid sick and safe leaves at a later date. I would be perfectly happy to take a look at this at this policy at the appropriate time. I did want to also let you know that the Office of Labor Standards points to a desire to have some consistency between the three tiers. And I've reached out to the to the mayor's office, both the labor liaison and the mayor's office business liaison. And I have been told that they are fine with the amendment as drafted. They understand the Office of Labor Standards point about the they preferred approach to have consistency between the three tiers, but feel that we could reevaluate that in the future. I really appreciate you reaching out to the executive department that would be overseeing it as well as you're saying the business liaison as well. That is correct. Okay. Thank you for doing that outreach because I know things are moving really fast around here. So I just want to flag my concern for you. You know, I am very open to looking at these policy changes that would be made permanent in the future. I just I'm a little concerned about doing it so quickly here. I'm not it's not necessarily not a good idea. It's just that it's happening fast. And I don't and I'm glad to hear that that outreach was done. That makes me feel a lot more comfortable. So thanks for answering my questions. Sure. And I will I will I will send you the the language that I received from the mayor's office. In response, I already shared it with council president pro tem Mosqueda. I'll send it to you as well. Thank you. Thank you. Have never heard council councilmember colleagues. Is there any additional question for Councilmember Herbold on amendment number two? Sure? None. Councilmember Hubble, thank you for your work on this. As you mentioned, I think that this is in line with the directive that the governor has also hope that many employers will take advantage of, and that has also expanded access to leave options at the state level. I think that this is a friendly amendment and a really well timed amendment. And as you

mentioned, we will again come back to this question about second safely and see what other clean up legislation is needed. Hopefully you knock on wood when times come back to normal. So we will engage in the robust stakeholder engagement of that process as well and look forward to having you and Councilor Paterson

as well involved in that discussion. Thank you for your support. Thank you. Hearing no other comments or questions on amendment number two, will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of Amendment number two as outlined by Councilmember Hubble? Councilmember Strauss. I. Councilmember Herbold II Councilmember Suarez. I. Councilmember Lewis. I. Councilmember Morales. I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Terrible members of what I. Council President Muscat us. I. Eight in favor of an unopposed. Thank you very much, council clerk. The amendment is adopted and the council bill is amended. We have one more amendment for consideration before final passage. This is amendment number one, which I am supporting along with Councilmember Peterson. Copy number. Peterson is the prime sponsor of this amendment. Would you like to speak to it? Yes. Thank you, Councilmember. This amendment is adding a finding to the council bill to basically add clarity that this change regarding schools and places of care will go on in the future, that it's not just during this crisis and just felt it was important to signal to the general public that it this is this is not just about the pandemic, but it would go beyond that. And I really appreciate councilmember skater's leadership on this and also being very open to my questions during the process. I know there's there's been a lot of common ground and unity during this crisis by this council, and I really appreciate that continuing here. Happy to answer any questions. Peterson. Thank you so much. I appreciate your leadership on this. And for the collaborative work you've done to make some clarifying, clarifying language really, really stand out here. So thank you. Couple colleagues, are there any other questions for come from Peterson? Appreciate all of your work, Councilmember Peterson. There are no other comments or questions on a number one. Well, the clerk to call the roll on adoption of amendment number one. Councilmember Strauss. I. Council member, Herbold. I. Councilmember Suarez. I Council member Lewis. Hi. Councilmember Morales. I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Councilmember so on i. Council President Mesquita I attend favor and oppose. Thank you. Council colleagues amendment number one and number two have been included, as you just said. Again, the motion carries and the amendment is adopted. Council colleagues, the amendment, number one and number two have been adopted into the bill. Are there any further comments on the bill as amended? Vernon, will the clerk please call the roll on the final passage of the bill as amended? So sorry from President Mosquito. I did have a moment. So sorry I was too quick. Folks have to get off on the council. Want to go ahead? Thank you so much. Council President Jordan Mosquito. I wanted to make some remarks in the interest of public input. I will be supporting this ordinance, of course, to clarify that Seattle's basic and safe dime is available to workers who need to take time off t

o care for a family member if their school or other place of care is shut down. And I appreciate the presence of the mosquito and other council members on this effort. The qualifier that is going to be removed from the underlying ordinance is important. And of course, I would hope that even with the original language, the law would be applied in the case as we hope to be, hopefully will be applied to. But it's good to make it clear that it does and I will be supporting that. I do want you to know that as we know this this the vote today that we will be taking today and the underlying ordinance, unfortunately, do not still do not address the most pressing limitations that workers face, which is the lack of guaranteed paid leave, whether it's here or nationally, and that workers only have access to, at most a few paid station sick days per year, which we know is not nearly not nearly enough time in normal circumstances, and certainly not sufficient to cover the time people might end up having to spend in quarantine in the context of a pandemic or the months the schools might be shut down. You know, workers accrue one hour of paid saving sick time every 30 or 40 hours work, depending on the size of the business. That means a worker within in the job for six months will only have three or four page seven sick days available. And because the hours that can roll over from year to year is limited, workers will have to max out about two weeks they leave. Those days are essential under normal circumstances, but I don't believe they're sufficient under the coronavirus crisis. And I think that this should be used as an opportunity also to highlight the need for working people to fight for guaranteed paid leave, both locally and nationally, and also the fact that, you know, businesses should be urged right now, the businesses that do remain open within

the state mandated requirements that they should be urged to guarantee workers all the paid time off they need, because we know that the alternative is workers returning to work sick and fact infectious. Thank you. Thank you. I also want to take a few moments to thank Moms Raising Protect 17 and Civic Ventures Council colleagues. You should have letters in your inbox from them who wrote in letters of support and think that there's a break. I know there's a lot more that much of us that was working on to try to address in light of the desire to make some amendments to the second safe leave legislation. For a long time, this is the tip of the iceberg and we'll continue those efforts. Hearing no additional comments. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill as amended? Councilmember Strauss. I. Council member, Herbold. I Council Member Warren I Council Member Lewis. High. Council Member Morales I Member Peterson. II. Council Member So on. I. Council President Muscat on. I. Eight in favor and then opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk pleas

e affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Moving on to item number two Transportation Utility. Please read the report referred to Transportation and Utilities Committee Agenda Item Member two Resolution 319 32 relating to the City Department acknowledging and approving city lights. Adoption of a biannual energy conservation target for 2024, 2021 and ten years of conservation potential. Agenda item five. Resolution 319 42. Adding the West Seattle Bridge Emergency Closure and repairs to the watch list of capital projects for enhanced quarterly monitoring. Establishment Resolution 319 31. Okay. Thank you so much. I move to adopt resolution 31942. Is there a second check? It's been moved the second to adopt the resolution. I am going to hand it over to Councilmember Herbold as the lead sponsor of this resolution to address the resolution. Please come to my verbal. The floor is yours. Thank you so much. This resolution would place the West Seattle Bridge onto the capital improvement program watchlist. Just some general points. As you know, the council has has a watch list that we approve every year and we create a yearly watch list by resolution. Just last month, the council approved resolution 31931 sponsored by comes from Muscala to adopt the 2020 Capital. Projects Watch list for projects requiring. Quarterly enhanced reporting. In 2018, the Council adopted legislation to establish this enhanced reporting, which includes these quarterly updates on all individual projects that are on the watch list itself, as well as ongoing programs. This resolution adds the West Seattle Bridge to the 2020 watch list. It does so in light of the fact that a week ago it announced the closure of the West Seattle Bridge due the public safety threat posed by cracks that were expanding rapidly. They announced the closure of the West Seattle Bridge to two council members about 3 hours before actually closing the bridge. So that really highlights the need to get projects like this in front of the council. And any time that there is advance knowledge of there being being risk associated with the project. Now that we know that there is risk, we want to make sure that we are monitoring the short term and long term work associated with this project as it relates specifically to some of the technical aspects of the legislation, because the project doesn't have a capital project ID number yet. It's described a little differently than other projects adopted by by resolution in the watch list. And so for that reason, it says the city council requests that the mayor add any capital projects with spending related to the near term. Repair. Long term repair and mitigation during closure of the West Seattle Bridge to the 2020 watch list for enhanced quarterly reporting, as described in Section two of Resolution 31931. So we have that description of the project instead of as an identification number. I really want to thank Councilmember Peterson, the chair of the related comm

ittee, for his work on the resolution and co-sponsoring it and his commitment as chair to work towards greater transparency and public reporting on important escort issues. I do have a small amendment as well, just to kind of get to the meat of the importance of the bridge. Okay. So why don't we go ahead and consider your amendment first and then once we vote on that amendment, we can provide your co-sponsor, Councilmember Peterson, an opportunity to make remarks as well. So why don't you go ahead and make the formal motion to introduce the amendment? Councilmember Herbold. I moved to amend Resolution 31942 as presented on version two of Amendment one of the agenda. Okay. Is there a second? Second. It's been moved and seconded to amend the resolution. Councilmember Herbold, would you like to speak to the amendment? Thank you. Yes, this amendment was requested by a member of the community in West Seattle. I do agree that it's really important to highlight the critical nature of the West Seattle Bridge as the busiest roadway in the city of Seattle, handling 100,000 vehicle per weekday under normal

conditions, along with 70,000 transit riders and ferry traffic from Vachon and Kitsap County, including this language in the resolution. Putting this project on the watch list, we are signaling as a council that we understand and agree the importance of this of this roadway to to Seattle residents, not just on the peninsula, but throughout the city. Great. Are there any comments on the amendments? Okay. Hearing none. Well, the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the amendment. Councilmember Suarez, I. Councilmember Lewis. I. Councilmember Morales. I. Council member Macheda. I Material Council member Peterson. I. Council members want. Councilmember Strauss, I. Councilmember Herbert. Hi. President Gonzalez. I. Eight in favor, none opposed. Okay. The motion carries and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further comments on the resolution as amended? And I, I think this might be an appropriate time to hear from Councilmember Peterson, if you would like to make some remarks. Thank you. Council President, just briefly, I appreciate working with Councilmember Herbold on this. I think that we were all surprised last week to hear about the need to close the Seattle Bridge so suddenly. But we support the decision of the mayor and start to do that closure. However, we want to put it on the watch list because now it's become a major capital project. We have to intensify our scrutiny of this not only the West Seattle Bridge, but it really raises the question about what is our start doing with the other major bridges throughout our city that need major maintenance and repair? There are some seismic projects that are happening throughout our city on bridges. So really just raising the level of intense scrutiny on getting back to the basics of our city infrastructure so that we can not only get the West Seattle Bridge fixed and open as quickly as possible

to keep everybody safe, but also to look deeper at what our state is doing with the other bridges throughout our city. So I look forward to working with our state and my council colleagues to intensify oversight of this. Thank you. I thank you, Councilmember Peterson, for those remarks. Are there any other comments on the resolution? As amended. All right. Hearing well, the clerk is called the roll on the adoption of the resolution as amended. Council member, Juarez High Council member Luis. I. Councilmember Morales, I. Councilmember Mesquita. I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Council members want. Councilmember Strauss. I. Councilmember Herbold. I. President Gonzales. I ain't in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The resolution is adopted as amended and the chair will sign. It will please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. So we are now going to address other. I understand that a councilor will say that has other business for the Council to consider, so I will hand it over to her. Council President Gonzalez, this is show me. So I'm sorry. We lost we lost you for a moment. I understand you have some technological difficulties, so thanks for calling back. Yes, absolutely. But I was just going to request, could we take the last two votes that I missed again so I can vote? Oh, boy. Yes. I'm going to have to remember my Robert's Rules of Order. So I think I have to move for reconsideration of. Of those agenda items. Is that correct, Madam Clerk? This is Amelia. Yes, that's correct. And we can do that by unanimous consent. So if you'd like to request that there's no objection for reconsideration of agenda item four as amended as well as number five, and then after you seek the reconsideration for item for, then we will give you the roll call. Okay, great. And if there is no objection to is if there is no objection to reconsideration of agenda item four as amended, we will reconsider it. Hearing no objection. We will reconsider agenda item four as amended. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of resolution 31940 as amended? Councilmember warrants. Hi. I'm sorry. Councilmember Lewis. I. Councilmember Morales. I come from Ramon's ghetto. If they lose her, I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Council members who want I. Councilmember Strauss. I. Councilmember Herbold. I. President Gonzalez. I. I'm in favor and I'm opposed. Okay. So the. Adoption of resolution 31940 passes and the chair will sign it if the Court will please affix my signature to the list on my behalf. If there is no objection, we will reconsider agenda item five, which is resolution 31942. CHEERING Gentlemen, please. Okay, hold on here. No objection to the reconsideration of an agenda item five, which is resolution 31942. I'll ask that the clerk please hold the roll on the passage of resolution 31942. Councilmember Suarez, but. Council member, Lewis. I. Councilmember Morales. I. Council member. Ambassador I. Council member Peterson. I. Council member. So what I can rememb

er. Strauss. I remember herbals. I. Do dollars. I. Nine in favor and then opposed. The resolution as adopted, as amended, and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? All right, so other business this I understand that council members get a has a letter to discuss with us. So I'm going to hand it over to her for discussion. Thank you. Council

president and I again want to thank our central staff. I know they did a lot of work over the weekend on many of those amendments, so just a special thank you to them. Also on Friday, I circulated to your offices a sign on letter for the city of Seattle, the council members to send a message to our governor's office to extend a moratorium on all foreclosures, including multi-family structures and commercial properties throughout the state. This is in line with much of the conversation we've already had today. So I'll just say, well, there's been action taken at the city and the state to protect residents, small businesses and nonprofits from eviction. All of our offices are hearing the concerns that we've already talked about today, that banks will foreclose on thousands of property owners and that those property owners are facing loss of income for households and small businesses due to the downward spiral in the market. A lot of our renters who live in the city live in multi-family structures, and families across Washington are being forced to choose between necessities like food or paying for rent. While many businesses are also struggling to stay afloat and may be unable to make their rent or mortgage payments as a result of this crisis, placing a moratorium on evictions would complement other protections that we have already enacted as the city of Seattle and that you have seen echoed at the state level thanks to Governor Inslee. I think this would support housing stability and economic resilience for our communities and would help us avoid long term negative impacts. Our economy is statewide. Moratorium on foreclosures would address large gaps in the state that the federal administration has taken to authorize the Federal Housing Authority to implement a foreclosure and eviction moratorium for single family homeowners with FHA insured mortgages for the next 60 days. It also responds to the call from the Washington Low Income Housing Alliance and others to enact foreclosure moratoriums to help protect renters and small business owners as well. The letter has been discussed with the governor's office and the governor's staff, and I think that they appreciate us continuing to elevate these issues. They said that the letter would be welcomed as they look at various strategies at the state level to address the requests that they're also getting. So with your consideration, we'd love to have the council members sign on to the letter that has been circulated. We will affix your electronic signature to the letter if you indicate if you're interested in s

igning on. I mentioned this in my emails to the City Council, but a special thank you to Councilmember Peterson for following up with law on the request from the Washington Low Income Housing Alliance to advocate for foreclosure moratorium that would protect multifamily housing providers. Thanks to customer referral for weighing in as well. And you've already heard other councilmembers a morales and so lot that are working on similar efforts but really appreciate your consideration of signing on to this letter to the governor's office to continue to amplify the call for state level action as well as, I think, what Councilmember Morales effort did, which was to call for federal action. I appreciate all that's happened in our efforts already to try to protect homeowners and small business owners. This would be, I think, a really important measure as we look at protecting renters and those who are paying as small business owners as well as their monthly rent. So thanks for the consideration. And again, thanks to customer Peterson Brown for helping to draft that initial letter. That's the central. Thank you, Councilmember Mosqueda. So typically we deal with letters that are being circulated in in an open public session in order to make sure that we're complying with the Open Public Meetings Act. So I really appreciate you bringing in this opportunity for in this public setting. Before I go through the process of seeing who would like to have their signature added to the letter, I'm going to open it up and see if anyone has any additional comments or questions about the proposed letter. Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. I also just want to give a shout out to Councilmember Kate Burke in Spokane. Councilmember Burke has been doing a really wonderful job of assembling council members throughout the state who are housing champions to talk through many of these issues so that we can be speaking with a unified voice. This is one of those issues that came up in that context. I know it's come up in other contexts as well, but if folks who are on the council are interested in learning more about Councilmember Burke's housing champions calls just shoot me. Or Councilmember Mosqueda an email and we'll be sure to get you on as well. It's a really great opportunity not just for us to talk to one another, but for us to be guided by the on the ground work that our advocates in the housing community are doing, as in particular led by the Washington Low Income Housing Alliance. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold. Are there any other questions or comments by my colleagues? Okay. Seen none. Just to avoid having to do a roll call again, I'm going to sort of do this in the negative, if you will. If you do not want your name added to you, do not want your electronic

signature affixed to the letter as described by Councilmember Mosqueda. Please, please indicate so now. Okay. I'm not hearing anyone register their objection. So it sounds like you have the consent

by all council members to have their electronic signature affixed to your letter. Council Member State I thank you for bringing it forward in open session and all present with our rules and state law. Really appreciate it and really looking forward to having that letter be transmitted to the governor. I think it's really important as we are continuing our conversations around providing relief to tenants. It's really important for us to acknowledge that there are many renters who who need this relief. But there's also it's really important for us to acknowledge that there are plenty of homeowners or condo owners that are going to be and are experiencing economic distress as a result of the economic crisis that was precipitated by COVID 19. So that's really important for us to make sure that we're looking at this as holistically as possible, to provide that to ensure that those reliefs can be provided. So I really appreciate your advocacy. Okay. Is there any other further business to come before the council? Okay. Hearing on that was the last item of business on our agenda. Our next regularly scheduled full council meeting will be on April 6th at 2 p.m. and there is no other business to come before us, so we are adjourned. Thank you, everyone. Thank you. On the agenda. Will the clerk please read agenda items two and three into the record? Agenda items two and three quick file. 3144284 Unit lot subdivision ono rim development LLC to subdivide one parcel and. 21 unit. Lot at 8559. Mary Avenue. Northwest. Agenda Item 34119776. Approving and confirming the part of Serrano Roy in portions of the southwest quarter of a quarter of section 36, Township 26, north range three east in King County, Washington. Thank you. I will move. Clerk file 314428. Be placed on file. Is there a second? Second sentence. Okay. Thank you so much. It's been moved a second into place. The clerk file on file council member stressed both items two and three were have been read into the record. We are going to take separate votes on each item but I think it makes sense since they're related for you to address items two and three together . Great. Thank you. Council president and I also have Councilman Morales on the phone because she's not able to call into this virtual meeting. Not that this has anything to do with the previous piece of legislation that we just voted on with technological issues for meetings. Councilmember Strauss, thank you so much for reminding us that Councilmember Morales is continuing to have technological issues here. If I can have the legislative I.T. department try to contact Councilmember Morales while you continue to have her on the line, that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you. Yes, my question is how best to move forward? So I will speak again to items two and three. Clark, file 314, four, two eight and culpable 119776. This is the final plat approval for the view on Roy 8559 Mary Avenue Northeast in the Crown Hill Urban Village. This plat would

divide one parcel into 21 units for the sale of individual townhomes. These townhomes have been constructed. Council role in this process is to certify that the plat has met the conditions placed by the hearing examiner and we are as a council are required to act within 30 days of the final plat being filed. Scott as DCI and Cancer Council central staff have confirmed that the PLAT meets the applicable conditions and recommend that we grant final approval. Is this the time for me to move the bill or. No. I've already I've already moved the clerk file. So we're going to take a vote on the clerk file first, take comments, and if and then we'll and then we'll move for that for the bill. So are there any questions or additional comments on agenda items? One, two or three? Okay. Hearing none. No comments on the clerk file. Well, the clerk please call the roll on the filing of the clerk file. Mosquito. I. Peterson. I want. I. Strauss. I. Purple. I. Suarez. I. Lewis. Hi. Morales. I. Council. President Gonzalez, I. Nine in favor. None opposed the motion carries and the clerk file is placed on file at will. The the clerk is already read agenda item three into the record, which is council bill 119776. So I will move to pass council bill 119776. Is there a second second. It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Strauss anything else that you would like to add to this discussion? Nothing further to say at this time. Thank you, Council President. Thank you so much. Are there any other comments or questions on the bill? K hearing none. Will the clerk please call the roll on the part of the bill? Macheda i. Peterson. I'm the one I. Strauss i. Verbal I. Whereas I. Louis II. Morales. I lost her over here. All right. President Gonzalez. Morales, as we tried to call. It. Hold on a minute. I see her I see her name pop up. Can you call her name again? Jodi. Councilmember Morales. I. And President Gonzalez. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. I ask that the clerk please affix my signatures to the legislation on

my behalf. We're now going to move to other business. Is there any other for their business to come before the council? Ain't seen none. That is the last item of business on our agenda for today. The next city council meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 27, 2020, at 2 p.m.. There is again nothing left on our agenda, so we are adjourned. Thank you, everyone, and enjoy the rest of your day. Bye bye. Agenda Item one Capital 119 781 relating to the city's response to the 2020 COVID 19 crisis 26,000, which is the 2020 budget appropriations to various departments and budget control levels and from various funds in the budget. Declaring an emergency and establishing an effective date for the City Council. Thank you, Madam Park. I moved to pass Council Bill 119791. Is there a second? Second? It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Mosqueda, you are the sponsor of the bill and we'll hand

it over to you to address this particular bill. Thank you, Council President. Thank you. Council colleagues. As you have heard from me over the last week or so, we have worked to put some language together in Council Bill 119783 as a follow up to the legislation that we passed. I'm sorry. As a follow up to legislation. We passed on May 4th, which was Constable 119783. The bill in front of us counts about 119791. Make sure that we move forward on accepting and appropriating federal and state funding related to COVID 19 pandemic crisis in response, including CARES Act funding. This allows for us to allocate the remaining \$1.4 million of CDBG funds through this substitute. This allows for us to make sure that the CDBG funds are being spent, ideally on policies that help with densification and redistribution of individuals who are currently in our shelter system. Among a number of other strategies to help make sure that people have appropriate housing and shelter to respond to the COVID crisis. We know that \$1.4 million is not a ton of money. Our hope is that this is a down payment on the densification and redistribution efforts to initiate future policy discussions and funding to come from future conversations with the department and the mayor's office so that we can all work towards reducing even further congregate, shelter setting numbers. We know that the congregate shelters are not really considered a safe space, especially given the high risk of individuals in those shelters due to underlying health conditions and their age, which we know is critical for people to have the appropriate public health response. While the 1.4 that we're allocating today to date, that's vacation and redistribution doesn't specifically talk about individual rooms or hotels, I think that this will be a nice complement to future conversations and future investments that we hope to see over the next week or two when we look at additional federal dollars. Again, our hope is that this of 1.4 million, in combination with future dollars from the executive and the CBO that they're evaluating right now, will help us identify additional funds that can be used for frontline homeless service providers. We've talked a lot about mounting costs to support COVID related response, including the need for additional pay for staff, PPE, cleaning food services and other services as we try to serve this very vulnerable population. The good news is that in addition to the funding that we already approved in the last bill, we have learned that \$130 million from the Corona Relief Fund can also be used for a comprehensive strategy to meet both the needs for densification and can be used for rental assistance. So it's really important for us to look at the holistic picture as these dollars come forward over the next week and make sure that we're doing both and both rental assistance to prevent folks from falling into homelessness and also to respond to the public health crisis and to move tow

ards additional densification and redistribution strategies. To date, we are aware that there's conversations happening between homeless service providers and departments and the mayor and the mayor's office. So we appreciate that. We look forward to future conversations about the additional staff cleaning food services and housing options. And today, again, while this is not a ton of money, the \$1.4 million, I think, does signal our interest in adding additional support to the densification redistribution. Even if we're not directing it towards individual rooms, we have, I think, a joint interest and expressed a shared a shared interest in moving forward on that public health strategy and hoping to have future conversations about this with the next round of funding. Very happy to have learned that the 130 million from the CRF walk run relief fund can also be used for rental assistance. So colleagues, I know that was a question earlier and we will have more opportunities to allocate additional funding as well as efforts around identification and redistribution in our future funds. Thank you all for hopefully your support as we get 1.4 million out the door to quickly deploys as much funding as we possibly can for this critical population. It's not a ton of money, as we talked about, but it will make an important downpayment and signal our interest in

future conversations. Thank you so much. I thank you, Councilmember Mesquita, for those remarks. Are there any other comments on the bill? Councilmember Herbold, the floor is yours. You're right. I did. You recognize me? I did. I did recognize you. You broke up this time for me. Sorry. Sorry. I'm your friend. Well, I appreciate it. Thank you so much. I just want to, again, as I did this morning, flag my concern. I'm going to vote in favor of this legislation, although to be very honest, I'm not sure I understand it. We originally signaled by amending the previous bill and taking this money out of the rent assistance, its use as a way to try to leverage some discussions with the mayor's office to ensure that they would embrace a different model of the intensification of shelters, a model that does not rely on a congregate care model, but instead moves to individual rooms. These are the safest settings for both staff and clients. This legislation does not make that distinction, and I understand why. It's because the executive hasn't embraced this as a priority to support for its specific intensification goals. Nevertheless, if without having accomplished that, I'm not sure why we are moving this money away from rental assistance to to address the increased cost of shelter providers for providing service and for their staffing needs. I recognize that there are those increased costs. We have future pieces of legislation that can help fund the increased costs associated with shelter, as well as the increased needs of of rent assistance. Though and I appreciate that Budget Director Noble has proposed

a path forward where we can swap some funds in a future piece of legislation. But it just it seems very unnecessary to to do that, given the fact that we could have just. Voted to put the money where it was originally proposed to be put and then subsequently fund the needs associated with the intensification of of shelter and their increased costs. I want to recognize that just in general, I have concerns about putting off rental assistance relief. There were 9000 applications received by United Way of King County over a period of 48 hours, and only 2000 households received assistance. And it's really important. To note that at. United Way of King County is able to provide rental assistance regardless of documentation of immigration status. So it's a very rare source of support for this population. I do recognize that we are going to hopefully be able to make what were the proposed efforts to to fully fund the rental assistance needs in the previous legislation, that there is a commitment to make those whole in a subsequent piece of legislation. But just am puzzled as to why we why we are taking this action, given the fact that there is there is more flexible funds available in in the next week or two to address the shelter needs. So I'm going to provide a customer mosquito sponsor of the bill an opportunity to respond. So councilmember mosquito handed over to you. Thank you. Council President and I want to underscore I share Councilmember Herbold frustration that we have not received confirmation that densification will include individual rooms. Obviously, this is a policy difference of opinion that we have with the executive right now. I will say this, the reason that I think it's important that we are putting forward the legislation and held back the 1.4 is that some leverage has already been accomplished. We know that there has been conversations over the last week and a half that have led to us having some that have led to the executive and the departments having conversations directly with homeless service providers prior to when this bill was originally sent down. There were new conversations that have been reported to us. We had heard from a number of homeless service providers that they had serious concerns about the policies being advanced without sort of checking in to see what the lay of the land was on the ground. Those conversations have happened. You're correct that there is still a policy difference of opinion on individual realms, which I think you and I and the CDC would argue is a good public health strategy. However, I think that when we look at the language in front of us, it does not preclude individual rooms. It offers it as part of the solution. And we know that in conversations with the CBO and others, they are considering an array of ways to do that. I wish that it was all going into individual rooms, but here's I think the reality that we're faced with. We know that there's 130 million from the Corona Relief Fund that

we have now identified can also be used for rental assistance, because that wasn't the case when the bill was introduced and there was a real fear that there wouldn't be those flexible dollars to be used for rental assistance in the future. We had a lot of pressure to get all the money out the door for rental assistance. We held back the \$1.4 million, though, with the desire for a leverage, but B, to make sure that the folks who are currently in shelters do see some form of de densification or de intensification that could include hotel rooms, but it could also include a number of other strategies that they say that they're working on right now. We know there's about 500 people who are

currently in congregate shelters who need densification strategies. I think by putting forward this piece of legislation and continuing to work to amplify our call for individual rooms, and I definitely want to underscore my support for that as a long time proponent of that strategy. Part of the reason that we had gone down this path is to try to urge the 1.4 million to be used for hotel rooms. That is still not a ton of money, but I think putting it forward does signal our interest in that policy discussion, and it also doesn't necessarily hold back the funds that could be used for helping the 500 people that are currently in shelters who need some level of identification. Also, I'll say about the rental assistance and small businesses piece were included in the initial policy that passed. So there was funding that went out. We understand that there's going to be additional funding from the dollars that do come from the executive office here soon. And we'll have the opportunity to ask whether or not that's enough rental assistance or whether it's enough assistance for folks to get out of congregate shelter services in the future. But I think the answer to the why now is we have 1.4 million. We also know that that's a drop in the bucket of what's needed for both rental assistance and for what is needed for the intensification. Since we already put money forward in this last bill for rental assistance and we know now that there's more money coming from the broader relief fund that we can use for rental assistance. My hope was to put the 1.4 million forward to allocate it for an array of D intensification services to really signal our interest to councils, interest in seeing those funds go into place now to help with whomever we can with the 500 individuals who need assistance immediately and that we complement those funds with future dollars. I don't think the you know, the leverage has obviously been a release. I think it's definitely initiated conversations that hadn't happened prior. And I appreciate, I think, our joint interest in both the intensification and rental assistance. This effort, I think, allows for both those policies to move forward in a complementary way. Add to that. Any other comments on the bill, colleagues? Okay. Seen no other comments on the b

ill. I'm going to go ahead and ask that the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Herbold, I. Juarez. I. Is I? Morale is high. Let's get her. I. Peterson. I. So i. I. Drought high. President Gonzales. I. Not in favor, not opposed. Thank you so much. The bill passes and the chair will sign it and I the to fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. We're not going to move to agenda items two and three, and I'd ask that the clerk please read both items two and three into the record. Agenda Item two Capital 119 784 relating to city employment, authorizing execution of a collective bargaining agreement between the city, Seattle and Seattle. Parking enforcement officers. Guilt and Ratifying Confirming Search for Iraq. I thank you so much. I'm honored to pass Council Bill 1197894. Is there a second? Second. It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill as sponsor of the bill. I will address that first and then see if any of you colleagues have comments to add. Council Bill 119794. As I discussed in this morning's council briefing is related to the Seattle Parking Enforcement Officers Guild's Collective Bargaining Agreement. This council bill would authorize the execution of a negotiated union contract between the city of Seattle and that bargaining unit. This is a three year contract from January 1st, 2019 through December 31st, 2021, and includes approximately 105 regularly appointed city employees in the Seattle Police Department. The financial terms of this union contract are similar to those of the State Coalition's union contracts and include a retroactive 4% annual wage increase for 2019 and a 3.6% annual wage increase for 2020. The financial and non-financial terms in this collective bargaining agreement were considered and approved by the members of the Labor Relations Policy Committee and are within those previously approved parameters. I'm happy to entertain any questions or hear any comments from any of my colleagues. Councilmember Peterson. Thank you. Council President Gonzalez, I appreciate. The hard work of our Labor Relations Policy Committee and the difficult decisions that you have to make. I do not serve on that particular committee of legislative and executive leaders who represent management and who negotiate the multitude of employment contracts. Impacting 12,000 city government workers. I carefully consider each contract on its own terms, and. At this moment in time, with the grim. Fiscal challenges our city. Government faces today, I'll be voting no on this particular contract for parking enforcement officers. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, for those remarks. Just really quickly, I want to be just responsive to the extent that I can. We don't need to belabor the point, but this this particular contract, and based on the evaluation given to us by the city Budget Office, does not have dire or detrimental impacts on the projected deficit of the city of Seattle. I think that I and the members of

the Labor Relations Policy Committee, which include four other Council members and members of the executive team, carefully engaged with the city budget office to make sure that this was not only a high road employer contract, but also a contract that was fiscally responsible and within our existing means as a city and feel comfortable that the contract before us strikes the right balance and that in approving this contract, we will not be subjecting the city budget to to further pressure or crisis as a result of the the the contract. So I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting approval of this particular contract. Any other questions or comments, colleagues? Because remember Lewis. Thank you so much, Madam President. I do just want to signal that I will be voting in favor of ratifying this contract today. I think it's critical that as we go into what is going to be a very difficult a lot of very difficult conversations about the budget over the summer, in this fall, can we not lose sight of the fact that some of the most essential functions of government that we serve as a city are our first responders, law enforcement, firefighters, and certainly the employees that are included under this contract that provide an essential law enforcement based mechanism that is really essential to maintaining the social contract that holds the city of Seattle together . This these are some of the services that we need to fight more than ever to make sure that we are maintaining adequately and that these are workers, that we are seeking to have measures in place to retain and encourage them to stay in our workforce. There's never been a more appropriate time, I think, to ratify a contract like this for this group of workers. I hope it sets a precedent that we try to make sure that we set a budget that not only delivers essential services, but really defines our values as a progressive city. And I think it really starts by making sure that we boldly stand by some of the workers doing really essential and critical work out there. That hasn't abated during this crisis. So I will be voting in favor of this. Thank you, Councilmember Lewis. Any other comments or questions on the bill? Hearing and seeing none. I would ask that the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill. Lewis, I. Morales, I. Let's get a my. PETERSON No. Strauss. I. Purple. I. President Gonzalez, I. Six in favor. One opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. And I doubt that the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Okay, colleagues. Well, we're going to go ahead and move to agenda item three, which is emergency legislation and will require a three quarters vote of the city council. This is the next agenda item, and I'd ask that the clerk please read item three into the record. A short title is fine. Agenda Item three Capital 119795 Relations for the employment authorized execution of a memorandum of Understanding for Flexibility to start a ci

vil emergency declared on March three, 2020, providing certain benefits that conditions for employees using relief pursuant to the Families First Coronavirus Response Act. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it and doubt that the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation. All right, let's move into committee reports of the city council. Will the clerk please read agenda item one into the record? Agenda Item one Council Bill 1197 97.1 Banning extending for six months the moratorium established by ordinance 1 to 5 764 and extended by Ordinance 20 6006 on the filing, acceptance, processing and or approval for any application to capture a new principal or accessory you or change a principal or accessory use for any site. Currently used. As a mobile home park, as defined in section 23.84 8.20 32 on this code. Thank you. Before I open the public hearing on this item, I'm going to turn it over to council members to want who as lead sponsor of the bill, may want to provide us with some introductory remarks. And then if Councilmember Warrens would also like to provide some introductory remarks, she will have an opportunity to do so as well as members want. The floor is yours. Thank you, President Gonzalez. This council will extend the temporary zoning restrictions that protect the residents of Seattle's remaining mobile home parks from displacement. One and a half years ago, the residents of the Halcyon Mobile Home Park not to have them contact the city council because their park owner at the time. There's a new owner. No. Was attempting to sell it to a developer. And when mobile home parks are eliminated, it can be absolutely devastating for the residents. The residents own their mobile manufactured homes, but despite the name, they are often unable to be moved. So when the land is redeveloped, everyone often loses everything. People are left with mortgages to manufactured homes that they can no longer keep and have nowhere to go. This was particularly dangerous as an outcome potential outcome for the residents of the Halcyon Mobile Home Park, who are seniors who have paid their dues to the community work for decades, and many of whom have been former union members. My office worked with the residents to develop and bus temporary zoning protections to prevent mobile home parks from being redeveloped into anything different. And through their excellent community organizing, we were able to pass that legislation, and councilmembers who were there the last few

years will remember that they are moving public testimony. Councilors passed temporary zoning restrictions and requested that the city departments do the work required to make those or other zoning protections permanent. Unfortunately, Mayor Dawkins departments have not prioritized so far that protecting the homes of the residents of Seattle's mobile home parks and really no progress has been made on the zoning work. So we will need a council bill for the temporary extension, w

hich the residents have correctly requested. I thank contemporaries for co-sponsoring this. I hope the Council will pass this six month extension day and I again request Mayor Durkan to agree to have the Seattle Department of Construction inspections of the Department of. Learning and community development. Do the CPR work necessary to make these protections permanent? Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember, and the want for bringing this bill forward together with councilmember suarez and for those opening remarks. I understand that councilmember suarez and you coordinated in advance and you were taking the lead on making remarks. So we will go ahead and move on now to the public hearing portion of today's agenda. So as Presiding Officer, I am now opening the public hearing on Council Bill 119797 extending the moratorium established by Ordinance 125764 on the filing, acceptance, processing and or approval of any application to establish a new principal or accessory use or change a principal or accessory use for any site currently used as a mobile home park. There are currently at least two mobile home parks located in the city of Seattle. The first is the housing mobile home park and the second is the Bellerby mobile home park. The online registration to sign up to speak at this hearing opened at 12 noon today, and I will call on speakers in the order of pre-registration. The online registration will remain open until the conclusion of this public hearing. The rules apply to the public comment period also apply to those public hearings at which Speaker will be provided 2 minutes and will receive a 10/2 warning to wrap up their comments. Speakers microphones will be automatically muted at the end of the allotted two minute public comment period. Public comment relating to Council Bill 119797 is only being accepted at this public hearing. Speakers are asked to begin their comments by stating their name. And without further ado. We'll go ahead and begin the process of. Accepting public comment on this particular council bill. We only have three people signed up at this point for public comment. The first is Linda McCoy and then we will hear from Dominique Chandler. Linda. Hi, I'm Linda McCoy, and I'm the current president of the homeowner's association here at Health Yard. And I just want to say that we learned very, very late, like just yesterday evening, how this worked. So several people have sent emails to you about this. So if you have a chance to read them, please do. Patti Zetland is one and Sharon Brown is another. She wanted me to mention that. So thank you. Councilmember suarez and councilmember someone for putting this forward and for helping us get through. Two things happened that made it difficult for us to move forward on getting the things done for the. Reason or permanent. Where and when we changed the board of directors here. So we had to kind of start over with a new group. And then of course, COVID 19 happened. So because of that,

we really weren't able to to move forward with use or intention is to request that you pass this extra extension. And then in the next six months that we work with you in the mayor's office and the city department to get the reports done that need to be done in order to move this into a permanent zoning mobile only. Okay. I guess that's it. I am I. You got about 4 seconds. You got about 4 seconds. Okay, well, vote yes. I don't know what else to say. Thank you, Linda. We've worked on this for a year and a half, so. Yeah. Thank you, Linda, for calling in and for your continued work and advocacy on this. Our next speaker is Dominique Chandler. Dominique. Is Dominic Chandler on the line? Hello. Hello. Now we can hear you. There you go. Oh, thank you, Del Monte Chandler. And yes, I live in Halcyon Park. And let me tell you, the last hour has been. Oh, so tragic to hear everyone's sadness. And that's not the reason for this phone call. But my God, everyone is suffering now. And all I want to say. Is help him park. It's a senior park. And he now the choice we've got is we bought our homes. It's only one really left here that we're homeowners of ours, you know, mobile unit. And if they kick us out or just, you know. Level it. We have no place to go. There are a lot of people that will add to the homeless. Population. Because we're seniors. And come on, you guys, don't you have senior parents? Don't you have people that love you and that, you know. There's a time that. Yeah, taking care of your elders should be. A good thing. Not a bad day. And I. My hearts being broke. With everything going on, as all of yours are. And that's about what I need to say. That let's hope tomorrow is better than the weekend. All right. And and thank you,

Dominique, for calling in. We appreciate you taking the time to do it. We have Stuart Duckworth listed on this public hearing list. I know we heard from him during the general comment period. But if Stuart is still on the line, we'll be happy to hear from him. Well, hello again. Yes, I'm still on the line. And I agree with Dominique about all the other people that have talked. This is an amazing situation that we have out there. However, I'm here just to support the extension of the mobile home park, and actually we should make it permanent because this has always been a mobile home park and they try to develop put development in here because it's a fairly large piece of property, but it is built on a garbage dump in the late fifties or middle fifties, and underneath the garbage dump is the water from hell or lake. So this is really unstable ground and a mobile home park is basically all that it's really good for or manufactured home parks. We have homes, we have a couple of those in here, too. So we just need to get a vote to. Make this a permanent mobile seniors mobile home park. Thank you very much. And. Have a great rest of your day. Thank you, Stuart, for calling in today. That concludes the public commenters that I have

formally signed up for today here. So we will go ahead and close out the public hearing on a council bill 119797. And we will now proceed with a vote on the bill. So I will move to pass Council Bill 119797. Is there a second? I thank you so much, because there was a lot. I thought I saw your lips move, but I didn't hear anything, so I wanted to have a little pause there. Thank you. It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmembers want again as lead sponsor of the bill. I'd like to go ahead and recognize you in order for you to address this item in further detail. Thank you, President Gonzales. I don't plan to have any more points. I think the points that we made are also by the residents themselves about why it's important that we maintain their housing and that. And as they highlighted, they are our senior members of our society and we should absolutely be prioritizing, protecting their housing. Thank you. Thank you. Council Member So what? Are there any other comments on the bill? City Councilmember Peterson, followed by Councilmember Mosqueda and then Councilmember Strauss. Councilmember Peterson, you're recognized, please. Thank you. I wanted to thank the residents who called in today and also to thank Councilmember Sharon and Councilmember Arias for their leadership on this. It's this is a great example of preserving affordable housing that we already have, preventing homelessness. So I just want to thank them for their leadership on this. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson. We will now hear from Councilman Mosqueda and then Councilmember Strauss. Thank you, Madam President. Just a quick question for the sponsors, if I might. Given the delay in the initial plan to have a more concrete strategy, can you talk a little bit more if it's appropriate, Madam President, if it's appropriate for the sponsors to do so? Can you talk a little bit more about what your hope is at the end of the six months? And I know we want folks to work with us to see that. Are there concrete plans that we think will come to fruition at the end of these six months? Who wants to take that? Does that council member so want or Juarez want to take. Back. Something worse? Madam Chair. Thank you. Councilmember Mosqueda. As you know, we've been working on this for health promotion and I, when councilor was drafted, was here as well. And the short answer is yes. We would like to see what success looks like is a legislative fix. That is that we join with CCI and we actually carve out a particular zoned area for these manufactured mobile home parks. I think a lot of people think these are just mobile homes, that these are actually manufactured homes with a concrete foundation where people have lived there for many, many, many years. And as council members who want shared, we have a lot of elders, retirees, we have a lot of we just have a older generation living there. We've been there at least three times and have met with the different leadership at both areas. And s

o the endgame is that we carve out some legislation that we make it permanent. And we looked at other zoning and how other cities did, it appears, the home county, Thurston County, and I believe the city of bias, if I'm correct. So that's that's what success should look like, hopefully. So thank you for that question. Okay. Council member, council members wanted. You want to respond to that as well? Okay. We'll do that. And then we'll hear from Councilmember Strauss because mercyone. Thank you. As I mentioned here, there are other cities that have created that permanent mobile home park zoning designation. And so there's nothing new or strange or difficult about this. But Seattle does not happen to have that zoning type so far. So in order to make that happen and to make that zoning board permanent, the department would need to carry out a CPI analysis, which is a state Environmental Protection Act analysis. Again, this should be fairly routine work. But for

whatever reason that, you know, the mayor's office should be answerable to, they have not carried that out. But if they did carry that out, which they should be doing, because we cannot indefinitely be extending the temporary. Designation, they should carry that out. And once they do that, the council can pass a similar bill. But that designation would be permanent, and not just for six months only. And so, I mean, in terms of controlling mosquitoes. QUESTION Concretely, I think it comes down to the city council members. You know, joining me in putting pressure on the mayor, do not postpone this any longer and just do this, because as far as I understand from a technical standpoint, there are no obstacles to getting this analysis out so that we can make the zoning designation permanent. And I thought that clarification would be helpful as we think about what happens at the end of six months. So thank you both to the prime sponsors and happy to support today. Councilmember Strauss Yeah, thank you. Council President Thank you, council members for sponsoring this bill. It is something that I would like to engage with you on for a permanent fix for six months is up because we know that a permanent piece of legislation will stop us from having to renew every six months. My grandmother lived in a manufactured home park for seniors, and I understand that. I understand that the ground that you keep your home on is not necessarily the ground that you own. And it's important for us to be able to provide this affordable housing and ensure that it remains stable. So I'd love to work with you on making this permanent fix. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss. Any other comments or questions from my colleagues? I'm not seeing any. I think I share the same interest as many of you. I think it might be the third or fourth time I'm being asked to vote, a third time that we're being asked to vote on this issue. You know, it would be really nice to be able to just have the substance and the actual legwork

done and completed by the executive so that we can move on from this issue. It is really frustrating that that has not happened. So. So hopefully we will be able to encourage the mayor's office and and and the SDC to actually just do the CPA and allow for us to have some level of certainty as it relates to this particular issue. So. Looking forward to ongoing leadership from Councilmember Juarez and so on in that space and of course from our land use chair. Councilmember Strauss. To be able to figure out what the path forward is to facilitate the execution of the work that needs to happen. So I definitely plan to support this bill. Okay. Looks like folks don't have any more questions or comments. I do want to offer the sponsors an opportunity to close out the conversation if they have anything else that they'd like to add. It was like, all right, looks like nothing else to add here. So I would ask that the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill. Morales. I must get. I. Peterson. I. So what. I. Strauss. I. Juarez. I. Herbal. I. Lewis. Hi. President Gonzalez, I. Nine in favor. None opposed. Excellent. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. I'd ask that the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation. All right, colleagues, we're going to go ahead and move to our next agenda item. That's item two. Will the clerk please read agenda item to interview the record? Agenda Item three. Council 119805 relating to the Seattle Police Department banning the ownership, purchase, rent, storage and use of crowd control weapons and adding a new section 3.28. 146 of the Kalamazoo Code. Thank you, Amelia. So I am going to go ahead and put the bill before us. I'm going to move the past. Council Bill. 119805. Is there a second? It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Customer Silent You are the sponsor of the bill, so you are once again recognized in order to address the underlying bill. And then we have several amendments to walk through as first one. Yes, I. I actually want to. I want to speak to the bill, but I also want to move to amend council bill 119805 as presented on Amendment three. So I want to know the order in which I should do that. Should I speak to the base amendment and then move the amendment? So I think we're going to take the amendments in the order that they were published. So that's two amendments from Council member Herbold. And I know that you circulated your office excuse me, your office circulated an amendment three after the noon deadline. So I would ask that we go through the amendments as they were published on the agenda and then and then consider Amendment three if it's needed. It's it's a little bit of a Jenga puzzle that we're going through here, because there are portions of your amendment, Councilmembers Amendment three, that would incorporate. Components. Of Councilmember Herbals and amendments as represented in both Amendment one and Amendment two. So depending on how Amendment One, an amendmen

t to shake out, we may not need Amendment three or we may need all of Amendment three. If Councilmember Herbals amendments do not do not pass. So I think I think that we should do what we should do and fairness here, because it's very confusing and there's been a lot of back and forth

and in email. And I want to make sure that all of our colleagues and the public have a full understanding of the suite of amendments before us. I think before calling anything to a vote, I think it would be prudent for us to have a conversation of all three amendments. And so that we can get an understanding of Amendment one amendment to an Amendment three that I will be planning on calling for a vote on the amendment in the order that they were presented on the agenda. I'm happy to have a conversation about all of them. But just in terms of the order, I just wanted to clarify. I don't agree with your description of the order in the sense that all the bills that came from my office has, as has been there long before her verbal brought out amendments. I just want to clarify to the members of the public that what my office published after noon incorporates components of Councilmember Herbert's amendment that I don't object to. So it's a hybrid bill, except for the amendment that I deeply object to. So it's not it's not accurate to say that my bill came after hers. And as a matter of fact, this bill does amend this amendment. That doesn't Herbold has, which will really be a real attack on the bill, was sent out by her at 11:12 a.m. this morning, giving the public about 2 hours and 45 minutes to see it. So I just wanted to clarify that. And I would I would say that the fair way to do it is to consider Amendment three, because it's basically my bill with the amendments on Councilmember Hubble that I don't have an objection to. And because my bill came before everything else, I think that should be considered for amendment, which should be considered in my view. But. And if you want to respond to that, I'll stop or I'll I'll continue with my description. Yeah, I think I think you've you've made your record. I don't think I said anything inconsistent. I didn't if I use the word bill, that was an inadvertent use of the word bill. What I'm saying is that your Amendment three and was not published on the agenda, at least on the version of the agenda that I had , was not published on the agenda. Am I am I wrong that your Amendment three was published on the agenda? No, no, you're not wrong. All I'm trying to clarify is that that bill is it was just with the intention of simplifying the work by incorporating consumer herbals bills that we don't disagree with, so that the discussion was focused on the the Key Amendment, which I don't believe should be passed by the city council. And I hear you again. I do hear you. I just wanted to clarify that. I didn't mean to imply that that somehow I'm not trying to make any sort of I'm not trying to imply anything. I just want to make sure

that we have the sequence of how we got the amendment. So there were two amendments that were published on Friday to the public and to Councilmembers Amendment three. I came to us at noon, and I understand that there is nothing necessarily new in there because you're incorporating portions of things that were already published. And I think that's maybe where we're getting our semantics crossed. And I'm following now. I'm following now. So thank you for thank you for for your for your patience and your your understanding on that. So so I think I think just so that we have a holistic conversation about it instead of I think it would be prudent for us to go through each of the motions. And but I'm not going to call for a vote on the motions. I want to sort of hear how conversation goes before we start calling for motions. But but why don't we go ahead and start at this point? Councilmember Silent, since you are the prime sponsor of the bill and and I and I need you to address the underlying bill, I will hand the floor over to you, too, as the prime sponsor of the bill to address the substantive bill. And in doing so, you are free to describe your amendment, your proposed Amendment three. Again, not asking you to make a formal motion yet. Just describe and talk to us about your proposed Amendment three. And then we will hear from Councilmember Herbold accordingly. So customers want the floor is yours. Thank you, President Gonzalez. Appreciate that. The bill that's under consideration now from our movement and from our office bans the city from owning and the police from using crowd control weapons like tear gas, mace, blast balls, flash flashbangs, plastic bullets and other weapons that are typically used indiscriminately on gatherings of protesters. Some of these weapons, like your gas, have been banned for decades from use in war by the Geneva Convention. And yet the mayor of Seattle, Jenny Durkan, and Seattle police under her control have repeatedly on a daily basis used them since the George Floyd protests began on May 30th against the people of Seattle. As we've discussed before, we believe many of us have witnessed the. Many of us have experienced it in the members of the public. And for days the Seattle Police Department used these weapons on the streets of Capitol Hill. They falsely claimed that the protesters were violent riders and that they had no alternative. That is absolutely untrue. I mean, it could not be more untrue. They have even attempted to maintain those lives in the face of video evidence showing us that the police were the source and the sole source of violence and that they were not , quote unquote, responding to any

situation, but that they were there with the intention of inflicting violence. We have evidence that the police were a source of the violence even further now, because after the mounting public outrage eventually forced Mayor Jenny Durkan to pull the police back from the streets of Capitol Hill, the violence has

left with them . There is nobody there with riot gear armed to the hilt, with all kinds of equipment and chemical weapons. There's no such thing. Only the police have them. Here in Seattle and around the country, demonstrators have been grievously injured by these weapons. And an open letter signed by over a thousand medical professionals has explained that weapons like tear gas and mace significantly increase the danger of COVID. We need to ban these weapons which have been misused against protesters for decades. The police and the political establishment simply cannot be trusted with them. Seattle police might argue that without tear gas, rubber bullets and blast walls, they will use even more lethal, even more lethal weapons against demonstrators. We have to completely reject this dangerous argument. The purpose of this legislation is to prevent the police from meeting protests with any violence whatsoever. If the Seattle police instead show up with more lethal weaponry, that would be absolutely devastating and disastrous. But that would only I and I hope that doesn't happen, but that would only prove the point that this Black Lives Matter movement is making, which is that it does not work for us to have a police state. We need our community to be organized, for us to keep ourselves safe and for public safety for all. If Seattle passes this legislation, it will be historic and it will be an inspiration for what movement around the country can win. But we also need to remember that this won't be enough. We will need to go much farther with all the steps that I was outlining earlier, which I will reiterate once again later before passage of this bill. Just wanted to quickly say that in terms of making sure that the public is on the same page as us in terms of understanding the process, at some point, Councilmember Herbert's amendment will be considered, which on the face of it claims that all it's doing is clarifying what is what it is, what is, what is crowd control, that it is simply intended to say that the legislation does not apply to non crowd control situations. But what it will actually do is create giant truck sized loopholes that will allow the use of these weapons in virtually any situation. The problem is that Seattle police will abuse those loopholes. Look at what happened at the mayor's much publicized 30 day O.C. ban. Seattle police, to quote one of the public comment, are simply do not have the track record that should lead us to believe that we can trust them to not use weapons on peaceful protest. We heard testimony from Bettina who said a woman took a flashbang grenade in the chest and almost died and had to be revived with multiple CPR routines. That's a really important example of why I in my view, it would be horrific to pass Councilmember Herbert's amendment, because it brings up the question of what kind of society do we want to be? We absolutely you know, it will be sending a message to the people of Seattle whether that

amendment is based on which side the council is actually on. And whether the council is actually doing everything in its power to prevent such occurrences and to prevent such violence. I have more points on the amendment that Councilmember Herbold has, which I hope that she just withdraws. I honestly, I'm being very honest. I hope that Councilmember Herbold has taken to heart the incredibly powerful public testimony that we have heard, and that she puts that in front of us and understands that we cannot you know, we cannot have politicians co-opt the language, the vocabulary of movement and say we are going to reimagine the police and we're going to dismantle the police and then refuse to do the bare minimum. I really hope Herbold withdraws our amendment and that we are able to, as a city council, unanimously pass this legislation. Sorry. Sorry for my delay. Thank you, Councilmember Solent. Can you specifically just before we open it up for more comment and consideration of the amendments? Because I want to be really clear as to what language in the amendments you see as being being a loophole B in large part because your Amendment three incorporates some of the language in Councilmember Herbals amendments, but does not incorporate other parts. So could you walk us through what portions of Councilmember Herbold, Amendment one and two you favor and what what specific language you believe is problematic to the underlying intent of your council bill. Yes. To do. To do it. In a brief summary, I will say just to keep it short. I won't say that I, I don't I don't necessarily think the other amendments are that great, but I don't object to them. I'm glad that Gartenberg old has withdrawn her intention to delay the vote on the bill, so that's not no longer a question. What I am objecting to and what you heard, what we all heard public, powerful public testimony on is on page two of what is titled as

amendment number two. That is and that show's got a sponsor council member Herbold. And that is section D in the in the in the in the amended version by on verbal, that section D is amendment is what I'm objecting to. And I just want to read that out and explain it a little bit. That amendment says a kinetic impact projectiles, chemical irritants, acoustic weapons, directed energy weapons, water cannons, disorientation devices, ultrasonic cannons, or any other device that is designed to be used on multiple individuals for crowd control and is designed to cause pain or discomfort is not a crowd control weapon for the purpose of owning, purchasing, renting or storing under the subsection if the device is used for a purpose other than crowd dispersal. The problem with this amendment is that it leaves up to the up to the police to decide what they were actually doing and claimed that it was not for crowd dispersal or for crowd control called crowd control. Because, you know, I mean, just to explain, this amendment would rebel would create an exception tha

t says that any of these weapons, the number of weapons that I mentioned, including direct energy weapons and tear gas and flashbangs and ultrasonic cannons, can be used if and I quote, the device is used for a purpose other than crowd dispersal , unquote. What this means is that the ban on owning all these weapons would be somewhat meaningless by itself because the police can say that they are owning them to use for other purposes. It wouldn't stop them from buying them. You also mean that they could be used anywhere if as long as the police claim that they are that they didn't. That specific incident of use of that weapon was not for crowd dispersal. For example, if the police. Say that there is a person in the middle of the protest and they just don't like that because the person is saying something or because they threw an empty water bottle at the police then. And if the police respond to that person by spraying the crowd, supposedly to stop that person from throwing a water bottle, then suddenly under this amendment, if this amendment passes, then this is this would be allowed under this bill, which is basically for the police to respond to somebody throwing a water bottle by spraying the entire crowd, including children with mace or pepper spray or tear gas. And I and I use this example because this is not a hypothetical situation. This is exactly what we saw again and again on the streets of Seattle with police officers using the fiction that they were somehow endangering. I've seen she's best making the same argument that somehow sometimes the police work hard. How is it possible that the police were hurt with water bottles? I mean, look, let me let me be clear, though. Let's let's let's contrast the water bottle with the police who have been they don't come just by themselves as police officer. They come as riot police. They they come there to start a riot, which means that they are armed to the teeth with riot gear, protected with helmets, face shields, body shields, shoulder arm, car golf and badge batons. I mean, it's absolute gaslighting, too, for the police to even remotely claim that we need to allow them any leeway to use this these weapons. On Sunday, when the SBT, you know, Sunday a week and a half ago and the hospital used flashbang teargas and pepper spray on myself and other protesters, they at that point also, they claimed it was to get people to back up, not to disperse. And we were doing nothing. We were peacefully protesting. Those are our streets. We were demanding the right to walk on those streets. That's all we did as walk forward. So anytime we make a restriction on police brutality, depending on the purpose or the intent of the officers, that creates a loophole that can then encompass the whole world because then you can never prove intent. That was the whole point behind the whole campaign of not this time is to go after this whole this insidious idea that unless you can prove the police had malicious intent, you ca

n't hold them responsible. This the situation is not the same, but it's analogous to that situation where it comes down to the police claiming that it was not for crowd dispersal. So I would really urge council members to reject this loophole. I mean, this whole protest movement, this whole uprising is against police violence and brutality. I mean, you cannot have politicians saying Black Lives Matter and that you stand with a protest movement and then turn around and then pass loopholes that hand the power back to the police. I second the person who said in public comment on the fact that they're even having to discuss this is repulsive. And I will say this, this if this amendment passes, it will be a continuation of the past pro-police policies of the Democratic politicians on the city council. And it will be nothing less. And I and I don't say this lightly, it will be nothing less than a racist amendment. And it would be a betrayal of the movement and of the black community. This is not a small thing. I really hope that this amendment does not pass. And better yet, I would urge Councilmember Herbold to withdraw this. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember. So once all what I heard from you in particular, that in terms of the full breadth of Amendment two,

you read directly from amendment to the language that you think creates the loophole in the way that you have described it. In other words, if the police department is allowed to continue to purchase chemical weapons that are used for crowd dispersal and not currently allowed to be used for crowd dispersal, but prohibited from being used to from crowd dispersal in the future, that sort of allowing them to continue to have possession of these types of weapons undermines the broader goal of of of being able to control how they use it. And sort of your argument I'm hearing is, is, you know, we should have a policy position of not allowing the police department to own these own these chemical weapons for free for any purpose, but in particular for crowd dispersal use. And it's too hard for us to figure out how to control the legitimacy of the position that might be taken by the police department, that they were using it for, quote, crowd dispersal, close quote. So I just because I really want to sort of zero in on the and the part of the amendment to that you find that most most problematic. And I'm hearing that that is the language and those are that in general a summary of the reasons why you think it is problematic. Generally, I agree, but I would of course, put it in very strong terms as I did before. But also just to clarify. Absolutely, it is about not allowing the police to have possession of these weapons, but that is related to the fact that we cannot trust them. And and if anything's been established about the police, without without any doubt is that they cannot be trusted because they have broken that trust every single time. And as I said, a concrete example, as I used, was something th

at I personally experienced and witnessed where the police did say this is not for crowd dispersal and the next thing you know, they were dispersing the crowd with teargas. They said it was not for crowd dispersal only because we were moving forward. That's my point. It's already happened. We have examples that show that if we pass this loophole, what happened on Sunday night, what happened on the night before will continue to happen even under that law . That's why we have to reject that. Got it. Okay. That's very helpful. I think to me and to members of the public to hear a little bit more clearly about where the difference lies between Amendment three and some of the language of this amendment that you included there, but not this particular language. I do want to go ahead and provide Councilmember Herbold an opportunity to address both that specific language in amendment in amendment to that she has put forth in front of the council, as well as having her describe other parts of Amendment two and then also an amendment, Amendment one. So why don't we go ahead and shift over to Councilmember Herbold to respond to your concerns related to Amendment two and describe other aspects of Amendment two, and to also walk us through Amendment one. Thank you so much. So Amendment One does several things. It amends the recital clause as it relates specifically to the actions of SPG over the last few weeks around escalation of crowd violence. It adds a new recital reflecting the findings from the June 12th, 2020 Office of the Inspector General Report. Less Lethal Weapons in protests. It makes some changes to Section one. One is to exempt from the prohibition of crowd control weapons any device that meets the definition of the crowd control weapon but is not used for crowd dispersal purposes. And also in section one, there are some other technical and legal changes. It requests that the police accountability agencies provide by August 15th, 2020, a recommendation on the use of crowd control weapons for crowd dispersal to include suggested policy revisions to the speed manual identification of a crowd dispersal authorization process that requires the executive approval and reflects best practices in policing to minimize harm to protesters. And it is, of course, the statutory authority of the OPA, CPC and OIG to do this in the 2017 Accountability Ordinance that Council approved. And I really want to lift up their authority to, to consult with the council on in these areas. This in no way this request or for a report back in no way as we have heard from some folks in public testimony, I'm not sure where people are getting the information, but maybe it's just because it's the short turnaround. This request of the OPA, OIG and CPC to report back to council does not in any way delay implementation of this legislation. The bill amendments like the Bill before it requests that there be notice of the the prohibition against crowd control weapons to the Department of

Justice, the Court and the Monitor in accordance with the consent decree . Use of force is at the heart of the consent decree, and changes to city policies must be submitted to the court. And the amendment indicates that the Council recognizes the role of court there. And then also similarly to what we just did in the earlier bill, the amendment expresses the Council's intent to support Labor relations in the implementation of the of the prohibition against crowd control up in use. And then

finally it adds as an attachment the less lethal weapons in protest report from the Office of the Inspector General for Public Safety, jointly issued with the OPA on June 12th, 2020. At this time I would like to offer or invite, I should say, amendment to my Amendment one as it relates specifically to the section where we exempt the prohibition of crowd control weapons. When a device that meets that definition is not used for crowd dispersal purposes, this has become, I think, a distraction around the intent of the amendment. And from my perspective, offering this was just merely consistent with the title of the bill itself, which talks about crowd control weapons and recognizes that there are some circumstances where the the police department has things to do besides crowd dispersal, where a less lethal tool like these might be useful. Again, I invite any council member to to amend council I'm sorry, Amendment one to remove the new language under section D, which says Kinetic Impact, projectiles, chemical irritants, weapons directed energy weapons, water cannons, disorientation devices, ultrasonic cannons, or any other device that is designed to be used on multiple individuals for crowd control and is designed to cause pain or discomfort is not a crowd control weapon for the purpose of owning, purchasing, renting or storing under subsection 3.28. 146a if the device is used for a purpose other than crowd dispersal. So again, an amendment to that would remove that language as I just read and read the. Old Section D language. Madam. Madam President, may I make such motions, Councilmember Juarez, to strike this for said language of Councilmember Herbert regarding Amendment two that it be stricken. Okay. So let me confer. Let me confer with our Clerc, Emilio Sanchez, who is on the line. And there has been an expressed interest from Councilmember Juarez to strike subsection D from Amendment two, which is the Herbold amendment. Can you please advise the Council on the procedural rules related to such an amendment? Council members. This is Amelia Sanchez. At this point, this motion has not been made. It's also not before the council. This is just for discussion. So therefore, the sponsor and the can actually modify this amendment before they even present it or after she moves the amendment. So therefore, you have a couple of options. One, when the motion is made, we can consider a modified amendment, which would be with the exception of that section, subsection

n D, if that is the only amendment that we would sustain proposed to be removed at this point. So. Council President for clarification to Madam Clerk, do I withdraw my motion to strike and allow Councilmember Herbert to reintroduce her amended amendment? Councilmember suarez at this point, you are welcome to withdraw your amendment. At this point has not been seconded. And at that point, after Council member Herbals can then move her modified amendment without that section. See a section. Okay. All right. Thank you. So, Emily, if I understand you correctly, are you saying that the only member that is allowed to make a motion to strike subsection D is the prime sponsor, which in this case would be Councilmember Herbold. At this point because this amendment is still not before the city council has not been moved, nor has it been seconded. Got it. Okay. And I ask a question and hopefully that might also help. Sure. Sure. So I will take all the help I can get. And if it doesn't help, I'm. My apologies in advance. But I. Is. Is my understanding correct, Councilmember Herbold, that you are essentially withdrawing that subsection D, that D that I was objecting to, which in which case we could take Amendment three, which takes up which include incorporates all of Councilmember Herbert's amendment, except that one and all my technical amendments, which were on the advice of the city attorney. So is is is that essentially going to be agreeable for everyone? Councilmember Herbold. Thank you. Unfortunately, your substitute or your Amendment three does not include the language lifting up the role of the OPA, OIG and CDC. So I would I would prefer to move forward as as proposed where we move on Amendment one as as I proposed to modify. Customers want. That's fine with me, but I. I have a million. You've got me if I'm wrong. But I have a feeling that will be a longer process. Wouldn't it be shorter if we take Amendment three? Put that on the table and then have constant verbal move, an amendment to include that language, which I'm not opposed to and. And then have a vote on that. I think the process is going to be about equal length because both require an amendment to an amendment. So I don't think that one is more expeditious than the other. But nice try. I appreciate it. I wasn't I wasn't going to be clever. I thought there would be more iterations to the other way because I thought my technical amendments are not incorporated in yours. Guns and herbals, am I right? I don't know if you have additional technical amendments beyond the technical amendments that I have in mind and that you have included yours. So. Okay. Okay. Thank you for clarifying. My. My understanding is that you you have incorporated the technical amendments that I that I proposed in my original amendment one in yours. Yes. I just wanted to I just clarified with my staff that the

technical amendment of those suggested by the city attorney's office are also in that latest version from whi

ch they are. Great. Okay. So why don't we go ahead and take Amendment 1/1? I think we have sort of a landscape of what the different versions are. I appreciate the discussion and the debate here, and I appreciate that you all were flexible enough to hear about all three amendments as three potential rounds here and before we made formal motions. And Councilmember Herbold, I do appreciate your willingness to invite striking subsection D from amendment. Amendment one. I, I think that that the ultimate goal here is to prevent the acquisition and the possession of these chemical weapons. And I think that we will have an opportunity to, you know, have the court weigh in on the appropriateness of the policy choice that the city council has made. I certainly continue to support this bill and its underlying intent as introduced by Councilmember Samant. And I do believe that you do as well. And and I think, again, I think we will. We will be better served as a city without the language in subsection D and really do sincerely appreciate your your willingness and your flexibility in considering making an amendment to your own amendment to strike that language so that we can move forward on this really important policy and so that we can follow through on the City's obligation to submit this Council bill to the Court for review by both Judge Roe Bar, the Federal Monitor and and the DOJ. So I think the sooner we get that clock started and get that review going and the better served we will all be. And hopefully they will agree with our strong and clear policy position that we just don't believe these weapons have a place in our department. So, Councilmember, I'm going to hand it back over to you to walk us through Amendment One. Thank you. So I I'm happy to walk us through it again. But I in in the short term, I'd just like to move to amend Council Bill 11 9805 as presented on Amendment one on the agenda, accepting the language in Amendment one related to new Section D and restoring the old Section D as in the proposed legislation. Okay. Emilia, before I invite a second, I want to make sure that that motion was. Was properly. Raised. I understood it from parliamentary procedure. It would be to reinstate the stricken section, subsection B language and to completely remove the new section subsection B language as proposed by council in the referral. Okay. So the end result of that would be elimination of new proposed subsection D as reflected in Amendment two. Okay. So is there a second? Second? It's been moved and seconded to amend Amendment two, Amendment one, as described by Councilmember Herbold. Is there any further discussion? Okay. Hearing none with the clerk, please call the rule on the amendment to Amendment one. Peterson. I. So what. I. Drew. I. Herbold. I was. I. Lewis. I. Morales. I must get to. I. President Gonzalez. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you so much. So that amendment passes and the bill is amended as described in Amendment One.

So we now have a Second Amendment to consider. And I will hand it back over to see. Amendment two is councilmember hurdle does that your amendment? Now. Okay. So Amendment two is council members wants amendment. I believe after the steps we've just taken, amendments two and three are not necessary to go through. Okay, great. Councilmember Herbold, do you have any other amendments to put forward? Nine. What? Excellent. Well, we have resolved a lot of issues in and just I think being able to have the conversation that we did was really helpful. So thank you again, colleagues, for that. That exhausts our amendments on this particular bill. So we now have an amended bill before us. And let's see here. Let me get back in line on my. Agenda here. And then, Madam Clerk, is there any formal language that needs to be done besides councilmembers silence language around withdrawing amendments two and three? I am double checking really quickly. So we just type and it looks like the actual subsections are numbered correctly. So we are good to go at this point if you want to consider the bill as amended. Excellent. Thank you so much. Music to my ears. So, colleagues, we are we now have an amended bill before us. Now is the time where we can take further comment on the underlying bill as the amended confers. What? You will have the last word as the prime sponsor of the bill. Are there any other council members who would like to address the substance of the bill as amended before us? Councilmember Peterson floor is yours. Thank you. Council President I just wanted to thank Councilmember Swan for introducing this bill. I was an early supporter of it and also wanted to thank our public safety chair, Lisa Herbold, for for reviewing it, carefully thinking it through from a from additional lenses so that we could have these additional amendments and thank council president and the city clerk for guiding us through all the amendments. I appreciate it. I hope the public can see that we're trying to be unified here

and work together on these serious issues. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson. Any other comments on the bill? Okay. I also want to signal my my thanks to Councilmember Blunt, who quickly introduced this bill, as well as the previous bill that we just looked at around chokeholds. I just really want to thank you, Councilmember Silent, for introducing this bill. Many of us had made public statements before the introduction of this bill about the need to ban the use of chemical weapons that were intended for for foreign wars and to address terrorism in the aftermath of 911. The fact that those types of weapons were being used domestically on our own residents is just abhorrent. And so I was an early supporter of trying to use the levers that were available to me as a council member in the background to use the power of persuasion to stop the use of those weapons and those tactics on our people who were peacefully protesting. And unfortunately, those th

ose those calls for for action and for a pivot were were not answered. And when we had a moment, a small, brief moment of thinking that it was going to be answered, that the call was answered to stop using those chemical weapons, we saw that within within approximately 24 hours, that same tear gas was being used once again on peaceful protesters and within one of the densest neighborhoods, not just in the city, but the densest neighborhood in the state, where we kept hearing reports from families and from other residents who weren't even protesting, who were just existing on Capitol Hill, who were suffering the consequences of this non discriminant use of tear gas. So I absolutely support this legislation. I look forward to submitting it to the court for further review. Again, following on our model that we used in 2017 when we consider the Police Accountability Ordinance and then submitted it to the court for review. We understand that we have an obligation to do that and know that that our city attorney's office will pursue that path. And hopefully we will get affirmation from the court as it relates to the policy choice that we've made here today. And again, really appreciate the commitment to bringing this forward, to doing it quickly, because we do have a sense of urgency around making sure that this is addressed quickly. Of course, we still have the issue of all of the chemical weapons that are currently owned by Seattle Police Department that are in the inventory. And the language of the bill does not necessarily require them to dispose of those that existing inventory. So we will have to have a conversation about how we effectuate the disposal of those items without the unintended consequence of having to send those weapons to other cities where they will be used in ways that will have negative impact and harm there as well. So looking forward to having that conversation. I did see Councilmember Mosqueda as I was talking, raise her hand. She's she's feeling inspired now, so we're excited about that. So I'm gonna go ahead and hand it over to councilmembers gave if any other councilmembers have comments to make please do raise your hand or shoot me a quick text message to let me know that you have comments to make. And again, Councilmember will have the last word on this bill as members get it. Thank you very much, Councilmember. It's a want for introducing this bill in council president. I think you did inspire me to want to chime in on a few more pieces. We talked a lot this morning and in the last week and a half about the type of situations that we've seen. And I want to give you a list of how I think that this piece of legislation will immediately help protect the health and safety and save lives of residents throughout the city. This is not just coming out of a desire to de-escalate the strategies police are using. This is actually coming from a direct result within the last two weeks of people calling us. Emailing us, grabbing us whi

le we're in the street to tell us what they've seen from the inspector general. The list of of claims that we've heard are people who have experienced having a thumb amputated because of a flashbang device. A protester who is now partially blind due to rubber bullets being used. We heard stories of a woman who had to be resuscitated after getting hit in the chest with a flashbang device. We know the story repeatedly of a young boy, seven years old, getting sprayed in the face with pepper spray. And this is in addition to all of the other stories that we're hearing just about excessive force officers kneeling on the neck of two detainees in our area, officers punching a youth on the ground the Friday night before the main Saturday night protests. An officer punching a person on Saturday night. Failure to secure the rifles in their cars. These are the type of complaints that we're hearing from across the city. So at least taking away these weapons of war and to the good points that were made earlier today, the weapons that have been deemed illegal in actual course of war . Getting those off of our streets and having those not used against our residents is critical. I thank you for putting forward this bill, and I just think it shows a strong show of solidarity across this entire council

that every single person was wanting to act quickly last week and today to move forward with this legislation. It was probably past due before this week, and I appreciate the urgency in which it's been brought forward to respond to the calls for action from the community. Thanks. I'll. Hey. Councilmember Herbold, please. I just want to underscore how much I appreciate the fact that all council members voted for my Amendment one, particularly as it related to lifting up the the role and the importance of our accountability partners. Again, in 2017, under Council President Gonzales. Leadership, we voted for our accountability ordinance, which gives the OPA, the OIG and the CPC and a very, very important role in consulting with the Council as it relates specifically to policies like the ones that we are about to vote on and the amendment that councilmember. Councilmember Salant was proposing her version of Amendment three did not include that language. And I think it's really important that we as a council not do anything to undermine the role of those bodies as we as we continue to have these conversations around around the use of force and changes to police practices. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold, for those remarks. I also agree that we can take a strong position on on this particular policy issue, while also continuing to lift up the role, the importance of the role of the OPA, the IG and the CPC in in sort of as we continue to move forward, I think it is really important for us to continue to to do that. We have not, to my knowledge, received any recommendations from the Community Police Commission about needing to completely redo our three legged st

ool around accountability system. And and I think they have still, at least as far as I know, still support the model that was originally proposed in 2017 through our Police Accountability Ordinance. And I intend to continue to to support that model until we we receive different recommendations at the Community Police Commission. So thank you again for pointing that particular issue out. And I do think that we have found a nice balance now where we have are we going to be able to achieve the underlying goals that councilmembers originally had, while also still creating a clear pathway and signal for the three accountability organizations to still clearly, through a directive of the ordinance, have an opportunity to formulate recommendations without delaying the implementation of the underlying goals of the Council Council Bill. So with that being said, are there any other comments? Councilmember Strauss You have comments, please. Thank you. Council President I'll keep this short. I know that I've said many times that weapons of war have no place on our streets here in Seattle and used against the residents of our community. I realize that I've said that so many times. I do need to let the record reflect here in this moment as well. Hearing from the the veteran from North Seattle during public comment today was very important to me to hear about how weapons of war used on our that are not even allowed to be used on our enemies on foreign soil have been used on our residents here in Seattle. The residents of Seattle are not our enemy. They are the ones that we are here duty bound to protect, as well as your words Council President about using these these weapons in the densest neighborhood in the entire state. So thank you to the sponsor for bringing this bill forward is as quickly as possible. And thank you, everyone, for your diligent work. The council president. Thank you so much, Councilmember Strauss. All right. I think we have exhausted folks who want to make comments. Looks like we are ready. So, Councilmember. So why don't you want to you want to take us home on this bill? Unless. Councilmember Whereas I see that you just lit up. Do you have comments you want to make? I was just saying going to do my famous line for the love of God, but go ahead. Well. Now you said it you for the record. Okay. Councilmember So you get the last word on this bill to take us home so we can take a vote on this and get the law on the books. Thank you, President Gonzales. I really must congratulate everybody who was fought for this. These are major victories. Undoubtedly, as many have said, we have a long way to go in terms of police accountability, let alone really eliminating police violence and brutality and addressing the longstanding racism and oppression in our society. But still, these are major victories. They're historic, and the movement must celebrate its victories. Both this bill and is about to be voted on and the bill that we just passed on banning

chokeholds. I thank all councilmembers. I'm assuming this is going to be unanimous from all the comments that we've heard. And I really appreciate that we are going to have a unanimous vote on this on both these important bills. I congratulate everyone who spoke in public comment and who have been speaking up in the last two days, because it was through your intervention, through your getting organized, that this bill that's going to be passed is now going to be a strong bill with no loopholes, needless to say, and as we have said lots of times before, passing legislation is not

going to be enough. But yet it is crucially important for the movement to hold its elected officials accountable to make sure that the strongest possible legislation is passed at all times. So I want to thank the movement. This this victory belongs to you if you faced. Joe. Chemical weapons and rubber bullets if you march rallied or organized, justified. If you weren't able to rally and organize. But you made a phone call to an elected official who held up a sign. You talk to a neighbor or if you did anything to stand up for the Black Lives Matter movement and the movement of all working people against police violence, then today's victories are your victories. I especially wanted to congratulate all the hundreds of young people who faced down just unbelievable, unspeakable violence right in our district, in district three on Capitol Hill, and whom it was my honor to meet and have lots of political conversations with. In fact, we were sprayed with mace and delirious when we were in the middle of a very exciting political conversation. So I wanted to thank many of them. I obviously won't be able to name everybody, but I specifically wanted to name a few. Sean Turner, who's been on the front lines of this struggle and who's also a member of Neighbors. 242 She's been a union member. I also wanted to thank Patti Page and Justin Spears, Jody Wiser, who's been documenting the struggle for days. And this victory belongs to everybody who was there on Capitol Hill. Everybody who has been marching and especially wanted to make a mention of all the families and friends who have lost their loved ones because of police murder, like the family of Charlie Lyles, the family of the family of John Dee Williams. And indeed, there are too many, because at least 30 black and brown people have been murdered by the Seattle police since 2011. And I've read their names before, but I won't be able to read them now. But this victory belongs to the families of all of those community members whose lives were lost at the hands of the police. I completely agree with the mayor. The council members have said that we we we don't we do have to discuss the disposal of the weapons that are in the hands of Seattle police right now. We absolutely do not want them to sell them to another jurisdiction, whether it's another city, another state or another country, because this is about international solidarity aga

inst police violence and racism. So absolutely, we will not let that happen. But we do need to figure out what what what happened to that. And I welcome input from scientists. If they know if there is any socially constructive use at all for those weapons, then we should directed theirs. I welcome your input to my office. And in terms of next steps, I think it's important that I just like we had a strong showing of the community today at the meeting for these two bills. Let's hope that we have a strong showing for the Budget Committee on Wednesday. There's going to be a public comment sign up. That opens at 8 a.m.. The committee meeting will start at 10 a.m.. As you know, you can easily find out how to sign up. Just Google Seattle City Council public comment and you'll find the online sheet, but you'll have to sign up at 8 a.m. on Wednesday, June 17 . As you know, there are important tasks ahead of us. We need to fight to defund Seattle police by at least 50% and make sure that this city is not controlled by police repression, but by community organizers and through social justice and restorative justice. And we are also discussing the tax Amazon legislation to tax big businesses in order to fund a major expansion of social housing, to address homelessness, to fund Green New Deal programs, and most importantly, to fund jobs that will be union jobs, union good paying union jobs and priority hire and free apprenticeship programs to address the inequities faced by our marginalized communities. Another next step I wanted to mention is on the same day Wednesday, June seven, 2017, at 4:30 p.m. Calendars and Park. I hope everybody who's fighting in the Black Lives Matter movement will join us because there is a rally being organized by the rank and file of Seattle's labor movement, and they will be demanding that the local labor movement leaders, the Labor Council, the King County Labor Council remove the Seattle Police Officers Guild out of Labor Council. And so this is the rally of Seattle police out of our labor council, because this is our labor movement and there is no room in our labor movement for police brutality because an injury to one is an injury to all. So please join us in the public comments. Sign up at 8 a.m. on Wednesday, June 17, and also join us on the same day Wednesday, June 17th, at Cal Anderson Park at 430 for a rally alongside the rank and file of the labor movement. And then last but not least, I'll say that all of this is extremely important and it's historic, but it's also minimal. So we need to go forward in making the real kind of change that we need to do to defund the police by 50%, to raise progressive revenues by taxing big business to fund housing. And most immediately, we need to make sure that those who have been arrested in the protest movement of the peaceful protest movement should be released and no charges filed against them. I hope all councilmembers will support these next steps. Thank you. Councilmember Salon.

So I think I'm going to go ahead and close out debate so that we can go ahead and call the roll on this bill. So I am now going to ask that the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill as amended. Peterson. I. So why don't. I. Strauss I. Verbal high. Whereas. Hi. Lewis. Morales. I mosquito I. President Gonzalez. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes as amended and the chair will gladly sign it and would ask that the clerk please to fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Congratulations, Councilmember Salon, and to all of the folks you mentioned specifically and in general, I think that both agenda item two and three and now for all are contributing to a better ecosystem here. And of course, we have a lot more to do, but this is a good, good place for us to start. So congratulations, everyone. Will the clerk please read into the record agenda item for. Agenda Item one Capital 119814 related to the funding for housing and community development programs, adopting a substantial amendment to the City of Seattle 2019. Annual Action Plan Amendment to the 2018 to 2022 Plan for Housing and Development and operating its submission to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Thank you so much. Okay, I will move to pass Council Bill 119814. Is there a second icon? It has been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Esqueda, you are the sponsor of this bill, so you are recognized in order to address this item, please. Thank you. Council President. This legislation adopts amendments to the 2019 Annual Action Plan to detail how the city will spend approximately 8.9 million of dollars in federal funds allocated to the city through Housing and Urban Development for COVID response, including CBD funds, ESG and housing opportunities for people with AIDS or the Heart grant. These funds were appropriated by the Council through Ordinance of 126074 and 126084 passed in May. Funds have been allocated to the Human Services Department, Office of Housing and the Office of Economic Development to prevent, prepare and respond to the coronavirus. These funds will support emergency rental assistance, grant payments to small businesses and meal programs for people experiencing homelessness. In order to enter into grant agreements with HUD and to receive the funds, we have been directed to amend our most current annual action plans for these appropriations. You will note that we approved the 2020 Annual Action Plan in May. However, since the grant agreements for the 2020 Annual Action Plan have not yet been executed by Housing and Urban Development. The 2019 Annual Action Plan is still our current plan, and therefore we must send in that plan to receive these paired COVID emergency funds. Last week we held a public hearing on the legislation on Monday. Thank you to the public because the vote on that, this legislation is considered part of the budget rebalancing package. However, it is scheduled for a vote tod

ay because adoption of amendments to the annual action plans are required before these funds can be distributed. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you so much, Councilmember Mosqueda. Are there any additional comments or questions on the bill? Councilmember Herbold, please. Thank you. I just want to highlight for folks, both in our renter communities as well as to the folks who are providing rental housing to to renters, that this amended plan clearly states that the 1.4 million that the council previously moved away from rental assistance towards shelter will be spent on rental assistance. This plan will help ensure that desperately needed resources for homelessness, prevention and rental assistance are restored. I think as we originally intended a couple weeks ago now. Thank you. Thank you so much, Councilmember Herbold. Any other questions or comments on the bill? Okay. Hearing it? None. I would ask that the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Herbold, i. Whereas. Hi. Louis. Hi. Morales. I just gotta. I. Petersen. I want Strauss. I. President Gonzalez high nine in favor unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Okay, folks, we're going to move on to item two. Will the clerk please read agenda item two into the record? Agenda item for Council Bill 119111. Establishing a spending fund for proposed use of the proceeds generated from the payroll expense tax authorized by the ordinance introduced at Council Bill 1198 ten. Establishing an oversight committee and adding a new Section 3.35 100 of the code. The committee recommends the bill passes in that order with council members must gather Herbert Gonzalez Suarez Lewis Morales to want and shop in favor and council member Peterson mistakes. Thank you so much, Madam Clerk. Casimir Mosquitoes. Chair of the committee. You are recognized in order to address this item. Thank you very much. Council President. So, council colleagues, we have in front of us. I just want to make sure I wasn't frozen. We have in front of us legislation that includes the categories of spending. And this is critical for us

to be able to pass today so that we can couple this revenue proposal with the tax package that we just passed. We will also have the opportunity to invest or to talk more about investments in the upcoming Wednesday, a meeting not this Wednesday, but the following Wednesday, to talk more about the specifics in terms of what additional allocations you'd like to see. It was not possible for us to know exactly which amendments to advance without knowing the universe of dollars from this conversation. And we wanted to make sure we got that completely right. So now we have feedback from all of you. Your amendments are included. This allows for us to pass this category spend plan to coupled with the tax proposal and to then work in greater detail, much like we've done with other levies in the

past, for example, the Families in Education Levy. We followed it up with very detailed spending plan to complement the categories of spending. Again, I want to thank you for her work to amend this bill so that we could have these categories here. And I will also take a quick minute to add to the thank you that I just said a moment ago we would not be in a position to have money to spend without the ongoing feedback that we got from the robust individuals that I listed before who were part of a very broad coalition, and that includes folks at Expedia and Ethan Stoll. I want to thank the business leaders who have been helping to provide feedback on the tax proposal so that we do have not only the vote that just happened to ensure that there is progressive revenue, but also make sure that we have the ability to invest in critical programs like supporting small businesses which will reinvest into larger business. Taking a minute to thank those businesses that include Expedia Civic Ventures, Matthew Leong, Budget Policy Center and BFD, and all those folks that provided a lot of feedback. And thanks again to Richard and Steven for the ongoing feedback of, as we talked about, various ways to raise sufficient funds to get money into the hands of those who are hurting, including needing housing and food assistance and small business assistance and investments in the long run. So I was remiss in not mentioning them before and wanted to say that, and that is my closing comment. Thank you, Councilor Mosquito. Are there any other comments on the bill? Okay. Looks like there are no other comments on the bill. I'm excited about this approach. Councilmember, I thank you so much for putting it forward. I know that you and I and our teams had conversations about structuring this ordinance in this way to allow for more thoughtful conversation around specific potential spending. So I really appreciate this, the structure in this direction. Thank you so much for that. With that being said, colleagues, I'm going to ask that the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Her bold. I. Suarez. I. Lewis. I. Morales. All right. Let's get to. Hi. Peterson? No. So what. I. Strauss. I. President Gonzalez I eight in favor one opposed. Thank you so much, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Clerk Please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Colleagues, other business. Is there any other further business to come before the council? Have you seen no other business? Colleagues, this concludes the items of business on today's agenda. Our next city council meeting is Monday, July 13th, 2020 at 2pmi want to congratulate once again Councilmember Mosqueda, her team and of course, most importantly, every single socialite who has been emailing us, calling us and engaging with us about the importance of passing Jumpstart Seattle. I look forward to the coming weeks of conversation around how we are going to allocate and appropriate this fundin

g also through an equitable lens. Really appreciate everybody's hard work today and over the last few weeks to dig into the hard work that lays in front of us over the next several weeks. Thank you again. Budget Chair Mosqueda for your work at our next City Council meeting is Monday, July 13th, 2020 at 2 p.m.. I hope that you all have a very wonderful afternoon and evening. We are adjourned. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. I'd ask to the OR please affect my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Okay, folks. Agenda item three eight. Will the clerk please read? Agenda item eight into the agenda item eight. Resolution 31952. Adopting revised financial policies for the Cumulative Reserves Fund of the General Fund and preceding Attachment B to Resolution 31848. The Committee recommends. That the resolution be adopted as amended. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Council member, state sponsor of the resolution and chair of the committee. You are recognized in order to address this item if necessary. Thank you very much. Madam President, I made it to Council Member Herbold, if that's a. That is quite all right. Councilmember Herbold, please. Well, thank you. I just wanted to lift up another important element related to the. What's the average of our budget actions today, specifically in this resolution? This particular resolution, among other things, adopts financial policies for the use of

reach the real estate, a real estate excise tax, and specifies that rate can be used to fund the debt associated with repair or replacing the West Seattle Bridge. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold. Any other comments or questions about the resolution, colleagues? Hearing and seeing. Not that we will go ahead and ask the clerk to call the roll on the adoption of the resolution. Peterson I. So want. Yes. Strouse Yes. Purple? Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Mosquera. Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Please affix my signature to the legislation. Agenda Item nine. Will the clerk please read Agenda Item nine into the record? Agenda Item nine Council Bill 119824 Relating to the city's response to the 2020 COVID 19 crisis and venue ordinance 126000, which adopted the 2020 Agenda Item ten Council Bill 119825. Relating to the city's response to a 2020 COVID 19 crisis. Audience 126000 which adopted. The 2020 budget. The committee recommends the bill passes, amended with council members must. Gather Herbold, Gonzalez, Lewis, Morales, Pierce and Strauss in favor with council members to launch opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I will go ahead and recognize Councilmember Mosqueda as the chair of the of the Committee to address agenda item number ten. Thank you very much. Madam President, the bill in front of us is multi-dimensional in that we take attempts in many places to try to provide investments and community priorities, suc

h as making sure that those who are living unsheltered have the housing and support that they need, making sure that fewer people fall into homelessness, and that there is truly support for working families in our most vulnerable in the city. And also that we that we take a significant step forward to trying to address the call from community to divest in our policing system and to reinvest in the community. I'll just say a few comments here and then I'll save some calls for the closing portion. I want to thank folks for all of their tremendous work, especially our central staff and our teams on each of our offices. There's been it's been a very long budget session and it's only august. I want to thank the folks in i.t. And clerks for your work to helping make sure that we can get through each of these meetings and that we had robust public comment from communications and our i.t. Folks. I want to thank our council colleagues for their staff and their tremendous hours. It's important to note that many of you, like the organizers in the streets, have been pulled from your families, have had to spend long hours, day and night working as we try to deliberately address the call for action in this civil rights uprising . What we can't do everything in this summer rebalancing package. We have set the path forward for tremendous work in front of us as a council and as a city. And I think that all of that work should be really called out and appreciated because a lot of this work is happening around the clock. And that's true, again, for the folks in the street and the folks who have been working around the clock to provide the budget documents in front of us today. We started the city budget inquests in the first week of June and have had have had two sessions a week. At the minimum. Sometimes we've had more than one meeting with two sessions each week. We've had hearings. We've heard from central staff. We've heard from the Seattle Police Department. We've heard from elected leaders in other cities and national research entities. And importantly, we've heard from community coalitions who've been calling for change and who have been doing the research in this area for years. This inquest process has been helpful in us finally acknowledging and recognizing that there is massive changes that are needed, structural changes and continued investment in community for us to realize the changes that are being called for from community, this process and our deep analysis focus on a racial justice lens. Centering our work by lifting up and including the voice of folks who have been most affected is how we aim to make policy decisions. We aim to center politics policy decisions based on those who have the lived experience. And that is exactly what we've done in this speedy budget inquest over the last few months. And honestly, over the last two years, we have been aware that there have been many people who've been calling for structural change. And today, council

colleagues, we are beginning to put ourselves on the path to righting the historic wrongs. Structural change. Institutional change is really the only option as we look at individuals who've been killed year after year, month after month, unarmed individuals in our community, black and brown community members who've been killed at the hands of the current status quo policing system. And we can make changes. We can make changes to make sure that folks who are showing up are those who are adequately trained, who are from our community, who have trusted partnerships and who are not showing up with arms. That is the conversation we set ourselves on the chart that are

the path that we are charting for this conversation. That is coming up. And we're taking important, critical first steps today. I'll save the rest of my comments for closing comments. But I just wanted to say how important it is that we have centered the policy changes and the budget decisions that are included in this bill, not just on speedy, but also as it relates to caring for our most vulnerable, vulnerable community partners based on what community has told us that they want. And that's a critical change as we think about inclusive budgeting and policy making. So thank you to everybody who has made this process possible, and I'll save some comments for later. Madam President. Thank you, Councilmember Mesquita, for those introductory remarks. I'm going to go ahead and call on council members who are interested in speaking on me on this bill before we pass it. I see that Councilmember Herbold has our hand up, and as others become inspired to also speak on this Council Bill, I'd ask that you raise your hand accordingly, and I will shut you down in the order that you raise your hand. Councilmember Herbold, please. You're on mute. And whoever's playing bingo probably just got a square because I reminded somebody that they were on mute. So before I moved to the speed related budget amendment, I do want to just flag my appreciation for some other important elements in this next bill. The pilot project funding the Stay Connected program for seniors is included in here. The proviso to remove the police department as the gatekeeper for co-lead referrals is included in here. The funding for the Race Inequity Toolkit on expansion of choose 180 to begin to serve defendants over the age of 24. The pre filing diversion program is included in here and I'm I'm sorry that this is somebody else's somebody else led on this but I feel like it was maybe councilmember awards and I don't want to miss it. The restoration of funds for the AIDS Memorial Pathway is included in here as well. This package also, of course, includes much of the work that this council has been doing since June in the the Seattle Police Department budget inquest led by Councilmember Mosqueda, the package of amendments that we worked together on and came to a unanimous council decision on includes 38 full time employment reduction

ns starting in November, with suggestions from specific units, including mounted patrol, school resource officers, the Navigation Team, Harbor Patrol, Public Affairs and a SWAT team. It includes us capturing the savings from an additional 30 FTE, from expected attrition through the officers voluntarily leaving or retiring from the police department. And it also includes an additional 32 FTE suggested general reduction in sworn officers. It's really important to understand that ultimately Chief Best holds the authority to make decisions about how and where these reductions may occur. The Council may determine the overall appropriate size of the police force and suggest specific specialty units where layoffs may be made. It's the chief of police who will make the determination as to where layoffs occur. In addition, all of the reductions take a very specific format in order to set the city up for the most positive labor bargaining outcomes. Instead of making cuts of positions, the amendments put a proviso on two months worth of salary for each position that is targeted for reduction. We have received expert advice that it may take between 2 to 4 months for each reduction to be bargained. If it takes longer than that officers so that officers can continue to be paid as the bargaining finishes up. But the proviso format means that the city will have those dollars on hand just in case they are needed. The actions, if approved, approved by the council in bargaining as described below, will result in a reduction of Spd's police force by about 100 officers. From the current level of about 1400 officers, that's about a 7% reduction in the sworn force and also a result in savings of about \$2.9 million. The package also includes modest cuts to the Seattle Police Department's travel, training and recruitment budgets, which seemed appropriate given the current travel restrictions in the mayor's hiring freeze. Those cuts totaled less than \$1 million. Finally, the budget actions, which we'll talk about later in the in the resolution, commits to a number of transfers of functions out of the police department. The other point I think is really important to make, as we are about to take this vote, is that, you know. I think that we as a council and the mayor's office are in a really unique position to seize upon a moment in this city and in this country. And I am hopeful that we are more aligned in our desire to do that. That has appeared in the last few weeks. The mayor has been saying that we should be realistic and that we've been irresponsible for committing to a goal before we have the details. And I really believe that big change like this, shaking things up, accomplished by limiting to action to what seems realistic is never has never been realized. We always have to think beyond what is normally considered realistic and possible. We have a we've we've through agreeing to try to work towards a 50% reduction. I hope with the kind of partnership with com

munity that has brought us to this place where we're at now and has created a pathway and a plan for reductions in 2021. I think there was over the weekend there was an editorial that we took a swing and we missed. And I think. I think it's really important to look at what we've accomplished for the left for the next four and a half months of the budget, and understand that that's our starting point for deliberations for a whole year's worth of budget. So it's really important to annualize the value of these four months of cost. And I think when you do that and you take a paper and pencil up to do that math, our actions now are significant and noteworthy and also express a commitment to not. Disregard public safety, but to recognize that public safety means public safety for everyone in our community. And public safety must be we must recognize that by asking police officers to do too much. There are two things that go wrong. One, you send an armed response in some cases to a situation that doesn't require an armed response, which is an unsafe situation. And two, you're reducing the capacity for officers to respond to core law enforcement efforts. And so I'm really encouraged by the work that we've done, and I'm really hopeful for our efforts in implementing the council's interests, in working together with the Mayor's Office and the Chief to try to realize this this pathway for reimagine public safety for our city. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold. Appreciate hearing from you as our public safety chair on this issue. Colleagues, I apologize to Councilmember Morales and to all of you. I didn't realize that I had an updated script in my inbox reflecting two additional amendments that are being brought forward by Councilmember Morales, and so had inadvertently opened it up for general debate before we considered those amendments. And so I want to apologize and apologize for that oversight. Councilmember Morales did not mean to bypass your amendment. So again, I understand that Councilmember Morales has two proposed amendments to this bill that we are currently discussing that were distributed after 12 noon. And in order for the Council to be able to consider these amendments, the Council rules will need to be suspended. So if there is no objection, the council rule relating to circulation of amendments by 12 noon will be suspended to allow consideration of two amendments. Hearing no objection. The Council rule is suspended and the Council will proceed with consideration of these two amendments. Councilmember Morales You are recognized in order to move version two of Amendment 59. Thank you. Council President. And no need to apologize. There was a lot happening this morning, so I want to thank you for letting me bring these. And thank you for all of your indulgence. As I mentioned this morning. We did have a couple of provisions ready to go last week. We learned over the weekend that we had to change them around a little. So we were

just waiting to hear back from law. So you have received the new versions in your inbox? Amendments 59 and 60. As Councilmember Peterson said, there has been a lot of work happening over several weeks now. And this reflects the intent of amendments 33 and 34 that we passed last week. And those amendments were committing us to investing in organizations that are the intent of them, was to commit us to invest in organizations that are led by people of color, for communities of color, for organizations that work to improve community safety through restorative justice, mental health and wellness, youth mentoring programs. These are the kinds of organizations we want to invest in so that as we build up community safety infrastructure, we can do that while we are trying to dismantle our overreliance on policing. So the provisos that we have today are intended to hold each city to that standard in a way that hews as closely as possible to the preference for bipoc organizations. And as I said earlier, the issue is that because of our 200, we cannot directly express intent to contract with Bipoc communities. But that doesn't mean that we can't exercise our express express our intent to our departments, that our contracting process should be more inclusive in its criteria and selection process. So this Amendment 15, Amendment 59 amends the \$4 million investment and clarifies that receiving organizations should have culturally relevant experience with holistic community safety efforts. And the amendment requests that the chair of the Community Economic Development Committee, who oversees civil rights, receive a report identifying the selected organizations. Thank you so much, Councilmember Morales. Are there any questions or comments on a proposed amendment 59? Okay. Hearing. I'm going to go ahead and. Actually, I think I'm not sure we've had a formal motion. And second. Yeah, so can you go ahead and move it and then we'll see if there's a second. Yes, I move Amendment 59 again. Okay. It's been moved and seconded to adopt version two of Amendment 59. Councilmember Morales has already addressed the proposed amendment. Are there any other comments on the amendment? Hearing none. I will ask that the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of version two of Amendment 59.

Peterson I. Want. Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Lewis Yes. Morales Yes. Mosquera Yes. President Gonzalez? Yes. 18 favored and opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The motion carries and the amendment is adopted. Councilmember Morales, you have a Second Amendment. So I am going to recognize you to move version two of Amendment 60. And move version two of Amendment 60. Excellent. Is there a second? Second? It's been moved and seconded to adopt version two of Amendment 60. Councilman Morales, the floor is yours to describe this proposed amendment. Thank you. Colleagues, I'll be brief. This amendment places a proviso on the \$10 million investments that we made last week to require that HST submit a

spending plan through the committee overseeing civil rights issues and that the plan be approved by ordinance. Thank you for that description, Councilman Morales. Any other comments on the proposed amendment? Hearing no additional comments on proposed Amendment 60, I will ask that the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of version two of Amendment 60. Peterson I. The one. Yes. Strouse Yes. Purple? Yes. Lewis. I mean. Yes. Yes. Morales. Yes. Mesquita Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Adrian Favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The motion carries and the amendment is adopted. All right, so that concludes all of the amendments that I'm aware of. So I will now open it back up to general comments about the bill as amended. So, colleagues, any other comments on the Council bill as amended? This will be your last shot to talk about this bill. Okay. Councilmember Strauss and then Councilmember Swan and then Councilman Lewis and Paterson. Okay. Thank you. Council President. As we all know, there is much more work to be done regarding improving our public safety, to provide public safety that works for everyone in Seattle so that when you call 911, you get the right response right away. We already know that 56% of Spd's 911 calls are non-criminal calls. These are parking violations, noise complaints, mental health crisis and welfare checks. And for these types of calls, we don't need a police officer with a gun to respond. And we absolutely need the appropriate first responder to respond quickly with the resources they need to be successful to resolve the reason for the call. And this means greater responsiveness across the board. We currently already have programs in place that we can scale up to meet these needs, such as Health One Mobile Crisis Unit, Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion, and our Community Service Officer Program. These are the same models that are already in place in Eugene, Oregon. And their program is called cahoots. The biggest difference between cahoots and our programs is that cahoots is hard. Why are these 911 responding to 20% of their nine calls? While Seattle's programs require an officer to respond to make a referral. If these programs were hardwired into 911, patrol officers would have more time to respond to and complete traditional police work. The results of this historic transition that we are in right now will enable us to deploy the proper professionals to respond quickly with the appropriate resources needed, whether it be crisis intervention, special victims assistance, medical care, social services, or with an armed response when necessary. Through this transition, you'll always be able to call 911 to receive a response. And at the end of this transition, if you have to call 911, you'll get the right response right away. Every day of this work, we have found additional ways that additional proven improvements that can be made to the Seattle Police Department's budget and how we deliver public safety. It is i

mportant for us to ensure that we are delivering the priorities of government in an efficient manner. And this 2020 rebalance is just the first step in that work. In this work. I look forward to receiving the real time speed. Reports about their spending every other week and the robust reporting ahead of the creating the 2021 budget in the next six weeks will have the opportunity to make additional improvements to make meaningful and lasting change. And again, throughout this transition, to always be able to call 911 and receive a response. And at the conclusion of this transition, if you have to call 911, you'll get the right response right away. And if your call merits the response of an armed officer, you'll receive that response. And for every other call, you'll receive the first the right first responder who will respond right away. There's much more to be said about this council bill. And I know that I wanted to focus my comments specifically on the Seattle Police Department's aspects, and I'll reserve comments for another time on the rest. Thank you, Council President. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss. Next up is council member so on. And then after customers what will be Councilmember Lewis. Thank you. This is the vote today to adopt the city's new budget as a whole. It is euphemistically called balancing package, but that is only because the political establishment does not want to call it what it is an austerity package. There is nothing balanced about this budget. It completely fails to defund the police by 50%. Six of the eight other council

members are promised to support, and it carries out a major austerity program on behalf of big business, cutting tens of millions from the essential work of the city across departments like parks, roads and libraries. It is mind boggling to me how council members can claim they are anti-austerity when they are voting yes on an austerity budget. Where is the balance? When Amazon reported profits in the second quarter of 2020 of over \$5 billion. Double their profits from a year earlier. Since January 1st of this year, Jeff Bezos's net worth has skyrocketed by 72 billion. That's billion with a B to an astounding \$188 billion to date. At the same time, tens of thousands of Seattleites have lost their jobs and incomes, cannot pay rent and are struggling to put food on the table. Where is the balance when the Seattle Police Department continues to be funded more of the city's discretionary funds than any other department. My office fully supports and voted yes on. And in fact, the People's Budget Campaign and Black Lives Matter activists and Socialist Alternative have fought or every progressive budget amendment won by our movement. We won the funding for the Green New Deal Oversight Board, the end of funding for the euphemistically named Navigation Team, which carries out the inhumane and ineffective sweeps of homeless governments. Of course, I would caution that there are other ways that Mayor Durkan

could allow sweeps, and we need to continue organizing to completely end them. We want a small reduction in the police department. We want millions in funding for community programs, funding research into alternatives to repressive policing, youth programming and restorative justice. Our movement succeeded in reducing the salaries of most of the top executives in the police department who teargassed peaceful protesters and then lied about it, saying that the protests were riots. We want a proviso to end the hiring freeze in the Office of Labor Standards. We want a proviso to protect the North Lake, tiny house village from being swept this year. But as I said, on balance, this budget does not prioritize or meet the needs of ordinary people. It is not a moral document. Seattle Times conservative columnist Danny West need is as opposed to my socialist politics, as you might imagine. But he looked at the budget committee's action last week and came to the same conclusion that we did. Quote For all the heated rhetoric about Seattle defunding the police, both from activists demanding it and the police union decrying it. The key takeaway right now is this Seattle is not defunding the police. Not by half. Not by a quarter. It's not even clear whether this first phase of proposed cuts to the city's police force would reduce the current number of officers out on the street at all. That's the headline. The city isn't defunding the police, unquote. A month ago, the city council voted on the Amazon tax, a historic victory for working people and the oppressed, and an a victory for the Black Lives Matter movement. At that time, my office and the Jackson Amazon movement proposed an amendment to increase the Amazon tax by a \$293 million per year to eliminate the need for austerity, which no other council member supported. Now the police. Now the political establishment insults the intelligence of working people and acting like there is no alternative to budget cuts, as if our memory cannot stretch back a few weeks. City Council Democrats had an alternative. They had a choice, and they decided to side with Jeff Bezos. Many activists in the movement will be outraged at council members for reversing their pledges to defund the police by 50%. And they should be. This vote. Is going to reduce the police budget by less than 2%. That's not a defunding. Less than \$3 million out of \$170 million remaining in the city's budget this year, instead of the 50% demanded by the movement and promised by six of the eight Democratic Council members. It represents a total abdication of responsibility and abdication of responsibility in the context of the historic movement for Black Lives. The brutal attacks on protesters, the Seattle police's long record of racist and violent policing, and yet eight years of failed attempts at police reform, our people's budget movement gave council members every opportunity to follow through on their promises. We proposed defunding the police by 50%

now, but every other council member voted no, falsely claiming that the budget cuts could not be done until November. In response to that, on Wednesday, my office proposed defunding the police by 50% starting on November 1st, even though I don't accept that logic but still. Okay, let's have it by November 1st and no other council member would even second that proposal. We just received a powerful letter signed by 25 rank and file leaders of UAW 4121, the Union of Student Employees and Postdocs at UW, as they wrote, quote, We are deeply disappointed that many of the same council members have tried to delay the 50% defunding by claiming it would interfere with the Seattle Police Officers Guild contract as a public sector union. We recognize this tactic for what it is management grasping for justification to maintain the status quo. These issues are not new and we

have too long seen both the city and the Police Officers Guild use collective bargaining as political cover to evade responsibility rather than as it should be as any of the strongest tools available to fight for progressive change. We know that defunding SBT is possible, possible now. And we reject any attempts to prop up collective bargaining as a politically convenient way to evade responsibility. This hollow excuse is an insult to the labor movement, as our union wields our position at the bargaining table to protect workers and people of color, not our oppressors. We urge other council members to vote for someone's proposed cuts to SBT in the 2020 budget, unquote. That was just an extract of their letter. If our movement does not win defunding the police this summer, that does not mean that we cannot win. It means that we need to learn the lessons of the struggle. Recognize that what we win is a function of the strength of our movement and the balance of social and political forces. We will continue to organize and fight for defunding and the militarization of the police. We should learn the lessons from the Amazon tax fight, where in 2018 we saw the repeal of the tax and betrayal by Democrats on the Council. We learned that we can win if we build a stronger movement and never give up. We learned that our movement needed to be democratically organized by the hundreds who attended. Each of the Amazon action conferences, made key decisions democratically after public debate, and that the leadership of the movement was not going to make alliances with the Democratic establishment, but instead relied on independently organizing ordinary people, including the thousands upon thousands who eagerly signed our petitions of the George Floyd protests. How would today's Budget Committee discussions be different if there was a credible ballot initiative to cut 100 million or \$200 million or \$300 million from the police budget? That's a question our movement should ask ourselves throughout history. Progressive change has come from mass movements, not from friendly politicians and the political esta

blishment. The history of our recent struggles also shows once again, working people need our own party, not one beholden to big business. Socialist alternative. And I celebrate the victories. We are one, but stand against this austerity budget and failure to address the ongoing epidemic of racist and violent policing. With my no vote today, I perform our movement's unchanging demands. Defund police by at least 50%. That's big business and their reach and not austerity on working people. Because we can't pay and we won't pay for this crisis. This crisis of the racist and bankrupt system of capitalism. Thank you. Thank you comes my response. Next up is Councilmember Lewis and then we will hear from Councilmember Peterson. Councilmember Lewis, please. Thank you, Madam President. I'll be brief. Given all the other comments that I have made throughout this morning and throughout our broader process, I really just want to say, you know, I didn't know when we were starting this out exactly what type of plan we would be able to create and to finally start taking shape and to lay the groundwork for much bigger. And coming up this fall in 2021, where we get to well, for the 2021 budget, where we're really going to be able to make final decisions on a lot of the things we're laying the groundwork for right now, given the limitations of the summer budget session. And I you know, I just really think it stands as a testament to the leadership of Councilmember Mosquito Councilmember Herbold and, you know, the president, in assembling a package that has united a lot of the factions on this council from the far left to the far center left. I think that we've really been able to reach a pretty good initial package that lays the groundwork for much bigger transformative change to come in short order. You know, I don't know if this counts as an obscure metaphor or an analogy, but I'll throw it out there and hopefully the judges in the in the competition will let it ride. But, you know, if you if you want to go fast, go alone. But if you want to go far, go together. And I think that's really what we've been able to put together here is a process not just of this budget, but of the accompanying resolution later to make these final reforms and transformative changes that Councilmember Strauss alluded to earlier, too, in terms of the different types of first response. You know, I remain a very big advocate of building a community based low acuity. First response modeled on the crisis assistance helping Out in the Streets program. Who is from Eugene, Oregon? Following the lead of other cities from Denver to Oakland to Portland who have been doing the same thing and engaging in the same process. You know, we are not alone as a progressive city working to finally. Right, right size our first response. And I know many others will join based on the examples. So I won't take up any more of our time here. And I look forward to voting for this package. C

ouncilmember Lewis for those comments. Next up is Councilmember Peterson, followed by Councilmember. Thank you. Council President. So in the middle of a persistent pandemic and ballooning budget deficits and even the cracking of our West Seattle bridge stranding a hundred thousand of our residents. In the middle of these crises, your elected officials are striving to seize this historic moment in the wake of the brutal and wrongful killing of George Floyd and countless other black, indigenous and people of color, so that we address systemic racism by rethinking policing and revitalizing community health and safety. It's not an easy process. It's messy, it's difficult, it's uncomfortable, but it's necessary. Even as I speak now, I'm getting emails and phone calls from constituents who want us to do more now and other constituents who want us to slow down and think it through more. Of course, we were elected not only to synthesize these various viewpoints and address the concerns of our constituents, but also to craft thoughtful plans on how to do things better. We need to apply our own critical thinking and plan ahead rather than just reacting. I'm cautiously optimistic that the legislation today is a prudent mix of all these goals. It leverages the few tools in the tool belt of this city council to make a down payment toward a bigger, broader discussion, bigger, bolder changes as part of a long, more thoughtful, small budget process. I thank my colleagues for incorporating my amendment earlier today to answer some basic questions with the reasonable initial reductions approved today. What will the impact be on the ground in every neighborhood? How will the chiefs of police choose to redeploy our resources? And what will the impact be on response times? According to the most recent data? Only 71% of the time spent by police officers is for priority one and priority two cars. That means 29% of the time is spent on non-priority cars. There is an opportunity there for community led solutions. These reports will also make sure we do not recklessly jettison the good work done by our Harbor Patrol throughout Lake Union. The reports we're asking for as part of this legislative package can be combined with the planning efforts of our mayor and our police chief as they craft their budget proposals for next year. These reports and planning documents are an opportunity, a second chance for the city council to work authentically and proactively with our mayor and our chief of police to rethink and revamp public safety and healthy communities. With the reductions we are making for 2020, that will likely carry on to 2021. I believe adjustments can be made so that response times do not get worse. As I talked about earlier today, the remaining officers could respond to fewer types of criminal calls. Fewer types of non-criminal calls. Elsewhere. Ms.. Strauss detailed this thoroughly earlier. We also need to recognize that we cannot do it all through the budget

t. We need to discuss what has not been discussed enough, and that's the need to redo the police union contract. This complex contract needs to be redone to encourage the good police officers to stay in Seattle, to reduce excessive salaries and costs to fix their disciplinary system so that it no longer impedes justice. We need a good contract more than good slogans, even as the city council partially defunds our police department. We still have a police department, and we'll still have a police department as part of a broader public safety strategy that involves more community led solutions. Are the police reforms implemented since the federal consent decree enough? No. Reforms are not enough when there are systemic and institutional racism. But should we toss aside the progress made by the Community Police Commission, the Office Police Accountability, the Office of Inspector General? No. We need both reforms, real reforms and reinvestment. And as we invest tens of millions of dollars, we need more black led organizations at the table from the everyday marchers to the Urban League. They all deserve a seat at the table. We need to make sure those investments are smart and effective and that we measure results to show the general public whether we are achieving the positive outcomes we all want. Now, today's legislative package is not perfect. I do not support ending the navigation team. That was a team created that had a coordinated response. A team of dedicated city government employees, public servants from our Human Services Department and Parks Department who have been engaging those experiencing homelessness and who work for the public health of all city residents. By a narrow 5 to 4 vote, a majority of this council took what I believe to be a hasty action without a full replacement plan. Business improvement areas across the city that represent hundreds of small businesses that employ thousands of our residents are disappointed and concerned. Even if the navigation team goes away, the challenges of homelessness will not. So I look forward to working with our Chair of the Committee on Homelessness Strategies to piece together a reasonable and responsive replacement strategy. I also do not support suddenly and with little to no analysis, cutting the salary

of the first black police chief in Seattle's history and the diverse team that she hand-picked. Yes, we should take a hard look at excess pay throughout our city government, but I believe it should be more thoughtful and methodical. But we're here today facing a massive deficit. We must be balanced the budget. We're required by law to do this. Just like all appropriation bills at all levels of government. There are items in the bill that each of us might not prefer. But the big picture is we need to throw together both the executive and the legislative branches to give the general public confidence that we can function and move forward for their benefit. Let's approve the budget package today

and resolve to work collaboratively with our mayor and police chiefs to solve problems and make progress for Seattle. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, for those remarks. Next up is Council Member Morales. I think it's still with us. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you. Council president. I will be brief. I really just want to take an opportunity to thank a few folks. I want to start with the central staff who, as we all know, have responded tremendously over the last several weeks. From my perspective, they've responded with grace and wisdom to every single inquiry coming from this freshman office, and there have been a lot of them. So I want to thank Justin and Dan, each of your members for the work that you do. I also want to thank advocates for community safety, for black lives, for our homeless neighbors, young people, immigrants and workers. And I want to thank my staff, the Kiesha Farmer. And turns out that you led the effort with King County Equity, now with De Croix, Seattle and all of the other community safety advocates that we've been working with over the last several weeks. Devon Silver, who worked closely with homeless advocates and service providers. And Alexis Turley, who knows how to ask the right budget questions to get greater transparency in the information that we get, particularly the way it's transmitted from the executive branch. This team has worked countless hours to serve the people of District two and the people of Seattle, and I am very thankful to have them on my team. And that's all I have. Thank you. Thank you, councilmember moralists for those comments. Really appreciate it. Okay, folks, so I think we are coming close to an end here. I will just really quickly before I give the last word over to remember Muscat as the chair of the Select Budget Committee. Just say that I also like some of what I just really want to express my appreciation for all of the Legislative Department staff, our council central staff, our legislative department, I.T. and clerk's office. And, of course, every single member of our individual office's staff who've been working tirelessly on staffing all of us on these really important issues and engaging in thousands of hours of community engagement and conversations across the city as. And look at how. To. Rise to the occasion of this historic moment that really calls upon us to take a hard look at how we can reevaluate how we deliver public safety services. And over the last few months, many of us have had an opportunity to engage in conversations across the spectrum, because, remember, Peterson did a really fine job of describing where that spectrum is. Obviously, there are folks who believe and we heard it in public testimony even today, who we need, who believe fundamentally that we need to continue to expanding and growing law enforcement arms, law enforcement approaches. And then there are people on the opposite end of the spectrum who believe we need to abolish the police depart

ment as council members and pursue this as a city wide council member. I believe it's my responsibility to listen to a variety of different opinions in this space and to weigh what the the balanced approach might be in moving forward. And I recognize that the proposal that we're voting on today is isn't perfect. But it does put us on a pathway towards having additional community engagement to have conversations about how we can truly capture savings and additional investments that we can allocate towards communities who are negatively impacted by overpolicing and criminalization in our city. And and I think that that's an important endeavor for us to to to undertake. I think it's going to become harder before it becomes easier. It is clear to me that folks who who are nervous about having the council and the city undergo this effort are many of those folks, I think, are worried about what impact this will have on their public safety day in and day out. And, of course, there are also individuals who believe that continuing to invest in law enforcement also carries with it dangers for their public safety in terms of police violence against black community members in particular. And so our job here today is to and always is to take as much input as we can to synthesize that information into evaluate strategies and options that lay before us that we feel represent the broader will of the people that we represent. And I guess what folks are seeing now is their democracy at work. And I hope that we will be able to, in the coming

weeks and months, continue to engage each other in these important conversations, and that we are able to really develop a broad table of stakeholders who will come together to help us identify clear solutions and strategies for how to meet the public safety needs of the people of Seattle without the need to resort, always the need to resort first to an armed response with a gun. Even in those even in those instances in which the activity that is at hand is a nonviolent, noncriminal offense. And so I am hopeful that we will be able to have this conversation. I think this is an opportunity for us to continue to engage positively with people across the city and with the chief and with Mayor Durkan around those potential solutions. And I look forward to doing that work in collaboration with all of you colleagues in this really important moment in in a time in our history. Oh. I will go ahead and leave it there and just say thank you to my own staff. Cody, writer Brianna Thomas, The Nguyen and and to all of the staff and all of your offices as council president, we get to serve in the unique role of having to be able to have the opportunity to engage with each and every one of your officers on all of these issues and really have appreciated the opportunity to learn with you and to work with each of you. And I have a tremendous amount of. Respect for. For all of our staff who have been working really hard at serving the

people of Seattle, they do that in the background and they do it extraordinarily well. And I just want to want to thank thank all of them, especially my staff, for all of the work that they've been doing to help me balance home life with with the work life. So with that being said, I am going to conclude my remarks and I'm going to hand it over to Councilmember Muscadet to close debate out on this bill, and we will then take a vote. Thank you very much, Madam President, and thanks to all of our colleagues for all of your comments. This council has done something truly extraordinary, something that hasn't been done, at least in recent memory. We have passed and we are on the verge of passing a mid-year budget revision while working remotely during overlapping health and homelessness and housing housing crises. It would have been easy for us to, instead of going through this robust process that we engaged in, it would have been easier for us to just rubberstamp the mayor's proposed budget. And conversely, it would have been easy to vote no and not do the work. But instead we're rolling up our sleeves. We've committed to doing the hard work, and we've put forward a comprehensive and robust proposal. We didn't do this over the series of a few hours or a few meetings. Instead, we worked over the past few months on several budget measures that centered equity, anti austerity, transparency and collaboration at the heart of what we've put forward as a comprehensive package to address the crises that are in front of us. And it started with passing Jump Start Seattle. \$214 million a year in payroll tax coming in the form of immediate release for covenant and long term economic stability. We are replenishing the rainy day and emergency funds with a payroll tax on our largest companies and the highest income earners. We're doing this with the knowledge that this is a smart fiscal policy, a way to jumpstart our local economy, prevent flatlining our local economy, and support our community and family members. This is how we help stand up and respond to the crisis in front of us. This week, we're directing \$14 million in community investments, including youth focused diversion programs and community led public safety programs. We'll be allocating 3 million for participatory budgeting process so that community can better engage with the city. Specifically, the black and brown community can engage with the city in a directed way to make sure that our future efforts will craft a 2021 2022 budget. Investments and investments. We've done this on the heels of adding tens of millions of dollars to the Seattle Transportation Benefit District package to focus on frequency and transit trips, recognizing that we want essential workers to be able to get to their jobs and that we provide essential services across our city. We have done all of these things in a way to help center our families and community members who've been calling in and asking us for an anti-austerity a

pproach. We have been trying to invest back into the community to respond to this crisis. So to be very clear, all of the steps we have taken have been in alignment with community, our most vulnerable and working families. No one is signing with Jeff Bezos. We are increasing funding for our community, part of our community members, where possible, and recognizing that we will do much, much more when Jumpstart Progressive Revenue comes into play in just two years. At this moment, our city is identifying ways to fight back austerity budgeting. We have committed as a council that we will not succumb to an austerity budget and we will not allow programs to be pitted against each other. We knew that there was going to be tough choices, but ultimately we crafted a budget that addresses the economic impacts of the COVID crisis. We've made new investments in

our social safety net programs. We've invested in homeless services and COVID relief for families. We've made meaningful down payments to following communities. Call to defund the SPD by raising investments in community safety programs and scaling down our current state budget. We came together collectively and put Seattle residents and workers priorities and their values at the forefront of our discussions. We crafted a mid-year budget that lifts up anti-austerity efforts as we respond to COVID and caring for our most vulnerable. As I mentioned at the beginning of today's budget deliberations, the speedy inquest that we started in June has been very helpful in finally reckoning that we have much more work to do to invest in community and divest from an over invested and expanded police budget. But this process and our deep analysis has always been centered on the fact that we cannot do it all in a summer budgeting process. We're using a deep racial equity analysis, and we are bringing folks to the table who are from community to help us look at the years upon years of community strategies and priorities and calls for action to put those into place, a path to be put into place to really lift up bipoc communities. Local governments have continued to double down on the disproportionate investments in police and jails and courts and prisons. And that is what the status quo has always been. The Black Lives Matter movement is not new. But what's new is the way in which we're responding to their calls for action. This is our beginning. This is our effort to show that we're taking first and important steps to right historic wrongs, to begin building that trust back with community, and to make it clear that today is only the first step in that process. We have to be real about what is possible in this summer 2020 rebalancing process, and our teams and our community members that we've been working with around the clock have helped to provide much of the much of the input on the package in front of us to do what is possible this cycle and sets us up for what must be done in the upcoming months and years. The s

peed package voted on today is one step of a larger plan that encompasses the 2021 budget cycle, which starts again in just a few weeks. We are ensuring that funding for community organizations is actually being allocated dollars out the door so that organizations can scale up and engage in the participatory budgeting process and community led research project that we know we need in order to make sure that our community remains safe and that especially black and brown communities are safer when we demilitarize and reduce the police presence in communities, especially communities of color around Seattle. We need time to scale up to make sure that those larger volumes of work that community organizations are going to take on occurs. And this is our process. This is our commitment to scaling it up by investing the money that we will pass on Wednesday. It is our effort to scale up the organizations that have been calling for community organizations to really be at the forefront of responding to what communities need to be safe. That's housing, food assistance, childcare assistance, and other strategies that have been led by black and brown communities that actually invest and create safety. So today, again, is one step in the process. It says it sets us up for the continuation in the 2021 process, which again just starts in just a few weeks. And we will truly be led by the Community led research project to help undo centuries of harm, harmful systems that have continued to be funded over years or years. It will take time for us to get there, but we are acting with urgency today and setting us on the right path to correct these historic wrongs. I hope folks continue to work with us as we are intentional in our efforts to build trust, to be honest about what is possible here today, and to build that process for a truly re-envision community safety program and services going forward. What's important today is that we haven't just said no. What's important is that we have said, we will walk with you. We will walk with you in community to recreate a truly community led public safety model. What's important is that we have not just stood in the way or blocked the road. We are walking with community. We are identifying barriers together. We are pointing to those barriers or blockades and collectively putting the blocks together to get around them, to get around what has previously been insurmountable by working collaboratively with community and with a sense of urgency. On Wednesday, you will see us take action on some final votes, including an on loan bill amending efforts to get out the \$3 million to community led research project to desegregate SFPD precincts from patrol operations to. Pass the COVID relief bill that is jump start and to amend our efforts to make sure that there is community relief that is being provided and not just a veto that stands in our way. That will happen on Wednesday. Again, this is just the first step in a very long process t

hat has been long overdue. So I want to thank the community organizations who've been working with us to really come up with the strategies and the individuals. Obviously, we've talked a lot about King County equity now and decriminalize Seattle everyday march, but I want to pull out some specific names and helicopters Shiseido, Jackie, Bang, Shawn Flats, Isaac, Joy and Kira, Oliver, Andrea Richie. From across the country, we have Councilmember Jeremiah Ellison from Minneapolis, New York, Councilmember Brad Lander. Awesome City Councilmember Greg Cassar We have folks from San Francisco who provided us with ideas and strategies. Supervisor Jason Walden. We have organizations within the city that have been working to lift up how we can identify non sworn individuals and really invest in making sure that community and the city servants have supports that they need that are not embedded within SPD. So I want to thank individuals like Allison Eisinger, Floyd Gayle and Lisa Dugard, who've been working with us on how to de-politicize or sorry the police or demilitarize our homelessness response system. We have Katie Garrow and Nicole Grant from MLK Labor, along with Sean Van Dike and Kenny Stewart, who work with the Coalition for City Unions, who constantly said that they would be willing to help think through these next steps and have provided tremendous feedback and especially want to thank the folks who've been shouldering much of this work. A lot of our colleagues have already commented on this, but thank you to the people who've been working day and night shouldering this work. And I mean physically their shoulders probably hurt from the amount of work that they have been doing over the last few months. Our central staff, the clerk's office, council communications, our legislative staff, and all of our council members. But I want to specifically call out our central staff team by name because we appreciate yourself. Allie Penalty, Tom Meisel, Lisa Kay, Ostrov, and then COG from. Brian Goodnight. Calvin Chao. Carina Bull Ring Dos Amy Gore. Jeff Sims. Tracey Ratcliffe. Yolanda Hull Whish-Wilson Eric McConaghy. Carlos Lugo Kettl from Carroll Freeman. Patti, we're in Deputy Director Dan Itr and director Eric Pearson said we appreciate you. We know that this was a ton of work and I will be looking forward to hearing your feedback along with all of our council colleagues, feedback about how we can continually improve our process going into the fall budget. And with that, just a huge amount of appreciation for our teams. Some of you have already mentioned all of your incredible staff, but I also want to say thank you to the folks that have possibly reached out as well, not just to my staff, but directly to me. Thanks to Cody, writer and Brown, Thomas and Casper Gonzalez, his office, Cristina and Alex and Customer Referrals Office, Lakeisha and Alexis and Councilman Morales. His office. Peter and Councilmember Strauss. His office and Jonathan and Councilme

mber. So once office was reaching out as well and especially want to thank Aretha Basu and our office. She has been part of the organizing efforts in the past years and deep roots in community with King County Equity now and decriminalize Seattle and was on the forefront of inviting community partners to our table so we could hear directly from those most impacted. Thank you for your leadership in this effort. Along with Sage, all three. Who are. Angel, who is always at the forefront of pulling together the analyzes and feedback. Thank you. Along with Buddy Cuevas, who led our committee discussions and is going to continue to be our shepherding us through the select budget efforts and Erin House for your ongoing feedback and helpful engagement, especially as it relates to the federal dollars. We greatly appreciate all of your work to all of our council offices, even the folks that I did not name, but just want to see how much I deeply appreciate you. And we have set a budget, a set of package budget in front of us that truly reflects our council values centered again on anti-austerity, equity, transparency and collaboration while there's two more votes to come. Just wanted to get those last thank you again and I will be short going forward. Thank you very much. As I mentioned previously, I promised the public that there would be many, many words and thoughts shared with them publicly, and I have fulfilled that promise. So with that being said, I want to thank you all for your ongoing patience and engagement on these important issues. I do think it's an important thing that the council is moving forward in a in a unified fashion on this issue. I think it gives us a clear place to start the conversation in the coming weeks and over the next several months and really do appreciate the that that opportunity to be unified in this effort. So thank you so much, Councilman Musketeer, for your leadership on the issues facing us through the Budget Committee. And we will be back at it in about seven weeks. So here here we go. Without further ado, folks, let's go ahead and take a vote. I'm going to go ahead and close out debate on this particular bill. So I am now going to ask that the clerk please call the vote on the passage of the bill as amended. Peterson I. So want. No. Strauss. Hi. Yes. HERBOLD. Yes. Lewis.

Yes. Morales. Yes. Macheda. I. President Gonzalez. Yes. Seven in favor, one opposed. Thank you, Madam Park. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it and assist the clerk. Please affects my signature to the legislation. Okay. Will the clerk please read agenda item 11 into the record? Agenda Item 11 Resolution. Agenda Item 19 Council 119849 Relating to start conservation, a person controls upon the urban blight do apartments, a landmark designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I moved to pass Council Bill 119849. Is there a second deck? It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Str

auss, you are the sponsor of the bill and are recognized in order to address this item. Thank you. Council President. This legislation acknowledges that designation of new apartments as a historic landmark. Imposing controls and incentives. The review was built in 1924 and Capitol Hill, and it actually still has the original landscaping on Peterson. The builder also built the Ballard Bridge in the first portion of the King County Courthouse. The two later additions that on top of it is being designated for its distinctive characteristics as a courtyard apartment. And at the end of the English Gothic revival style, it has an outstanding work of the developers was outstanding and the Bergman brothers took a large portion of this and because of the prominence of its neighborhood is why it is coming to for the historic designation. The controls would apply to the site and the exterior of the building. Thank you. Councilmember Strauss, are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing no additional comments on the bill. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Strauss. Yes. Verbal. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Petersen. Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Seven in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. And I'd ask that the clerk please a fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Item number 20. We're getting close, folks. Item number 20. Will the clerk please read item 20 into the record? Agenda Item two Capital 119 840. An ordinance named in honor of my chance to run get terms relating to set up police department prohibiting law enforcement officers from questioning except in limited circumstances. Person 18 years of age or younger where a miranda warning is administered unless legal counsel is provided prohibiting law enforcement officers from quite requesting permission from a person under 18 years of age to conduct a search of a person or property, dwelling or vehicle under the person's control unless legal counsel is provided for that person. And a section 3.28. 174. A gentleman. Thank you, Madam Clerk, for reading that into the record. I will move to pass Council Bill 119840. Is there a second? I can. It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Morales, you are the prime sponsor of the bill. And I know several of us are are proud co-sponsors of this legislative efforts. So I'm going to go ahead and recognize you in order to address this item, please. Thank you. Council President. Thanks, everybody. I do want to begin by thanking the parents of my chance, Frank and Alexis, for joining us this morning and for calling to testify today in support of this bill and in honor of their son. It would certainly be an easier path for them to keep a lower profile and to grieve in isolation. But instead, they've made the intentional choice to do what they can to empower other youths to understand that they have rights and really to keep the honor and the lega

cy of my chance alive. So, Frank and Alexis, we mourn with you. And while we can't know your grief, we are grateful to know that the action we're taking today as a council can change the path of youth here in Seattle and inspire change in other places across the nation, as we've heard already. My choice was a 17 year old high school senior from Des Moines who had dreams of going to law school and one day being a champion for the rights of young people. He was tragically shot in King County by the King County law enforcement in 2017 before he had a chance to realize those dreams. And I'm certain that if my chance was here today, he would be with us defending the rights of young people with regard to this ordinance. This bill establishes some safeguards for young people who are asked to waive their Miranda rights when detained by a police officer. The bill would protect children under 18 by ensuring that they consult with counsel prior to waiving their constitutional rights to interrogation or requesting requests for searches. The bill does include an exception that allows officers to interrogate children without counsel if they reasonably believe the information sought is necessary to protect life from imminent threat. Colleagues, we've heard before when when the community advocates and the public defenders were here at the beginning of August, we know that studies find that due to their continuing brain development, children may not have the mental capacity to make decisions that have serious long term impacts on their lives. That means that when youth are in a situation where they may be approached or questioned by a police

officer, they may have a harder time asserting their constitutional right to silence and the right to refuse to be searched. We also know that children of color are disproportionately stopped by law enforcement and incarcerated in King County, 73.2% of children charged in 2018 were children of color. Between January and September of 2019, 86.5% of youth incarcerated were children of color. I'm going to say that again in King County. Between January and September of 2019, 86.5% of youth incarcerated were children of color. I want to say for all of us that this is so much more than just a piece of legislation. This is legal protection for young people and particularly for young people in my district who's a who's lived experience dictates that law enforcement does not necessarily have their best interests in mind. Many people have spoken about the lack of trust between young people, in particular in law enforcement. And this is a recognition of the way that communities of color have been policed, particularly young black and brown men. Many people have spoken already about the the the need for protecting young people. I want to thank the folks who called in. We did receive a memo in July from the King County prosecutor and from the sheriff's office, where they state that this proposal would further erode trust between juveniles

and law enforcement and could lead to increased danger in the community. As John Good has said and other callers have said, you can't erode what's not there. This ordinance is intended to help rebuild some trust by ensuring that young people have their rights protected and requiring that law enforcement assist them in seeking counsel before they are questioned. And I do want to say that young people can choose to assert their autonomy after they've been provided legal counsel. They can still choose to speak to law enforcement if they want to. The difference is that we're demanding that they have their right to counsel, that that not be waived, that we recognize interactions with law enforcement are inherently coercive because of the power dynamics at play. So we want young people to have the information they need to make informed decisions that would inevitably impact their lives. The steps this council is taking would ensure that we protect our young people and that this would be the first of many pieces that we need to do to dismantle the racism that is embedded in our criminal legal system and stop the school to prison pipeline. As Councilmember Herbold mentioned this morning, this bill did pass and King County Council in their Law and Justice Committee by a 41 vote. I want to say King County Councilmember Jameis hello for his work in moving this at the county level. This bill will be heard tomorrow in the full King County Council. And I will also say that the county council's law department had no issues with the ordinance and were actually helpful in drafting it so that it could pass in the county level. I'll have a closing remark, but I will stop there and I'm happy to take questions from our colleagues. Thank you, Councilmember Morales. Morales, for those remarks. Really. Appreciate it. Are there any other comments on the bill? Okay. Looks like. Okay. Councilmember Herbold. Please. Thank you. I've spoken numerous times about this bill. I really appreciate the partnership of Morales and in developing it. And the main thing I wanted to really make a point to add is to thank you, Council President Gonzalez, for allowing us to hear this on our full council agenda during a period of time where we are not having regular committee meetings. It really is appreciated that the urgency for acting on this piece of legislation is shared by all of us on the on the Council, and that there is such strong support for moving this forward. In addition to Councilman Morales, I want to also thank her staff there as I'll touch my staff, Alex Clardy and of course, our friends at the Public Events Department at Public Events and all of the members of the public for their hard work on this legislation, including the family members of of my chance. It's just so important that we are able to honor his life with this critical reform that expresses our commitment to zero youth detention by recognizing that sometimes at the the first interactions with law enforcement,

those are the actions that often begin the the the types of interactions that can result in, in detention and dramatically changing people's lives . I also just want to finally, in closing, just recognize that I just think this is just. Common sense of of an approach. It is common sense to want to do everything that we can in our city to ensure that young people not only know what their rights are, they understand them, and they know how to act upon them. This is just really, I think, an important step that we as a council can take to show that we not only understand that there is a power imbalance between young people and law enforcement. We understand that there's reason for young people to not always trust those in power, particularly those in law enforcement, and that we want to take this action because because we care about our young people. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold. Councilmember Strauss. Just briefly want to thank the parents of my my

chance for speaking today and turning your grief into a an important bill that we're taking up today. I want to thank Councilwoman Morales and Councilmember Herbold. This is important legislation. Thank you, council president. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss. Colleagues, are there any other comments on the bill? Okay. I just wanted to say really quickly, thank you also to Councilmember Morales and Councilmember Herbold for your work on this as as one of several mothers on this city council. I would be just completely horrified if I found out that that my own child was detained and questioned without legal counsel available. And so I think I think it's so important for us to make sure that we we acknowledge how, as Councilmember Herbold said, how common sense this approach is and and how, frankly, overdue this legislation is in terms of providing this obvious legal protection to young folks who don't yet appreciate the significance of their right to remain silent in the event that they are detained. And this is a step forward in making sure that that the power dynamic and differential that exists between law enforcement and children is reflected in their access to legal services that could could quite literally make the difference between life and life in jail or or liberty at home. And I just think that that the action that we're going to take here is so significant in advancing that basic principle that I was really proud to join up as a co-sponsor and will be proudly supporting that the passage of this council bill here today. So, colleagues, I just want to go ahead and close out debate by handing it back over to Councilmember Morales, who's going to bring it home for us before we call the room? Hey, thanks, everybody. So I do just want to thank again the community members who brought this forward. Organizations like Choose One Creative Justice, Community Passageways, the King County Department of Public Defense. I want to thank Greg Doss on central staff, who's been guiding us along the

way and taking lots of questions and providing lots of information for us as we process how to incorporate the feedback that we've been hearing. And I do want to also thank my own staff, Darcel Tuch, who has spent hours working with public defenders, with community, to make sure that we are keeping our young people safe. So thank you, Darcel, and I'm ready to vote. Great. Let's do it. Okay, well, the clerk, please call the roll on the passage of the bill Gonzalez. Yes, ma'am. I'll think about it. I apologize. Yes, ma'am. If you want to add one more sponsor to this, well before we vote on it. I'm sorry. I did not hear your question. Did you want to add one more sponsor to this bill before we vote on it? Oh, sorry. Yes. I understood council members to want once to also co-sponsor this bill. And so she's not here today. So it's possible. I would like to add her, please. Thank you. Is there an opportunity to join you? Sorry. That's out of order. It is not out of it's not out of order because we're we're addressing the issues related to additional co-sponsors, for the record. Councilmember Strauss want will both be added as as co-sponsors for purposes of the legislative record. Madam Clerk, is there anything else that you need on that front? No, thank you. Thank you so much. Okay, colleagues, let's go ahead and go back now to calling the roll on the passage of the bill. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Peterson. Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Seven in favor. None of those. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Agenda item three. Will the clerk please read agenda item three into the record? Agenda Item six Capital 119845 Grassing on the EU LLC. Permission to construct, maintain and operate a below grade private thermal energy exchange system under and across John Street, Eastbourne Avenue and west of Therapy Avenue, north where 15 year term renewable for one successive 15 year term specified the conditions under which the permit is granted and provided for the acceptance of the permit and condition. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I will move to pass Council Bill 119845. Is there a second? I can. It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Peterson, you are the sponsor and are recognized in order to address the second. Thank you. Council President. Council Bill 119845 would grant final approval for a utility tunnel under John Street in South Lake Union. The tunnel would be used for a heat exchange system to transfer heat between an office project being developed on the site of the former Times building and a residential project being developed on the block to the south. Last September, the Council granted conditional approval of this tunnel. All conditions included in the conditional approval have been met or will be met once the tunnels built. A

scott recommends approval and central staff expressed no concerns. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Peterson, are there any comments on the bill? Seeing and hearing no additional comments on the bill. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Strauss Yes.

Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Peterson. Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Seven in favor. None oppose. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Item number seven Will the clerk please read item seven into the record? Agenda Item 20 Council Bill 119867. An ordinance relating to the city's traffic code amending sections 11.4 6.10 and 11.4 6.020 of the Seattle Invisible Code to revise permissible areas of operation and the right of way and other public pathways for electric personal assistive mobility devices and motorized scooters. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Councilmember Peterson, as chair of the committee, you are recognized in order to provide the committee report. Thank you. Council President Gonzales. Items 20 and 22 on today's Agenda 20 is Council Bill 119867 and 22 is 119868. Both deal with the SCOOTER program. Council member Straus is vice chair of the committee. The sponsor on those two bills. So I would recommend that we at least discuss those as a group, as a couple and then. We can vote on it however you want. But. Those two items go together. 20 and 22? Yeah. Madam Clerk, can you please read into the record? Item 22, so that we can have a conversation about both. But we will take up the bills separately and then they will sit on the agenda. Agenda Item 22 Council Bill 119868 An ordinance related relating to use of the city right of way by free floating scooters amending section 15.17 .005 of the Seattle Municipal Code, adopting a free floating scooter share program, fee schedule and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Councilmember Peterson, back to you as chair of the committee to provide the committee report. Yes. So the committee recommended adoption of both of these council bills. However, Councilmember Strauss would like this. I'd like to turn it over to Councilmember Strauss, who's the sponsor of the Bills, who could speak more eloquently in favor of them than certainly I could or would. Councilmember Strauss, please. Thank you. Council President. Thank you, Chair Peterson. You know, we've had a robust discussion. We had a robust discussion this morning at council briefing about the scooter legislation. And first, I just really want to thank start the mayor's office, especially Joe Miller, for presenting it, the last Transportation Utilities Committee meeting. As I've said before, we've been engaged in a very long intellectual conversation for 18 months or longer. And I still have concerns about safety, parking, equity, how this

program is used, how it will be rolled out and implemented. I feel that Scott is working in good faith with us, and I feel that any changes that we need to see made to the permit structure will be made. And if we don't think that the scooter legislation scooters are appropriate for Seattle after we give it a try, we can we can in the program. I guess my problem is, is that for so long, we've continued to circle around questions that can only be answered if we try it in the real world. It is important that we start now, as I said earlier today, because. Even right now. Sunset is at 730. We had sunset at 930 just two months ago. We are heading into the darker, wetter parts of the year and it's important for people to learn how to use these devices in good weather. Another one of the features as part of a pilot program is that the first ride must will only allow a user to travel at eight miles an hour. That is the speed that some people can run. I can't, but some people can run at eight miles an hour. And so. Looking at this. You know, one of my concerns was about equity. One of my concerns was about safety. And especially within this eight mile an hour issue that was that was brought up, I asked asked if we could if when we saw users using these devices, that if they needed more learning time, could we make that change in the permit? And they said yes. So I believe them. And so I do think that if we are going to continue having a good discussion about scooters, we need to have that discussion rooted in real life data, in real life experience, and that's why we need to move forward at this time. I did talk about indemnity earlier today and there is robust indemnity within the program. I do want to just cite, though, that that doesn't mean that the city will be free from any suit ever. People sue for all sorts of reasons, for cars, for bikes, for all sorts of things. I do want to highlight the fact that, you know, if if the issue is with the scooters, operability, scooter, scooter malfunctions, then there is robust indemnity that would ensure that the city is not liable for us. That's different than user error or if the city's infrastructure is not up to it, has has a problem that we've seen before with people using cars or bikes that suit the city because the city's infrastructure is not set up. And that doesn't have anything to do with scooters. That has everything to do with how we create the built environment that we want to see here in the city. We're going to continue seeing additional electrified micro-mobility choices. We have had powered bikes in my district. In District six, Grandpa Bikes has had a, I believe, a very large back order during the pandemic because

people are starting to move around their spaces and cities using this micro-mobility that is charged with electricity because it allows you to move as quickly as you need to without exerting effort that will make you sweaty when you appear at the destination that you're going to. And

so this will call for a need for more bike lanes and more spaces for people to be able to travel safely with micromobility. And the reason that we need to move forward today and thank you, Councilmember Humble, for raising your concerns this morning. I do appreciate that we need to be thinking about this in a robust manner with a delay. Today would make the launch of this less safe because of the changing, changing weather, changing daylight as we're moving into fall and winter and having had an academic conversation for so long, if we're going to find the answers to these questions, if we just continue having them in an intellectual fashion, we'll just continue circling around these questions. We are at a point where we need to try this in the real world to get the answers that we need to these questions. And while I have concerns, I believe that those concerns will be alleviated by should we bring them up from the city council to the department. Thank you, Council President. Thank you, Chair Peterson. Councilmember Strauss Are there any other comments on item 20 or 22? Councilmember, please. Thank you so much. As I mentioned this morning, I did have some concerns. I still have concerns. I would have appreciated it in the week. But I do understand the position of the executive as it relates to the late date of Council's consideration. It would have been really great if we had received the legislation earlier. And I also want to note that the the the draft permitting requirements we only received as of the the date of the last committee meeting. And these are these are permanent requirements that, as President Gonzales said this morning, we hope to continue to to influence those permitting requirements even after the council acts on these on these two bills. I'm willing to vote in favor of this of this legislation at this time, despite my concerns, because I feel that my through the the work that my office has done, checking in with various advocates about the legislation, that hearing from advocates from the disabilities community who are the most vulnerable use users of our of our sidewalks. The fact that for instance as the arts of routine rights says that they were in touch with Joe Miller from a start as the legislation was being developed. They're not opposed to the legislation. They're interested in seeing how the end trip order requirements. One of the things I'm interested in as well could help resolve some of the sidewalk access issues. Marcy Carpenter, another disability rights advocate, also conversed with my with my staff about her interactions. It's she said it's been an open and collaborative process. And they kept insisting on a place table and they're happy with the requirements that Scott has developed for Scooter use enough to support the program pilot going forward. She's still worried about having too many scooters on the sidewalks and the sort of squishy nature of wording around who decides whether or not there's been a vi

able alternative to one riding on the sidewalk. But nevertheless, in voting in favor of these two bills, I do want to make note that there is there are some important things I believe we need to continue to emphasize. To start, I think it's really important that we closely monitor the trail. It's already extremely crowded. We have heard from the West Seattle bike connections about their concerns about using scooters in parks or on bike trails. And really not only feel that we need to closely monitor trails like the Elk Trail, but I'm concerned that the permit requirements that allow for 2 hours to address blockages is not acceptable. And I'm interested in learning more about how we can entice vendors to do geofencing in areas where it is unacceptable to drive a scooter. And then lastly, I just want to highlight, you know, again, that I appreciate Councilmember. I'm sorry. Council President Gonzalez mentioned this morning that we can still influence the permit requirements outside of the the legislative process. And I and I hope we find that to be true, because I think a number of us have some changes that we would we would like to request that Ascot make to those permitting requirements. So. Thank you very much. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold, for those comments. Really appreciate it, Councilmember Peterson. Thank you. And thank you for thanks to Councilmember Strauss for shepherding this legislation. And you make a really good point about, you know, needing to try and see what's actually going to happen. I do support improved mobility options by encouraging environmentally friendly alternatives to gas powered single occupancy vehicles and ideally electric scooters. E-Scooters will provide an alternative for some trips for some travelers. At the same time, the city government is essentially authorizing a new mode of transportation, thousands of scooters traveling within our streets and other rights of way. So this is a big change that warrants a careful tracking of the results. I had been looking forward to a standard

pilot project that would measure results for scooters, as we are seeing elsewhere in King County. But in my opinion, this legislation is not a detailed pilot. In my view, the legislation itself does not explicitly or fully address safety, financial liability, infrastructure costs and measures for success. Scott, however, made a compelling case. This legislation is time sensitive, so I fulfill my role as Transportation Committee Chair to facilitate discussion and ask questions and enable us all to vote on it. And while a majority of my colleagues approved it at committee, I was personally not willing to vote yes for something that I believe lacks these details. Both Council Bill 119867 and 119868 total only two pages in length. The legislation essentially cedes all the details of the program to the executive branch. So as chair of the Transportation Committee, I'll be sending a letter to our state director asking our staff to retur

n to our committee by next June and next December to report on the results of the first six months and first 12 months of the new program. Those dates will give them time to assess those results for those periods of six months and 12 months. Having our staff report back to the Committee on Specific Metrics of Success, which would normally be standard for a pilot program, it will enable our start to give us consistent, thorough information to us as council members and of the general public on the pertinent details and results. So we can truly evaluate this new program and my conversations with Director Zimbabwe. I've been assured that the Durkan Administration also wants to measure these results of the new scooter program. I believe we need to measure the results to truly assess whether the program is safe, equitable and effective in getting people out of their cars and doing this without requiring tax dollars to cover injury lawsuits or to build special infrastructure that would basically subsidize the profits of private companies headquartered outside of Seattle. I want to thank Dr. Fred Rivera, founding director of the Harborview Injury and Prevention Center, for writing to express his concerns about scooter safety provided several studies from around the country about this. Just last week, Dallas, Texas halted their scooter program due to safety concerns. So this letter will encourage you to get back to us within six months and 12 months. But I still have serious concerns about introducing this new mode. Thanks. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Mosqueda and then Councilmember Lewis. Thank you very much, Council President. I am really excited about this piece of legislation. As folks have said, this is a few years in the making. But first, I want to publicly acknowledge the important questions that Councilmember Herbold asked this morning. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold, for your questions and your comments. And I also want to publicly say I'm sorry that this morning I defaulted into a defense of the policy versus really hearing what your question was about, waiting a week to hear the impact of the lawsuits and the impact here in Seattle. So I want to say thank you for that and acknowledge that I defaulted into debating the merits of the policy instead of really hearing what you were saying. So thank you for all of your work on the issues to get to the heart of the questions that are being asked to us today and also for the Council President for sending that email to start so quickly and for Director Zimbabwe to answer those questions. I think that was all very informative in our debate today. I think that Councilmember Herbold, your your points around wanting to see the policy impacts and really the work prior to deployments of scooters about how folks can continue to maintain safe trails and sidewalks is going to be very important. So I look forward to working with you on that and I want to thank you for your highlighting th

at issue, and I absolutely support it. I also think that it's important as we look at that data, to see how this can further inform our efforts to fix our broken bike system and make sure that there's more areas that have protected bike lanes, truly protected bike lanes. Council Member Petersen as Chair of Transportation. I appreciate that you also outlined your concerns and the letter that you'll be sending. I would love to potentially work with you to include a few items in that letter as you think about ways to ensure implementation moves forward. As I mentioned, one of the things that I've had that was a concern in the past was how workers have been treated in the industry. But there's some really great examples out of Chicago, for example, on how to make sure that workers in this arena have the protections and benefits that places like Seattle have really fought for. So I'll look forward to potentially working with you, if possible, to include a few questions in that letter as as your draft and moving forward . And then lastly, I just want to thank Councilmember Strauss. You came in dedicated to this issue. I know had been working on it for quite a while, really excited to see this effort move forward even in this pilot sort of initial stage. Thanks for all of your work and your pre and your previous office as well, working with Council member Bagshaw and of course

Councilmember O'Brien in their previous roles. I think this is all taken a thoughtful approach to making sure that we're advancing on this multimodal transportation option. And I'm really excited about the work that you've done here to move this this part across the line. I also want to thank Representative Macri as she was the prime sponsor of House Bill 1772 to enable more clean and equitable mobility options and climate change and mobility change challenges. And we received a letter from her outlining how she appreciated this piece of legislation, especially as we're dealing with multiple challenges. At the same time, it's really important to bring people to a position on a circle around a bill that creates greater stability and sustainability for our local environment. So really excited about the work that she did in Olympia and that this piece of legislation follows other cities, neighboring cities like Tacoma, Spokane, Portland and cities from across the globe who have advanced efforts to try to make sure that there's more micro-mobility shared options. And as she said, we're taking a small but important step to implement a program that will help support this the city's commitments to mobility, equity and reduce congestion. And I'm excited about the work that is in front of us yet to do so. Thank you so much. Looking forward to supporting this. Thank you. Councilmember was here for those remarks, Councilmember Lewis. Thank you so much, Madam President, and thank you, Councilmember Strauss, for bringing this forward. As someone who currently does not own a car and has not own

ed a car actually for almost a decade now, which is sort of interesting to reflect on since I was an undergrad. I am happy to support this legislation today. You know, the future of a lot more people coming up in the world who do not own cars are arranging their lives specifically in a way to be multimodal and transit oriented is going to depend on having more options and more micro-mobility options like scooters and like bike shares. And I think it's time that the city of Seattle tried this out and went through the process, as Councilmember Strauss has said, of essentially, literally having the rubber meets the road to see how this can work in the city of Seattle. I do continue to have concerns about safety, but I want to be clear. I have concerns about safety all the time. As someone who bikes regularly and has been using biking as my main method of commuting and getting around the city during COVID. As somebody who sees all the time as a pedestrian on a bike or the impact that myself and similarly situated bikers and pedestrians are put into by a society that relies on single occupancy vehicles for transportation. You know, safety is is a conversation that goes beyond just our conversation right now on the pilot. And I think it's important to center that as we continue to work towards Vision Zero and continue to work toward not just enhancing micromobility, but also increasing protective infrastructure for micromobility platforms around the city. I'm also encouraged by some of the safety measures that are baked into the plan that Assad is going to be pursuing in terms of the maximum speed setting, the banning of riding the scooters on sidewalks and trips, photo requirements to make sure that they're not blocking or obstructing sidewalks. This is these are really important functions that gives me confidence that the pilot can return with meaningful data to shape and guide how scooters can work in our transportation environment. I continue to be concerned, as I'm concerned with lots of other transportation mode discussions, but it is definitely time that we tried this. It's definitely time that we expanded the options for getting around the city of Seattle that aren't single occupancy vehicles. And this pilot will hopefully really lead to a great new addition, an option for people to get around the city. So I look forward to voting for this. Councilmember Lewis, are there any other comments on the bill? Either. Councilmember Strauss, please. Right. And I will close it out, if that's all right with you. Councilman. President, I just also want to herbal or highlight what Councilmember Herbold had said about ensuring that this program works for folks that have different ages and abilities, who might be experiencing disabilities, that we ensure that the program is set up so that we're not creating clutter on our sidewalks. I really want to thank Councilmember Peterson again for his letter to Scott, because the concerns that we have need to be monito

red. And that's what he's requesting. And we need to see what the real world data reports, because we'll just continue circling around these questions, these intellectual questions until we have that real world data. And we need to ensure safety, equity and proper use are retained and that we provide people a new way to move through our city that ensures that we are transitioning away from gas powered cars and that we are able to get people the last mile between the transportation systems that we have in their homes or destinations where they're going. Thank you, Council President. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss. And thank you, everybody, for that robust

conversation and really appreciate both the committee conversation and the conversation this morning in council briefing and the conversation we just had. Now, as indicated before and as I voted in committee, I intend to vote in favor of both of these bills. I do think it's time for us to advance the pilot program and and and begin to have conversations about the future of this mobility device in our city at a greater scale. And that is only possible, in my mind, by moving from the theoretical and hypothetical to, to the real world. And so this is an opportunity for us to do that and to learn more while still having our ongoing concerns addressed. I believe that the Department of Transportation does want this program to be successful, and I think that that is common ground with many of us on the council. And as a result, I think that they are, at least based on my interaction with them, very receptive to ongoing conversation and engagement and cooperation with us as council members to continue to address some of the remaining concerns that exist in the permitting in the permit requirement document, which is I think well over or close to 50 pages, if I recall correctly, from the time that I looked at it before we went on recess. So I think that's where the details are and that's where I think there is great opportunity for us to continue to engage with Massdot around some of these lingering concerns and look forward to doing that. So without further ado, let's go ahead and close out debate. And I would ask that the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill, which is agenda item 20. They're both. Yes. Whereas. I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Mosquito? Yes. Petersen No. So on. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Council President Gonzales. Yes. Nine in favor and unopposed. I thank you so much. The bill passes and that. Chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Agenda Item 21 Will the clerk please read the short title of Agenda Item 21 into the record? Agenda item for resolution 31967. Providing an honorary designation of 28th Avenue, northeast from Northeast 1/25 Street to Northeast 1/27 Street as Hayashi Avenue. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I will move to adopt Resolution 31967. Is there a second? Second, it's been moved and seconded to adopt the resolu

tion. Councilmember Juarez, you are the sponsor of this resolution and are recognized in order to address this item. City Council president. This legislation, as you've learned, came from a resident, Hayden Bixby. Thank you, Hayden, for all your information and your public comments today regarding the house, your family that they once owned the property between 28th Avenue and 38th Avenue Northeast, where the Bank of America now stands. If you guys had a chance to look at your summary and fiscal note, they've put together some background information and I'm just going to share a few more details. This land was their home and this was also their family farm where they grew and sold produce and vegetables to the community. As you heard, they also donated decorative trees and plants to the community where there was a new school, whether there was a new school or other civic activity. Unfortunately, the house your family lost their farm when they were interned by President Roosevelt during World War Two through his executive order. After their removal, they never returned back to the neighborhood where they were once valued members. As you heard from Hayden this afternoon, she found this information and she wanted to share it and wanted to do something about it and shared it with the community that we should acknowledge and honor the family that were treated so justly by our government. So Hayden brought this history to the community, to the attention of the community, the Lake City community, and provided us with the background information about the house, your family, their land, their home and their farm, and their contributions to the greater northern north Seattle community. Therefore. And after three new leaders formed an exploratory committee to attempt to recognize the Hi Ashley family using the honorary street name program they could have done. Committee members reached out to then show an organization that is committed to preserving and honoring Japanese America's history in the region. Danielle from Dan Schorr was able to locate Bonnie, the granddaughter of the she family. Bonnie is the daughter of the last living and youngest child of the family. They received the blessing from the family to move forward and they started to reach out to the community members and organizations in the area to build support for the project. And we were happy that over 14 Lake City organizations supported the Street renaming. Another community letter leader. I'm sorry, our friend Chris Levinson. Let's build Lake City together. Begin asking for financial support from local businesses. And the committee started a go fund me to fund the installation and the manufacturing costs for the project. In just under 24 hours, as they shared this morning, they reached their fundraising goals with the generosity of over 30 individual contributions to the community we hope will be holding unveiling ceremony and the public is encouraged to join will following the public hea

lth safety protocols, of course. I've been told that the granddaughter Bonnie of the House family will be in attendance. And so I'm really happy to hear that. And Scott is working with our office and the community to find a date, to unveil the signs and honor the family at the time, as you heard me share this morning. We're hoping it might be the 25th of this month, but I'll let you know. Just as a side note, as we've talked about this for years, particularly in this council and particularly in our committee. This is just an example of how sometimes when you just recognize the past in our past wrongs and you address the truth and the history, and you offer just a simple, humane gesture, recognizing as a family, the house, your family, and just changing the street name to really reflect the history of that place, that sense of place, that sometimes that truth and healing goes a long way. So with that I recommend council affirm confirm. I'm sorry. Resolution 31967. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Suarez, for bringing forward this resolution and for those comments, are there any comments on the resolution from my colleagues? Looks like there are no additional comments. I want to thank you once again, Councilmember Suarez, for shepherding this through the city council process and appreciate those who like you, those who called in to give public comment in support of this resolution. At this point. If I could just add. Council President, if I'm sorry, would you mind if I. No, of course, please. Last word is you. Oh, I'm sorry. You're going to do that anyway. I apologize again. You know, going through parks and going through escort. And we've certainly seen and familiar with native communities. Well, we're doing this at Linton Springs for the for the Duwamish community and other tribes. When you go to the city, I also want to thank Abigail, alcoholic, who had us take down some offensive signs that were up at Maple Leaf and up the community center. You know, just going through the city and actually being honest and renaming the places and honoring what really happened there didn't happen there. It's it is akin to just telling the truth and telling the history that we are on indigenous land and also that there are other people here that have a history that have been erased and their families and their legacies have not been marked or honored. So with that, I'm hoping if my colleagues have other places and hear from other community groups and stories that we learned and really big, thank you to Hayden for taking the time to do this and bringing this to community. I would really encourage my colleagues in your committees, in your communities to work with our office, certainly, and so we can help you shepherd through this kind of these kind of changing where we what they say. Decolonize, I guess, and rewrite and put in the right history. So we are more inclusive about everybody's place in this great city. And so I will leave it at that. Thank you. Thank

you, Councilmember Suarez, for those closing remarks. I appreciate your work in this area and your constant reminder to to say the names of those that are oftentimes erased by our by our history. Okay. It looks like there are no additional comments from any of my colleagues. So at this point I will ask the clerk to please call the role on the adoption of the resolution. Whereas. I. Louis. Yeah. Morales. I must get a. Hey, Peterson. Yes. Sergeant. Yes. Strouse? Yes. Purple? Yes. President Gonzalez? Yes. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? All right. Report of the Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item five. Will the clerk please read item five into the record? Agenda item two Clerk File 314457. Office of City Officers Request for a one year suspension of a citywide financial condition report pursuant to set on the code. Section three point 40.0 60. Thank you. I'm going to approve and file clerk file three one, four, four, five, seven. Is there a second? Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve and file the clerk file. Casper Room Estate. I believe this is a item that you have sponsored and are recognized in order to address it. Thank you very much, Council President. Beginning three years ago, we asked the city auditor's office for an independent analysis of the city's financial indicators and trends to allow for us the ability to make the best decisions for the city budget pursuant to SNC 3.040.060. The city auditor has prepared that analysis in September of 2017 and May of 2019, and the next biennial report would have been due this September. Earlier this month, the city auditor asked for suspension of this requirement for two reasons. And first, I want to say thank you to the council president and your office as well for engaging in this conversation and your leadership on this effort. We discussed with the council sorry, with the city auditor, the two reasons. First was the economic downturn of Calvin. And the city auditor did not believe that the reporting covering financial conditions and trends through December. 2019 would. Have provided Council with any insight for the period that followed COVID 19 outbreak. And the second reason for moving forward with this today is that the city audited the 2019 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, or CFR, CFR for

the fiscal year of 2019, and it was not even completed until a month ago. So he requested we also requested a long term consideration of the best vehicle for a council to have up to date information about the city's fiscal health and condition, an issue that will likely need to be picked up next year. After consulting with the council president and under the guidance of the central staff who was incredible. We agreed that the report would not be provided in a timely or useful manner this year for council to begin its budget consideration.

ions. And thus I am supporting this piece of legislation in front of us. Item number two and encourage folks to vote yes. Thank you, Casper Maceda. Appreciate that. Are there any additional comments on the clerk file? Carrying on will the work please call the role on the approval and filing of the clerk file? Lewis. I. Morales. This guerra. Yes. Petersen. Yes. Sir. What? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Verbal? Yes. Juarez. Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Nine in favor. Nine opposed the motion carries in the court file is approved and filed new item number three from the amended agenda. Please read new item three into the record. Agenda Item 19 Resolution 31 917 Identifying proposed comprehensive plan amendments to be considered for possible adoption in 2021, and requesting that the Office of Planning and Community Development and Societal Planning Commission review and to make recommendations about proposed amendments. The Committee recommends that resolution be adopted. Thank you so much, Madam Park. Councilmember Strauss, you are the chair of the committee and are recognized in order to provide the committee report. Thank you. Council president has just discussed the annual Council Comprehensive Plan Docket Setting Resolution, which identifies amendments that should be considered in the 2020 cycle to develop the docket. Potential amendments are submitted by the public to the departments or council members, and they are evaluated against a set of criteria included in Resolution 37, adopting a potential council's , agreeing that it meets the criteria for further discussion and consideration, and is asking of PCV in the Planning Commission to review and make recommendations for the action in 2021. There are six potential amendments included on the docket. The Council requesting the review, including expanding the boundary of University District Urban Center to include west of 15th Avenue, northeast between 56th Avenue and East, with an overt over reviewing policies and a comprehensive plan to determine whether changes are needed due to the failure of the West. Selfridge Review the goals and policies related to trees adjusting the title Single Family Zoning to operate with titles such as neighborhood residential preliminary changes related to the station area around future 130th Street Light Rail Station and preliminary changes recommended by the new Industrial Alliance. Maritime Strategies should that will be required this year. Additionally, the executive identified for potential docket of items due additional review, including whether South Park meets the criteria for an urban launch. Completing the planning work around 132 station Street Station, including possible urban village designation amendments related to reducing the impact of fossil fuel production and storage and further changes resulting from industrial maritime strategies. Finally, the resolution also recognizes that further analysis is needed to to implement impact these which were previously doc

keted and that council is leading the analysis . We there were several other amendments submitted that I was interested in acting on, but that did not ultimately fit within the comprehensive plan or criteria at this time. For example, when it was proposed to change the target date at which the city will meet its tree canopy goals, that they should be evaluated in the context of the foster management plan and a new tree ordinance rather than now, which I had requested to see if that could be possible to just move up the date, the target date for city to be extended, because it has been I've been instructed to hear back from the trees about the Urban Foreshore Management Plan and the new tree ordinance before doing so. And while some of the some of these topics did not fit within the proper point, typically I do look forward to continuing to work to address items, code changes, city budgets or other needs. I want to thank the morning for putting forward the brilliant the Tree Amendment, which I modified to fit within the criteria . Chris Lehman, thank you for our conversation outside committee last week. I do look forward to that every report. Thank you so much, Councilmember Strauss, are there any additional comments on the resolution? Councilmember Peterson, please. And then Councilmember Mosqueda. Thank you, council president. Thank you, Chair Straus, for shepherding this through. And I really appreciate your comments about Dave Moore and Chris Lima and others who have good ideas for us to consider these. This legislation is really complex, and with the COVID pandemic and other things that were

occupying my time, I know that I'll be more prepared next year to engage earlier in this process, and I know others will be looking forward to that too. So thank you for your leadership and getting us through, and thank you to Councilmember Swan for raising the real estate developer impact the issue. I'm glad to see that it is in here. There are several ways that those funds could be used if we were to agree on a program. Casper Swann mentioned transit. There's also possibility to use it for bridge maintenance or a combination thereof, either through GMA or through Transportation Benefit District at some point. So thank you for raising that Councilmember Smart. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson, Councilmember Mosqueda and then Councilmember Morales. Thank you very much, Madam President. And thank you again to Councilmember Straus for your leadership on this. I ask during the last bill to clarify which amount of which item we were on, because I, too, was about to make comments on agenda item number 90. And so I'm glad that I held off. I did want to underscore my appreciation again for everything that you were able to get into. Agenda item number 18 and here on agenda item number 19. I do want to note for the record my concern that I brought up during the committee meeting, noting as well that I will be supporting this bill and voting yes today

y. But I wanted to note the importance of the conversation around single family zoning. And think again, Councilmember Strauss, for including the name change for family zoning in this year, advocating a resolution given the single family name is inaccurate, rooted in exclusion and as we discussed during the committee meeting, does not reflect the diverse and multi-generational housing that exists throughout our city. We had a robust conversation about how it is past time for us to update this terminology to create a more inclusive and accurate name, such as neighborhood residential. In fact, Seattle's single family zones have expanded year after year, and as they are expanded, they encompass multi-family structures. They've encompassed old apartment buildings, duplexes, triplexes that are throughout the city, including in the neighborhood I used to live in in Queens, and that a zoned for single family use but was an apartment building surrounded by other duplexes and triplexes. And it's really important that we have a name that is inclusive of the actual fabric of our city. We requested Pcdi to study the name change in 2018 in the companion resolution. We again requested this during the comprehensive plan annual docking process in 2019. So that's why there's a sense of frustration, I think. And if you go back and look at the tape from the committee meeting, there's frustration that this name change has been recommended as well by the Planning Commission and has been called on from housing advocates. Yet unfortunately it was not included in the piece of legislation that was transmitted to us this year in 2020 and because it wasn't already studied, we therefore cannot ask for it to be included in this year's update. It's frustrating and yet we are again including in for darkening for the third time through this piece of legislation for consideration as an amendment to next year's campaign update. So my hope is that the third time will be the charm and that this minor change could go into place, and that this major change truly would be an effort that would go far in updating how we talk about housing and Seattle to be more inclusive and equitable and change. That was a change that squarely fits within the priorities that have already been studied by other entities have been called for for many years. And it's truly a minor update. We should not wait until the next plan update in 2024. So thanks again to Central South and okay to make sure that we follow up on this language in this legislation regarding the study and so that we don't have another year go by without changing single family zones, hopefully residential. Neighborhood residential. Thank you, Councilman Muscat, for those comments. Councilmember Morales, please. Thank you. Council President I am not part of the Land Use Committee, so I wasn't part of the ongoing conversation. But I'm happy to see that this resolution is here because I have a lot of questions. I think we all know that our p

lan is designed to guide the future actions of a community. It presents a vision for the future and long range goals and objectives. And our plan here in Seattle includes a focus on a growth strategy, the environment. And, importantly. On community well-being. So I'm really thankful that the Land Use Committee has included, again, these specific elements in the resolution asking for the analysis to be conducted. If, excuse me, if we want to move in a direction that advances a clean. Environment like health. Allows for the vision zero investments that lead to walkable, walkable, 15 minute neighborhoods. And we need the analysis of impact fees, a discussion of zoning and other issues that will allow us to make the critical changes that we need to make for the vision that we

have of Seattle. That's how we plan for the seventh generation. That's how we repair the harm done to black and brown communities. So I am hoping, as Councilmember Skinner said, that the third time's a charm and that we have the analysis completed. We need in order to. Make these decisions. You. Thank you so much, Councilmember Moran. That's are there any additional comments on the bill? Councilmember Lewis, please. Thank you. So much. Madam President, I similarly just wanted to echo the comments from council members Sergeant and Peterson regarding the rocketing of in taxes as a potential source of revenue for transportation related projects in the future. As we have seen this year and in a recent editorial actually in public by the Transportation Choices Coalition Director, we continue to struggle with finding sufficient revenue options and revenue resources to to underwrite infrastructure and support for transit impact fees, particularly through the Transportation Benefit District, could offer an interesting path to explore, and I appreciate that we've targeted that today and look forward to working over the course of the next year on on that as a strategy and follow . Many of our neighbors in King County that have for four years used impact fees for certain infrastructure improvements. So with that, I look forward to voting for this today and and look forward to working on those docketed priorities over the course of the. Thank you so much, Councilmember Lewis. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing? None. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution? Morales Yes. Mosqueda Yes. Petersen Yes. So what? Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. President Gonzales. Yes. 9 a.m. favorite in a post. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the port please affix my signature to the legislation? Adoption of other resolutions. Item 20 Will the court please read the title of item 20 into the record? Agenda Item 20 Resolution 31972. Setting the time and place for a hearing on the. Appeal of Eugene. We have for. Us and already examiner case number of. CWA dash 002 and the findings and recommendations report of the he

aring. Seminar. On the final assessment role for Local Improvement District number 6751 and directing the specific classify. Any required notice of the hearing in the matter required by law. Thank you so much. I'm moved to adopt resolution 31972. Is there a second? I thought we were going to be down there for a minute. Oh, so it's been moved and seconded to adopt the resolution. Councilmembers. You are the sponsor and are recognized in order to address this. Thank you. So as I share this morning, this is the second appeal. So colleagues expect a few more coming down the pike and we will be doing the same requirement in process. Again, this bill sets the time and place for hearing on the appeal by Eugene Elisabeth of the Hearing Examiners Findings and Recommendations report. Are the waterfront led or the local improvement district number 6751. This resolution hearing for December 1st 2020 and the public assets and Native Communities Committee. Meet the requirements of the quasi judicial rules. Council must take action this week via this resolution, and this is a mandatory and procedural matter. I recommend council confirm Resolution 31972. Thank you. Thank you, councilmember suarez. Are there any additional comments on the resolution? Hearing no additional comments on the resolution. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution or else? Yes. Ms.. Skinner. Yes. Peterson. Yes. Sir. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis? Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Nine in favor. Nine opposed. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation? Colleagues, other business. Is there any further business to come before the Council? Hearing no for their business to come before the council. We are set to adjourn, colleagues. This does conclude the items of business on today's agenda. Our next regularly scheduled city council meeting is on Monday, October 5th, 2020 at 2:00 PM. I hope you all have a wonderful afternoon and evening. We are adjourned. Thank you. Agenda item eight Resolution 31971 relating to the city department adopting a Transportation Electrification Strategic Investment Plan at the City Department that will guide the development of the utility's infrastructure strategy and investment priorities related to the electrification of transportation. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. You are chair of the committee and are recognized in order to provide the report on this item. Thank you. Council President. Just pausing to admire the little one there. This is resolution 31971. It would adopt Seattle City Lights, Transportation, Electrification, Strategic Investment Plan. It's required by House Bill 151 to pass in 2019. It allows for electric utilities to invest ratepayer funds in transportation electrification. This plan, which has been part of a multi-year planning effort, outlined Seattle City Light

s, recommended strategic investment priorities based on a robust stakeholder outreach effort following adoption of the Strategic Investment Plan. The utility will begin the second phase of customer and community engagement to develop the utility's more detailed program offerings and metrics to increase electrification. See also heard from many stakeholders about the importance of City of Seattle aggressively working to reduce carbon emissions, including from the transportation sector. This investment plan will help with that. It was recommended unanimously by the committee. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, for those comments. Are there any additional comments on the resolution? Hearing none will work. Please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution. Oscar I. Peterson. I so want. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. President Gonzalez. I ain't in favor and unopposed. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation? Okay. Last item. Adoption of other resolutions. Will the clerk please read the short title of item nine into the record? Agenda Item nine, Resolution 319 73 Setting the time and place for the hearings on the appeal to certain appellants during examiner case number. Thank you so much. Madam Clerk, I move to adopt resolution 31973. Is there a second? Second. Thank you so much. It's been moved and seconded to adopt the resolution. Councilmember Strauss, I understand that you are prepared to provide a report on this item and are recognized in order to do so. Thank you for letting me speak on behalf of Councilmember Juarez in regards to Resolution 31973, this bill sets the time and place for a hearing on 62 individual appeals to the hearing examiners findings and recommendation report of the waterfront wid or local improvement district number 6751. This resolution sets the hearing of each appeal to either December 1st, 2020, or January 5th, 2021, in the regularly scheduled Public Assets and Native Communities Committee to meet the requirements in the quasi Judicial Rules Council must take action this week via this resolution. This is a mandatory and procedural matter. I recommend the Council confirm Resolution 31973. Thank you, Council President and colleagues. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss, for that report. Are there any additional comments on the resolution? Hearing on will the court please call the role on the adoption of the resolution? Oceana I. Peterson. I so want. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Vice President Gonzalez I eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation? Okay. Other business colleagues, Councilmember Juarez, had intended to be able to join us today, but unfortunately, that was not possible. So I'm going to move to excuse her from today's meeting. So if there is no objecti

on, council members will be excused from today's meeting. Hearing no objection. Councilmember Juarez is excused from today's meeting. Is there any other business? Is there any other further business to come before the council? Councilmember Muscadet, please. Thank you very much, Madam President. Thanks as well for my council colleague, Councilmember Strauss, for reporting out this morning. I'm sorry I couldn't be there. As the council president noted, our daughter was sick this morning, but I did want to take this opportunity to remind folks there is a public hearing on the budget tomorrow at 5:30 p.m. public testimony opportunity opens up at 330 to sign up. We will be sending you all some images you can use for your social media. But I wanted to take this as a chance to do a PSA to get that public testimony on your calendar for tomorrow. Anybody who is interested in testifying. Thank you so much, council president. Thank you, Councilmember Muscat. And thanks for the reminder to the general viewing public about tomorrow's evening, a public hearing and the opportunity to sign up to give public comment and also hope Camila is feeling much better. Okay, colleagues, this does conclude items of business on today's agenda. Our next regularly scheduled city council meeting is on Monday, October 12th, 2020 at 2:00 PM. I hope you all have a wonderful afternoon and rest up for what promises to be a very long evening tomorrow. We are adjourned. Thank you. Bye bye. I. Three report at the L.A. Sun has committed to and four counts about 119877 have waited so long due to a few decision and meeting procedures, temporarily modifying suspensions, procedures and titles 23 and 25% on this proposal. The committee recommends that the bill passes amended with a desire to report with the staff together. And we were in favor and Counselor Peterson opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Councilmember Strauss, you are the chair of the committee and are recognized in order to provide the report of the committee. Thank you. Council president and colleagues. This legislation extends provisions that allow for virtual design review and landmarks board meetings to continue until the end of the COVID 19 emergency. You will recall that in April we adopted emergency legislation in response to

the COVID 19 emergency, which allowed projects that would originally ordinarily go to design review boards to instead be considered through administrative design review, which is conducted by STC staff. When we passed that legislation, council made clear that we expected SDC and Department of Neighborhoods to start virtual design meetings of the design, review and Landmarks boards as soon as possible. SDI and Department of Neighborhoods both worked hard to move these very technical, complex meetings to a virtual format, which included the need for additional staff. These meetings are now up and running and are going well. This legislation allows for those virtual meetings to continue for the duration

of the COVID 19 emergency and automatically sunsets two months after the emergency ends to allow time to ramp up in-person meetings again as the original emergency legislation required. New projects, except for affordable housing projects, are now going through full design review board processes again because virtual meetings have begun. This legislation does not propose to change that. The legislation does allow for a limited number of projects that already started in the administrative design review process to stay in the administrative design review process through the end of this year. Specifically projects that state that can stay in administrative zone review through December if the project has completed the early design guidance process, or if STSCI cannot provide a virtual meeting before the ordinance takes effect of the 67 total projects that opted into administrative design review through the emergency ordinance. There are currently just 15 who qualify to remain in the Administrative Design Review through the end of this year. Administrative Design Review still includes opportunity for public input akin to full design review, even though it is not a full design review meeting. As I mentioned at council briefing this morning, I did consider whether to bring an amendment that would have shortened this timeline of this legislation to six months from now for us to be able to consider modifications to be made or aspects of the bill that are working well and should be made permanent. I'm not bringing that amendment forward this afternoon because it is better policy to simply extend these temporary provisions for the duration of the emergency. Rather, we will do the work between now and then to understand which of these changes are working well or not. So that at the end of the COVID emergency, we are ready to make the needed changes for the new environment in which we will live in. As well, we retain the opportunity to make permanent or make modification before the COVID emergency is over. On a separate track as to not conflate this emergency and temporary these emergency and temporary changes from the permanent or ongoing changes that are needed. Finally, I've heard from some residents who shared their concerns about this legislation and some of whom we heard a public comment today. My staff or I have met with Megan Cruz repeatedly and in the recent weeks, and we appreciate those conversations because it enabled us to understand her concerns more indefinitely. And we even brought an amendment with Councilmember Lewis to shorten the original duration of this legislation directly in response to the issues that she raised. It was originally proposed to be six months. The extension of this legislation would be in effect six months past the end of the COVID civil emergency, and we have reduced that duration to two months past the COVID emergency. I've heard from central staff that it takes about three months for us due to public hearing require

ments and other land use code requirements for us to make the needed changes. And so that is why we will get working before the COVID emergency is over, so that when the COVID emergency, the civil emergencies is ended, we will be ready to take the next step. This policy does not allow new projects to bypass design review. It still ensures that the design review process can continue smoothly and safely during these extraordinary times. This bill is an extension of the bill passed in April, and I urge your support. Thank you, colleagues. Thank you. Council President. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss, for that committee report. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Councilman Mosqueda, please. Thank you very much. Council Member Strauss I just want to say thank you for your leadership again supporting us through this process. I think it's really important. I am very excited to vote for this. I understand it's a small but important measure and I don't want to oversell its impact or its significance because it's really more and more process in nature, making sure that the functions of core government can continue during this crisis. But I wasn't planning to speak, but I do think it's important to just sort of clarify for the record. There is nothing that this council is doing that is trying to use COVID as an excuse to change policy. In fact, what we are doing is being responsible stewards of the public's health by making sure that processes can

continue and to do so in a way that protects the very vulnerable in our community. And frankly, all of us, as we know that COVID has no bounds. It will infect people whether they are young or old. It just happens to be those who are elderly and those with underlying health conditions that are more susceptible to death. So while we continue to see increases in the number of COVID cases in our city, in our region, we also take pride, as the Seattle Times has noted just today, that Seattle is among the largest cities that has this slower, slowest rate of infection among its population. We have taken very important measures led by public health data that is intended to both slow transmission and also keep our population healthy. As we think about who are the individuals who would more likely be in a situation to become exposed, it would be those who are sitting inside a closed door room for long periods of time and somewhat stuffy meetings in the past. Making the opportunity for folks to participate electronically is the right thing to do for public health. And it also recognizes that when we force people to go back to in-person meetings sooner than they should be, we will effectively be screening out those who have underlying health conditions and those who may be elderly because they are not going to be able to participate in an in-person room. This is a smart thing for us to do. It is sound public health policy that we are following and it allows for our city to continue to govern in a thoughtful

I way that is cognizant of the public health advice in front of us. So I do take issue with any sort of accusation that this is being done for any other policy rationale other than trying to protect the public's health and make sure that the city government core functions can continue. This is why Seattle is leading the nation in strong public health policies and helping to slow the spread of transmission. We cannot continue to keep up those good statistics that were just reported by the Seattle Times. If we rush to reopen or try to get back to normal, there is no getting back to normal. So I appreciate the council member, Councilmember Strauss, as the sponsor of this legislation, recognizing that we will have to continually update our policies and practices and we have built in time to do so. But we must center on policy both on public health and also protecting the most vulnerable in our city. And that's what this policy does. Again, it's a small procedural change to make sure that we can continue to move forward. But I really thought it needed to speak up and correct the record on the issue. Councilmember skater Councilmember Lewis, please. Thank you, Madam Chair. And you know, I just want to take a moment to thank Councilmember Strauss for navigating an issue that's been very difficult and that none of us anticipated was going to come up in 2020 in really changing the paradigm of how we do this essential process of community involvement and that there can be continuity with the assistance of technology to make it happen and that we can stand up on a system like this. And I appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with Councilmember Strauss on a couple of changes that Councilmember Strauss made in his introductory remarks on the bill regarding the timeline post-COVID that I know are important to a lot of constituents in District seven and appreciate that that was incorporated in committee. I know that there's been a lot of concern in the community on both sides with this legislation since the spring as an opportunity to sort of litigate the merits of design review and try to fight that battle in the context of this. Basically, emergency legislation certainly was in the spring. Now it is more of a normal ordinance but still reflecting an emergency situation. And I would just say that, you know, I'm sure that's a conversation and a discussion that will come in its time. But, you know, we need to just make sure that the essential functions of government can continue in times of crisis. And that may be adapted to reflect the public health situation. And as councilmember skater said, make sure that we are giving everyone the space to participate in these processes in a safe way. So I do just want to say, you know, it really is due to the nature of the emergency. I don't think anyone on this council is thrilled that a lot of the work in the city has to be done remotely right now. But to protect those that we love and those who are vulner-

able in the community, this is really an essential thing to do. And I also want to thank Stsci for for being able to stand up a pretty impressive system to be able to do this. As Councilmember Strauss stressed in his opening comments. The the ADR Administrative Design Review for for market rate projects is only going to affect 15 projects that have essentially already vested that right in the summer, in late spring, and that will expire at the end of the year. So going into 2021, we should be on an all virtual footing for these projects except for those projects that otherwise have exemption. So look forward to voting for this legislation today. No one is excited that a lot of these processes that typically involve in-person outreach have to be put on a virtual footing. But it really is

in the best interest of best practices and public health. And to do it this way and I and again, just appreciate Stsci and Councilmember Strauss's leadership in navigating a very complicated situation and doing it quite well. So I appreciate it. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Lewis, are there any additional comments on the bill? Councilmember Peterson, then Councilmember Herbold. You Council president. And thanks to I want to kudos to Chair Strauss for also navigating this and the amendment to shorten the time frame on this. The legislation seems to do a couple of different things. I definitely appreciate the rationale for continuing to exempt certain affordable housing projects from both design review and administrative design review. Most affordable housing projects receive city money and are required to do a separate community engagement process anyway. So for me, it's really just about if we can maximize public input, community engagement, I'm in favor of that and I'm glad that CCI has stood up the virtual design review process. My my concern is this bill. Would those 15 projects would get to keep the administrative design review benefit for themselves. They're all for profit market rate projects. And I just think that they should have to go back to the regular design reviews since they can do it virtually safely online and provide additional input. So consistent with my committee vote, I'll be voting no on this legislation. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, because Herbert. Thank you. I just want to speak. A little bit to. Some of the issues that have been raised about the. Question of whether or not the council. Is sort of using the state of emergency to make changes to important policies and procedures for. Public. Input. And given that I voted against this legislation back in, I believe it was April, I want to just clarify for the record that the reason I did so in April was because we had a we were operating under. A different set of rules. And of course, there were there was different. Interpretations of those rules under. The types of legislation that we were permitted to be acting on. It seems like ancient history now, b

ut we weren't. We were limited. To taking. Action on emergency legislation under the governor and the the AG. And I felt at the time that a portion of this ordinance did not fit into that rubric. That is not the case any longer. And so for that reason, I feel comfortable voting in support of this legislation. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Verbal. Thanks for reminding us of that legislative history. It was only in April, but you're right, it does feel like it was about a million years ago already. And that's an excellent point, that the proclamation that limits or provides exemptions related to the Open Public Meetings Act is been pretty drastically modified to allow us to consider things that are not just strictly related to COVID anymore. So I appreciate the reminder around that particular perspective. Any other comments on the bill? Members trust. You have the last word as it appears that no one else is interested in making any comments. So please take us home on this. Thank you. Council President and colleagues, just to also echo the words of Council Member Herbold and Mosqueda regarding this is not a way to use the Cogat emergency to make permanent changes to legislation. There have been a number of aspects of this legislation that have been received very well in community. Virtual Design Review is one of them, and one of the things that I wanted to begin looking at is if we could make a combination of in-person and virtual design review because of requirements that in-person design review meetings occur in a new community and near the projects that they are reviewing. It does make it difficult to cohabitate virtual and in-person design review meetings because a lot of the rooms that in-person design review meetings are held in are not a set up for the technology that we need to use for virtual design review. And so, again, separating permanent changes from this temporary from this extension of emergency and temporary changes demonstrates that we are not slipping anything through or using this emergency as a cover. Rather, we are making important process changes that protect public health and continue the direction that we are heading with the number of COVID cases that we have in our community. So I look forward to reviewing this, the positives and the drawbacks that this emergency in this legislation has created in our community and making further changes to our design review process in the future. Thank you, colleagues. Thank you. Council President. Councilmember Strauss. With that being said, that debate is now closed on this particular bill. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Mosquera I. Peterson No. What? Yes. Strauss Yes. Purple? Yes. Lewis. Yes. MORALES Yes. President Gonzalez Yes. Seven in favor. One opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation? Write item five Will the clerk please read agenda item five into

the record? Agenda Item one Constable 119945 relating to civil service commissions, amending election procedures for the employing elected members of the Civil Service Commission and Public Safety Civil Service Commission, making temporary provisions for the 2020 elections. Amending Section 4.04.250 and 4.08.040 of the standards for code and ratifying and confirming search and prior acts. Thank you, Madam Chair. I moved to pass Council Bill 119945. Is there a second? Second? Thank you. It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Herbold, you are the prime sponsor of the bill and are recognized in order to address this item. Thank you so much. As discussed earlier this morning in council briefings, this bill relates to both the Civil Service Commission and the Public Safety Civil Service Commission. Both entities have three members, one that's appointed by the mayor, one that's appointed by the council, and one that's elected by the relevant city employees for the Public Safety Civil Service Commission. That is police and fire employees for the Civil Service Commission. It is nonexempt employees who do not work for the mayor or council or civil service commission staff. Both entities are having elections this year and things are slightly delayed. By. COVID 19. So this legislation allows the city clerk to hold the elections in December rather than November. It allows for electronic ballots rather than only physical ballots, though the option of paper ballots will still remain, and the schedule changes only for 2020. And these elements are only included in the ordinance, not the Seattle Municipal Code. There are some municipal code changes and that is only related to eliminating out dated language in the municipal code related to the election process. And it allows the city clerk to modernize the election election process by rule in the future. Thank you. Thank you so much, Councilmember Herbals, are there any additional comments on the bill? Councilmember Peterson, please. Thank you, council president and thank you. Councilmember Herbold, a viewing public mind. I know, but during council briefing this morning, we talked a little bit about this particular council bill. And I want to thank Councilmember Herbold for clarifying and just want to point out to the public, the fiscal note does say that this legislation has contingent language to cover that. The Public Safety Civil Service Commission is because of the accountability ordinance from 2017, intended not to have any elected members in the future, so that this leaves open the possibility to implement that provision of the 2017 Accountability Police Accountability Ordinance, which I know several members on this Council were champions of that and authors of that. And so we, by passing this ordinance, are in no way signaling any sort of deviation from our commitment to implement the rest of that accountability ordinance, which which actually excluded employees from this commission.

So thank you for clarifying that this morning. Great. Thank. Thanks so much, Casimir Peterson. Any other comments on the bill? Okay. Hearing. I appreciate the ongoing conversation here. I'm going to go ahead and ask the clerk to call the roll on the passage of the bill. Suarez i. Lewis. I. Morales I. Mosquera. I. Peterson okay. So what? Yes. Strauss Yes. Purple. Yes. President Gonzalez I nine in favor. Nine opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation items two through five Will the clerk please read items two through five into the record? Nobody would know what we were doing if it wasn't for I.T. department helping us make this possible along with sales channels. So items 37 and 38. Will the clerk please read the short title of items 37 and 38 into the record. Agenda items 37 and 38 Council 119939 relating to the levy of property taxes. The Committee recommends El Paso Council Bill 119940 authorizing and levy of regular property taxes by the City of Seattle for collection in 2021. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Are there any comments on Council Bill 119939. Item 37 on the agenda. Hearing no comments. Will the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill? Morales Yes. Macheda Yes. Petersen Yes. Sir. Sergeant. Yes. Strauss Yes. HERBOLD Yes. SUAREZ Yes. Lewis Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the court please affix my signature to the legislation? Okay. Item 38 Are there any comments on Council Bill 119940. Agenda Item 38. Hearing none. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Morales Yes. Mesquita Yes. Petersen Yes. Squads Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez Yes. Lewis Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you so much. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will a quick please affix signature to the legislation on my behalf. That is the last item of business on our agenda. Is there any further business to come before the council? Hearing? None. Gratefully, colleagues just concluded the items of business on today's very full agenda. Our next regularly scheduled city council meeting is on Monday, December 7th, 2020 at 2:00 PM. The council, as I just mentioned a few minutes ago, will meet as board members of the

Seattle Parks District shortly after we learn from this meeting. Councilmember Suarez, how long would you like to adjourn before reconvening? Well, I. Originally said 15, but maybe ten. Is that good enough for everybody? 10 minutes. And then we it's a pretty straightforward agenda. Yeah, I think that's fine. We've we ran a little bit late this evening, so I'm fine with 10 minutes. So. So let's say we're going to convene at 5:10 p.m.. Yes. As board members of the Seattle Park District, which is chaired by Councilmember Suarez. So for now, we are adjourned with full council and I hop

e see you all in about 10 minutes. Thank. Agenda Item 17 Constable 119956 relating to set of public utilities authorization. The General Manager, CEO of Seattle Public Utilities to execute an agreement with King County Fire Protection District 40 for fire protection and emergency medical services for certain City of Seattle Water System Properties in King County, Washington. The committee recommends the bill pass. That's member Peterson. You are recognized in order to provide the committee report. Sorry. Councilmember Peterson, you are on mute. Thank you. Council president. This bill counts no. 119956 approves a negotiated agreement to provide fire coverage for Seattle Public Utilities. Cedar River Pipeline Maintenance Facility at Lake Tapps, SPU Pays King County Fire District Number 40 for that service. And this is an update of a prior agreement. The result is a small, positive fiscal impact due to a slightly lower cost for the fire district services. The community committee unanimously recommended approval. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing no additional comments on the bill. Will the Court please call the role on the passage of the bill? Petersen. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Mesquita. Yes. President Gonzalez, high eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Item 18 Will the clerk please read the short title of item 18 into the record? Gentlemen. 18 Constable 119961 relating to the general public utilities authorizing the General Manager and chief executive officer of Seattle Public Utilities to acquire, accept and record on behalf of the City of Seattle, both temporary and permanent property rights from owners of property. Agenda item 28 Constable 119959. Imposing a revenue measure a 15% sales excuse me, 15% sales of use tax for transportation purposes as authorized by Seattle voters at the November 3rd, 2020 election and ratifying confirming certain prior acts, the committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. This one is also out of your committee. So you're recognized in order to provide the committee report on this council. Bill. Thank you. Council President. Council Bill. 119959. On November 3rd, the voters of Seattle, by a very large margin, approved the 0.15% sales tax to provide revenue to the Seattle Transportation Benefit District. Today's action by us is essentially ministerial, authorizing the city finance director to take all actions needed to work with the State Department of Revenue to turn on that revenue stream for us. The committee unanimously recommended approval. Thank you so much. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing none. Will the court please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Peterson Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez. I. Lewis Yes. Moral

es Yes. Macheda i. President Gonzalez, I. 18 favor none opposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Item 21 Will the clerk please read the short title of item 21 into the record? Agenda item for Council Bill 119971 authorizing and 2020 acceptance of funding. From non city sources. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. That's what I'm asking you. You are the chair of this committee and are recognized once again to provide the committee's report on this bill. Thank you very much, Madam President. Collins. Item. Item number four on today's agenda. We talked about quite a bit this morning. This is related to the federal grants that we are accepting. There's a number of important federal grants that are accepted at the end of the year each year. There has been a document that was circulated this weekend by Greg Doss from central staff. And we appreciate all of the work that they did over the weekend to help answer questions that stemmed from the robust discussion in our committee meeting on Wednesday. One of the things that you should also note, in addition to the questions that we have submitted that resulted in 11 page response document, is that Director Noble has sent a letter today to make sure that if there are any additional questions that those get answered before those 2021 allocations are spent. And that's an important commitment from the CBO office, from Director Noble, that he has sent this letter to us, which you all should have received just around 2 p.m. today, to make sure that any

additional questions specifically as well related to Homeland Security grants do get answered. As the council member, Strauss discussed this morning. There was a long conversation in Wednesday on Wednesday's meeting, and I do have additional concerns and questions that I will be submitting. Folks are asked by Alex Nucci and Greg Doss that if you do have additional questions that are not yet answered in that 11 page document, please make sure that you send your questions by Wednesday at noon so that central staff can coordinate with the office to answer any additional questions. I want to make sure, though, as Vice-Chair Herbal did during our committee last year, that folks know that there's a number of really important grants that are included in the overall bill as well, and we want to make sure to move this forward to accept those grants. With that, I will be voting yes and the committee voted 5 to 0, recommending passage during full council today. Thank you very much, Madam President. And you consider our musketeer for that excellent report while multitasking. Well done. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Councilmember Strauss and then Councilor, you want to go to Councilmember first? Okay. Councilmember Herbold and then Councilmember Strauss. Thank you. I also want to make note of Budget Director Ben Noble's commitment in the

Budget Committee meeting to do more work with the Council prior to the the development and submittal of grants that may be of concern to the Council. An example of the work that this Council has done around funding sources that are of concern relates specifically to legislation in 2017 that the Council adopted. You might remember that that year I proposed to create a new section of the municipal code prohibiting Seattle Police Department participation in the U.S. Department of Defense 1033 program that allows cities to transfer excess military equipment to civilian law enforcement agencies at no cost. This was a particular program that we had received concerns about, and in response, we, the chief, had decided to no longer participate in that program. And then we sort of solidified that policy decision of of of chief best with this with this particular ordinance, I would suggest that our ongoing efforts to take a look at some of these grant sources might result in a request from the council to the department to no longer participate in in some of these grant sources. But I think that is really important work, and I appreciate that that we need to do moving forward. And I appreciate that we have a commitment from the Budget Director that we can take a deeper dive in the future before these grants are sought. Thank you. Oh, excellent. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold, Councilmember Strauss. Thank you, Council President. Thank you, Chairman Skater. And thank you. Also Chair Herbold. Also want to thank Director Noble for your letter. Your letter, as well as the conversation that I had with Greg Doss and Alex Nucci, have resolved the concerns that I have for today. And I will be following up with additional questions as per your letter has requested. I really just want to thank you, Director Noble, for sending that along and working with us in an expedient fashion as well. Again, a thank you to Dr. Fisher and Angela Sochi and Greg, for all of your work answering the 11 pages of questions over the weekend. Thank you, council president. I will be voting yes. Thank you. Now way to bury the lead counselor with Strauss. Thank you so much. Colleagues, are there any additional comments on the bill? Right. Hearing non-whites want to thank the chair and member Strauss and conservatives for their good work on getting as much information about this as we can. Lots more to always, particularly as it relates to oversight issues. So really look forward to the opportunity to continue to engage in that work. That being said, will the clerk please call the role on the passage of the. Bill you want? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbal. Yes. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Or better. Yes. Peterson. Yes. Yes. Nine in favor and oppose. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Item five will please read the short title of item five into the record. Men oppose the bill passes and the chair will sig

n it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Okay, Donna, item two Will the clerk please read item two into the record? Agenda item two Capital 119969 relating to the citywide and Seattle Public Utilities departments temporarily removing the charge of interest on delinquent utility consumption and utilization accounts, superseding several sections under Title 21 that authorize and require the collection of interest on delinquent utility consumption and utilization accounts and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I move to pass Council Bill 119969. Is there a second? Second? It's been moved and seconded to pass the bill. Councilmember Peterson, you are the sponsor of this item and are recognized in order to address it. Thank you. Council President colleagues, as I mentioned this morning at council briefing. Council

Bill 119969 would extend our forgiveness of late fees on utility bills during the COVID pandemic. We adopted this policy earlier this year and then extended it with ordinance 126182 to provide this financial relief from both Seattle City Light and Seattle Public Utilities. But that ordinance expires in just two weeks. So today's council bill would extend this utility related coverage relief for another six months. It's important to note that this relief policy does reduce revenue to the utilities that we own and operate, but I believe it's worth it during this unprecedented pandemic. While we seeing a spike in COVID cases, we can see the light at the end of the tunnel with the approval of a vaccine. And we'll learn more about the financial impacts of COVID on our utility enterprises next year when we discuss their strategic plans and future rates. This legislation is consistent with the goal of keeping rates low, and I encourage your support. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, are there any additional comments on the bill, hearing? No additional comments on the bill. Will the please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Excellent. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbal. Yes. Whereas I. LEWIS. Yes. Morales Yes. Skinner. Yes. Petersen. Yes. Council President Gonzalez. Yes. Nine and seven, unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the court please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Okay. Moving along to the committee report for the Finance and Housing Committee. Will the clerk please read agenda item three into the record? Every part of. Of every part of the Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item ten Constable 119978 relating to flood plains extending interim regulations established by ordinance 126113 for 12 months. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much that I'm clear. Councilmember Strauss, you are the chair of the committee and are recognized in order to provide the committee's report. Thank you. Council President. Colleagues, this legislation extends for one year. The interim regulations rega

rding flood plains that the council adopted this last year. These regulations are required for the city to remain in federal compliance and for property owners in floodplain areas to be able to continue using FEMA's flood insurance program. The interim regulations will allow Stsci to finalize the permanent regulations, which are currently working their way through the outreach process and will be transmitted to council later this year. The Department is required to contact every single property owner in the flood plain area, which has grown quite significantly. Thank you. Due to the climate crisis and the contacting of every property owner is the cause for delay today. I am confident that the final and permanent regulations will be before council before the end of this year. Thank you. Council President and colleagues. He's so much. Concerned with stress. Casper Peterson was. Thank you. Council President. Thank you, Councilmember Strauss, for leading on these interim flood regulations from our Seattle Department of Construction and Inspection. As the permanent regulations these flood regulations are developed, we will rely a lot on experts at Seattle Public Utilities to evaluate areas prone to flooding. As a reminder to the viewing public, the city council's now requiring all new legislation to be evaluated through the lens of climate change, such as emissions and adaptation. This particular bill was drafted prior to adding that analysis. So when we receive the final regulations for review within the year, I look forward to the new climate analysis being applied. It's important that the final flood regulations incorporate the best available science and keep our city resilient by adapting to climate change, such as rising water levels and additional storm events. We want to make sure we build infrastructure to the standards necessary to withstand climate change challenges. And we should use this knowledge to prevent new construction of buildings in areas that will be flooded later. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing on the Clark. Please call the role on the passage of the bill or s. I. Lewis. I. Morales. Yes. Macheda. Yes. Peterson. Yes. Sir. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. President Gonzales II. Nine in favor. None opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the court please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Well. The Court Please read items 11 through 16 into the record. Will the court please read item 35 into the record? The committee report on the Select Committee on Homelessness Strategies and Investments Agenda Item 35 Resolution 31987 Sponsoring the King County Regional Homelessness Authority's Application for membership to dissociation of Washington Cities Risk Management Service Agency. The committee recommends that the resolution be adopted. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Councilmember Lewis, I'm going to hand it over to you to walk us through t

he committee report. Thank you, Madam President. As I mentioned during a briefing today, County Regional Homelessness Authority is applying for the Washington Association Cities Risk

Management Pool. This requires a a sponsor, a sponsoring member to bring that forward. We are doing so here in this very short one page resolution. And I, with those comments, do move resolution 31987. Thank you so much. Colleagues, are there any additional comments on this resolution? Okay. Hearing none. I know we did have an opportunity to have a conversation about the resolution during the full committee. The select committee hearing, which is a committee of the halls, appreciate an opportunity to take the final vote in today's full council hearing. No additional comments on the resolution. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution? Morales I don't. I'm, I'm. I don't know if my motion was my motion seconded. Just wondering procedurally. Just want to make sure. There, there. There is no need to make a motion. We just have to describe what the resolution is and then have a debate. And then we can go ahead and call the roll. Perfect. Well, sorry for interrupting everything. That. And that's all right. That's all right. Is there anything else you wanted to say about the resolution? No. God, no. Okay. All right, folks. So it's a wacky Monday. I get it. Okay, we've got a roll on the adoption of the resolution. Morales. I mosquera i. Peterson, i so one. Yes. Strouse, yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Hi, Lewis. Yes. President Gonzalez. Hi. Nine In favor and unopposed. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign. It will occur. Please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Whoever says we can't have fun while governing is obviously wrong. All right. We're going to head over now to our last committee report, which is the sustainability and Renter's Rights Committee. And hold on a minute. I know we have a revised script here in light of some late breaking news. See that? Okay. I'm going to go ahead and have the clerk read items 36 through 38 into the record, and then I'll walk folks through some procedural changes that will need to happen in this section. Agenda item 33 Clerk File 314461. Application of Martin Liebowitz and 34th and Spring LLC for an extension of a contract for use out of the property located at 1106 34th Avenue. The committee recommends that the application be granted. Thank you so much. And I hand it back over to Councilmember Strauss to walk us through this application and the related clerk. Clerk file. It counts. Thank you. Counts president and colleagues. The next two items are are going to be taken together. The first is a clerk file and then the following is a council bill, all regarding a contract rezoning of 1106 34th Avenue. This is a bit of a different process than usual because this is an extension of an existing contract reason. So in 2017, the Council approved an application for a contract free zone of 1

106 34th Avenue in Midtown, up from low rise to two neighborhood commercial, one with a 30 foot height limit. In the intervening time, the reason application was not paired with any proposal to develop the site, and the property owner has been unable to find a developer, a development partner during the pandemic and has applied for a two year extension of this rezone. The Lands and Neighborhoods Committee held a public hearing on this application in December. Seattle Department of Construction Inspections has recommended approving the application based on the impact of the pandemic, on the real estate industry, and on changed circumstances resulting from the passage of meant for housing affordability, which increased density in the surrounding area. This Clarksville file contains the application itself. If the application is approved, then Council Bill 119987 effectuate the extension and adopts the new property use and development agreement. Thank you, counsel present. That is the report of the committee on this Court file. Thank you so much, Councilmember Strauss, are there any additional comments on the application? Hearing on the CLARK Please call the role on granting the application. Morales Yes. Macheda. Yes. Peterson. Yes. Sir. What? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez I. Lewis yes. President Gonzalez. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you so much. The motion carries and the application is granted. Item 34 Will the court please read the short title of item 34 into the record? Agenda item 34 accountable 119987. Approving the extension of a contract present to prevent ordinance 125433 and accepting an amended Probation Department agreement. Three part of the Public Safety and Human Services. Committee Agenda Item three. Council Bill 119996 relating to Seattle's construction codes. Adopting the 2018. International Fire Code by reference as. The Seattle Fire Code, the committee recommends the bill pass. Councilmember Herbold is chair of the committee. You are recognized to provide the committee's report. Q So as described this morning in council briefings, the fire code is typically updated along with the Seattle building code. The Seattle building code was passed earlier this month through Councilmember Strauss's leadership and through his committee. We work to pass a fire code in conjunction with the building code to ensure consistency in development standards. The fire code was last updated in 2016 and it's usually updated every three years. Last year, both the building code and the fire code updates were delayed due to the

public health emergency. Just highlighting the major changes in the fire code. There are four sort of categories of major, major changes. One relates to our allowing alternative fuel vehicles on display inside buildings to maintain their battery connection in order to keep their safety systems active. A second change relates to the need for integrated testing systems in high rise buildings to assure fire protectio

n and life safety systems work together in an integrated way as intended and are tested at least every ten years. Third relates to a need for mobile fueling of vehicles to allow allow for mobile fueling of vehicles in designated areas such as parking lots and only those parking lots that meet certain requirements. And then finally, there's a new chapter added to address the installation of large electrical and storage systems that are more prevalent now than they were and were unregulated by the previous fire code. I if it's okay now. Madam President, I do have an amendment. Absolutely. Please go ahead and address your amendment. Thank you. I move to amend the bill 11 9996 attachment eight as present on Amendment one on the agenda. Okay. Is there a second? Second. Thank you so much. It's been moved and seconded to amend the bill as presented on Amendment one. Councilmember Herbold, I will hand it back over to you so you can address the amendment. Thank you. This is a technical amendment. It's adding in a missing page, page 116. Regarding fuel tank storage, the page was inadvertently left out and includes some changes from the International Fire Council's code. Excellent. Are there any comments on the amendment as described by Councilmember Herbold? Hearing no comments or questions. Will the Court please call the roll on the adoption of Amendment One Ederson? Yes. So on. Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez. I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Macheda. Yes. President Gonzalez. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. The motion carries, the amendment is adopted and the bill, as amended, is before the council. Are there any additional comments on the amended bill? Hearing none. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the amended bill? Peterson. Yes. Sir. What? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Macheda. Yes. President Gonzalez, high nine in favor. None opposed. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Okay. Adoption of other resolutions will please read item four into the record. Agenda Item one clerk file 314469. The 2021 State of the City address addressed by Mayor Jenny Durkan on February 15th, 2021. I moved to accept and file clerk file 314469. Is there a second second? It's been moved and seconded to accept and file the file as. I just wanted to make sure that folks heard that again, as I mentioned during council briefing and now during full council. This is a requirement of Article five that Section six for us two of our charter to accept and officially file the remarks made by Mayor Durkan as part of her State of the City address. And so this file is representative of those remarks and does satisfy the charter obligations under Article five, Section six. I am happy to take any additional comments if there are additional comments from colleagues before we call this for me. Are there any comments? Here are no comments. Will

the clerk please call the roll on the filing of the clerk's file? Petersen Yes. Somewhat. Yes. Strauss Yes. HERBOLD Yes. SUAREZ Right. LEWIS Yes. MORALES Yes. Macheda yes. President Gonzalez. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. The motion carries in the file is accepted and placed on spot. Will the clerk please read item two into the record? Agenda item two Resolution 31989 Affirming support. Thank you so much. The motion carries and the appointments are confirmed. Will the clerk please read item nine into the record? Every part of the transportation and each lease committee agenda nine cancel 119998 authorizing the directions of Department Transportation to execute a transit service funding agreement with King County and Metro Transit in order to implement Proposition one as approved by Seattle voters in the 2020 general election and ran fine confirming certain prior acts, the committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much, Councilor Peterson. You're the chair of this committee, and I'm going to hand it over to you for this report. Thank you. Council President, colleagues. Council Bill 119998 is updated transit service agreement with King County Metro after voters overwhelmingly approved funds for Seattle Transportation Benefit District. We updated this transit service agreement with King County Metro for the enhanced bus service throughout Seattle. This inter-governmental agreement is important as we allocate bus service hours to get more people back on busses as our economy recovers and as our regional transportation network grows. King County is poised to approve the same document on their consent calendar with no changes within the next week. Every year we will review the

details in case any future changes are needed. This bill was recommended unanimously by our committee. Thank you. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. Are there any additional comments on Council Bill 119998. Hearing no additional comments on the bill. Will a quick please call the roll on the passage of the bill? So what? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Mosqueda Yes. Peterson Yes. President Gonzales high eight in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read item ten into the record? Agenda Item ten. Resolution 31986. Relating to the City White Department and excuse me, acknowledging and approving a 2020 Integrated Resource Plan Progress report as conforming with the The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the court please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Okay. Item two Will the clerk please read item two into the record? Agenda item two Resolution 31999. Agenda and the City Council's priorities to maximize local use of future federal funding to support COVID 19 relief and recovery efforts. The committee recommends that the resolution be adopted as amended. Councilmember Mosqueda This is the

item that you were very excited about. So now when I hand it back over to you to finish your remarks and amend, well, we'll take up the resolution. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, counsel. Colleagues, apologies for that. Thank you for letting me preview item number two and to pick up where I left off. As a reminder, this is the resolution that provides that backbone and guiding document for us as we consider future ordinances that allocate funding from the Federal Rescue Plan Act. So I appreciate all of the work that you provided. As a reminder, this includes priority investments that were made in the ACT in the following categories looking at investments grouped into categories such as vaccines and testing, food assistance, homelessness and housing services, including rental assistance, immigrant and refugee support, child care support, small business and worker assistance and workforce recovery. Community well-being. Transportation and revenue replacement and financial resilience. This is the foundation for the future work that our Council will work on, that the city will use as we respond to the crises that we see right now in the streets, a crisis that many small businesses and workers are facing with lack of access to security and the ability to open up shops or get back to work, and how we also invest in the long term when we create a more equitable economy as we look to recover. This resolution was developed with the following four principles in mind. First, I need to be I need to be prioritizing equity, prioritizing investments for those who are most impacted by COVID and the associated economic impacts. Second, coordination ensuring that the investments are coordinated with other entities to address gaps in services or provisions. Third, flexibility, as we heard from our federal partners this morning, who are tracking the development and allocation of funding out to cities and states. We need to be flexible and nimble, prepared to respond as needed both to federal guidance that comes out and also to the ongoing needs that are growing and evolving in our community right now . And fourth, resilience. This allows us to guard against future austerity measures of future uncertainty and position the city to make new investments, such as the resolution that we passed that went along with jumpstart our concrete spend plan that was baked into Resolution 31957. This is our effort to make sure that we are a resilient, more equitable economy in the horizon so that we don't go back to normal, that we actually go back to a much better, more equitable city. The resolution was developed with the following considerations in mind. First, that we have a need to be pivoting the city efforts from acute emergency relief to longer term economic community recovery. The second for potential to leverage other local, state and federal programs and partners. And third, a recognition of the city's capacity constraints that would limit our ability to deliver s

ervices if we didn't do it in partnership . A great example is the ongoing work that we're doing with the county where the ordinance just passed and led by Councilmember Lewis to partner with King County. As we think about responding to the crisis that's manifesting in terms of homelessness and growing homelessness. So we will be working through this public outreach process and look forward to working with you as we get word out to the community about how they can engage. Thank you very much, council president. Thank you so much, Councilmember Mosqueda, for that. Any other comments on the resolution? Casmir Peterson, please. Thank you. Council President I just wanted to thank the chair of our Finance Committee, Councilwoman Mosqueda, for providing the opportunity to non committee members to provide feedback on the resolution. I was able to make sure the resolution mentioned access to Internet supporting our transportation infrastructure,

and I look forward to working collaboratively with the executive to invest these funds in the most effective manner possible. But I really want to thank the inclusiveness from our finance chair. Thanks so much, Councilmember Peterson. Any other comments on the resolution? Hearing no other comments. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution. Or Alice as Macheda? Yes. Peterson. Yes. So what? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Juarez by Lewis. Yes. President Gonzalez. All right. Nine in favor and unopposed. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read item three into the record? Every part of the Transportation and Utilities Committee and I have three counts above 120008 relating to the City Department authorizing the General Manager and Chief Executive Motion carries and the appointments are confirmed. Will the clerk please read the short title of item 17 into the Record Report of the Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item 17 Constable 120021 Relating to historic preservation, imposing controls upon the Swedish Club, a landmark designated by the Landmarks Preservation Board. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much, Casimir Strauss. I'm going to hand this back over to you as the chair of the committee. Thank you. Council President, do I need to move for a second this bill before it? Thank you. I've seen. Such as? I know you can just speak. You can just speak to it. Go ahead. Wonderful custom, Bill. One to double, 0 to 1 is the controls and incentives agreement for the Swedish Club on Queen in which has been designated as a landmark. The agreement has been signed by the owner and approved by the Landmarks Preservation Board. Controls will be placed on the building exterior and a portion of the interior. The Landmarks designation applies to the building, which was constructed in 1959 in the surrounding alleyways, but not to either adjacent parking lot. In t

he interest of time, I will reserve the remainder of my comment, comments and if anyone is interested there, we had a very good robust discussion in committee. This it might seem as a non assuming building and it has an immense amount of history. And Christine Lederer. Leander also spoke to the history of the Swedish club, which the club being the social aspect, also had a civic aspect that began Swedish hospital here in Seattle. Again, I'll reserve the remainder of my comments just to say I urge a yes vote. And thank you to the Swedish Club of Seattle. Thank you so much, Councilmember Strauss. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing that will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of. Mosquito. Hi. Petersen. Yea. Yes. Sergeant. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yep. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. President Gonzalez. Nine in favor. None opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will these affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? All right. Other Business Council of Australia. I understand you have a request to be excused, so I'm going to let you make the. Thank you. Council President I would like to be would like to request to be excused from the April 12th, 2021 City Council meeting and City Council briefing. Because so much of there's no objection from overstress will be excused from the April 12th 12th City Council meeting. In council briefing. All right. Hearing no objection that Councilor Strauss has excused from the April 12th city council meeting. Is there any other business to come before the council hearing? None, colleagues. This does include the items of business on today's agenda. Our next regularly scheduled city council meeting is on Monday, April 5th, 2021, at 2:00 PM. I hope that you all have a wonderful evening and we are adjourned. Thanks, everyone. A part of the Sustainability. And Interest Rates Committee agenda one comfortable 120007 relating to residential evictions, guaranteeing the right to legal counsel regardless of ability to pay for any residential renter. And Seattle responding to it unlawful detainer suit and adding a new section 22.20 6.1 95 to the shelter. Ms.. Code. The committee recommends the bill passes the Divided report with councilmembers Morales. And Lewis. Of favor and Councilmember Peterson. Opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Consumer assignment. You are chair of the committee and are recognized in order to provide the committee's report. Thank you. Every eviction is an act of violence, an act of violence against the renters who are traumatized, displaced, suddenly forced into daily survival mode. Many evictions are a blow against children who are forced to move away from schools and friends and against the adults who are forced away from community and social support systems. Every eviction adds to our community's misery and suffering, and it accelerates racist gentrification. This bill would guarantee the right to counsel. That is a right to a lawyer, to any re

nter in Seattle facing eviction. In other words, if your landlord attempts to evict you, you have the right to a lawyer being with you, defending you in court, just like people have the right to an attorney if they are accused of a crime. This bill commits the city of Seattle to contract for all the legal representation needed so that eviction defense attorneys can defend every renter without exception facing eviction. Who needs the help? Before the pandemic, about 1200 renters in Seattle faced eviction every year, even during the pandemic, with the moratorium in place. Landlords have filed more than 300 eviction cases with the court as they are exploiting loopholes in the moratorium. Many more tenants than can be officially measured on top of that are constantly evicted from their homes when landlords try to evict because tenants are understandably intimidated when they get an eviction notice because they know that the eviction system in Seattle is completely stacked against them and they just move out and undertake greater precariousness in housing in order to avoid the whole experience of going to court or not going to court and getting evicted. This is especially true for black community members who are given eviction notices at three times the rates for other tenants. Without this right to counsel legislation, we can expect a tsunami of evictions once the city and state moratoriums expire as renters will still be struggling under the double blows of the recession and the global health crisis and will be burdened with debt. And this legislation will not be enough by itself. We will need a lot more. We know that eviction destroys communities, wrecks households, and even kills the 2018 report *Losing Home: The Human Cost of Eviction in Seattle* found that 87.5% nearly nine out of ten renters who are evicted end up homeless in their study of 2017 evictions. The authors of the report, the Seattle Women's Commission and the King County Bar Association, found that some tenants even died shortly after being evicted, according to the eviction lab at Princeton University. Despite the pandemic and the eviction moratoriums, landlords have filed 272,612 evictions since March last year in just 27 cities that the eviction lab has been tracking. Growing evidence, they say, shows that more and more evictions are not driven by so-called mom and pop landlords struggling to balance their personal checkbooks. Since the CDC eviction moratoriums took effect last September, evictions by corporate landlords have actually been steadily increasing. Research by the Private Equity Stakeholders Project, a research and advocacy organization, has tracked nearly 50,000 evictions by corporate landlords in select counties and six states since the beginning of September last year and found that corporate landlords are responsible for the majority and sometimes the overwhelming majority of evictions. Seattle is no exception to this. Major corporate landlords are the main actors

in our city. The most evicting landlord in 2019 was Goodman Real Estate, a corporation with \$2.5 billion. That is billion with a B worth of property holdings in the US and Canada. Other major victors include regional giant Epic Asset Management and National Landlord Corner Management Corp. The American Civil Liberties Union found that nationally, 90% of landlords are represented in eviction gold, while only 10% of tenants are. Can you imagine, as a struggling tenant facing eviction, perhaps because you just lost your low wage job? Going up against the likes of attorneys from Goodman real estate. Our right to counsel legislation will give these tenants at least a fighting chance in court when they have to go up against these greedy corporate landlords and their greedy lawyers and the impact on the right to counsel, as we have seen in cities around the country that have passed similar legislation, is absolutely astounding. With a lawyer, far fewer people are evicted. This is because unjust evictions are overturned in court, and it is because eviction defense attorneys can and do help connect people with social services when they are needed. The Housing Justice Project in Seattle, for example, works closely with Homebase, which administers rental assistance funds so that they can help people pay their back rent and then present that to a judge to prevent the eviction. Statistically, even for people who are ultimately evicted, having an attorney still improves the outcomes, with renters sites saddled with less crushing debts. But all of this is not the end of the story. It is also because when there is a universal right to work volunteers to have a trained attorney with them in court, that gives corporate landlords pause from issuing eviction notices in the first place. In New York, the rate of eviction filings dropped by a stunning 30% since their right to counsel legislation passed. Because landlords now know that they can no longer use the courts to bully renters who have no legal help. They are going to go up against a trained attorney. These are all the primary reasons to support the right to counsel because of the human impact of evictions on renters and the progressive outcome overall for our society by reducing housing instability and homelessness. Not to mention the racial component of this giving universal right to counsel is a Black Lives Matter issue. But even through the narrow lens of the city's

finances, the right to counsel is sensible. The Housing Justice Project, for example, has estimated that guaranteeing the right to counsel will cost approximately \$750,000 in a normal year. And by a normal year, I mean a year without an eviction moratorium. Compare that to the cost of the courts and the sheriff carrying out an eviction and the cost of homeless services because nine out of ten evicted people become homeless. It is orders of magnitude more expensive not to pass universal right to counsel. I appreciate the co-sponsorship of council

members Lewis and Morales, and I urge all councilmembers to support this legislation without watering it down with one loophole or another loophole. It is essential to defend the rights of renters in Seattle by offering universal right to counsel for all renters who need legal assistance. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember. Silence. Okay, so we are going to go ahead and consider several amendments. My suggestion is that we debate and vote on each amendment before we make comments on the legislation as a whole. If that's acceptable to folks, I'd like to go ahead and proceed in that manner. And then Councilor Salant as sponsor of the bill, you will have last the last word as is required under the council rules. You'll have the last word on the bill before we close out or in closing out debate. You'll have the last word on the bill. So just let us sort of say that out front, as is customary. So let's go ahead and deal with the amendments if that's okay with you councilors want. Okay. I'm getting ahead. Not so. I'm going to go ahead and go first. Let's go ahead and do them in order of the number of amendments listed on the agenda. So that means the First Amendment is Amendment One, which is being advanced by Council Member Herbold. So I'm going to go ahead and hand it over to Councilmember Herbold to make her motion for consideration and debate of Amendment One. Thank you. I move to amend Council Bill 12 007 as presented on Amendment one on the agenda. Okay. Is there a second and moved. And thank you so much, Councilor, whereas it's been moved and seconded to amend the bill is presented on Amendment one. Councilmember Herbold, you are recognized in order to address amendment. Thank you so much. So this amendment would specify that an attorney organization with that the the Department of constructions and inspections would contract with that. That organization should have experience providing legal representation to tenants. This amendment was suggested by an advocate who has deep experience working with tenants in the city of Seattle. In this individual's experience, they wrote that there are many legal aid organizations that might just provide advice about notices or on the other hand, might only represent tenants in some very narrow circumstances. This bill isn't a funding mechanism, but it is important, I think, that the Council include in our intention that this bill for future funding that would support this policy be made available only to those organizations willing to represent tenants in a courtroom in the broad circumstances that this this bill contemplates. Thank you. Thank you, councilmember rebels. Any comments or questions on Amendment one? Councilmember Salom, please. Thank you. Herbal This amendment provides clarifying language that is consistent with the intent of the legislation that I will be voting. Yes. Great. Thank you so much. Any other comments or questions on Amendment One? Hearing no additional comments on Amen

dment one. Will the clerk please call the role on the adoption of Amendment One? Mosquito I. Petersen. I saw one. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. President Gonzalez. High nine, in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The motion carries, the amendment is adopted, and the amended bill is now before the council. Councilmember Herbold, I understand you are the sponsor of Amendment two, so I'm going to hand it back over to you to make that motion and to solicit a second and haptic. Thank you. I move to amend Council Bill 12 007 as presented on Amendment two on the agenda. Their second. Second. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. For the second, it's been moved and seconded to amend the bill as presented on Amendment two. Councilmember Herbold, back to you to describe the amend. Thank you so much. This is an amendment regarding future reporting obligations. And as I said this morning in council briefings, meeting the amendment would require that the organization with whom the city contracts will provide reporting on numbers of cases for representation that occurs outside of the initial appearance or show cause hearing. Most cases, the vast majority of cases are resolved at the initial appearance or show cause hearing. In fact, the last year for which we have data in 2018, only 11 cases of a total of nearly 9000 cases actually went to trial. But we know that we had some really important and transformational statewide and local eviction law reforms. And it's quite possible, given that those reforms inherently give tenants and largely tenants who are

subject to eviction for nonpayment of rent, get them out, give them a basis to oppose their eviction in court for the first time. And so it's possible that there have been larger numbers of cases that are actually going to trial rather than being resolved in this initial show. Cause hearing in cases that go to trial are going to take more resources in order to continue the the funding of this really important right to counsel policy. And so this amendment would require that the providers providing the service include this information as report, as required by the contract, and inform the Council in the future about whether further legislative changes need to be made to address any issues that could be brought on by a future increase in the need for representation throughout the period of a longer trial. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Herbals, are there any additional comments on Amendment two? Seeing and hearing no additional comments on Amendment two. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of Amendment two? Mesquita. I. Peterson. All right. So what? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez Yes. Lewis Yes. Morales Yes. President Gonzalez. High nine, in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The motion carries, the amendment is adopted, and the bill has now includes Amendment two as well. So I'm going to go ahead and move now to Amendment three, wh

ich is my amendment. Which is my amendment. I move to amend the Council Bill 1 to 0 007 as presented on Amendment three on the agenda. Is there a second? Second. Thank you so much. It's been moved and seconded to amend the bill as presented on Amendment three. I will, as sponsor of the amendment, address it and then we will open the floor for additional comments and discussion of the amendment. Colleagues, as I mentioned this morning during council briefing, I was interested in pursuing a amendment that accomplished two things one that made the bill legally defensible and a more workable bill that would actually bring to fruition the right to counsel to those tenants who need it the most. And secondarily, I have a strong interest in supporting this policy and ensuring access to legal aid for those tenants who who need it the most. And so my office pursued this particular amendment, which accomplishes a few simple things. So first of all, this bill adds a recital to acknowledge that the council's intent to minimize that the council has an intent to minimize as many barriers as possible to accessing counsel for those who need it. Second Amendment three establishes that any tenant residing in Seattle has the right to legal counsel free of charge if the tenant meets a simple indigency standard. This indigency standard is modeled on the same standard utilized in the Immigrant Legal Defense Fund, which was unanimously adopted by the City Council in 2006. The definition of indigency focuses on the inability to afford an attorney at any point during an unlawful detainer lawsuit. Third, this amendment allows the contracted legal service providers to establish the process and manner by which to verify indigency. This is a common practice that is similar to the steps taken by service providers in other circumstances, such as the self-certification process that was approved in the COVID 19 eviction defense bill last year. In that example, the tenant simply needs to sign a form at their appearance in eviction court. That could be as simple as saying, I cannot afford an attorney and then signing that form and being therefore immediately eligible for receiving free legal aid. So we are not talking about a process by which by which a tenant is going to have to present a mountain full of paperwork in order to prove that they're indigent. It is as simple as the process that we currently have in place for the Legal Defense Fund, which is a self attestation or certification that you indeed cannot pay for your own attorney in this unlawful detainer action. I believe this is very simple. I believe that most individuals who need the access to legal aid are going to be able to easily simply and in collaboration with legal service providers who have a strong interest in providing legal services to those individuals is going to be able to accomplish the council's underlying policy goals here of making sure that we have access to legal aid for those who need it the most. S

o again, I believe that this language is is going to minimize the risks of having this law survive a legal challenge, which, again, I believe is almost going to certainly happen while also providing access to a right to counsel to those that need it. This amendment, again, as a reminder, is modeled after the Immigrant Legal Defense Fund that the city council unanimously passed in 2016. In that case, we also included an indigent standard. And again, in the three years of existence, the deportation defense fund has helped hundreds of immigrants and refugees fighting deportation proceedings while have. No administrative burden or chilling effect on those seeking services as a result of the indigence standard and the self-certification process. In that context, again, this was unanimously supported by the City Council at the time in the Legal Defense Fund. So I would today

ask for your support in voting in favor of Amendment three. All right. We have some comments here. So we're going to open up the floor. First up is Councilmember Herbold, followed by Councilmember Morales. Because my hurdle. You're not. Actually. Ready to. Go that win. All right. Well, thank you, Counsel President Gonzales, for bringing forward this amendment to make this bill stronger. This amendment is not an example of means testing. Legal services providers can simply ask renters to sign a statement that they are eligible for this service, and after doing so, they are immediately entitled to representation. There is no test for anyone to have to produce documents and wait for the test to be graded. It is not means testing. Means testing is a method for determining whether someone qualifies for financial assistance to obtain a service or good. And it looks at the means or monetary resources that that individual has available to them to pay for a particular service or good. Then it determines that the person's access to financial assistance is based on their ability to pay for it. Again, this amendment does not require means testing. This amendment will make the right for stronger, for eligible renters stronger to resist legal challenge from those who do not want anyone to have the right. Just one person receiving a free attorney when they have sufficient funds to pay for an attorney could bring the hard earned right to counsel law down. I do not want to take that risk. This amendment ensures that the greatest number and those most in need are eligible to receive assistance when facing eviction with the most minimal of requirements. I've seen data that means testing can be a barrier to services. I have not seen any data that a self attestation of poverty is a barrier to services. No one is caving to big landlords or creating loopholes to reduce the number of people who have access to the right to counsel that this policy serves. Nor are we watering anything down. We are trying to pass a bill to ensure that tenants can remain housed when they are unaware of their rights or don't h

ave the resources to stand up for their rights. And that's why it's so important that we ensure that this legislation can stand up to legal challenges. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Herbold. Councilmember Morales is next and then Councilmember Salaam. Thank you. I don't have much more to add than what Councilmember Herbert just said. It is basically the case that right now legal service providers already ask a simple question about one's. Ability to pay. And this amendment doesn't add requirements for detailed income information. It is simply codifying what is actually happening in practice and leaves to the providers decisions about how to set parameters for how to determine that. So I don't think that it creates any additional barrier. It just clarify some of the things that are already happening, and I intend to. Support this amendment. Thank you. Thank you. Customer. Customers. I opposed this amendment to insert means testing or any other kind of requirement for people to have to qualify for the right to counsel. I believe the right to counsel should be universally available for those who need it. Just because it has been a standard used in a previous legislation is not a good enough reason to reproduce it in this legislation. Council members may not want to call it means testing. You can call it happy joy testing if you want, but it is still means testing. In reality, it is asking people to go through us as a, you know, some kind of hoop jump through some kind of hoop before they qualify. People should be able to have universal rights. I also do not agree with the idea that this amendment makes the legislation, quote unquote, legally defensible. Eviction. Defense attorneys themselves have made it very clear that such amendments are not needed to make this legislation legally defensible. At the end of the day, what makes any law passed strong progressive law passed strong against legal challenges by corporations, by the wealthy, by corporate landlords, is a fighting united movement of working people, renters and everyone who wants to have and live in an affordable and just city. The right to have a lawyer to prevent eviction should be available for every renter facing eviction. Just like all the best public services. There is no means test to use the public roads. They are available for everyone. There is no means test for public education or for the fire department. There is no means test to use the lights on the street lights federally. Social Security is available to everyone, rich and poor. And because of that, it has endured for 86 years, almost a century, despite repeated attempts to dismantle it by the ruling class. Both Republican and Democratic administrations. And because these crucial public services are not means tested, nobody is shamed or humiliated for using them across the spectrum of social services. Any means testing, even the least invasive aspects or types, has the effect of preventing some of the most vulnerable peo

ple from using the service. Let's be clear. The reason this means testing amendments from city council Democrats is not as bad or invasive or onerous as it could have been is because the renters

rights and socialist activist movement who organized to win this legislation said loudly that we oppose means testing and we waste our position in a unified manner which made our collective voice so powerful. Order to say thank you to Seattle Tenants Union Socialist Alternative, the ACLU, The Housing Justice Project, Real Change, Transit Riders Union and many others for speaking out against any kind of means testing. We saw that organizing in public comment today, which has made it very clear the harm that means testing can do and is exposed to the light of day attempts by Democrats to bring far worse amendments. However, even when the process of applying is not onerous, people are hesitant about using any kind of means tested services because they feel humiliated or they're not sure they are eligible, or they have missed assumptions about how difficult the application will be. The Reality of Eviction. Gordon in town in King County, as 13 organizations have pointed out in their letter, shows that the eviction process in Washington makes the use of any kind of test unworkable. Unlike criminal proceedings, this is designed to be very quick and occur in as little as three weeks from the time it misses a rental payment. Unlike a criminal proceeding, which is much longer and involves multiple court dates, most have only one court date for that one court date. We should not, as a legislature, be putting any barriers, however less onerous. However, less invasive means testing has always been used politically by pro-business politicians, both Republican and Democrat, for over 40 years to divide and conquer and make it easy to dismantle the programs, or at least gut them in the future. One reason why Democratic former President Bill Clinton was able to destroy wealth vote in 1996 was because when it was set up in the first place, decades before then, it was set up with means testing in the first place. Throughout the existence of these means tested programs, there have been wildly false rumors about people abusing them. These complete fabrications were used by Clinton, along with legislators of both political parties to guard the welfare programs. The most important reason to reject this means testing amendment is because of the missed opportunity to set a better precedent that has been set in the past. Council President Gonzalez referred to other means tested services in Seattle and the state. And we've seen this before, but we've heard this before. But the city council is populated by self-described progressive Democrats. There is one socialist rather than Seattle, watering down local renter protections to match the concessions that are being made elsewhere or were made in the past. My question is why aren't progressive Democrats supporting the legislation with

out any watering down, without any means testing? However, less invasive it may be, and then use that precedent to demand that legislators in Olympia, for example, follow through and pass a strong law. Finally, I want to also emphasize that all these allusions to legal concerns are not acceptable, because, as I said and I wanted to reiterate, renters rights attorneys themselves have roundly rejected it. Renters rights attorneys want a bill that stands up in court. They are not in the business of wanting the legislature, like the city council, to pass laws that won't stand up in court. They absolutely want a bill to stand up in court. It is not in their interest to create any legal vulnerabilities and they are strongly supported this legislation without any watering down the idea that means testing is necessary is an idea that is only ever foisted on the most vulnerable people in our society. Over the past couple of weeks, we have heard from community members many examples of programs to give handouts to the rich and powerful that have no means testing whatsoever. Whether onerous or not, there is none. There was no means test required for the Seattle Mariners to prove they needed financial support for their stadium. There was no means test for landlords to get compensation from the city through other legislation. There was no means test when the city paid tens of millions to the wealthy waterfront businesses to compensate the interruption of their sidewalk access during the seawall construction. There was no means test when the city invested almost half a billion rebuilding the streets around Mercer to accommodate Amazon's campus. There was no means testing when Washington State gave Boeing executives and major shareholders a \$9 billion corporate tax handout in 2013. There is no means test for elected officials in Seattle to pay themselves exorbitant six six digit salaries. Means testing is not needed in this legislation because people in election code are already at the absolute end of their resources. If they had any money for attorneys. They would have paid their rent in the first place and not got. Eviction notices. Means testing is not legally necessary. Means testing can do real harm by creating obstacles for people in desperate need for help. And it opens the door to further weakening of the legislation in the future. And we have the opportunity to set a strong precedent against this today. So I urge council members to vote no on this amendment. Thank you, Councilmember. So once again. Next up is Councilmember Suarez and then Councilmember Tina Awards. Thank you very much. I want

to, first of all, thank Councilman Harold and President Gonzalez for their comments. You've been hearing me say some of this since March 4th. So this ordinance, as originally written without eligibility criteria, is arguably a gift of public funds and therefore violates state law. So in order to remedy this legal flaw and this vulnerability, because we already know

that preventing homelessness is a fundamental governmental purpose, which we all agree on today. We have eligibility criteria where someone can self attest that they are in fact indeed indigent, indigent, indigent. So what we do is we looked at other programs where we have a right to counsel in the civil arena, not the criminal arena. And we looked at the Northwest Justice Project and the Tenant Law Center and Council President as she shared proposal, which we all voted on in 2016, the Immigrant Legal Defense Fund, which was passed the simple. Eligibility requirement. I'm kind of tired of going back and forth about means testing and eligibility, but I will state this just for the record. Everything customers want said about means testing is true. But that's not what we have in front of us. Means testing is a requirement that applicants for any type of government public assistance submit to an investigation of their funds and resources that they actually have to provide documentation to show that they're indigent. The means test originated as a method of limiting. Payment of public. Assistance to those truly in need in order to reduce the cost of such programs to taxpayers. Means testing was used as to limit payment of public assistance to those truly in need. More often than not, it is weaponized. As a former public defender and as a former person at Evergreen Legal Services that represented people in court for unlawful detainer, that is what we looked at. We did not have means testing. We made sure that you had legal counsel for unlawful detainer and for the issues that were in front of us today, the eligibility criteria. Thank you. Council president which she brought forward talks about are actually is very succinct and it addresses the issue of what anyone may qualify for by simply saying that they're indigent. They choose that they want to participate. And by choosing that they want to participate, they show that they're in fact. And then in saying that poor. So the eligibility criteria allows and permits government to provide a benefit that promotes the public good and determines that such criteria, such as indigency, is why we would move forward to make sure and I want to make another point that I agree with, Councilmember Rubio had raised my main concern about allowing everybody, anybody like the Oprah show to have a lawyer all the time, every time. Is that then those truly in need that don't have money, that are truly indigent are not going to get legal counsel because there's only so much money. And the last three years we have put in the budget and we have all passed which council like has always voted no on, I'd say almost to the tune of \$1,000,000 in the last three years. Please correct me if I'm wrong. For people to have legal counsel during eviction, when we have put forward money in the budget to ensure that there's money there for people who are being wrongfully evicted, have legal counsel. So what I'm trying to say is that we

are moving forward on an important piece of legislation that is going to be permanent in which people must just say that they are indeed in need of legal assistance and they can choose to participate in the program. You know, it's just kind of disheartening that sometimes when you just try to do good things, I don't think I'm in the back pocket of slumlords or big corporations. I still don't know what a progressive Democrat is to some degree. I'm not against the homelessness. I'm certainly not against the poor. As a former public defender as well and as a attorney for 35 years, I can say this is pretty straightforward. And what we're just trying to do a good thing. So thank you. I'll leave it at that. Thank you. Consumer Awareness Council Member Mosquito. Thank you very much. Council President I just want to thank councilmembers a lot for bringing this forward. This is the first time I've had a chance to sort of talk about this legislation. Was looking forward to voting on it a few weeks ago, and I'm glad that this is moving forward today. So thank you for bringing this forward. I know cities across the country are also looking to do similar things, so I appreciate the work that's gone into this legislation. I think the outrage that has been expressed about means testing is absolutely right. I think the ire that we all feel that I've expressed before when we talked about this legislation about means testing and income testing is 100% accurate. And I have spent a long time fighting against means testing in the state legislature, especially when I worked to implement Apple Health, especially Apple health for kids about a dozen years ago. At that point means testing, as Councilmember Morales just said, was being weaponized to try to prevent immigrant kiddos from being added to the rolls for eligibility for Apple health at the time. And that is why I have and continue to fight against means testing. I think that it's important to me to have

understood the discussion today and that the briefing from the Council President on this amendment in the context of the Immigrant Legal Defense Fund ordinance that it was based off of. As I understand, this amendment in front of us, the legal organizational well except self attestation simply saying an individual can simply say they don't have the means to form an attorney. I know a lot of folks who are struggling right now, working month to month, many people out of work or, you know, still trying to pay their own rent and childcare and the concept of having to pay an attorney. On top of that, a lot of people are going to say that they can't afford an attorney. So basically someone self-testing that they can't afford an attorney meets the criteria here that the organization, the Legal Assistance Organization, is not going to ask for income verification. I'm not going to look at any monetary resources. And as I think Councilmember Herbold said, not comply with a test of any kind. So I think that this is a big di

stinction from the types of means testing that I have fought in the past. Self attestation is what we've actually fought for and many cases as an alternative to means testing so that people can get the services that they're eligible for. And in this case and this case that we determined a right to appreciate that there is clarification that there's no documentation required at the time of application or later. And as I checked in with a handful of legal assistance folks across the city who are currently helping and have previously helped, they noted that this is really important because it's been a long standing approval process by including federal entities like the Legal Services Corporation to avoid undermining attorney client privilege and that relationship. To. Make sure that they just accept from the client at the point of service that they are not able to pay for an attorney, that any additional type of barrier would be a barrier to the intake and could not be a functional process. So they are very much opposed to means testing but have been working under this existing model of self attestation and believe that it is the you know, that this is not an additional barrier. I understand that the standard is not a test now or an application later, and that's a very important clarification that I wanted to put out there because just like I think means testing can have a chilling effect on whether or not someone applies for services. I also don't want there to be any confusion out there when this bill passes the knock on way. When this bill passes, I don't want there to be any confusion out there about folks coming and signing up. There is no test. At the very least, it sounds like there's going to be a piece of paper that sign, and we want to make sure folks get access to those services. And I don't want there to be a chilling effect from any debate we can debate. But ultimately, this legislation is going to pass and I look forward to supporting the final legislation. And we'll be supporting this amendment to the. And you can smear a mosquito. Are there any other comments on Amendment three, Councilor Lewis. Thank you. Madam President, I couldn't figure out how to do the little digital raise hand today for some reason, so I did it the old fashioned way. So thank you for recognizing to me here for a moment. I will be supporting your amendment today. My colleagues have already made a lot of the comments that I would have, but I do want to emphasize a few more that I think are instructive and important. I do want to add that another distinction between the self attestation and means testing is that this will not incur procedural costs since we are not doing financial screenings and investigations into people's financial background to do a self attestation, which I think is a critical thing to note, that means testing. And one of the big arguments, in addition to what we've already discussed here today on the the the impact it can have on people see

king services, the deterrence effect you can have on people seeking services it also incurred would have incurred real cost to the city in buying the software for half million dollars, hiring an FTE at a cost of over \$100,000. Our model of self attestation does not do that and also can kick in procedurally at the point when people will need this legal assistance and will not require a delay or a rescheduling of these Tenet related eviction proceedings. So it doesn't come with those logistical and financial costs. That means testing would have come with in addition to all the other horrible things about means testing that we have already discussed extensively in this session. I do also just want to acknowledge that my appreciation for the Council, President Gonzales, and bringing forward a proposal that is structured to to provide the very minimum of potential hurdle while addressing the very real substantive impacts. I don't want to violate the fight fight club rules of executive session, but I will just say all of us were in that executive session. You know, I think that it is important that we center the guidance and advice of the team that successfully defeated vigorous legal actions against just cause eviction, against first in time protections, against the various

eviction moratoriums this council has enacted. And I believe that it was. I appreciate Council President's diligence in working with that team, working with us on the council to craft something that will still provide this vital service to everyone who will need it, while at the same time strengthening this law against the challenges that we know will come from deep pocketed and very well-resourced landlord interests that will sue to try to get rid of it. So with that, Madam President, I don't have any additional comments, and I appreciate your leadership in bringing this forward as well as the comments of my colleagues similarly speaking to this. Thank you, Councilor Lewis. Are there any additional comments on Amendment three? Okay. Councilmember Salant. Thank you. I just wanted to specifically address the question of self attestation. I do not agree that self attestation will not be a barrier because that's not what the data indicates at all. For example, according to Seattle City Light, the official enrollment number for the utility discount program, which is for low income people who cannot afford to pay their full utility bills as of the enrollment numbers as of the end of February is 42,094 and customers and they are currently estimating the department is currently estimating the number of eligible households that 90,000. So that means that Seattle's utility discount program has enrolled less than 50% of the estimated eligible households. It used to be even worse than that. It used to be under 20% when I first took office and became the chair of the Energy Committee, and we fought to improve it. And the city now, although endorse people who live in Seattle Housing Authority a

nd other low income housing, this was part of our effort from our movement to make it an opt out and rather an opt in program. But that was not enough. Also, now the application process has been made simpler, which, of course, I support any, you know, making any obstacles simpler. But now there's a simple self-certification so that people can self-certify their income. But still, the enrollment remains at less than 50% years later. And there are many other examples. But I chose this one because it is close to ours. You know, it's right here in the city of Seattle. And so when the evidence does not show that the station will not be a barrier, I don't know how councilmembers can claim that it won't be a barrier because it will. Thank you. Hey, are there any additional comments or questions on Amendment three otherwise? Because I'm the sponsor, I get the last word on it. So just last call on Amendment three. Okay. I'm going to make some closing remarks here. I do want to thank you all for the conversation and the debate around Amendment three and your consideration of adopting Amendment three. There's a few things I want to clarify in response to some of Councilmember Silence comments on Amendment three that I do think are are not entirely accurate. One, I do not believe that lawyers representing tenants are going to humiliate tenants as a result of the passage of Amendment three. There were some comments made that somehow a sales attestation was going to result in humiliation. But let's remember that the people who are asking the questions about eligibility and about accessing legal services are the very the very people we're relying to represent those individuals. And I believe that they are going to put forward, consistent with their current processes, something that is compassionate, that is not embarrassing, and that will fulfill their mission of making sure that as many tenants as possible have access to free legal services when needed during eviction proceedings. Second, there has been a there has been a creation of comparisons between access to water, light and roadways, to legal aid services that pay for a lawyer. And I believe this is a false equivalency and should be rejected for that reason. Third, this is not a means test. We have a constitutional obligation to not engage in the gift of public funds. This applies to every single action and determination and decision we make as a city council. That obligation flows again from the Washington State Constitution. I believe that Amendment three focuses our limited resources on those who most need access to free legal services and eviction proceedings. And I believe that even with the inclusion of Amendment three, those individuals who need representation for free in eviction proceedings will in fact be able to receive those services. Fourth, there's been a lot of remarks by Councilmember Salant about this setting a precedent that would not otherwise be set if we pass the base bill without Am

endment three. However, only an amendment to the Washington to the Washington states Constitution would allow for the state legislature to avoid the realities of the duties related to the gift of public funds. In other words, this obligation related to public to avoiding the gift of public funds applies equally to the Washington state legislature, as it does to us. There is no such effort at the state to amend the Constitution to allow for a different standard related to how we allocate and appropriate taxpayer dollars at the local, regional or state effort. That is exactly why Senate Bill

5160, which is specifically designed to address the eviction cliff that we are all facing, includes an emergency requirement to create a statewide right to counsel. And lastly, fifth, there has been an analogy created between the indigency standard that we're about to consider adopting an Amendment three to the provisions provided for in the utility discount program, a simple Google of utility discount program. Seattle request enrollment brings up the enrollment form that an individual would have to fill out in order to determine whether or not they're eligible. Unlike the UDP program, my amendment does not, for example, include the disclosure of what is the expected or estimated monthly income for your household before taxes. In fact, if you look at the UDP eligibility enrollment form, there is a question that requires disclosure of the expected or estimated monthly income for your household before taxes. That requirement is not included in Amendment three, only a self attestation that you cannot afford. An attorney will be asked in order to determine legal eligibility under this particular program. So, again, I think that there is there is not a clean comparison between the UDP. The UDP certainly requires much more than a self-certification and attestation of not being able to afford, for example, in that case, paying your bill. So I will close out debate there and appreciate again y'all's consideration of adopting Amendment three and am excited about voting on this bill to finally, once and for all, create a right to counsel for tenants in the city of Seattle and look forward to doing that, doing that very soon here. So without. Further ado, while the piece called a role on the adoption of Amendment three. Macheda I Pietersen. II. So what? No. Strauss. Yes. HERBOLD. Yes. Suarez, I. Lewis Yes. Morales Yes. President Gonzalez. I. Eight in favor one opposed. The motion carries, the amendment is adopted, and the amended bill is now before the council. Councilmember Peterson, I'm going to hand it over to you to make your motion for, I believe, it's Amendment four. Thank you. Council President I move to amend Council Bill 1 to 0 007 as presented as Amendment four on today's agenda. Saddam is there. Okay. There's been a it's been moved and seconded. Thank you, Councilmember Juarez. It's been seconded to amend. The bill is presented on Amendment four. Councilmember

Peters, I'm going to hand it back over to you to walk us through your remit. Thank you. Council President. I'll be brief. This amendment number four on today's agenda, as I mentioned in council briefing, would advise one of the recitals in the bill to clarify that the executive department should conduct an open request for proposals process for awarding these tax dollars rather than making a direct award to a single attorney organization without an open process. This amendment will provide a grace period of a year and a half to continue with the existing contract and the request for proposals. Process would occur and that comports with best practices in awarding ongoing contracts to provide additional opportunities to attorney organizations, which could include the existing one as well as others that would like consideration for providing these important legal services. Thank you. Thank you so much, Casmir Peterson. Any comments or questions on Amendment four? Councilmember Mosqueda, please. Thank you very much. Thank you. Councilmember Peterson. I always try to make sure that no one is surprised by my votes. And so I want to give a chance to let other folks know. I did have a chance to check in on Cosmo Peterson. And I apologize that I didn't ask some of the questions during morning briefing this morning. I am not in favor of this amendment simply because I think it might be more in the weeds than necessary for us. See, I think that while it's advisory, they certainly can take it under advisement, but it's not directing them. I feel like it is not necessary, given what I understand is that they go through a process for their hour of peace on a fairly regular basis. And I also think that there's a level of urgency around the relation, the trust relation that hopefully a contracting entity would have with referral entities or with folks who work with those who might need services. So I appreciate where you're coming from with this, because I do think it's important for those court contracts to go out. But I understand that CCI already has something similar in the works, and I'm going to be voting no on this today. But I appreciate the intent from where you came from. It seems they were silent. Thank you. I will be voting no on this amendment. As was explained, it is just an amendment to whereas clause does not change the substance of the legislation. However, I am voting no because it is overly prescriptive of how the department, the Department of Construction Inspections contracts out these services and does not reflect the reality of eviction. In the bill that my office has proposed, the base bill, it says that the Seattle Department of Construction Inspection, or as DCI, which is the city department responsible for enforcing renters rights, is responsible for contracting with an organization to defend renters facing eviction. Our bill then gives parameters for what makes an organization a good choice to provide these services. We want attorney

s with experience defending renters in court against eviction. We want an organization that works out of the King County Courthouse so that renters in eviction court can be met by an attorney when they show up. The reality is there is the the the the Housing Justice Project is the only organization like that right now in Seattle. And as they will themselves tell you, there aren't many private firms or any at all, perhaps, and very few around the country that provide this kind of service, which is defending renters against eviction. The Housing Justice Project attorneys are dedicated, and they do their best they can to support renters. That is why the various laws we propose states that as DCA should continue contracting with OJP unless another organization becomes better qualified. The legislation currently includes that language unless another organization becomes better qualified. We recognize that we do not know who will be defending Rangers in ten years. 20 years, maybe it will be. Maybe it will be some organization that doesn't exist. Right now, the department is empowered by the legislation to make that decision. We do not require that the department contractors be, but we do acknowledge the role that they are playing right now. Whether as ECI uses an RFP or an IQ are few or renews existing contracts. None of this needs to be prescribed in the legislation. I do want to stress again that because this amendment changes only awareness clause, it does not change any functional part of the legislation. However, I do think it's unnecessary and overly. Prescriptive, so I would be, you know. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold. You know, so I think the language in the existing recital about a future organization potentially becoming better qualified, that that determination could be made by an RFP. I don't know what other way a department would have to make that determination if it was not for an open, competitive process to determine who is most qualified. Given that this is only a recital, it's only providing the council's policy preference. I mean, given that it's important to Councilmember Peterson and given that, I would hope that with this amendment, we could get his support for for the bill. And I think that's important that the council speak with unanimity when there is unanimity and when there's disagreement about small recitals. I would say that let's let's let's not focus on where our differences are. Let's try to focus on where, where, where we have agreement. And I for all those reasons, I would definitely support the recital as proposed. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold, any other comments on Amendment four? Okay. I'm going to hand it back to Councilmember Peterson in a minute. But I do want to signal that I intend to support this amendment as well. For many of the reasons stated by Councilmember Herbold, I don't think it creates a different rubric. It's a recital. It's not part of the law. I appreciate the intent with which i

t's brought forward, and I intend to support it for that reason. So. Peterson Anything else to add? No, thank you. I appreciate the ability to bring this forward and further down the road. Robust discussion. Thank you so much. All right. We're closing out debates now that the sponsor of the amendment has had the last word. So will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of Amendment four MACHEDA? No. Paterson. Yes. Sir. What? No. Strauss. Yes. HERBOLD Yes. SUAREZ Yep. LEWIS Yes. Morales No. President Gonzalez, I. Six in favor, three opposed. Thank you so much. The motion carries, the amendment is adopted and the amended bill is before the council. Okay, folks, that exhausts our amendments as we know them. And now we have a bill is in front of us and is amended again as a result. We'll have the last word on the bill as the prime sponsor of the bill. But I am asking for folks who might want to speak on the bill now. PETERSON Thank you. Thank you. Council President. I want to I want to thank the council president for her leadership on this, to help us to give us more time and to her substantive amendment that passed today to enact laws strong enough to survive scrutiny so that we can actually help our most vulnerable neighbors. Policymakers sometimes need the time to think through the various ramifications. And because we took the time in this case, we were able to consider and approve sensible amendments to make this legislation better. So I am able to update my vote to a yes. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson. Councilmember Morales. Oh, thank you. Sorry. Technology. Thanks, colleagues. I just want to reiterate, I'm proud to be a co-sponsor of this legislation to bring all tenants representation and eviction cases and really appreciate today's discussion. It's true that any renter can face eviction and a tenant should know that they have support during one of the hardest times in their life . And that support shouldn't be contingent on a public health emergency or any other limitations. We know that prior to the pandemic, tenants were already facing tough odds in eviction court if they didn't have legal representation. And as eviction moratorium are lifted across the region and the public emergency is in our rearview mirror, we know

that many of our neighbors will be in tough situations again. So at the moment, those lucky enough to know about programs like the Housing Justice Project or the Tenant Law Center know that legal representation can be the difference between remaining housed and creating a plan to have to live in your car. And folks shouldn't have to feel lucky to access limited, free legal representation. So as I said before, the landlord tenant relationship is unbalanced and the right to counsel goes a long way toward providing tenants with some protection and putting them on equal footing with landlords. And I'm proud to sponsor this legislation. Thank you. Thank you, Councilman Morales. Are there any other comments?

Councilman Moschino, please. Thank you very much. Thank you. Councilmember Peterson, again for bringing forward your amendment. I am very happy to hear your comments as well. And along with what Councilmember Herbold said, always do want to strive for where we can highlight the unanimous unanimity and the collaborative work on council. And I am very excited to be able to support this legislation today, including with the amendments that were passed today. I think that it puts us on more solid legal ground. I think that there's a tremendous amount to celebrate as Seattle, again, is going to be looked at as a national leader in this issue. I was trying to look up the statistic just to remind myself, but on this morning's news, I believe it's on Democracy Now! I heard that around 20% of renters are still struggling to be able to pay rent. And the cliff for when those eviction moratoriums go away is very real and threatening. We are working very hard to make sure that renters have dollars in hand. And I want to reiterate rental assistance bill that we're considering next week is also a small landlord assistance bill. Right, because it passes through and it's part of that support network that goes to our smallest landlords who are also being impacted by the consequences of COVID. So I see it as a both and conversation. Today's bill is truly something to be celebrated and for us to continue to reiterate to people that if you are facing eviction, you now have a right to counsel. And we can say that with incredible pride in the city of Seattle. Thank you all for all of your amendments that you brought forward today to make this legislation stronger. And thanks to customers a lot, and Morales and Lewis, who are the original co-sponsors as well, this legislation. I am looking forward to passing it and to showing that unanimity unanimously across council for our united support. And to do that not just for renters who are facing eviction, but truly to provide a more stable local economy as we recover. We cannot create a more equitable or stable economy if people continue to fall into homelessness. And this is this is quite literally at the foundation, a economic stimulus for our local economy, as well as a humanitarian piece of legislation to make sure that people have access to housing and prevent them from falling into homelessness. So very excited to support this and thank you all for your work on it. Coulson humbled. I just went to ground. I'll say that we're making today and some quick facts from the losing home report that was commissioned out of my office in collaboration with the Seattle Women's Commission, the Northwest Justice Project, and Washington can. And some of the findings include the fact that nearly 52% of tenants in eviction filings were people of color of 31.2% were black tenants. And this is an eviction rate of 4.5 times what would be expected based on their demographics. In Seattle, women were more likely to be evicted over small amou

nts of money of single tenant households where a tenant owed \$100 or less. 81% of those being evicted were women. Tenants faced steep financial costs resulting from an eviction. The median court judgment was over \$3,000, including rent owed non rent charges and legal costs. And nearly 86% of eviction filings were for nonpayment of rent. And of these, 52% were for one month or less in rent. Tenants were required to pay attorney's fees 91% of cases, with a median charge of about \$416. And court costs 92% of cases with a medium charge, median charge of about \$360. So, you know, this is this is really those stats are really focused, I think, on not just the basis for why we made changes to the eviction law, both in state law and in in our own local law, in eviction cases that are related to nonpayment of rent. Now, tenants have more of a right to make an argument about the conditions that lead to nonpayment of rent cases. But in order to make these arguments to address these these really heartbreaking findings from the losing home report, tenants need to have eviction prevention, legal advice from trained attorneys in order to make make the arguments that that that that for the for the for the application of the new rights that they have since since 2019 changes in the state legislature and in city law as well. So again, just really want to bring it back to the inequities that we see in our in our eviction court system. And, you know, we can't just always work on improving the the the laws and the rights, but we have to also address people's ability to

stand up for them. And I want to thank Councilmember Sawant and all of the tenant advocacy groups who have made that loud that that call loud and clear. Thank you. Councilmember Herbold, are there any other comments on the bill as amended elsewhere in the. Lewis, please. Thank you, Madam President. I will just make a couple of additional remarks to build on what my colleagues have already said. And for me, a big thing that was instructive early on to sign on as a co-sponsor to this critical legislation was the statistic out of New York, which has a robust right to counsel law and has for some time that 86% of the people. Who were represented in an eviction proceeding, avoided an eviction, which suggests to me in the way that our eviction system is set up and the law around evictions and the courts and how these hearings are conducted and the traditional expectation of who does and does not have representation in those proceedings has led to thousands, hundreds of thousands nationally of illegal evictions. That when you have counsel in the courtroom and an advocate that can stand with you to address the merits of the case that your landlord is bringing. Tenants overwhelmingly have been able to stand up and hopefully this will have a deterrent effect as that countervailing power in the courtroom for tenants becomes well known that unmeritorious evictions will no longer be tolerated in Seattle and King Co

unity. And this legislation could end up having a really profound impact and certainly has in other parts of the country. And I really look forward to the impact that we're going to see in our neighbors who are tenants being able to live with a sense of security in reducing the number of our neighbors who fall into a state of homelessness and end up living in encampments and in vehicles. And I really look forward to the next phase here in making sure we have sufficient appropriation to sustain and build on this right going forward in a city that is majority renter and make sure that this right is vigorously well enforced. Thank you. Thank you, Councilor Lewis. Any other comments on the bill? Key opens first trust, please. Thank you. Council President. Thank you to the sponsor of this bill. I'm very excited to vote yes. This is going to have incredible benefits to many people who need legal representation in eviction process proceedings. We're going to see a cascading impact of net benefits because when people are able to be legally represented in legal proceedings, their rights and they are able to receive the advice that they need to make the decisions to their benefit. So just want to thank the sponsor and thank you, colleagues. I'm excited to vote yes. Thank you so much. I don't see any other hands raised. I also wanted to say thanks for an opportunity to consider this legislation in spite of our disagreement as it relates to Amendment three. I still think that this is the right policy for the city. I have long advocated for expansion and establishing legal aid programs in a lot of other areas and have in fact been very supportive at the prime sponsors and others efforts to add additional resources for the express purpose of legal aid and prevention of other addictions in our community. And I think that that and that need related to evictions and the need to have access to a lawyer is that much more important in this period of time where we know that we are facing a tsunami of evictions after the moratoriums are lifted, but before people are able to get back on on foot, on good footing economically, to be able to catch up on their rent. This council has taken really important steps on other tenant protections that I think we are all proud of and appreciate the opportunity to have a bill that will be able to be implemented quickly and that will be legally defensible in a court of law. So with that being said, I'm going to hand it over to Councilmember Salant for closing remarks, and then we will call the roll on this bill. Thank you. I'm very happy from the comments that councilmembers have made that this bill is likely to pass unanimously. With this legislation, Seattle is about to become the first city in Washington state that guarantees the right to counsel for renters facing eviction. This victory belongs to the renters light and socialist movement, which my council office is proud to be a part of, and which understands that it takes a fight

ing strategy to overcome corporate landlords and politicians. Seattle now joined New York, San Francisco, Boulder, Colorado. Newark, New Jersey. Baltimore, Maryland, among others, in prescribing legal rights for renters facing eviction. Hundreds of community members and many community organizations deserve credit for this victory, particularly the Seattle Tenants Union of Washington State. UAW 4121 Socialist Alternative, the Book Workers Union. The Housing Justice Project, the American Civil Liberties Union. Both the Washington State affiliate and the National ACLU. Real Change, Transit Riders Union, Faith Action Network, and many others, including the dozens of activists, specifically socialist alternative members, virtually all of whom are struggling workers and renters who collected 468 signatures from working people in our city who strongly support this legislation. For the last seven years, our Council office has served as a center of

organizing for the renters rights movement. We've built powerful movements, fought for and won breakthrough renters rights legislation like the law that bans rent increases in buildings where code violations exist, the ban on winter evictions, a cap on movement fees. We did all of this through collaboration and unity. Collaboration and unity among ordinary people, workers, rank and file members, community organizations, and individual community members who have no power or influence by themselves but become strong when we organize together and fight back. We have won unanimous votes repeatedly by fighting back. As a movement, we celebrate this victory. But we also cannot become complacent because we know that the status quo is still heavily stacked against renters and in favor of corporate landlords. Landlords are immense power and in many cases power over whether people can afford to remain housed. That is why we still need a huge expansion of social housing by public revenues, that big business. So we need to increase the Amazon tax. We need to make sure that renters rights themselves are continue to be strengthened. That's why my office and our growing renters rights movement will not rest after today's passage of Labor Council. Our movement will claim today's win as a win for the grassroots movement and will go forward to advance legislation to protect renters from default evictions. Half of all evictions in Seattle happen by default, meaning the court automatically evict the renter because they did not fill out the paperwork to request a hearing or did not attend the hearing. And often it is the most vulnerable renters who are affected by default, the renters most in need of legal support. We have heard horror stories of people who are bedridden, who are in a coma or who have dementia being evicted by default without even knowing it is happening. My office is already also working on a moratorium on evictions of schoolchildren and their families during the months of the school year, as was suggested import

antly by school board member , we have also been working on legislation requiring landlords to have to meet a just standard for all evictions by closing the current loophole that allows landlords and tenants without cause. We are also preparing to develop legislation creating standardized dance for rental leases. The reality is the average renter in Seattle has no opportunity to negotiate or alter even the smallest part of their lives when they move into a house or apartment. As a result, many leases have outrageous terms, so we do need to continue to strengthen renters rights to have a full bill of renters rights. And even that will not be enough. We will need to fight for rent control. We will need to fight to cancel rent and mortgage and utility debt for those who are struggling because of income or job losses, because of the pandemic and the recession. I congratulate everybody who fought to win this. Let's keep going. When we fight, we want. Okay, colleagues, we're going to go ahead and call this vote now. Debate is officially closed and I'm going to ask that the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the amended bill. Most Jetta I. Peterson I. So want. Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez, I. Lewis Yes. Morales Yes. President Gonzalez. I line in favor. None opposed. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read items two through five into the record? Report of the Transportation and Utilities Committee Agenda Item nine Council Bill 120024 An ordinance relating to surveillance technology implementation authorizing approval of uses and accepting the Surveillance Impact Report for the Seattle Police Department's use of 911 logging recorder technology. The committee recommends the bill pass as amended. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. I'm going to hand it over to you to walk us through the committee report. Thank you. Council president, colleagues, as we know, the council adopted the surveillance impact reports on existing technologies already being used by Seattle City Light and the Seattle Fire Department. This is part of our required work to comply with the underlying surveillance ordinance adopted in 2017 and refined in 2018 to implement our cutting edge surveillance ordinance. Our existing technology and computer programs undergo an extensive review process by the Executive Department. A community led surveillance working group and other stakeholders. While technology is vital to enable local government to provide services more efficiently to the public. Some technology can also have surveillance capabilities or privacy concerns that need to be evaluated with surveillance impact reports. As promised, we took the single counsel bill containing the five existing police department technologies introduced February 22nd and broke it into five separate bills. We heard them in our committee over several meetings. March 3rd

, March 17, April seven. Thank you, committee members, for finalizing your amendments so that our City Attorney's Office could complete a thorough review of them. On April 7th, our committee

amended and then unanimously approved these five surveillance impact reports on existing SPV Technologies. And that's what's before us today for final adoption council bills 12002400250026002720028. These five existing technologies are a911 recording in full license plate readers for patrol license plate readers, parking enforcement, computer aided dispatch technology and online crime reporting technology. Based on some feedback after committee, Councilmember Herbold is further refining a couple of the bills today. I support Councilmember Herbals amendments. These are the remainder of the so called Group two technologies. We also have Group three and Group for Surveillance Impact reports coming later this year, which again undergo a thorough review by our Information Technology Department and Surveillance Working Group. The good news from an accountability perspective is that it's not over after council's approval of these ordinances because then our City Auditor and Office of Inspector General will continue to review the technologies after we approve these reports. Thank you. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. Councilmember Herbold, I understand you have an amendment to council Bill 1230247 to hand it over to you to make your motion. I moved to amend to Bill 12 0024 as presented on Amendment one on the agenda. Second. It's been moved and seconded to amend the bill as presented on Amendment One. Because remember Herbals, you are recognized in order to walk us through your amendment. Thank you. So this amendment adds a recital to the council bill recognizing the plan to transfer 911 dispatch to the new Community Safety and Communications Center and the need for an updated surveillance impact report to align with the new organizational structure. Once that occurs. Right. Thank you so much. Are there any questions or comments on Amendment One? Right. Hearing none while the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of Amendment One. For both. Yes. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Councilmember Ross. Thank you, Mosquera. I. Peterson. Yes. So what? Yes. Council President Gonzalez. I didn't favor not oppose. The motion carries the amendment is adopted and the amended bill is before the council. Are there any additional comments on the bill as amended? All right. Hearing no additional comments, will the Christie's call the roll on the passage of the amended bill? I'm sorry. I'm a little slow. No, that's all right. All right. Go ahead. Customers want. Thank you so much and apologies again. My comments are for both the agenda items ten and 11 of today's agenda, which are connected. These agenda items approve the Seattle Police Department and Parking Enforcement use of automatic license plate readers. As the patrol car drives around with an automatic license pla

te reader, it automatically scans every license plate it sees, records the number, and compares it with a list of numbers it is looking out for it. To be clear, it scans and reads every license plate it sees whether or not you are doing anything wrong or illegal. It is the automated equivalent of facial recognition software being randomly used by the police on every face they see and is an unacceptable infringement on privacy in my view. It is also important how the surveillance technology is being used. According to the Surveillance Impact Report, it is used to enforce Seattle's scofflaw ordinance, which I voted against. The scofflaw ordinance criminalizes people for being poor. If you cannot pay your parking tickets, you are declared a scofflaw and the city boots or tows your car or people who rely on your vehicle to get to work were forced to live in their vehicles because of the housing affordability crisis. This can be particularly devastating with this technology. If the police drive past your car and you have unpaid parking tickets, if you cannot afford, the computer will announce that you should be booted or towed even if you are parked legally at the time. The Surveillance Impact Report also says that this technology is used to find people with outstanding warrants. Think about wanting a ride to a stop first for expired plates and then for an outstanding warrant. Before he was killed, this is technology used to allow the police to do more traffic stops like that. No doubt proponents of this technology will point to uses like Amber Alert. But the reality is you do not need a computer for serious issues like what would generate Amber Alert. Human beings will look down and will look for a car in an Amber Alert. You need to comply. You need the computerized technology only when you want to scan everyone looking for minor things like unpaid parking tickets. This is the technology of a surveillance state that prioritizes the power of the police over the privacy of ordinary citizens. I will be voting no on items ten and 11 authorizing the approval of this surveillance technology. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, colleagues, so we are now going to call the rule on item nine, which is Council Bill 1 to 0 024 in lesson or any additional comments. I apologize if I spoke out of turn for some reason, I. That's why I was confused and late anyway. Now, that's okay. That's okay. I just wanted to make sure that reorient us all to item nine. I appreciate the heads up on items ten and 11. Okay. Well, the court fees called

the role in the passage of the amended bill. Verbal. Yes. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Let's get to I. Peterson. Yes. Excellent. Yes. Council. President Gonzales. I. They didn't save or not oppose. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read the title of item ten into the record? A report of the City Council Agenda Item one. Reso

lution 32003. A resolution retiring, introduced and referred council bills, resolutions, clerk files, and appointments that have received no further action. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I move to adopt resolution 32003. Is there a second? Second. Thank you so much. It's been moved and seconded to adopt Resolution 32003. I am the sponsor of this item, so I will address it and then I'm happy to open the floor for additional comments. Colleagues, as I stated this morning during Council briefing, Resolution 32003 is legislation requiring introduced and referred council bills, resolutions, clerk files and appointments that have received no further action. This is a routine parliamentary action which occurs in accordance with the general rules and procedures of the Seattle City Council to retire legislation that has been introduced and referred but not acted upon by the Council. Each committee chair has been consulted on this process in order to ensure only legislation appropriate for retirement is included in this resolution. I'm happy to answer any questions or hear any additional comments. Hearing no additional comments. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution? Morales. Yes. Muscular. I. Peterson I so want. Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez, I and council president gonzalez i eight in favor and opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The motion carries, the resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? All right, well, the clerk please read item two into the record. And item 27 Council Bill 120058 relating to the Office of Housing, authorizing the acceptance of a transfer of real property in southeast Seattle. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much. Customers, get back to you to provide us this committee report. Thank you very much. Council president, colleagues. Again, this is the item that came from the Housing and Finance Committee that came to us from the Office of Housing to accept the land transfer from sound transit to Office of Housing for the purpose of developing for purchase affordable homes. There are three main points that I'd like to really highlight as you consider this legislation today. The first is that the city is accepting this land at no cost. This is possible through our commitment to the land disposition policies that we have seen really featured in Sound Transit First and then what I replicated as well in our land disposition policies passed in 2018. This is our city's commitment to making sure that if we have surplus or underused land, especially when starting with sound transit, that we make sure that this property is available for the highest and best public use. And right now that's housing. The second thing to consider is that this land is located in the South End near three light rail stations Mount Baker, Columbia City and Othello Station, and is a response to the community's ongoing demand for more af

fordable housing located in these existing communities that have seen a tremendous amount of displacement and a skyrocketing cost of housing over the years. Again, with the need to make sure that we address housing is not just building more affordable units, but it's also creating opportunities for people to have home ownership opportunities, which this ordinance allows. And the final thing is that this focus, as I just mentioned, is on creating a for purchase housing. This land provides accessible home ownership opportunities for Seattle residents, creating a path out of generational poverty and allowing folks to create greater equity in their pocket. This is also a commitment to our equity principles for more people to be able to have a place to call home that they can own, which allows for folks to build build wealth in their own community. The last point, I think, is extremely important as we recognize a disproportionate amount of wealth in whiter households in Seattle compared to black and brown households, which can be traced directly back to our exclusionary policies of redlining that prevent many bipoc communities from being able to purchase their homes in the city of Seattle. And this is not only part of our past, but it's still the living policy of our city. So we're really trying to provide more opportunities now for folks to be able to continue to afford to live in the city. According to a report released by Prosperity Now, the pre-COVID median wealth for white residents in Seattle was three times higher than that of Native American households. Black residents were three times more likely to be unemployed than white residents. And this all compounds to fewer opportunities to allow for folks to be able to own homes in this city. This project, this opportunity is one way that the city can begin to address the past and begin to help

close the wage gap. As we look for many opportunities for future affordable housing options and home ownership options to ensure that more bipoc communities can continue to live and thrive in our Seattle for general, in Seattle for generations to come. We'll continue to do more work to close this gap, and I look forward to more funding opportunities in housing and an equitable development, and especially using our Jumpstart Seattle dollars, about two thirds of those dollars going into housing and home opportunities, especially making sure that those who don't have opportunities have a place to call home and appropriate shelter. And this is an indication of our ongoing commitment to the need for creating more affordable and accessible housing and addressing the disparities that we see in our city. So looking forward to this legislation being passed today. Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Councilmember Mesquita, any other comments on the bill? Councilmember Morales, please. Thank you. I just want to share that. I am very excited about this legislation. This is an opportunity to create more permanently af

fordable home ownership, not just rental units, but home ownership opportunities, particularly in the South End. And that means that these homes will be affordable not just for the first home buyer, but for the subsequent homebuyers to the original homebuyer will get a reasonable rate of return when they sell. But the price is still allowing the next owner to also participate and enjoy the benefits of home ownership. So I think this is a really important opportunity. I do want to also note that there's been an a really important community engagement process for years to make sure that this happens. I want to thank Puget Sound Sage for advocating and helping pass the legislation that required South Transit to offer 80% of their surplus property to organizations that are doing affordable housing to low income folks . And this is really a chance for those of us in the South End to move past the numerous fenced off lots that have lined the light rail stations for the last ten years. I'm really excited to see that, you know, the the fenced off lots along the way are starting to be to be used and that this in particular will be used for for homeownership opportunities. So I just want to say thank you again for sponsoring this, leading this Councilmember Mosqueda. And I do want to also thank director Alvarado and Ericka malone for working so hard on this. I'm really looking forward to more. Homeownership opportunities. In the South End. Thank you. Thank you so much. Councilman Morales couldn't agree with you more. It's important for us to do sort of the both. And obviously, we all want to continue to support affordable pathways to do those units in our community that are only subject to rent. We know that over 50% of the people in the city rent. And I think the last time I looked, about 30% of those renters are bipoc folks. So but obviously the most important, critical thing that we can do to ensure that we are that we are actually making a meaningful difference in terms of closing the wealth gap in income inequality is to allow people opportunities to have affordable homeownership. So really excited about this bill. Sorry that I wasn't in committee to vote it out of committee, but I am really excited about being able to support this particular council bill and thanks to everyone for playing a really important role in getting in front of us . Councilmember Mosquito, would you like to have a last word? Thank you very much. Just echoing the appreciation for folks who have for a long time focused on sound transit and the city of Seattle land disposition policies. The 80, 80, 80 principle is something that we replicated in the land disposition policies that the city passed and with the things that folks like Puget Sound, Sage, Africa Town and so many others who were at the table wanting to make sure that that type of principle expanded to other local jurisdictions. This is one of many efforts that we hope to highlight in the future. I want to thank after Ho

uston for his work also on this legislation. In addition to Director Alvarado, as Councilman Morales accurately pointed out, he's really been spearheading this within the Office of Housing and to her team for their continued commitment to making sure that there's more opportunities like this. Obviously, much more work to come. And we'll continue to follow up to make sure that it's not just affordable housing opportunities that we're creating for renters and first time buyers, but that we're creating that pipeline so that people have that next place to buy. So there really is a place to move into as people acquire additional equity and the next generation or the next folks get a chance to move into these homes as well. It requires us to continue building, building, building. So thanks so much for your continued support on this for the comments today. Wonderful. Thank you so much. I don't see any other comments or folks with their hands up. So will the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill? ROSQUETA. Hi. Peterson. I want. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Whereas I. MORALES Yes. Council President Gonzalez, I Ididn't favor none of those. No passes, and the

chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Well, the clerk please read the short title of item 27 into the record. Jan 1944 Council Bill 120062 Lean to the Madison Bus Rapid Transit Rapid Ride G Line Project. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much, because remember, Peterson, I'm going to hand this back over to you. Thank you. Council president, colleagues, this item and the next council bill on today's agenda are important steps forward for the Madison Street bus. Rapid Transit Rapid Write G Project Council Bill 120062. This item enables our Seattle Department of Transportation to accept two small easements and the next bill 120063 enables SE to accept two grants totaling \$65 million , which we had been expecting from the U.S. Department of Transportation. These capital improvements to that bus corridor for city councils, district or city council districts. Three and seven include over 26 million of city government dollars that we've already approved, including an additional 5 million that we approved last fall. The total project cost for the single corridor is approximately 133 million, while busses already travel up and down Madison Street. This project is designed to improve speed and reliability and improve the connection to the light rail. The revised date for construction to start is this fall of 2021 and Scott hopes to complete the changes to the streets and sidewalks in 2024. Our committee unanimously recommends approval of both bills. Thank you so much. Councilmember Peterson, are there any additional comments on the bill? Carry none will the corpses call the roll on the passage of the bill. Oscar. Hi. Peterson. Hi. Swan. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Whereas I. Morales. Yes. Council President Gonzales. I

wouldn't say ran unopposed. Thank you so much. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the quickly the fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Well, a quick please read the short title of item 45 into the record. Agenda Item 38 Constable 120033 authorizing the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation to execute and accept from Seattle School District one on behalf of the City of Seattle, a reciprocal right of entry license agreement. The Commission recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Casmir. I was going to hand it back over to you. Hey, still person sale. Public schools seek to renew agreements to share parking at two separate locations the Helene Madison Pool at Ingram High School and the Southwest Teen Life Center at and pool at she self high school. This agreement allows for sale of Parks and Rec and sale public schools to formally share space between the two lots . The appraisal done on the two sites show the value of the two parking arrangements. In the agreement, renewal was equal. That is, the public benefit certainly matched up equally for both sites for parking the public assets and name communities committee recommend city council pass this bill. Thank you so much, Councilmember Juarez, are there any additional comments on the bill, hearing? No additional comments on the bill. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Just. Yes. Peterson. I. Silent? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Whereas I. MORALES Yes. Council President Gonzalez I in favor and unopposed. Bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read item 39 into the. Agenda Item 45 Council Bill 120063 Relating to grant funds from the United States Department of Transportation for the construction of the Madison BRT Rapid Ride G Line Project. The committee recommends the bill pass. All righty. Councilmember Peterson going to hand it back to you because you have anything else to add. Thank you. Council president. Nothing else to add, except that this bill was also recommended unanimously by committee. Thank you so much, Councilman Peterson. Are there any additional comments on the bill? Any additional comments? Hearing on will occur. Please call the role on the passage of the bill. Mascara. I. Peterson I. Want, yes. Strauss Yes. Lewis Yes. Whereas I. Morales. S Council President Gonzalez. I voted in favor and unopposed. Thank you so much. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read the short title of item 46 into the record? Agenda Item 43 Council Bill 120045 relating to the City Department declaring certain real property rights to be surplus to the needs of city life. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much. Madam Clerk, I got to hand it back over to Councilmember Peterson to walk us through this item. Thank you. Council Pr

esident, colleagues. Council Bill 120045 is one small prop. It's one more small property transaction needed to facilitate the extensive Georgetown the South Park Trail with its multiple benefits of environmentally friendly mobility, connectivity and open space. This Council bill involves a temporary lease for a small triangle of land along the route. Later this summer, we expect to see the

final actions authorizing construction of the trail project. The total project cost for this trail between District one and District two is about seven and a half million, which includes about 5 million. This council added to the project is part of our budget process a few months ago. Our committee unanimously recommends this bill. Thank you. Thank you so much. Councilmember Peterson, are there any additional comments on the bill? Any additional comments on the card, please call the role on the passage of the bill or Sarah. I. Peterson. I. So, aunt. Yes? Strauss. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Whereas I. MORALES Yes. Council President Gonzales, I know you didn't favor and opposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please, please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Well, the clerk please read the short title of item 44 into the. Jan 1944 Council Bill 120062 Lean to the Madison Bus Rapid Transit Rapid Ride G Line Project. The Report of. The Land Use. And Neighborhoods. Committee Agenda Item two Council Bill 120067 An ordinance relating to the 2021 budget authorizing the Director of the Department of Neighborhoods. To accept a grant and execute related agreements. Amending Ordinance 126237, which adopted the 2021 budget, changing appropriations to. Various departments and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. Strauss As chair of the committee, you are recognized in order to provide the committee report. Thank you. Council President Pro tem humble. Do I need the second promotion? Do we need to put a motion forward? No, you do not. Thank you for that clarification. Speaking to this council bill 1 to 0 six seven, the Department of Neighborhoods grant acceptance. This legislation authorizes the Department of Neighborhoods to accept a \$20,000 grant from the National League of Cities and Local Democracy. This grant will support Department of Neighborhoods ongoing coast census community engagement work that will include the establishment of the Civic Engagement Digital Academy, which is the new version of the Peace Academy. It will be similar to People's Academy for Community Engagement piece, which will focus, which focuses on working with historically undercounted communities to stay engaged. As the census results are applied to policy and funding decisions in the upcoming years. I want to recognize and congratulate the Department of Neighborhoods and their community partners who worked on census engagement because of their great work. Seattle has a return rate of 76.3%, one of the hig

hest in the country. Great work department and neighborhoods. And Elsa couldn't have done it without you. Kels. President Pro tem. That is my report. You so much. Are there any comments on this legislation? Seeing no comment. Clark, can you please call the roll the passage of the bill? Peterson. Yes. So, aunt. Yes? Strauss. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales Yes. I'd counsel the council president, pro tem. Herbold. Yes. Seven in favor and unopposed. And kill. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix signature legislation on my behalf? Moving on to item number three on the agenda, will the clerk please read item number three into the record? The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read the short title of item three? Agenda Item three Council Bill 120087 An Ordinance relating to Appropriations for the Seattle Office for Civil Rights amending Ordinance 126237, which adopted the 2021 Budget. Thank you, Madam Clerk. And the past Council Bill 120087. Is there a second? Second. Is so much because of everyone else. You're the sponsor of this bill. I'm going to hand it over to you to walk us through this list. Thank you. Council President There is an amendment. Do I address that first or should I address the base bill? It would be helpful if you addressed the base bill first and then I'll take up the amendment. Okay. So thank you. So, colleagues, this bill lifts the proviso on some of the participatory budgeting funding and directs the Office of Civil Rights to begin engaging with community members to draft a request for proposal. That RFP will begin the search for an organization that will manage the actual participatory budgeting process. An RFP would allow for an open and transparent process, gives our organizations the opportunity to bid on the work and will lead to more equitable outcomes for our community members. I have to say I'm really excited to be getting this project started and to listen to our neighbors calls for a seat at the table about how our public dollars get spent. We did here in committee, my committee last week that OCR will be working with community members this year to find the right organization to launch participatory budgeting. Next year, community members will begin to brainstorm ideas for how investments should be made. In my committee meeting, we heard from two guests Councilmember Menchaca from New York City, who said about their experience in New York that people were really hungry to connect to their government, to share the ideas that they have, and that once people started seeing their ideas were being listened to, once

they began to understand the cost of a program or project, they no longer felt outside of government, but really began to understand how the government works. And it also brought their neighborhoods together. People started teaching one another about how these processes work. That's th

e potential of participatory budgeting. It's about democratizing access to power and resources, and it's about increasing civic engagement. So our neighbors understand how these processes work and understand that their representatives are listening. We also heard from Sean Good, who we've heard from before. He's with Choose 180. And Sean, I think, said something really important, which is that the \$28 million we're talking about here won't begin to make up for the economic inequality in some of our neighborhoods. It won't begin to address the injustices or gentrification that our communities of color have experienced. But what it will do is begin to blaze a trail that speaks to how we do this in the future and acknowledges that this is the right way to allocate taxpayer dollars so that those who have been pushed for this to the margins can begin to have access to power and resources. That's the path that we're working on today. That is the equitable way for us to address our role as elected officials. And with today's vote, that's what we begin to do. So I am excited to get this moving and look forward to my colleagues support. Rethink is so much consumer wireless. I'm going to go ahead and have you make your motion on the proposed amendment, describe the amendment, and then we can consider the amendment and then we'll open it up for general comments on the bill as amended. So maybe amendment passes. Okay, I move amendment one. I'll wait. Okay. I'm sorry. Okay. So Amendment One adds a sunset provision this week. Hold on, hold on, hold on. I'm so sorry. It has to be seconded before we can discuss it. So. So Councilman Wise has moved proposed amendment as presented on the agenda. Is there a second? Second? Great. It's been moved a second and to amend the bill is presented on the agenda. Now we can have that discussion, including a description of the proposed. My apologies. Thank you very much. So the base bill does create three new positions at the Office of Civil Rights to help manage the process, coordinate other departments within the city so that this work can get done. Well with the amendment does is provide a sunset provision so that it abrogates those three positions at the end of December 2023. At that point, Council will determine how to proceed with the participatory budget program and what the appropriate staffing level should be. So we are just trying to give ourselves latitude to make adjustments and course correct with this program as we move forward. Thank you so much, Councilman Morales. Are there any comments or questions on the proposed amendment as described by Councilmember Morales? I've not seen any hands raised. So will the clerk please call the role on the adoption of the proposed amendment? Strauss Yes. Herbold? Yes. Whereas I. LEWIS. Yes. Morales Yes. Mosquera I. PETERSON Yes. Swan Yes. Council President Gonzales. I. Nine in favor. Nine oppose the motion carries the amendment is adopted and the amended bill is now before t

he council. Are there any additional comments on the bill as amended? Councilmember Mesquita, please. Thank you very much, Councilor. President, I just wanted to take this moment to say congratulations to Councilmember Morales, to her team, and to the community at large who have been long advocating for this. We know that participatory budget is a cornerstone to how we are considering reimagining policing and reinvesting in community priorities that have been long put on the back burner. And I wanted to say thanks to Councilman Morales and the community who's been advocating for this. This is an exciting step forward as we begin the process to make sure that dollars are going directly into the communities that have been long, underinvested and underserved and look forward to the chance to follow the community's lead as we can receive feedback from the participatory budgeting process and really proud that our city has been a leader across the nation. Many other cities have called to us. Folks with the mobile progress have been looking at our participatory budgeting process and our model, and I'm looking forward to this process yielding additional information for directing investments into community based solutions. Obviously share the frustration from Councilmember Morales and team and the community that this hasn't been done sooner and appreciate the opportunity to vote on this today so that we can get these wheels into motion and get some feedback for our upcoming processes. Appreciate it and congratulations. Those comments confirm was gay. Are there any additional comments on the bill as amended? Councilmember Morales, do you have the last word? You can close out debate eight. Well, thanks so much, everybody. I do want to thank everyone who's worked so hard in the last year to get us to

this point. And the organizing that's started last summer was critical to moving the city in this direction. And this is a direction of a more democratic way to allocate resources. So I want to thank the folks at Decriminalize Seattle King County Equity Now, Freedom Project, the Black Brilliance Research Project. I also want to thank my staff Leticia Farmer, Darcel Tuch, Alexis Perla, who all had a hand in keeping this moving over the last year. And I want to thank central staff, immigration and trauma La, Switzerland for helping us with all the technical aspects of how to do this right so that we can serve community well. And finally, I want to thank Dana Robertson, Stephanie Guzman, and just for helping us really elevate the voices of our community members so that we can share the information about how this works. We are adding a page onto the council website so that folks have a place to go and can follow along in the process and can answer some of their basic questions about what it is we're trying to do here. So thanks to everyone who's worked so hard on this, and I'm eager to get us started. Thank you so much, Casimir, and one on us for those closing rema

rks. You wrapped it up very well. With that being said, I'm going to ask that the clerk please call the role on the passage of the amended bill. Strauss Yes. For both. Yes. Whereas I. LEWIS. Yes. Morales Yes. Mr.. I. Peterson, I so want. Yes. Council President Gonzales. I needed a favor and unopposed. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it. Will the Court please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Congratulations. Members of the community, that's a unanimous vote in favor. Again, a unanimous vote in favor of a participatory budget bill. So I appreciate the work that's been done here. Well, the clerk please read item four into the agenda item for appointment 01915 The reappointment of Martha Lucas as a Member Community Involvement Commission for Term two May 31st, 2023. Agenda Item ten Council Bill 120051 relating to public assets, land use and zoning, establishing regulations for the Center Campus Hub area within the sign overlay district for the sale center amending section 23.50 5.0 54 of and adding a new section 23.50 5.0 62. The columnist for code. Thank you so much ram clerk customer worries back to you to address this particular. Item. Thank you. Council President So this. Bill would allow for the implementation of Seattle Center's signage improvement project that we've been working on for a few years, as well as this, as well as its long term vision for campus signage described in the Century 21 master plan. For those of us that have had the opportunity to read that lovely document, the proposed legislation would amend. The land use code. And I think that's Title. 23. To establish regulations for the center campus area of the Seattle Center Sign Overlay District. So the Public Assets and Native Communities Committee held a public hearing and briefing and vote on June 4th, passed unanimously. And so today I'm asking that full. Council pass this bill. Thank you so much, council members, are there any additional comments on the bill? I don't see any hands raised. Double checking here. No hands raised. Okay. With that being said, we're going to go ahead and close out debate. And this comes from our wires. You have anything else you'd like to add? No. Got it. Well, the clerk, please call the roll on the passage of the bill. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Peterson Yes. Swan Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold? Yes. Whereas. Yes. Council President Gonzales. Yes. They didn't favor and then oppose. The bill passes and the chair will sign. It will work to fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Will the clerk please read item 11 into the record? Agenda Item 11 Constable 1200 32 relating to weapon park transferring jurisdiction of a portion of Whitman Avenue north for the sale department transportation to Seattle Parks and Recreation for open space park and Recreation Purposes. The committee recommends that the bill passed as amended. Gender issues need to be part of the Community Economic Development Committee. Agenda Item

13 Council Bill 12009 Terribly into regulation of food delivery businesses and platforms. Adding a new Chapter 7.32 said on the speaker. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much. Colleagues, this is a bill that I have primarily sponsored, but I do want to give Kels, Vermont Morales, as the chair of the committee, an opportunity to make comments on the bill before I do. Thank you. Council President All I will say is that the bill passed out of committee with five in favor and unopposed with their recommendation that it do pass and I will pass it back to you as a sponsor. Thank you so much, Councilman Morales. I am really excited to have an opportunity to bring it forward at Council Bill 1 to 0 zero 92, the Fair Food Delivery Bill. I believe that this bill is going to be instrumental in helping restaurants by ensuring their presence on a delivery platform is in their hands and their control. And then they can continue to own the guest experience from

beginning to end. The guest experience is something restaurants work very hard to build and to execute. When restaurants are unwilling participants on a delivery platform, this creates space for errors, mistakes and misfires that can and do affect the restaurant and also negatively impact the delivery driver. When a customer has a negative experience, it is my hope that this will also help the delivery drivers by allowing them to just focus on the delivery of food. When a restaurant isn't a willing participant and there may be an old, out-of-date menu on line, for example, drivers become the customer effectively and have to make an order on behalf of customers that they're bringing food to. So this entire process of ordering, waiting for food, getting the food to its delivery address takes a lot of time and of course, reduces income for a driver who has little or no protections or benefits. This is especially made worse as this process can mean a lot of places where an order fails to meet the expectations of customers, despite being well executed by the people at the restaurant or the driver who got food to the customer. Drivers should not have to suffer financially because of this. Nor should restaurants take the hit when they have no idea a customer is ordering from an out of date menu. Other businesses across the city have shared similar issues and experiences with platforms. Some of those businesses include Boomerang, Hill, Tap, Bang, Bang, Cafe, Cafe, Patreon, so simply soulful and Uber, Cabra and so many others. My office in developing this legislation engaged with working in Washington, Teamsters hospitality groups like Seattle Restaurant Association and Seattle restaurants United. We also engaged with representatives from the delivery platforms directly, and we have also heard it directly from other restaurants, all of whom have expressed broad support for this particular piece of legislation. This legislation is very narrowly focused on ensuring restaurants are willing. Partic

ipants in the delivery food world, which we know now in pandemic life, is become the new normal for so many of us here in Seattle. So it's my hope that this bill will help improve and streamline the process of ordering for customers, making the food reflective of an up to date menu for restaurants, and that delivery drivers can just focus on pickups and making deliveries. So I'm really excited about having an opportunity to bring this forward to you all and want to thank everybody who was on the committee who voted in favor of recommending that the full council pass this legislation. And I also want to thank the union, my senior policy adviser and Yolanda Ho from our council central staff for their amazing policy work on this legislation. And with that, colleagues, I hope you'll join me in supporting restaurants by voting yes on Council Bill 120092. Any additional comments? Hearing that. Will the court please call the role on the passage of the bill? Lewis. Yes. MORALES Yes. Peterson. Yes. Sergeant? Yes. Strauss. Yes. For both. Yes. Whereas I. Council President Gonzales was I aide in favor and then opposed the bill. Passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Well, the clerk please read items 14 through 19 into the record. Agenda items 14 through 19 appointments in 1923 1925 appointments of Andrew Ashafa and Deandra Braswell. As members, Taylor should be decommissioned for term table 30th 2022 Appointment of Raja Forward as members LGBTQ Commission for Term two October 31st, 2022 and three appointments of Latasha Harrell, Deontay Damper and Bryant Symptom Simpson excuse me Simpson as member SEL LGBTQ Strauss. Yes. And Council President Gonzalez. Yes. Seven in favor. Nine opposed. The motion carries and the appointments are confirmed. Well, the clerk please read item 26 into the record. Report of the Transportation and Utilities Committee Agenda Item 26 Council Bill 120115 relating to the traffic code amended sections 11.14 .277, 11.16 .121 and 11.7 6.015 of and adding a new section 11.1 4.276 to the seven municipalities to establish on. Street parking. Rates for large events that are expected to draw at least 10,000 attendees. The committee recommends the bill pass as amended. Thank you so much, Casper Peterson. You are the chair of this committee. Somebody handed over to you to provide the report. Thank you. Council president, colleagues, as I mentioned at the council briefing this morning, our Transportation Utilities Committee amended and then unanimously recommended Council Bill 120115. This bill will enable our Seattle Department of Transportation to better manage on street parking availability in the uptown neighborhood by increasing parking rates as needed during large events at Seattle Center. Large events are likely to include professional sports at the newly renovated climate pledge arena, formerly known as Key Arena. While our committee unanimously adopted the bill on Jul

y seven, we decided to have the legislation arrive at today's council meeting a full three council meetings later, just in case the public wanted more time to comment. Thank you to Councilmember

Morales for her important amendment in committee, which clarified that the scope is limited just to large events at Seattle Center. Thank you. Thank you so much, Councilmember Peterson. Any additional comments on the bill? Councilmember Lewis, please. Thank you so much, Madam President. Well, as I am not a member of the Transportation Committee, today has been my first opportunity to engage in a council process on this bill. I do want to thank Councilmember Peterson for providing space to meet and discuss potential concerns with him in the run up to his process in his committee, and do appreciate that that that process was inclusive of my positions as the councilmember representing uptown. I do feel like I should make a statement on the legislation now that is facing final passage, and I have the first opportunity to weigh in with an official vote on it. I do support the legislation and I do think it's important that we have a strategy around the finite on street parking supply in the uptown neighborhood and how the coming significantly large events. At the climate pledge arena are going to impact that parking supply. I do just want to put on the record for folks watching and this will probably be redundant to the discourse in the Transportation Committee. But for the first hour of parking, for the first rather 2 hours of parking, the rate will be assessed at \$3 an hour for the second two hour period of parking that will be assessed at \$8 an hour, with the director discretion to increase to \$12 an hour for a four hour period. Folks could end up paying as much as \$22 for on street parking or up to 30 if the full discretion afforded to the director is permitted. I think it is important to acknowledge that the Uptown neighborhood has considerable additional demands as a neighborhood with a number of small businesses, with additional arts and entertainment facilities in the region, all of which are going to be competing for limited parking supply with these significant events. I do want to just come on the record and state that I think it is important that when we are planning moving several thousand people into a discrete area, that we do provide incentives to take advantage of the multitude of direct bus routes that go to the Seattle Center campus from all over the city of Seattle, that we take advantage of the souped up monorail transfer that is going to be available to visitors on game days to transfer from the light rail at Westlake to the monorail in order to get to the Seattle Center campus. And we can't forget the upcoming Thomas Street improvements that this council has supported for a number of years to increase bike and pedestrian options and indeed to facilitate potential parking from further afield and provide a good pedestrian promenade to the

Seattle Center campus. All improvements in anticipating moving significant numbers of people to the Seattle center. There are considerable alternatives to driving, and if folks do drive, we need to make sure that we are doing our due diligence to make sure that the parking is being rationed in a way that can be. That can coexist with some of the other demands the uptown neighborhood faces for street parking, and also make sure that we are incentivizing those other methods of folks to get to the center campus without depending on single occupancy vehicles. So at that, I will be voting for this. I do think that considering again that it's only limited to situations when there are large events, these are not new default, 24 hour a day parking rates for the uptown neighborhood. That this is a reasonable course of action by the department and I will be voting for it. Thank you so much, Councilmember Lewis. Any additional comments on the bill? All right. Hearing none while the court chief called the roll on the passage of the bill. HERBOLD. Yes. Suarez, I. LEWIS Yes. Peterson Yes. So, Sergeant. Yes. Strauss Yes. And Council President Gonzalez. Yes. Seven a favor and unopposed bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the caucuses affect my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read items 27 through 31 into the. Agenda Item 11 Council Bill 12013 for granting Seattle Arena Company LLC permit to construct, maintain and operate a tunnel under an across from Thomas Street. The committee recommends that the bill pass. Thank you, colleagues. Council 120134 would extend Council's approval on a SkyBridge over a minor avenue between Columbia Street and Cherry Street. This was previously approved in 2016 with ordinance 125142. As with all these, the three Swedish bills or items for us today, Council, Committee for Transportation, Utilities unanimously recommended approval of all of these. Are there any comments on this bill? Okay. Well, clerk, please call the role on the passage of the bill. LEWIS Hi. MORALES This must gather. All right, so on. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. Yes Juarez I encountered President Peterson. High. Eight in favor and in opposed. Thank you. And with this, we will. Let's see with this clerk file clerk files approved as condition and the chair will assign the conditions. Well, the clerk please fix my signature to the conditions on my behalf. And apologies, counselor. I'm just reorganizing the script here. One moment. Look, Clark, please read the next item into the record. Agenda Item one Council Bill 120151. Relating to the Department of Finance

and Administrative Services. Authorizing the Director of the Department of Finance and Administrative Services or the Director's designee to negotiate and execute a real property lease with the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority for vacant land at 1000 Northeast 45th Street, Seattle, Washington. And ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. Thank you. I m

oved to pass house 120151. Is there a second? Second? Thank you. Councilmember Lewis, it's been moved and seconded to pass the bill as co-sponsor of this bill. I'll address it first and then I'll recognize Councilor Lewis as the other co-sponsor and open it up for comments, if there are any. Colleagues, in the spirit of engaging the homelessness crisis with the urgency it deserves. Councilor Lewis and I walked on to last week's introduction of referral calendar of this Council Bill 120151. This expedited bill would authorize the city to enter into this lease with sound transit for the use of this site for a tiny home village in the University District. I want to thank Sound Transit for making this land available to us to address homelessness in the area. And thank Councilmember Lewis for enabling us to go straight to the City Council rather than through a committee. The council already authorized the funds for this tiny village during our budget approvals last November. The nonprofit Low Income Housing Institute, known as Lehigh and their volunteers have completed building these tiny homes for the University District, which I was able to visit in their factory recently. So the last step of approval is this lease so that we can get more people off the streets and into their own space and onto a positive future. The site is approximately 18,000 square feet and can fit approximately 36 tiny house structures. The lease would be for approximately two and a half years. After hosting the tiny village, the construction of new permanent affordable housing will occur on this site in our university district. To further expedite this project of our sound transit, to sign the lease today, which they have already done. We've also asked the mayor to sign the legislation within the next 24 hours, and her office has agreed. And finally, our financial administrative services director standing by, ready to sign the lease on behalf of the city government. I know the nonprofit Lehigh is eager to get started on this site so we can finally get this done and get more people who are experiencing homelessness inside. And as we discussed this morning, we're hopeful this lease can be used as a template for future partnerships not only in Seattle, but throughout the region to accelerate our response to the homelessness crisis. And now I'll go ahead and recognize Councilmember Lewis. You'd like to speak to this. Thank you, Councilman Peterson, for giving me the opportunity to weigh in on this really important bill. I do. First, I want to clarify this morning, I believe I referred to this village as the Roosevelt Village. And I did so because it is on Roosevelt, but in the university district. So I do just want to clarify if I confused anyone out in the public as to the location that it is in the university district. Speaking a little bit more broadly, I think here's just a few big points I want to make at the top. Just to emphasize, Councilmember Peterson, some of your points

. We are in a dire state of emergency on chronic homelessness in the city of Seattle. We need more tiny house villages as part of, at the very least, the short term response to give more people a safe, dignified and hygienic place to live. As we work toward getting more folks into housing and as we all know, permanent supportive housing is the ultimate replacement to finally make progress in chronic homelessness. But in the meantime, we do need to wean into some of these shelter placements that have demonstrated results. We know from the past five years of our homelessness state of emergency that. Tiny house villages are one of the interventions that have scored the best on the data that we have accumulated. We know that on average people move on from a single family, sorry, from a a tiny house, a village to a placement that is permanent supportive housing or some other kind of subsidized housing after an average stay at 16 months. We know we can speed that up with other interventions like rapid rehousing and like a bigger supply of permanent supportive housing. But we also know in the meantime that people find people experiencing homelessness and with lived experience, find tiny house villages to be highly desirable interim placements. If they weren't, they would be empty. All of our tiny house villages are full right now and the folks who are living currently in unsanctioned encampments would jump at the opportunity to be in a tiny house instead of the encampment as they await an offer to go to a better place than the tiny house village. So I just wanted to make those broader points that we need to continue to do this work. I also just want to say, as I mentioned in the meeting earlier today, that this lease that you did an excellent job of running down Councilmember Peterson and working with all the stakeholders to make sure that after our vote today , quick administrative action will be taken to move this forward. Does offer a

template for future collaboration with sound transit as a partner in this space. As I mentioned at a briefing today, my office has been in several meetings with sound transit over the course of the last six months. Sound Transit has generously identified and sent on to us three additional suitable sites on both sound transit with similar characteristics to this site in the University District. And we should continue to explore how this lease that we are voting on today could be a template to potentially create more tiny house villages on those sites in partnership with our Friends of Sound Transit. And with that, I have nothing else to add and look forward to voting for this. Thank you, Councilmember Lewis. Any other comments on the bill and the clerk? Please call the roll on passage of the bill. Lewis, I. Morales Yes. Macheda I saw on. Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez I think as president. Peterson. Yes. Eight in favor. Nine opposed. Thank you. Colleagues, the motion carries, the bill passes and the chair will sig

n it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my cards? Item two was held. Item three with a clear place. Read the short title of the item into the record. And Adam, ten counts go 12012 8 million to drainage services of Seattle Public Utilities Adjusting drainage rates to pass through changes to treatment rates charged by King County Committee recommends the bill passes amended. Thank you so much. I want to hand it back over to Councilmember Peterson. In council president. Colleagues, as I mentioned earlier today during council briefing, we're finally voting on three utility rate ordinances for Seattle Public Utilities to implement the Strategic Business Plan and Rate Path, already endorsed by the Customer Review Panel and then by the City Council on May 10th via Resolution 32000. As you may recall, we had good news with average, as do rates coming in lower than what was promised during the previous strategic plan. And that was made possible thanks to ideas proposed by our previous committee chair, Councilmember Herbold, as well as the focus of general manager Mommy Kara and her team to keep rates low. Keeping rates low is important for you and Seattle City Light as rates are essentially regressive, with lower income households paying a larger percentage of their household income for utility bills. The rate ordinance is to be approved today for drainage, wastewater and fresh water. And this is the first one, drainage council 4120128. Thank you. Great. Thank you so much, Councilmember. So why don't you have your hand raised, please? Thank you. This agenda item and the following two items all relate to increasing utility rates. I will speak to all three at once. I will be voting no on all these three bills because increasing utility rates on regular working class people is simply not acceptable. In fact, since the COVID emergency began, I have supported community demands to cancel rent and utility debts, and increasing utility rates for those same communities that are facing the brunt of the COVID crisis is going in the wrong and opposite direction. The reality is, utility bills are negligible for the rich and for big business, but can be a real burden for working class people. If these bills raise utility rates on big business but not on working people, I would certainly support that. In fact, several years ago, when I was the chair of the City Council Committee that the Seattle City Light reported to a move legislation to redistribute the utility costs to the electricity cost to lower the bills of working people. But the majority of the council at that time opposed it. I will be voting no on these three bills increasing SB rates. Thank you. Thank you so much. Customers want are there any additional comments on the bill? Hearing none. Well, the quick, please, for the role in the passage of the bill. PETERSON Yes. So what? No. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales a musketeer. I President Gonzalez. I. Sorry

, I was on mute. Eden Faber. Want to pose? Oh, it's been almost two years. You think I'd figure that out? Okay, the bill passes, and the chair will sign it with a quick fix to fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Well, the clerk please read the short title of item 11 into the record. Agenda Item nine Council Bill 120 159 Building to grant funds from the United States Department, Transportation and other non city sources. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much, Casmir Peterson, back to you. Thank you. Council President Colleagues Council 120159 authorizes our Seattle Department of Transportation to accept various grants totaling \$40 million. This includes federal, state and regional grants for the West Seattle Bridge, 38 million, a Puget Sound Regional Council grant for 15th Avenue South, and also a pedestrian safety grant for Aurora Avenue North. The \$1.5 million state grant for Aurora is vital. That state highway has been a dangerous area that we must address for the city to meet its vision zero transportation goals. Thank you. Thanks so much to their any additional comments on the bill? Thank you so much. Hearing no additional comments, including from the sponsor. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage

of the bill? Sen. Yes. Sir. Why, yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold Yes. Suarez, I. Lewis Yes. Morales s
 mosqueda i. President Gonzalez. I am favorite and unopposed. Thank you so much. The bill
 passes and the chair will sign it will is affixed my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Will the
 clerk please read the short title of item ten into the record? Agenda Item 13 Resolution 320161 to
 the University of Washington Safety and Transportation Management Plan. The committee
 recommends the resolution be adopted as amended. Thank you so much. Back to Councilmember
 Peterson. Thank you. Council president colleagues. The University of Washington asked just to
 prove their updated transportation management plan for major events in and around Husky
 Stadium, including how the university intends to encourage the use of transit during big sporting
 events. The committee added language to Resolution 32016 to encourage increased use of transit,
 to reduce traffic congestion and improve the environment, and also to ensure the university covers
 the full costs of their impacts, including traffic management costs. I appreciate the flexibility from the
 University of Washington in their crafting and implementation of this plan, as well as the generous
 and insightful input we received from the impacted communities. Thank you. Thank you so much.
 Councilmember Peterson, are there any additional comments on the resolution? Hearing that. Will
 the court please call the role on the adoption of the resolution? Peterson Yes. So what? Yes.
 STROUSE Yes. HERBOLD Yes. Suarez, I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. I. President Gonzalez. I nine
 in favor and unopposed. Thanks so much. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will
 the clerk

please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read item 14 into the
 record? Agenda Item 14 Appointment 2027 Reappointment of Warren Jr as member of Seattle
 Freight's Advisory Board for Trump two May 31st, 2022. The committee recommends the
 appointment be confirmed. Agenda item nine Council Bill 1 to 0 161 relating to the sale of public
 utilities, updating water regulations to conform to current standards, making technical corrections
 and amending Section 21.0 4.4 87. Mr. Code Committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so
 much, Councilmember Peterson, back to you to provide the report. Thank you. Council President
 Colleagues Council 120161 updates our water regulations specifically to clarify how and when
 Seattle Public Utilities will use estimates for reading water meters, all of which are owned by Seattle
 Public Utilities. And a committee unanimously recommends approval. Thank you. Thank you so
 much, colleagues. Are there any additional comments on the bill sharing? Please call the bill on the
 passage of the bill. So what? Yes. Strauss Yes. Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales As
 misgender i. Peterson by. President. Gonzalez tied nine in favor, nine opposed. The bill passes and
 the chair will sign it. Will the piece of fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the court
 please read item ten into the record? Agenda item six Constable 120163 relating to the satellite
 department adding a new section to Chapter 21.49 Sunset. On this approach, establish the
 Renewable Cluster Program. The committee recommends that the bill be passed as amended.
 Excuse me. That the bill passed. Thank you so much. So much amendment on the on the brain.
 Okay, Councilman Peterson, you're the chair of this committee. How many handed over to you to
 walk us through this report? Thank you. Council President Council 120160 authorizes an innovative
 new program to encourage development of additional sources of clean and renewable energy. This
 program, called Renewable Plus, has been carefully crafted by Seattle City Life, and the committee
 unanimously recommended its approval. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember Peterson, are
 there any comments on the bill hearing? None. Well, the clerk's office called the roll on the passage
 of. So what? Yes. Strauss Herbold. Yes. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Mr.. I. Peterson.
 Yes. President Gonzales. I. I am in favor and oppose. The bill passed. Those in the chair will sign it
 with a courtesy to fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Will the clerk please read the
 short title of item seven into the. Record and item seven Capital 12017 be relating to the City
 Department authorizing General Manager and Chief Executive Officer of City Light to establish and
 fund an early action Skagit Habitat Enhancement Program. The committee recommends the bill
 pass. Item three, Catskill 120 172 Relating to city employment, commonly referred to as the third
 quarter 2021 employmen

t ordinance, the attorney positions the Civil Service System and amended classification titles. The
 committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much. As Chair of the committee, I'll provide
 the committee report and then open the floor to comments if there are any colleagues. This item
 passed unanimously out of committee last week. I have talked about this council bill I think about

three times now to all of you. So once again, it is routine legislation regarding third quarter city employment of all of our central staff provided the full council, including members of the committee, a detailed memo on all of the particulars related to this Technical Council bill, and I don't have anything else to add to this Council Bill that I haven't already said. So I'm going to go ahead and leave it there and ask if there are any additional comments on the bill. Hearing none. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? So what? Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbert. Yes. Lawrence. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Let's get it. Hi. Hi. President Gonzalez. Hi. Nine in favor and unopposed. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will Clark, please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Well, the clerk please read item four into the record. Report of the Public Safety and Human Services Committee agenda item for Council Bill 120 142 relating to the Seattle Police Department prohibiting trainee exchanges in partnership with certain governments and adding a new section 2.20 8.1 41 to set limits for code the committee recommends the bill passes the matter with council members for both moral lessons to watch Agenda Item 14 Council Bill 120 163 We into the city of Seattle, right of way along the central waterfront designated portions of Alaskan way Elliot way relevant bay and Union Street as Park Boulevard Committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much. Going to hand it over to Councilmember Juarez, who is the chair of the committee and is going to provide this committee report. Thank you. Council president. As the clerk stated, that bill will do that and it also authorizes the transfer of the jurisdiction that will preside over these portions of those right of way from the Seattle Department of Transportation to the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation. Still, Parks and Recreation is better positioned to lead consistent maintenance operation and enforcement to activate this area of the entire for the entire city. On September 7th, the Public Assets and Native Communities Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the city confirm this legislation. Thank you. Thank you. Councilmember suarez, any additional comments on the bill? I'm not seeing any hands raised. So with that being said, will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill? So what? Yes. STROUSE Yes. HERBOLD Yes. Suarez Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Morales. A mosquito i. Peterson hi. President Gonzalez, I nine. I'm favoring unopposed. The bill passes and

the chair will sign it. Well, the clerk sees a fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Well, look, please read the short title of items 15 and 16 into the record agenda. Agenda Item ten Council Bill 1 to 0 175 Authorizing Seattle Public Utilities to execute agreements under RTW 78.1 40.0 44 Projects and programs to prevent water pollution. Using green stormwater infrastructure and other nature based approaches, the committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. They handed back over to Councilmember Peterson to walk us through this report. Thank you. Council President Castro. 120175 authorizes additional stormwater management partnerships as allowed by state law by encouraging additional green stormwater infrastructure. This program would expand our tools for managing our city's stormwater runoff to help prevent pollution of our waterways. Committee unanimously recommended approval. Thank you. Thank you so much, colleagues. Any comments on the bill hearing? None. Will the clerk please call the will on the passage of the bill? Why, yes. Stroud has. Purple. Ex. Suarez. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. S let's get to high. Paterson high. President Gonzalez. I nine in favor. Nine opposed the bill passes and the terrible sign up bill the clerk sees affixed my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Well, the clerk please read item 11 into the record. Agenda item 11 Council Vote 1201 71,000,000,002. Surveillance Technology Implementation Authorizing Approval of uses and accepting surveillance impact reports for the Seattle Fire Department's use of emergency scene cameras and hazardous materials cameras. The committee recommends the bill passed as amended. President Gonzalez? Yes. Eight in favor. Nine opposed. The motion carries in. The appointments are confirmed. Will the clerk please read item 19 into the record of Report of the Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee Agenda Item 19 Council Bill 120 153 Relating to land use and zoning at a new section 22.40 9.1 67. To challenge the code to provide alternative development standards for small lots located in downtown mixed residential zones, the committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you so much because member Strauss, you are the chair of the committee and I'm going to hand it over to you to provide the committee report once again. There is one known amendment to this underlying council bill that will address the Bass bill first and then move to the amendment. I think you council president. This legislation modifies development standards for small lots and build time to encourage development and to allow for the use of innovative construction methods like modular and penalize construction. For years, small one and two parcel lots and Belltown have been identified as being infeasible to

develop due to the size constraints of these sites and the development standards for the neighborhood. This legislation does not increase the development capacity of the sites, but shifts setbacks and massing requirements

to allow building shapes that enable modular construction where units essentially must be stacked from above after being built offsite. Modular construction is more sustainable and costs less to build owing to the offsite fabrication of these units. I support Councilmember Lewis's amendment and I urge colleagues for a yes vote. Thank you, council president as a community report. Thank you so much. Okay. I'm going to hand it over to Councilmember Lewis to make his motion to put Amendment One before us. And then after he makes his motion, I will ask for a second. Councilman Lewis. Thank you, Madam President. I move Amendment one to Council Bill 120153 seconds. Okay. It's been seconded. This much has been moved and seconded to amend Council Bill 120153 is presented on Amendment one. Because, Mr. Lewis, I know you already spoke to this during council briefing, but why don't you go ahead and walk us through Amendment One again. Thank you, Madam President. No need to go too deeply into this. Given my comments this morning, though, I will just think again, the community members who brought this amendment forward and had it further refined by our partners over at the Department of Planning, as well as the Seattle Department of Construction Inspections and Noah on in the Strauss office, who was helpful in assisting Parker Dawson in my office in cobbling this amendment together over the course of the last few days. The amendment, as I mentioned earlier, is designed to put in some accommodation and recognition of some of the existing development and setback standards in the Belltown neighborhood. It would revise the current bill to limit building width to 95 feet rather than 100 feet. It would also require setbacks to make sure that there's suitable space for light and pedestrian traffic in between some of the structures that would be built under this incentive legislation. As I mentioned this morning, it does have the support of the departments as well as Councilmember Strauss, as he just indicated. So I appreciate this as a testament to the value of people calling in for public comment and sending us emails, it does lead to material differences in legislation at times. So thank you so much and looking forward to just move on this amendment and proceed to the underlying bill so much. Casimir Lois, are there any additional comments on Amendment One? Hearing? None. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of Amendment One? Strauss. Yes. Herbold as. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Macheda I. Peterson. All right. So what? Yes. President Gonzalez. Yes. Eight in favor. None. Oppose. The motion carries. Any amendment is adopted. Are there any further comments on the bill as amended? Because my address is already letting me know that he does not have any closing remarks. So with that being said, debate is now closed on the bill as amended. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the amended Bill Strauss?

Yes. Purple. Yes. Lewis. Yes. Morales. That's Macheda. Hi, Petersen. Hi. So one. Yes. President Gonzalez? Yes. Eight is in favor and unopposed. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Well, please read item 11 into the record. Agenda Item 33 Council Bill 120203 An ordinance relating to the levy of property taxes, fixing the rates and or amounts of taxes to be levied and levying the same upon all taxable property, both real and personal, in the City of Seattle, to finance the departments and activities of the city government and to provide for the general obligation , bond, interest and redemption requirements for the year, beginning on the first day of January 2022 and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass with council members Macheda Herbal, Gonzalez, Suarez, Lewis, Morales and Strauss in favor and Councilmember Peterson abstaining. Thank you so much. Okay. Are there any comments on Council Bill 120203. Item three three. He kind of comments on agenda item 33. Hearing none. Will the clerk please call the roll on the passage of Council Bill 120203. Agenda item 30. 321. Yes. Strauss Strouse. Yes. Yes. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. I. Peterson. I. Council. President Gonzalez. I nine in favor and unopposed. So much council bill 120203 Agenda item 33 passes and the chair will sign it. Please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Will the clerk please read the title of item 34 into the record? Agenda Item 34 Council Bill 120204 An ordinance authorizing the levy of regular property taxes by the City of Seattle for collection Agenda Item 24 Resolution 32022. A resolution approving interest rates set by the Seattle City Employees Retirement System Board of Administration for 2022. The committee recommends City Council adopt the resolution with council

members Macheda Herbold, Gonzalez, Suarez, Lewis, Morales and Strauss in favor and Councilmember Peterson abstaining. Thank you so much. Are there any comments on resolution 32022? Agenda item 24. Looking for any comments on agenda item 24, if any see no hands raised with the court, please call the role on the adoption of resolution 32022. Agenda item 24. So on. Strauss. Yes. Verbal. Yes. Whereas I. LEWIS. Yes. Morales Yes. ROSQUETA. I, Peterson. I counsel President Gonzalez. I remain in favor and I oppose. Thank you so much. Resolution 32022. Item 24 is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the person please affix my signature piece of legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read the title of item 25 into the record? Agenda Item 25 Resolution 32023. A resolution amending Resolution 31334 establishing the City Council's intent to fund the Seattle City Employees Retirement System as informed by the January 1st, 2021 actuarial study. The committee recommends the bill pass. Excuse me. Thank you. Resolution 32024. Agenda item 11 is adopted. Mature wi

ll sign. It will fix my signature to the legislation on my behalf. Will the clerk please read the title of item 12 into the Record Gender Item 12 Council Bill 120190 An Ordinance relating to fees and charges for permits and activities of the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections related fees by the other Departments and Technical Corrections Committee. Recommend City Council Pass a Council Bill with Councilmembers Macheda, Herbold, Gonzalez, Suarez, Lewis Morales and Strauss in favor and Councilmember Peterson abstaining. Thank you so much. Are there any comments on Council Bill 1 to 0 190? Agenda item 12. Agenda Item 12. Any comments on that council bill? Not seen any hands raised so well. The police called the role in the passage of Council Bill 120190. Agenda Item 12. One. Yes. Strauss. Yes. For both. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Skinner. I. Peterson. I. Council President Gonzalez. High nine in favor an unopposed council. Bill 120190. Just agenda item 12 passes and the chair will sign it. Will the please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read the title of item 13 into the record? Agenda Item 13 Council Bill 120191 An ordinance relating to street and sidewalk use amending the street use fee schedule authorized by Agenda Item 14 Council Bill 120192 An ordinance relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation establishing the 2022 fee schedule for the use of park properties and other park and recreation facilities and services and superseding previous park and recreation fee schedules. The Committee recommends the City Council pass the Council bill with councilmembers mosquito Herbold, Gonzalez, Suarez, Lewis Morales and Strauss in favor and Councilmember Peterson abstaining. Thank you so much. Are there any comments on Council Bill 1 to 0 one nine to agenda item 14. Agenda item 14. Looking for any comments on agenda item 14. I don't see any hands raised. So will the Court please call the role on the passage of Council Bill 1 to 0 one nine to agenda item 14. It's a warrant. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Herbold. S whereas i. Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. I. Peterson. All right. Council President Gonzales. I. Nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you so much. Council Bill 120192 Agenda item 14 passes and the chair will sign it. Will Kirklees affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Will the clerk please read the title of item 15 into the record? Agenda Item 15 Council Bill 120193 An ordinance relating to Seattle Parks and Recreation authorizing an administrative amendment to Ordinance 115859, which established the Beach Maintenance Trust Fund as a subsidiary fund of the Shoreline Park Improvement Fund. Which fund was established by Ordinance 115496 as part of the settlement agreement with the Municipality of Metropolitan excuse me Municipality of Agenda item three Council Bill 120231. An ordinance relating to city employment authorizing the execution of an agreement between the City of Seatt

le and Seattle. Fire Chiefs Association. International Association of Firefighters, Local 2898 and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. Thank you so much. I'd love to ask Council Bill 12 0231 0 seconds again thank you. And moved and seconded aspects of the bill in the absence of the sponsor council president Gonzalez. Councilmember Mosquito will address this item that has been referred directly to. Thank you very much. Council President Pro Tem Council 1120231. Authorizes the execution of an agreement between the City of Seattle and the Seattle Fire Chiefs Association, International Association of Firefighters. I f f Local 2898. Specifically, the legislation will authorize additional pay for eligible frontline employees represented by Local 2898. Under the terms of this agreement, eligible employees would receive a. Lump payment. Sum total of \$100 a month, pro-rated by the number of hours the employees worked at each city work site retroactive to March 2020. This benefit is consistent with the additional pay for many other city workers, including those

in the coalition of city unions per legislation that was adopted by the Council in October via ordinance 120186. The mayor's office expects to transmit separate legislation that appropriates funding needed to make the payment of payment contemplated in this legislation. Council President Urges a Yes Vote. All right. Thank you so much, Mr. Musk. Are there any additional comments on this legislation? Right. Seeing none. You call the role on the passive level. Whereas I. Lewis. Yes. Macheda. I. Peterson, I want. Yes. Strauss. Yes. Council president pro tem. Honorable. Yes. Seven in favor. Men opposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. The clerk, please, affects my signature to the legislation on my behalf and for what is read item four and for the record. Agenda item two The Report of the Public Assets and Homelessness Committee Council Bill 120264 an ordinance relating to permits and Parks stating a maximum term for permits and Parks clarifying the nature of permissible commercial activities and parks and amending sections. 18.1 to 2.030. 18.1 2.042 and 18.1 2.160 of the Seattle Municipal Code. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Councilmember Lewis, it's all you. Thank you so much, Madam President. Hopefully, this can be a comparatively brief agenda item. Council Bill 120264 is aptly described by the title of the legislation. We heard a great presentation in committee last week from the Parks Department on the need to have a clearer regime to define what commercial activity might be in a park, and to have some kind of system to regulate the extent to which there can be allowed commercial activity, both in terms of the time and the space that that takes up in a public park going forward. So for the first time, this legislation creates a definition of what is considered commercial activity. To give a couple of examples of the kinds of activity p

arks has in mind that they would like to be able to facilitate with some level of consideration. And to do only permit would be something like an exercise class or a yoga class or some kind of mild food concession that might be seasonal. So some examples that were given were the food truck pilot for permitting in Westlake Park, which has been a fairly common occurrence over the last couple of years in the downtown core and potentially having services similar to that on a seasonal basis and some other parks around the city. This legislation was passed unanimously out of committee with five councilmembers voting in favor and nine opposed. And I am happy to move the legislation. Is there a second, second rate? Are there any other comments regarding Councilmember Lewis's legislation? Not seeing or hearing none. Will the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill? Want? Yes. Strauss. Yes. LEWIS Yes. Morales Yes. MACHEDA All right. Nelson, I. Peterson. I. Council President Juarez. I. I didn't favor none of those. Thank you. Before we move on to a chairman and other businesses, I have a few comments I want to make that I had been hoping that I would not have to make at this point, but apparently it looks like I. Moving forward as a point of order, this council president will have an exercise and hopefully you will all recognize my quote unquote, my virtual gavel that it will mute us. I am going to rely on our colleagues to abide by all rules, hold us accountable to rules, behavior, and courtesy of decorum, civility and basic kindness. The members are reminded that it is never in order to make personal remarks or attacks. The members are reminded that colleagues will not attack or question the integrity or motives of other colleagues. And the members are reminded that we will not be discourteous to each other or make personal and insulting remarks. I'm hoping that going forward as council president, that we instill a safe place, a kind place, so the rest of the city can see that we are a functioning council. They can agree to, agree to disagree and still move forward for this great city. Again, I will use the point of order and I will mute us if indeed this Council President feels that we are not following those basic rules of decency and debate to our colleagues. So with that colleagues, this concludes our items of business today. Our next regularly scheduled city council meeting is on February 15th two, and I hope you all have a great afternoon. Thank you, Madam President. Yes. Sorry. I did have a good of the order item. I apologize. But just briefly, I would like to ask to be excused from the March 20 seconds and 29 Council meetings. Tuesday to Thursday Senate March due to Tuesdays to Tuesdays. Okay. Well, let's do this then. Well, I do not have my script here, so I'm just going to have to do it from memory. It seems that Council member Lewis would like to be excused. Are there any is there any opposition or concerns or comments that you would

d like to share with Mr. Lewis on why he cannot be excused on those two Tuesdays? Hearing or seeing none. You were indeed excused. Mr. Lewis. Thank you, Madam President. Sorry for just jumping in there. That's right. It's. That's how I like it. Just jump right on in. Let me know. I have no problem being told when I'm wrong. Thank you. Agenda item 13, Resolution 3 to 0 44, modifying

resolution 31938 and the March 14th, 2020. Emergency order relating to residential evictions. Thank you. Counselor. So, one sponsor, you were recognized to move this item. Thank you. Do I have to move the item or to. Mention that you. Are recognized and then you move it and then somebody will second it for you? Okay. I move the resolution to extend the eviction moratorium. That we resolution 32044. It's its second for council councilmember. So on. Again. It's been moved and seconded to adopt Resolution 32044 councilors who want you were recognized in order to address this resolution. Thank you. President Juarez, this is a resolution that extends Seattle's eviction moratorium to the end of our city's COVID emergency. The losing home report commissioned by the Seattle Women's Commission in 2017 found that those facing eviction are disproportionately black, working class renters and other communities of color. The report also found that nearly nine out of ten people who are evicted become homeless. As we know, homelessness is an absolutely devastating, alienating and dangerous experience. When you are homeless, your physical and mental health suffers and you are vulnerable to violence. The women in Black held a vigil earlier this month. They report that, quote, The first King County medical examiner's list of presumed homeless temporarily housed that of 2022, arrived this week and was horrible. Horrible. At least 21 homeless, temporarily housed men died outside or in public in King County just in January and upwards. There has been vitally important progress with COVID vaccinations, and as a result, cases are declining. However, the reality is that the fatality rate from COVID is still frighteningly high. In fact, the daily fatality rate is still nearly as high as during the peaks of earlier waves of the pandemic. Ending the eviction moratorium now would lead to a deadly wave of evictions and increased homelessness in the midst of this ongoing crisis. And when someone is addicted, they are suddenly unable to self-quarantine, placing themselves and the community at large at risk. Mayor Howell's decision to end the eviction moratorium is, in reality, a plan to allow the eviction of thousands of working class renters in Seattle. This is inhumane and unacceptable. According to this month's U.S. Census Bureau Household Pulse survey. An estimated 133,000 Seattle metro area renters are behind on rent. Even before the pandemic, conditions for renters in Seattle had already become intolerable. Skyrocketing rents driven by predatory real estate speculation, forced many working clas

s renters out of their homes, out of the city or into homelessness. The economic devastation triggered by the pandemic massively exacerbated that crisis. The real estate lobby has claimed that renters rights are somehow the cause of increased rent, but that is the exact opposite of what the data show. Rent. Rent started skyrocketing in Seattle long before any new renters rights laws were passed. Rents have been spiking across the country and in cities around the world because real estate speculation is a nationwide and a global economic trend. What these steeply rising rents show is that we must fight for and win rent control and major expansion of social housing funded by taxes on the wealthy. Without doubt, every rental right we win is only buying time until the next rent hike. As I've said, I am committed to bringing comprehensive rent control legislation this year. The landlord lobby has also claimed that renters rights are causing landlords to sell their rental properties. Let's be real. Landlords are selling real family single family homes because the prices they can sell them for have gone through the roof, not because they have to give more notice for rent increases. Of course, I can see why giving any rights to renters is a concern for Windermere property management and real estate billionaires like George Petrie , who is a CEO of Goodman Real Estate, Seattle's most evicting landlord in 2019. But as far as our city's hundreds of thousands of working people are concerned, these are only basic protections they need in order to have somewhere to live. I also want to respond to questions about the so-called or comment about the so-called bad tenants. Eviction is not the only recourse that landlords have, and that is the only thing that this moratorium prevents. Violence is illegal regardless of whether someone is a renter, homeowner or landlord. Landlords have many legal options to collect rental. That's not just eviction. We live in a society that is unfortunately full of punishments for the poor. The eviction moratorium simply prevents people from being thrown out on the streets during a pandemic. And I am genuinely struck by the fear mongering about working class renters. That being done by landlords, quite frankly, it is not unlike Trump's attacks on immigrants as violent and Reaganesque, racist and anti-poor welfare queen arguments that were used to eviscerate social services in the eighties and the nineties. The speed with which the political establishment is moving to open the eviction floodgates is scandalous. The city of Seattle is still in a state of emergency. This council meeting is being held remotely to protect the health of council members. Working class renters and the poor

deserve at least the same consideration. Across the country, big business is eager to end any pandemic restriction that limits their profits. In this case, those profits are counter posed to both the health and the very lives of renters, and I urge council

members to decide what side they are on. Mayor Harrell and other Democratic Party politicians have attempted to justify a. Think the eviction moratorium by referencing past victories, victories that were won by renter movements such as rental assistance funds and defenses against eviction. In certain situations, those victories are important, and my office has sponsored and co-sponsored many and fought for all of them. But they are no substitute for extending the lifeline of the eviction moratorium. As long as the pandemic public health emergency remains. A moratorium means that renters cannot be sent to eviction court, which is far stronger than a defense to eviction, which only means that renters can defend themselves in eviction court to avoid eviction. That is a monumental difference because statistically, half of renters who are served eviction paperwork are unable to challenge the eviction in court and consequently are evicted by default. If that happens, even a watertight eviction defense opportunity does not keep a roof over your head because you never had your day in court. And as we all know very well, this disproportionately happens to the most vulnerable renters. I want to end my opening remarks by calling in Coleman and Christy Templeton, landlords who wrote to the city council saying, quote, Please help relieve suffering and keep the eviction moratorium until the emergency is over. And, quote, I will come back in to close the discussion because the council rules clearly state that the sponsor of the legislation speaks first and also last before the voting. I urge council members to vote yes. Thank you. Thank you. Council members want and with that, are there any comments? Casper Herbert I'm sure I would request that the rules be suspended to consider an amendment not lifted by 12 noon today. Thank you, Councilor. If there is no objection, the Council will relating to circulation of amendments 2 hours before the City Council meeting will be suspended to allow consideration of an amendment. Thank you so much. I move to amend resolution 3 to 0 four for an Exhibit E of the resolution AS and on the recently submitted amendment. Again. It has been moved and seconded that the Council will be suspended, so we will proceed with Council Member Herbert's motion to amend cancel her book. Go ahead. Thank you so much. And so this amendment extends the moratorium and April 30th, in order to allow the council consider all set of measures that have been unable to pay their rent financial hardship. I at all. We have heard from small landlords about losing funds, fighting to stop operating rent, housing or suffering other real harms associated with the eviction moratorium. Often the work that we as policymakers do is using to address greater harm or lesser harms. This is one of those times. Nearly 46,000 households have applied for rental assistance throughout the county. Again, these are primarily county numbers that you can extrapolate about. Abo

ut Seattle, so far, about 17,400 households received assistance during the second round of the program. And then for all the applications closed and the money is spent on, he expects about 7000 to 8000 tenants throughout the county will be left without assistance. We know that there is additional assistance in our funding for King County that will help serve some, but not all. About \$66 million in additional funding. And across the Seattle area, including all of you in Everett. We know that 13% of renters are still behind on rent, according to an early January census survey. That is 1000, 24,000 renters. The effects are disproportionate. And we know, of course, that renters of color are more likely to report being behind on rent. I think at my my offering of alternative amendments while still extending the moratorium and addresses one of the concerns with the moratorium as currently proposed on top of the protections that we have already enacted as described by Council Member. So what are concerns that an independently of extended moratorium could invite more lawsuits? And those lawsuits may not be limited to moratorium. They impact other pandemic related actions that we have enacted, and they could challenge the just cause eviction ordinance itself, a law that has Seattle tenants for decades. So unless and until the existing lawsuits are resolved and we can get more clarity on the legal landscape, I'm offering this alternative rather than an indefinite extension of the moratorium that could invite more litigation that could threaten other, older, more valuable protections. Thank you. Thank you. CARLSON Verbal. CARLSON must get a see. Your hand is up. Are you to you wanted to have comments to the proposed amendment? Yes. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Madam President, I did want to offer my support. I appreciate Councilmember Purple bringing amendment number one forward. I will be supporting this amendment. I'm also supportive of the underlying legislation as described by

the sponsor. I'm supportive of the amendment here today because I think it addresses the concerns as articulated by a councilmember for both the sponsor to make sure that we're protecting the legislation and allowing for the city to distribute the rental assistance dollars that we have on hand. I'll make a few comments, Madam President, and then I won't speak again about the underlying bill. Since I have the microphone briefly, I just wanted to recognize that there's a lot of factors that went into play, I'm sure, with this decision to both bring the eviction moratorium to a sunset. I know that that was probably a tough decision, but I also know that it's a tough decision for us to continue to look at the need out there and for the desire to make sure that we're addressing those needs due to the timing of the current eviction moratorium. I understand that there was an urgency to bring this resolution in front of us today, but I know that that came together quickly for various

reasons. I think that there are some policy considerations that have been discussed by Councilmember Herbal that I know that others have similar interest in helping. To make sure that we're looking at ways to extend the protections in place and to make sure that we're looking for solutions for vulnerable tenants. I think the resolution in front of us today is one of those some other policy considerations that I know folks are interested in looking at is certain considerations for small landlords on our move in conversations, ramp down options to make sure protections are in place when we anticipate a moratorium going away at some point in the future. But I have a lot of sympathy for some of those considerations. But the most important thing for me that I'm looking at, both with the amendment in front of us that I think, again, strengthens the approach here today. And the underlying bill is making sure that we get all of the rental assistance dollars out the door. There is still \$25 million to be spent from the rental assistance amount, 59 million that was allocated throughout last year. And importantly, for any small landlords who are out there concerned about the ability to pay their bills, 96% of those rental assistance dollars have gone directly to landlords. So I hope that does dispel any misinformation out there about landlords not being able to access that. What we want to do is make sure that all of those dollars get into the hands of especially the smallest landlords or the past few weeks as well. And want to note that I've been reaching out to our state legislative partners, asking for more rental assistance dollars for Seattle, and hoping that our state budget and our champions in the state legislature will help provide a dollars to King County that get passed through to our city. We've also been in communication with the Office of Housing to get the remaining rental assistance out the door as fast as possible. Again, that's \$25 million that the council authorized in our 2022 budget that we'd like to see spent a.S.A.P. And know that we need much more than that as well, especially if the moratorium is to go away. I want to thank folks like Chief Seattle Club, El Centro de la Raza, United Way of King County have been working very hard with other community partners to get those dollars out the door. But until folks have those dollars in hand, I'm concerned about the eviction moratorium going away and look forward to supporting the excuse me, I look forward to supporting this amendment and would also be a yes on the bill, given the various reasons that I noted above. And and also note, this is this is just part of the solution as we look forward to getting the \$194 million from council's budget passed for housing out the door and implemented to make sure that there's more affordable housing options across our city. Thank you very much. And thanks to councilmember horrible for bringing this for. Thank you councilmember skate under 10 m

inutes to thank you. I see that Councilor Sawant has her hand up and then Councilmember Peterson customers. Thank you. Just speaking in response to the amendment, I will be voting no on the amendment renders. I have lived in constant fear of the end of the moratorium through several three month extensions of the moratorium than one month and two weeks. Either there is an emergency or there isn't, and in my view, the moratorium is justified as long as there is an emergency. However, I also want to be clear that if this resolution passes with a two month extension, then that will be vastly better than the resolution not passing at all better for the renters who are the most vulnerable and suffering. It will give renters two more months to get back on their feet, and it will also give renters rights movement another opportunity to fight to extend the moratorium in two months time if the pandemic emergency has not ended by then. So I will vote no on this amendment. But regardless of whether this amendment passes or fails, I really urge council members to vote yes on the resolution as a whole. Thank you. Thank you. Councilors want Councilor Peterson. Thank you, Council President. Just to clarify, is this the first we have to vote on suspending the rules? We already did that. We suspended the rules to allow council over her vote

to bring forward her amendments. I thought we did. Did we not? Yeah, we did. Okay. So I'm just now seeing this amendment. It looks like this circulated while a council meeting was going on. And as I understand it, it would be would amend council members to wants resolution to April 30th. And I guess the question is seems to be about nine and a half weeks from now. And is there any sort of rational basis for that particular date of April 30th? Are you asking that question of Council member Herbold I. Think so, yes. A council referral did give an introduction of why she was doing what she's doing because we're herbal. Do you want to respond to Councilmember Peterson? Q Yes, in addition to as I described, the start of the description of the amendment will allow the Council to consider all set of measures to tenants that have been unable pay their rent, financial hardship, some of the things that ideas that Councilmember Mosqueda described in her her remarks. In addition, it is, as we discussed earlier today, the date is more closely tied. You'll see there's some some like some updated language, the recitals more closely tied to the health impacts of of the pandemic. And yes, I'm sorry for getting the amendment late. As you know, we had an executive session at 1:00 that ran right up to the to the 2:00 deadline. And I really wanted to have the benefit of the advice that we got in that executive session in order to craft this amendment. Thank you. If he calls for her bill, does that answer your question, Councilmember Peterson? Great. Okay. So with that, not seen any more hands raised. Well, the clerk, please call the roll on the

adoption of the amendment to the resolution and exhibit C. Councilmember Herbold? Yes. Councilmember Lewis. No. Council member macheda i. Council member Nelson. No. Councilmember Peterson. Oh. Councilmember Swan. No. Councilmember Strauss. Yes. Council. President Suarez. No. Three in favor, five opposed. So with that, the motion fails. The meeting is not adopted. So with that, now we're going to go on to the base legislation. This is where you have an opportunity. Council members, as Councilman Stewart rightly pointed out. She will close us on this on this last piece of legislation. Are there any council members that want to address the base legislation as it has before us? Before the final vote. Okay. Not seen. Oh, I'm sorry. Nope. No hands. Okay, so with that, then I have something to say. And then after that, Keltner Excellent. Will close this out. But, Counselor Strauss, your hand is up. No, thank you. Thank you. Council President Juarez colleagues, I assume that everyone will be jumping at the line. So I held my hand for a moment. I just want to highlight, as others have highlighted here, a number of other defenses that we have put forward, the six month defense, the repayment plan, the failure to pay defense. I think what is very clear for me in this conversation is that we don't have enough rental assistance and we don't have a good step down process from the cliff that the moratorium is creating. A moratorium is not a good long term solution. And while I could support a moratorium that was connected to it date, certainly I do have trouble supporting and voting for a moratorium that is vague in its end date because I do think that we want to understand what the cliff we are facing is and address it with the resources that are needed. So I know that this legislation was crafted in short order over a. Holiday weekend. And we just received an amendment during the during the meeting. And in that time type I. Short timeframe does not allow for the different options to be fully vetted. So our council president, colleagues, I won't be supporting the resolution today. And they will be bringing forward more. Protections and resources alongside each of you as we move forward. Thank you, Council president, colleagues. Thank you. That being said, in anticipation, as Councilmember Strauss pointed out, we had a three day weekend and we did receive a memo and a legal memo last week and some additional information. And thank you customers to want for your office for getting the information to us. Councilmember It's nice to have someone to take. Okay, so I'm going to speak and then when I'm done, then Councilor Swan is going to speak and then we're going to vote. Okay, good. So when the COVID 19 pandemic hit, the city council and the mayor were leaders in passing protections for passing protections of renters. We were one of the first in the country to understand the gravity of the economic recession, especially for low income renters. Just 13 days after

Mayor Durkan passed the proclamation of civil emergency, she issued an emergency order placing a temporary moratorium on residential evictions. But the key word is temporary. We knew this moratorium would not last forever. We cannot have a healthy economy when nobody pays rent. With that in mind, the interim. In the interim, the city council's focus has been to create as many protections as possible. It's certainly harking back to a casserole ROSQUETA had shared with us in her comments. Kent County has allocated \$340 million in funding for struggling renters, according

to the Department of Community and Human Services. King County has processed nearly 40,000 applications since the program began early in the pandemic and has handed out more than 244 million to help keep renters housed and landlords paid. According to the Stsci. The city has allocated \$59 million for rental assistance during the COVID 19 pandemic. Thank you to Director Tara Wilson of the Department of Construction and Expansion Inspections CCI for sharing all the ways in which the city of Seattle supports renters, including free legal assistance from the Housing Justice Project and assistance for rent and utility payments due to COVID hardships. Most all of you received, I believe, Friday, a memo from Director Robertson on the issues of what the renters rights are and what programs are available. I don't have that at my fingertips right now. Here is a non-exhaustive list of some of the protections that we have passed in the last two years. I had my staff at least just briefly go over the work that this city council and the former mayor's office had done. Just within the COVID period, beginning in February 2020, the city council passed Council Bill 119726 prohibiting evictions in winter months in March of 2020. An emergency order went into effect, placing an immediate and temporary moratorium on residential evictions in the city of Seattle in May of 2020. The council passed an ordinance 126075 providing a defense to evictions occurring within six months after the termination of the mayor's residential eviction moratorium. In May 2020, the Council adopted a repayment plan requirement via ordinance 126081 in March of 2021. The Council Bill the Council passed Council Bill 120007 providing a right to counsel for all low income tenants facing eviction and June 20, 2021. The Council passed Council Bill 120046 providing a defense to certain evictions of children, their families and educators during the school year. Thank you, Casper Resort, for bringing that forward. In June of 2021, Council created a defense to an eviction action. The tenant fails to pay rent during the proclamation of civil emergency order via ordinance 126368 in November 2021. The Seattle City Council again allocated funding for two additional supports. That is for Stsci, which added staff in a position to implement the Economic Displacement Relocation Assistance Ordinance and SSI 011b001, which added 400,000 for tenant

service contracts like eviction, defense. The 400,000 was added to baseline investments of about 615,000 for tenant service grants, including eviction, legal defense bills or budget actions that were passed in November 22nd, 2021, under the leadership of Councilmember Mosquera. Additionally and just this just a history here. The Just Cause eviction ordinance passed in 1980 states that the Seattle landlords must have one of 16 just cause reasons if they want to terminate a tenancy. And we've added to that. Thank you council members so want your leadership in that area. All of this just to say we have been preparing for this moment for a long time. Seattle is one of two municipalities with an existing ban on evictions. Mayor Durkan and Mayor Harrell have extended the eviction moratorium together a total of nine times. Governor Inslee's protections lapsed on October 31st, 2021, and given that COVID cases continue to decline, it's probably now time for Seattle to do the same. However, while eviction proceedings will start, folks will still have another six months to pay back their outstanding rent payments so people can pay back rent over time. I'm hoping and I believe in the voters and the residents of this city that we will make this transition as humane as possible about exasperating our homelessness crisis and yet balancing the needs of our recovering economy. And with that, I will be voting no on this matter. Councilmember So what would you like to wrap up this debate? Yes. Thank you. President Juarez, I want you to clarify that for renters and working people who are watching that, I do not think that many of the council members, as has been just said, who voted no on the amendment that just got voted on, share my position of why I voted no on that and are very likely to be voting no on this resolution, the resolution that would leave the eviction moratorium in place until the end of the public health emergency. This is really unfortunate. I also find it quite unfortunate and pretty stunning that there are council members who are complaining about the short time frame when we have had renters who have dealt with enormous uncertainty during an unprecedented crisis. Every time the eviction moratorium was up for either expiring or renewal and we had to deal with tremendous uncertainty and difficulties for a since before the pandemic. In Meirelles press release, he said that he identified \$25 million for rental assistance, which makes it sound like there is \$25 million being added to the funds available to rental assistance. Let's make a note of the fact across the U.S. there were \$46.5 billion in federal rental assistance money. Some of that went to the city of Seattle, some to Washington State County. And that money has been periodically available for renters and for landlords to pay down rental that has been absolutely essential to keep renters from becoming totally bankrupted by the crisis. However, the impact of the pandemic has been monument

al and that money has is running out and it was never adequate in the first place. We just saw the Seattle Times reported that King County has announced it is going to stop taking any new applications for rental assistance starting February 20. So basically, renters eviction moratorium is about to expire. That's when new applications are also not going to be accepted. So when mayor says that he has identified \$25 million, what it actually means is that there is only \$25 million left, not that there are additional \$25 million being added. I want to thank the Church Council of Greater Seattle, who strongly supported this resolution to extend the eviction moratorium. They said, quote, We came into being on the heels of the influenza pandemic of 1918 19, just like 100 years ago. We are facing a pandemic that has disrupted and ended many lives among our loved ones and in our communities, end quote. Most of all, I wanted to thank all the renters and housing advocates, the progressive labor unions and community organizations who have spoken up in favor of extending the eviction moratorium. Renters, working people, union members. Socialists. We see again and again that we cannot rely on the establishment. Several of the renters, like the president was just right read out, as she also acknowledged, came from the fight that renters in our Socialist Council office let on. And every single one that was you know, that had different council members sponsoring them was one because renters were fighting back, including the eviction moratorium in the first place. And even the federal games that were put in place, at least temporarily, to deal with a pandemic, that was because people spoke up nationally. So, you know, it is clear that from today's vote, it's going to be clear that working people cannot rest and we will need to fight back and we cannot rely on the establishment. And furthermore, it is not going to be enough to agitate around the eviction moratorium. QUESTION We will need stronger and permanent protections like a citywide strong rent control policy. We will need to increase the fight to win an increase in the Amazon tax, to have a massive expansion of publicly owned, high quality union build social housing. All of this is going to be necessary. I'll just end by noting how stunning it is that only about an hour or so ago, the same council members were about to vote no on this resolution, signed a proclamation on Black History Month, getting ready to essentially pave the way for vulnerable black community members to be evicted in big numbers and to the point that has been brought up by several landlords and also from council members earlier. No, the evictions don't start showing up on day one, but they are going to happen. We are already seeing data from the Princeton University eviction lab that monitors that is monitoring evictions in 31 different cities. That evictions have spiked as soon as the eviction moratoriums were ended, just that they take

a little bit of time showing up to the courts, which is the most unfriendly way for ordinary people because they don't even get their day in court in the first place. Most of them evictions will restart in seven days and more and more than ever. We need to build this movement for rent control and for expanding social housing. So I urge people to continue fighting back and also remember not to rely on the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party at the state level has sat on a statewide ban on rent control for the last 41 years, including during this legislative session when not one state legislature proposed. Legislative proposed. Lifting the ban on rent control despite the Democrats controlling all three houses in the state government. And so we cannot do that. But on the other hand, if we build a strong enough movement began when we have seen that again and again, we in 2018, we tried to pass legislation to tax big corporations like Amazon, but our movement was not strong enough to win them. And it got repealed. Or two years later, in the midst of the Black Lives Matter protest, the tax Amazon movement gathered 30,000 signatures on a possible ballot initiative. And then we succeeded in passing that measure four times the size of the first one proposed in 2018. We're going to lose this vote today. But I urge everyone fighting for renters rights to continue building the movement alongside our office and alongside progressive labor unions. Because when we fight, we can win. Thank you. Most of us want. Thank you. Thank you very much. All right. So we have now finished debate council member still wants resolution. She close this on the debate. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution? Council member Herbold. Yes. Council Member Lewis NOW. Council Member Macheda I. Council Member Nelson. No. Council member Petersen. No. Council member. So what? Yes. Council member Strauss. No. Council. President suarez. No. Three in favor. Five opposed. With that. The motion fails and the resolution is not adopted. So before we move on here, one can just hold up two other business. Are there is there any other further business to come before the council today? Not seen any hands before we journey, colleagues. This does conclude this items of business on today's agenda for next regularly

scheduled council meeting is on March 1st at 2:00. I hope you have a wonderful afternoon. We are adjourned. Thank you. Agenda item three, Resolution three, 2043 declaring the intention of the City Council to hold a public hearing relating to the changing the assessment rate for the Seattle Tourism Improvement Area. Thank you, Madam Clerk. I move to adopt resolution 32043. There a second. Second. It's been moved and seconded. Councilor Nelson. Thank you very much. Council President So the Seattle Tourism Improvement Area was established by Council in 2011 to help promote leisure tourism within Estes boundaries, which is the downtown core and waterfront stay r

ate. Players are hotels with more than 60 rooms and the current rate is \$2 per occupied room. Night stays. Ratepayer Advisory Board voted in January 2022 to approve an increase in the assessment rate to \$4 per occupied room to change assessment rates of a bia. R c. W 35.87 e requires that Council first adopt a resolution that states the city's intention to change the rate, describes the proposed change and sets the date and location for a public hearing on the proposal at least 15 days in advance of the hearing. So that's what resolution 3 to 0 for three debts. The RC W also requires that the public hearing resolution be published in the Daily Journal of Commerce and mailed to all potential ratepayers at least ten days prior to the hearing. The legislation that would effectuate the proposed assessment rate change. CB 120273 will be discussed in the March 9th Economic Development, Technology and City Light Committee meeting. The public hearing is scheduled for the following meeting on March 23rd for possible vote on that date. So that's the legislative process that we've got before us, and that's what Resolution 32043 actually does. As to the merits of the increase in the rate from \$2 to \$4 per occupied room night. This has the full support of the community, including the SGA membership and the hospitality industry that gets business from hotel guests. So, you know, Seattle hotels have fallen behind our neighboring cities in their ability to market themselves to visitors, whereas CEA has has had the same flat rate since 2011 over ten years. Portland's rate, for example, is 2% of the room rate. So as room prices increase, so does their marketing revenue. So this rate increase is one means to help our hotels recover from the pandemic and support the revitalization of our downtown core. And adoption of this resolution is the first step in that process. Are there any questions? Are there any crimes of Councilmember Nelson? Thank you. And I look forward to that because I know I'm the vice chair on your committee. So thank you, Councilmember Nelson. I don't see any questions or comments and no one's raising their hand. So with that, Madam Cleary, please call the roll. That's remember, Lewis? Yes. Councilmember Morales. This Council member must get up. I Council Member Nelson. I Council Member Petersen. I Council member Strauss. Yes. Council member herbals. Yes. And Council President Juarez. I eight in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The motion carries, the bill passes. And Madam Clerk, the chair will sign it. And Madam Slurpy, please affix my signature to the resolution. Thank you. All right. Let's move on to item number four. I see this is Councilmember Strauss. So, Madam Clerk, will you please read item into the record? Report of the Land Use Committee agenda item for a quick file. 314441 application of Wallace Properties Park at Northgate LLC for a contract result of a site located at 10735 Roosevelt, way northeast. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill p

asses. The chair will sign it. And will the clerk police affix my signature to the legislation. Our last item is from the Public Safety and Human Services Committee. Madam Clerk, will you please read it to the record? The report of the Public Safety and Human Services Committee. Agenda Item three Council Bill one 2277 relating to grant funds from non city sources authorizing the Seattle Police Department to accept specified grants and execute related agreements for and on behalf of the city. The meeting ordinance 126 490, which adopted the 2022 budget, changing appropriations to the Seattle Police Department and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Customer verbal. You so much as described in council briefings yesterday afternoon and discussed in the Public Safety and Human Services Committee last week. The bill accepts \$1.3 million in U.S. Department of Justice grants for funding to maintain two taskforces. The first is the Northwest Regional Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force, and the funding is to address technology facilitated child exploitation. The second task force is the Human Trafficking Task Force. These grants normally would have been included in a fourth quarter supplemental bill, but there was not a fourth quarter supplemental bill in 2021. And consequently, this bill is being put forward now. Thank you. ACU Council member Herbold. Are there any questions or comments that we have for Councilmember Herbold as chair of the

committee? All right. Not seeing any. Madam Clerk, will you please call the roll? As a member. Nester i. Councilmember Peterson. I. Councilmember Sawant. Yes. Councilmember Strouse. Yes. Councilmember Herbold. Yes. Councilmember Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. And Council President Juarez. I h in favor and in opposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation? So with that, I think we've covered our three items going into. Is there any other business before Steel City Council today? This afternoon? All right. Before we adjourn, colleagues, we will meet again March 22nd at 2:00. We are now adjourned. Thank you. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. And Madam Clerk, will you please do. Fixed my signature to the legislation. All right. Moving on to item number four. Looks like we have Councilmember Strauss again. Well, the clerk please read item number four, the short title into the record. Agenda item four Council Bill one 2265 relating to land use, regulation of home occupations extending six month interim development controls. The committee recommends that the bill pass. Its member Strauss. Thank you, Council President colleagues. This legislation extends the policies for home based businesses we adopted last year in the Bringing Business Home legislation. This six month extension will allow time for the departments to complete the work on p

ermanent regulations so that we don't rush to make conclusions and final regulations that we take the time necessary to make sure we get it right. As you may recall, the Bring Business Home legislation made it easier to operate a home based business during the pandemic by easing some of the restrictions on home based businesses, including the removing the limit of two nonresident employees of the business, removing the restriction that customers can only visit by appointment, and ending the requirement that businesses retain the appearance of a home and allowing for a slightly larger sign at home based businesses, while also closing the loophole that you could have many as many small signs as you wanted. During the past year, we've not I have not personally received complaints about home based businesses due to the changes in this Bring Business Home Bill. And I look forward to working over these next six months to make the right parts of this legislation permanent. Thank you, Council president, colleagues. That is the committee report. Thank you, councilmember Strauss. Just any of my colleagues have any comments or questions for Councilmember Strauss? Oh, Casper Petersen does. Thank you very much. Just to be consistent with my vote on the original Caspar 120001, I'll be voting no on this, but looking forward to the final regulations to consider those later. Thank you. Really. You're going to go on, though, on this one. The fry bread bill. That I want to be consistent in my previous vote. Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else any concerns or questions they want to ask before we go to a vote? Okay. Not seen any. Madam Clerk, will you please call the roll? Sara Strauss. Yes. Councilmember Herbals. Yes. Alcindor. Morales. Yes. Councilmember Ms.. Gather I. Councilmember Nelson by Councilmember Petersen. Oh. And Council President Juarez I. Six in favor. One opposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Madam Clerk, will you please affix my signature to the legislation? So let's go to item number five. Again, we have Councilmember Strauss. Will the clerk please read item number five and to the record. Agenda item five, Resolution three, 2048 approving and ratifying the decision of the Metropolitan King County Council to adopt a revised set of countywide planning policies. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted. Sorry. Go ahead, Mr. Strauss. I mean, council members. Yes. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. And Madam Clerk, can you please affix my signature to the legislation? Great. Thank you, Councilor Nelson. Let's move on to item number three from Land Use Committee. Madam Clerk, will you please read the short title and then we'll hand it over to Councilmember Strauss. The Court of the Land Use Committee. Agenda Item three Council Bill one 2207 Relating to land use and Urban Forestry, adding a tree service provider registration procedure and requirement. The committee recommends the bill p

ass as amended just STROUSE. I think you council president, colleagues, I was happy to partner with Councilmember Peterson on this legislation to ensure we hold tree service providers accountable for illegal tree cutting and we promote the businesses that are known for best practices regarding arborist work. This registration legislation is just the first step of a four pronged approach to strengthen tree protections in Seattle. And I'm really happy to move this bill forward through the Land Use Committee, while the other while the other three parts of the proposal are under SIPA appeal. There are several changes that I brought forward, along with Councilmember Peterson on

some in our substitute and my standalone amendment that I would like to highlight, because I believe they show how our partnership made this legislation even stronger. We added a date certain of November 10th for tree service providers to register, giving them clarity to comply with this new law rather than having to do the math. When was the bill enacted and how many days the mayor signed it? And then how many days after that? A date certain provides additional clarity. We added a requirement that when a tree service providers were moving a hazardous, exceptional tree, they get a different independent tree service provider to conduct the hazard analysis and apply for the permit to eliminate any potential conflict of interest of that tree service provider. We also aligned the penalties for violations of the tree code with penalties under stops tree provider registry. And lastly, we also adjusted the public notice requirements for tree removal from three days to three business days to prevent someone from posting a notice on Friday afternoon from Monday removal. Overall, I'm very excited for the full final passage of this bill today. I'm really looking forward to continuing to work with Councilmember Peterson and all of my colleagues, all of you, to continue strengthening tree protections later this year. Once it comes out from underneath the CPSC. With that, I have nothing more to say. And I've got with your permission, Councilperson passed over to Councilmember Peterson when he's ready. All right. You ready, Councilmember Peterson? Yes. Thank you. Council president. And thank you, Councilmember Strauss. Colleagues, this legislation will prevent reckless tree cutting in Seattle and is a small but mighty step toward protecting the health and environmental benefits of mature trees in our Emerald City. As heat waves and flooding increase with the climate crisis, we need to increase protections for our priceless tree infrastructure and Council Bill 1202 and seven delivers the accountability and transparency needed as we work to deliver a more comprehensive tree protection ordinance later this year. I want to thank our land use chair Councilmember Strouse for his co-sponsorship at the introduction of this bill and for his expert enhancements. A special thank you to all the city staf

f who worked on this bill and to all the conservationists and tree advocates who have called in many public meetings over the past several months. In addition to this widespread support from dedicated urban forest conservationists in Seattle such as the Audubon Society, a statistically valid survey conducted by the Northwest Progressive Institute in 2021 show that 75% of Seattle voters support requiring tree care providers like arborists to meet minimum certification and training and to register with the city. And that's what this bill takes care of. Thank you. Thank you. Councilman Peterson, is there any of my other colleagues that would like to comment on this legislation before we go to the vote? Well, I just want to say. Councilmember Strauss and costar Petersen, thank you both for being so collaborative and working together. We got here and I appreciate that. And I'm glad that we heard from the people that called in for the greenways and the trees. And a lot of them are long time people that have been working on this tree canopy issue. So thank you both with your commitment and modeling behavior that, you know, we really try to work together and work out our differences. We can actually get some legislation passed that means something. So thank you, all of you. Is there anyone else that would like to share? I didn't mean it that way. So. Oh, Caspar Nelson. I just want to say to second that emotion, that this was a collaborative process and there were a lot of details to run through. And thank you very much for bringing this forward. And I. I thank you for your efforts. Thank you, Councilor Nelson. Okay. So with that, Madam Clerk, not seeing any other hands raised. Madam Clerk, will you please call the roll out? Thank you, Councilmember Strauss, for that sign. Will you please call the role on the passage of the bill? Also member Strauss. Yes. Councilmember Herbold. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosque. Whether. I'm Councilmember Nelson. I. Councilmember Peterson. Yes. And Council President Juarez i. 770 favored unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. And Madam Clerk, will you please do. Fixed my signature to the legislation. All right. Moving on to item number four. Looks like we have Councilmember Strauss again. Well, the clerk please read item number four, the short title into the record. The Report of the Finance and Housing Committee. Agenda Item one. Resolution 32047. A resolution establishing a watch list of large, complex, discrete capital projects that will require enhanced quarterly monitoring reports for the 2022 calendar year. The committee recommends the resolution be adopted as amended. Thank you, councilmember mosquitoes. Chair of the committee. You may provide the committee report. Elsewhere. I'm a skater. And if you'd like to provide the committee report on this item. I'm also fortunate to be a member of Chair Mosquito's Committee and can speak briefly to the watch list. It's Cancer c

councilmember and is not available right now. Well, colleagues, you're all familiar with the watch list. It was a great idea that came from the city council years ago to create this watch list for those larger, complex capital projects so that we could keep an eye on them. Part of the fiscal responsibility accountability measures. So this list was discussed thoroughly in the committee and it was the committee unanimously recommended adoption of it. So are there any comments on this legislation? This is resolution 32047. All right. Let us go ahead and vote on attendance and comments on the watch list resolution for the year 2022. Will the clerk please call the roll on the adoption of the resolution? Council member, Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosquera. Council members. Lie. Sorry about that. I thank you. Council member want? Yes. Councilmember Herbold? Yes. Council President Pro Tem Peterson. Yes. Six in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The resolution is adopted and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affect my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Okay. Our next item. Will the clerk please read the short title of item two and to the record? Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will a clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Look, clerk, please read item four into the records. Agenda item for Council Bill 120291 An ordinance relating to rates and charges for water services of Seattle Public Utilities, revising water rates and charges for certain customers. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. As chair of the committee I provide committee report on this item council members as confirmed by our own City Council central staff during our committee meeting. This is a minor technical correction requested by Seattle Public Utilities and would impact no current SPU customers in the City of Beer, and our committee unanimously recommended approval of this bill. Are there any comments? Okay. Well, the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill. Council member Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosquito. I Council member Solent? Yes. Council member Herbold. Yes. Council President Pro Tem Peterson. Yes. Six in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the legislation on my behalf? Next item. There are no resolutions for introduction of adoption today and this is item H on our agenda. So we can go to other business council members. Is there any other business to come before the Council? Okay. Councilmember Mosquito. Sorry, Mr. Chair, I think I. Did I miss an opportunity to comment on the appointments under the Finance and Housing Committee meeting? Agenda items. I through 18. Am I looking at the wrong materials here? As for mosquito, they were part of the consent agenda. Oh, I have. So many great things to say about all those appointees, but thank you for remind

ing me of the new process going forward. Congratulations to all of our appointees and to the re appointments. Thank you, Councilmember Skinner. We know that there's so much work involved in identifying volunteers and folks to serve on these these advisory committees and that US charities so much work for those your committee is as well as the chairs and the other committees and really appreciate department staff helping us with that process as well. Agenda item two Council Bill 120309 An ordinance relating to surveillance technology implementation authorizing approval of uses and accepting the 2021 Surveillance Impact Report and 2021 Executive Overview for the Seattle Police Department's use of IBM AI to I-Pace. The committee recommends the bill passes amended. Thank you, Madam Clerk. Councilmember Nelson. Thank you very much. I based is a link analysis software program that speed uses to in the course of their investigations. This bill was amended. I will provide time for councilmembers Strauss and and Herbold to address those amendments. And it was amended and passed out of committee unanimously. Thank you. Are any of my colleagues ready to comment or have any issues to raise with council over Nelson regarding this particular piece of legislation? Just a verbal. Flagging the amendments that passed out of committee per SO member Nelson's prompts. We requested that Speedy take a look at its retention policy that complies with the minimum retention period allowed by state and federal law, but also defines a clear deletion oversight process. We also amended inflation to request a speedy report on the employee access policies or guidelines for use. And then again, we included the the equity metrics that I mentioned in the last Bill Roth included in this one. Thank you. Thank you. Is there any other comments for Councilmember Nelson? Okay. Not seeing any. Well, the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill. Councilmember Strauss? Yes. Councilmember Herbold. Councilmember Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Nelson. I. Council Member Petersen I Council President whereas I seven in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes and the chair will sign it. Madam Clerk, please affix my signature to the passage of the bill.

And moving on to item number three, Madam Clerk, we please item three into the record. Report of the Sustainability and Renters Rights Committee. Agenda Item 14 Council Bill 120330 An Ordinance relating to just cause eviction. Changing the terms of certain eviction defenses and amending sections 22.20 5.090 and 22.20 5.100 of the Seattle Municipal Code. The committee recommends the bill passed as amended. Thank you customers a lot. Thank you. President Juarez, this is a bill from my office in response to a court of appeals decision that objected to one small part of Seattle's six month eviction defense. That original ordinance requires renters to attest if they have suffered financial hardship in orde

r to be eligible to use that defense against eviction . The Court of Appeals objected to the mechanics of that attestation, specifically that there is not language giving landlords the ability to rebut the claim that renters face financial hardship. I wanted to be clear that the six month eviction defense is still in effect, as I mentioned in the council briefing yesterday as well, because the city has requested reconsideration of the Court of Appeals decision. However, out of an abundance of caution and due and particularly to avoid confusion, my office has sponsored this bill to respond to the Court of Appeals concerns. The initial version of the bill, introduced by my office addressed the Court of Appeals concerned by simply removing the requirement of financial hardship. Therefore, there would be no claim to rebut. As I've argued in the past, it should be a given that if a renter is an eviction court, it's because they have suffered financial hardship. Because why else would there be an eviction code requiring people to declare financial hardship, particularly if their landlord starts challenging those claims? It is likely to drag renters through a humiliating process. We see that happening all the time. And this, in fact, has a chilling effect preventing the very people, the low income and marginalized communities that this eviction defense was intended to help from using it. The bill that was just the bill was discussed in the Sustainability and Renters Rights Committee last Friday and was amended to address the Court of Appeals concern in an entirely different way. Instead of removing the requirement for financial hardship, the bill now keeps a requirement and adds language explaining how a landlord can rebut those claims of financial hardship. I did not support that amendment for the reasons I just explained. However, as I said in committee and yesterday, I still support the legislation because it will allow the urgent defense attorneys from the Harlem Justice Project to use this eviction defense without fear of confusion. While the six month eviction defense is technically still in effect, there is a danger that eviction court judges will choose to evict renters who attempt to use the defense. And because of that confusion, if that happens, renters will be out on the street without the opportunity to appeal with all the human suffering that that entails. So I urge council members to vote yes on this legal fix to the Seattle six month eviction defense in accordance with the committee's recommendation. Thank you. Thank you, Councilmember. So what if there are any questions or comments from Councilmember Ellis? I'm sorry, I should have mentioned Councilman Morales that we also agreed to co-sponsor that. I think it was in my notes to thank you. I should have caught that. I apologize. Councilmember Ellis. Yes, I would like to first request to be added as a co-sponsor, and I do want to thank Councilmember SOUTHWICK for allowing me to co-sponso

r this. And I want to share why this bill is important to me. Excuse me, in 2020, when I voted yes on the legislation that would come SNC 22.20 5.090. I did. So knowing that this pandemic would leave an unimaginable toll on low income tenants. I heard from countless people about their lost jobs, about janitors, baristas, restaurant workers, and lots of others losing their jobs. And I heard their fear of reprisal from their landlord. So that's why I voted for that legislation, to protect them in 2021, when my office worked with the State House Stay Healthy Coalition to craft and pass the bill that would eventually become SNC 22.4 5.101. It was because low income tenants and working families were still accruing debt, still worried about putting food on the table and paying for medical expenses, and still worried that the city was not offering enough protection. The countless tenants that we worked with were also afraid that the six months would not be enough time for them to catch up. Avoid eviction. Our eviction defense tied to the civil emergency was pursued because we knew that tenants needed another layer of defense. As recently as this morning, I heard the need from a tenant attorney for this defense will be necessary when rent relief runs out later this spring. So across the street, across the state, we've started to open back up and to try to live as we did in pre-COVID times. But here at the city, we're also talking about bringing folks back into city hall, starting in just a couple of weeks. We might feel like this pandemic is over. And those of us who

have been privileged enough to continue working through this crisis without financial stress may feel like this pandemic is behind us. The truth is, it's still going on. It's still taking a toll on neighbors. And amending these to eviction defenses will allow tenants who are still struggling to still have at least one last line of defense. So I'll just close by saying that we still need to keep fighting and doing more for low and middle income people here in Seattle. We need to provide more support to tenants so that a family emergency doesn't lead to eviction and homelessness. We need to build more affordable housing, and we need to invest in social housing in every part of our city so that renters aren't at the whim of a private market. We need to invest in our youth so that they're job ready out of high school or college and don't even have to worry about eviction. And we need to invest in protecting workers so they have the security that so many of us have had during this pandemic. So I just want to thank the co-sponsor. That's all members. So much for allowing me to co-sponsor. I intend to vote in favor of this bill and I encourage Miami Herald to sign it as soon as possible to ensure that tenants have this one hope to build a better support for them in the future. Q Councilmember Morales, is there any other comments before I handed off to councilmembers to want to close this out? Not t

oo many customers want. I have nothing else to add. Thank you. Thank you. And thank you, Casper Morales, for being the co-sponsor. Will the clerk please call the role on the passage of the bill? Councilmember Strauss. Yes. Councilmember Herbold as Councilmember Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Councilmember Mosqueda. I. A. Councilmember Nelson. I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Councilmember Swan. Yes. Council President. Chris, I. I'm in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes. The chair will sign it. And metal clerk, please. Affixed my signature to the legislation. So moving on in our agenda to the adoption of other resolutions, I don't see any other resolutions happening today. Other business. Is there any other business to come before council before I move to adjourn? Oh, Caspar Strauss. Thank you. Council President, thank you for running such a well-run meeting today. I will be attending the Association of Washington Cities Annual Forum, and so I am requesting to be excused from full council from council briefing on June 20th and full council on June 21st. Okay. Well, I'm glad you got that in early. Duly noted. Does anyone have a problem with Council member Strauss being gone June 20th and 21st? I don't accept that these gets to go not be here. But other than. That. Okay. So we are now done with our calendar and let me see what my last party lines are. Oh, I'm sorry. Counselor of Escape. Sorry. Counselor Strauss reminded me. I too will be at the board meeting. But I'll just ask for excuse or that's the word. I'll just ask to be excused on June 21st place. For the President. I was going to say something, but I didn't want to put you on blast. Isn't Kessler mistaken on that? Thank you. Okay, so we'll note that that. Would be the only time you then from now on lasts forever. But oh about I'm president and. Privilege of being an anti yes people note does anyone have a problem with Kessler? I'm scared of being gone on Tuesday, June 21st. Not seeing any both customers get on Kessler Strauss are indeed excused on those days. Okay, let me. It's nothing else. Okay, colleagues, this concludes our items of business for today's agenda. Our regularly scheduled next council meeting is Tuesday, May 31st. Oh, yeah, we have a three day holiday, folks, so enjoy. We will not be here on Monday, but we will be here on Tuesday at two. And with that, have a good afternoon and we stand adjourned. Thank you. Well, to the report of the Public Safety and Human Services agenda item to council, but one to 0 to 94 relating to app based worker labor standards, establishing a compensation scheme for app based workers with the minimum requirements and related standards for transparency and flexibility. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you. Kiss rehearsal. Thank you so much, Madam Chair. And have some initial remarks here. And I think we also have. Do we have an amendment? We do. All right. So I will with your with your permission kicks off wit

h my initial remarks. Thank you. So as we all know, we live in a very expensive city. And we also know that many app based delivery workers earn below the minimum wage after expenses and tips are accounted for. One platform that claims its workers receive \$28 an hour after including tips and not accounting for expenses, also has one of the highest numbers of employees on food stamps in all of Washington state and one of the highest numbers of employees on Medicaid in all of Washington state. We know that app based work is one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy, with more and more workers turning to this type of work and not receiving the protections of basic labor standards. The passage of this legislation today would help tens of thousands of

delivery workers make. Ends meet. While maintaining their flexibility. This conversation has been almost a year in the making. On June 9th, 2021, we held our first stakeholder meeting with. Since then, a total of a dozen large stakeholder meetings, followed by many additional one on one meetings. I want to thank the many participants in those efforts. This included representatives from DoorDash. DoorDash. Uber. Eats. TaskRabbit Rover. Instacart. Gopuff Chip. Seattle restaurants, United Workers and worker advocacy groups such as Drive Forward Working Washington and the National Employment Law Project. During last week's committee discussion, central staff walked us through 16 separate amendments. The committee then voted and with one abstention and four votes in favor to recommend the bill to the full council today. This is a testament to the hard work everyone has put into this process. While we know there are still some app based businesses that are concerned about the legislation. The fact is that, again, this is a very expensive city to live and work in, and if paying employees subminimum wage is the only way that businesses can sustain their model, there should be some consideration whether or not that business model really works. We know that these businesses are making record revenues. With DoorDash reported nearly 5 billion in revenue in 2021, up 69% over 2020. They also paid their CEO over \$400 million in 2020. Uber Eats reported \$5.8 billion in revenue for the fourth quarter of 2021, beating their own estimates and Instacart's 2021 revenue grew 10% year over year to 1.65 billion. That company's valuation is 24 billion, up four from almost 18 billion just a few months prior. Given this, how is it that paying workers a minimum wage could be a threat to their business model? Though I'm really disappointed that the legislation is passed out of committee strip protections for many app based workers. Let's remember that the legislation that the council passed last June, the Independent Contractors Protections Ordinance, means that independent contractors that are not covered by today's bill will have access to information so that they can receive pre-contract disclosures, timely payment and pa

yment disclosure disclosures for services valued at \$600 or more. The Office of Labor Standards has been conducting the directors rule process this year for that bill, and all of these protections will go into effect beginning of September this year. To the small businesses concerned about price increases, we know that a lot of small businesses are strongly in favor of this legislation like Seattle Restaurant United. But for those who do still have concerns, do keep in mind that you are currently protected from price increases in April of 2020. The former mayor signed an emergency order that prevents app based delivery companies from charging more than 15% of the purchase price of an order. And I understand that Council is working on drafting this policy as the Council bill to extend that protection. And I really look forward to supporting that, that incredibly important legislation. Remember, every dollar in a low wage workers pocket adds \$1 in \$0.21 to the economy and investment in our local businesses. And it leads to job creation, too, though, as we heard today, the app based platforms still have concerns. I do want to highlight the other alterations made to the bill on their request that I did support. We reduced each of the associated cost factors, the associated time factor and the associated mileage factor. These are all inputs that resulted in reducing the minimum payment calculation as originally proposed. We included a requirement that all US Office of Labor Standards produce the notices of rights and translations removing that burden from the company. We included a requirement that allows network companies to take adverse action against a worker for fraud if that company has a fraud policy. And we have changed the effective date of the ordinance from 12 months to 18 months. Remember that the transportation network company legislation, the fair share, was passed unanimously back in November 2019. The effective date for that legislation was January 1st, 2021. That gave them 13 months for rulemaking and for companies to adjust for pay up. We now have an effective date of 18 months after passage. That's five months longer than fair share. This gives the platforms more time to adjust, but also remember. It also means that the workers that we've been hearing from today will be waiting two years longer for the same kind of guarantees that taxi drivers are already receiving thanks to our legislation. I have some some closing remarks after hearing some a lot of. Thanks, Jim. Hopefully after hearing the amendment. But that's what I wanted to say from my opening remarks. All right. Remind me to come back to you, too, because I'll forget to do closing remarks. Councilmember Ellis, I understand you have an amendment, and even though it's labeled Amendment 17, I'm guessing it's 17 because 16 were in committee. Okay. Yeah, I'm not on that committee, so. Yes, but that is my understanding as well. And I would like to move to amend Council Bill 1 to 0

294 as presented on Amendment 17, which we did distribute before noon today. Second. Oh, I'm. You moved it. I second. It's been moved in second. Go ahead, Councilmember Ellis. Thank you. Well, I did watch the committee over the weekend and it was disappointing to see workers on a marketplace network. These get excluded from the policy at the last minute. I do believe that we need to make sure that these workers are protected as well. This amendment really expresses the council intent to consider regulating marketplace network fees regarding minimum payment flexibility and transparency protections in separate legislation no later than next summer, August 1st, 2023. I think it's important that we pass the legislation today and continue moving forward on additional policies to protect workers in our city. Because whether you get a job from an app or a want ad, work is work. And every worker deserves basic rights like minimum wage. So I am offering this amendment today in hopes that my colleagues will support it. Thank you. Councilman Morales, are there any comments for Council Morales before we move to a vote on the on Amendment 70? All right. Not seeing any. Will the clerk please call the role on the adoption of Amendment 17? Councilmember Herbold? Yes. Councilmember Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosquera. I. Councilmember Nelson. Okay. Councilmember Peterson. No. Council members? Yes. Councilmember Strauss. Yes. Council president. Whereas. Yes. Seven in favor to oppose. All right. That means that the motion carries an amendment, 17 is adopted, and now the amended bill is before the council. So with that, I will hand it back over to Councilmember. I was hoping to give closing remarks. I don't know, particularly my co-sponsor, Councilmember Lewis might have some remarks as well. Yeah, I'm sorry. I apologize. Councilor Lewis has his hand up, too. So you came? I can't see. Is it just Casper Lewis? All right, Casper Lewis. And then councilmembers. Want council President Suarez appreciate the opportunity to briefly speak to this legislation and appreciate the partnership of Councilmember Herbold in moving this forward. This is the first in a series of measures to right size long standing inequities in our local economy that the introduction of gig work and app based work has driven over the past decade of technological changes and shifts in our economy. You know, this legislation by no means is going to be the final word on this. I appreciate the amendment brought by Councilmember Morales putting a timeline for one aspect of future legislation which will be looking at ways to. Create some level of certainty and regulation into how the marketplace that's conducted their work, but also several other pieces of legislation, including how do activations work in this world and transparency and and notice of how these pay standards impact folks who are in this gig economy. As Councilmember Morales just noted. A lot of this work increasi

ngly is being driven not because it's new work or new types of jobs that people do, but because there are new ways to deliver them across varying business models. This council previously moved to regulate the transportation network companies Uber and Lyft in that same vein. Today we extend those regulations to delivery companies and soon will be considering other aspects in this economy and appreciate the work of Councilmember Herb in bringing us together. Very much appreciate the work of Camilla Brown on my staff, who has worked hand in hand with Alice Clardy in the Herbold office in the stakeholder ring and bringing together our folks appreciate the work and the stewardship of work in Washington, in this area, as well as all of the partners from other organizations who have provided input, including representatives from the platforms and representatives from drive forward. So this is the first step in continuing the mission to expand increasingly what the role and future of work is going to look like in the city of Seattle. And I look forward to continuing this work throughout this year and into next year and to continue to monitor this legislation as it goes into rulemaking. So I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this and look forward to voting. If you just so I make sure I got the role, I got it correct, I think. Casper So what was next? And then Councilmember Mosqueda and then Councilmember Morales and then Councilmember Nelson and I write this down. I apologize. I kind of got it mixed up. Casper Salon. Thank you. I voted yes on the amendment, and of course, I support the legislation as a whole. And I thank all the workers who spoke today and previously in public comment in support of the legislation. As a socialist, I have repeatedly explained in the past that big business under capitalism has enormous power, and every victory of the workers movement that has been won comes under attack and is gradually chipped away. When the movement as the only alternative really is to fundamentally end the power that big business has to claw back every penny that workers have won and fight for global socialism. Big business does not want to pay minimum wage. It does not want to respect other worker rights. And when we say big business is not an inanimate object, it is

the billionaires, it's the multi-millionaires, it's the very wealthy, the elite. So they invent the notion of gig workers, so-called gig workers, independent contractors. And suddenly you have a whole section of the workforce where workers rights regulations apparently do not apply. The evolution of the gig industry is also linked in other ways to the fundamental nature of capitalism. It is not only the reforms that have been won by workers are constantly under attack, which they are. But the gig industry also illustrates how, as the global capitalist system has gone deeper and deeper into a long term crisis over the last decade, the billionaires and the multimillionaires have inc

reasingly created more and more avenues to squeeze every last drop of blood from the global working class. And that is why you see the evolution of such industries now that the pay gap legislation would extend minimum wage protections to gig workers at the last minute, and committee members Peterson, Nelson and Lewis passed an amendment to create a new legal section called so, quote unquote, marketplace network workers. And no doubt more and more big businesses will redefine the marketplace. Network workers, no doubt more and more big businesses will redefine themselves into that loophole. Really, the city council should be reversing that loophole. But that was not the amendment before us in the last vote. I support this legislation to close the loophole in minimum wage protections created by the independent contractors legal notion. And I will support closing the marketplace network loophole too. If members want to do that. The workers movement fights for better wages and that is essential. And we also need to fight for socialism. So we are not continually the working class is not continually forced to fight for the right to survive like. You customers want. Council Member Mr.. Thank you. Council President. And thanks again to Councilmember Herbold and to Councilmember Lewis, the co-sponsors of this legislation. It's my. My great privilege and pride to be able to support you in this legislation today and to continue to underscore for members of the public how long this process has been under way. And to say that it's been coming for a long time is an understatement. We knew that this type of legislation was needed for basic standards to protect gig workers. And the concept of the pay gap legislation and the campaign fund community really got a lot of attention way back in 2019. And since then, gig workers, frontline workers, quote, essential workers and workers that we deemed to be heroes have only since then, because of the pandemic, been put more in the spotlight in terms of the type of work they've done and more at risk to do the work that they do during this pandemic. So I'm excited to support this legislation today and to recognize the many months, the years of hard work that went into this piece of legislation. And to really as well thank the staff from the from the co-sponsors, Alex Clardy and Camilla Brown. I also want to thank central staff and named them by name. Amy, Carina and Jasmin. I know that they have done a tremendous amount of work with specifically Office of Labor Standards, but many of the other departments as well to craft the legislation. And I know, Councilmember Herbold, you are saving your thank you. So I hope I'm not stepping on toes, but I know that they probably don't hear it enough. So I do also really want to thank several for my chief of staff who has worked with these what the pieces of the piece of legislation in front of us through the various iterations and in close coordination with Alex and Camilla, as well

as members of the Mayor's Office and Office of Labor Standards and the broad community, both the community of worker representatives as well as industry representatives, to further understand the implications of the bill in front of us. So thanks as usual, for the hard work that she did as well in digging into this legislation. I will be as well voting yes, as I noted. But I do want to underscore the significant reservations due to the amendments that were made in committee last week. This legislation, it will still benefit thousands of workers. That should be a moment where we all celebrate today. But to be honest, we also need to at the same time, recognize that the amendment that was passed in committee last week cuts out basic protections for thousands of other workers and sets a precedent that I hope will not replicate across this country. And I appreciate the amendment that was brought forward today so that we can continue to work on this policy area. We all know no policy is perfect, but when faced with the decisions, I think it's our belief and in my office that we always err on the side of listening to those who are on the front line, listening to those who have less power, listening to those who are in more vulnerable situations. And with the lived experience of being deprioritized, whether it's on platforms or deprioritized in terms of funding and protections and state and federal law, we need to continue to listen to those voices who have been on the front line. And we will not relinquish in our efforts to make sure that more workers are folded into these

protections today. I appreciate everyone who has continued to call in and offer robust testimony and to explain how separate policy from marketplace workers will impact them. Looking forward to continuing this conversation throughout this year. As I know, council her will do have other pieces of legislation in the hopper and we'll look forward to the following conversations in 2023 as well as noted by the amendment. And thanks as well for the committee members for your support for the amendment that we put forward. Councilmember Hubble's and I put forward an amendment to make sure that we were looking at the implications for the budget this year and that we began a process of ensuring that there was additional conversations around drawing in revenue, especially in difficult budget year. So I look forward to building on this legislation and to celebrating all that workers were able to accomplish today without letting our eyes off the end goal of getting more workers included as well. So congratulations to everyone who has fought for pay up and thank you very much for all the work that you've done to incorporate so many different voices, ours included. And congratulations on this win today. OC House member Alice. Thank you. I am also excited for this legislation and the pieces that I know will be coming in subsequent weeks and months. We know that there's over 40,000 workers in Seattle

who depend on work, particularly people with disabilities, people of color, immigrants, single parents, LGBTQ workers. And and these apps, while they do provide an opportunity for folks to find employment who might have challenges otherwise, they also shift all of the costs and all of the risk to workers and really leave them earning well below minimum wage after expenses. We know that a recent report found Seattle gig workers are getting paid just 958 an hour. 92% of jobs pay less than minimum wage. And we know that there has been an exploitation of a of a glaring loophole in our labor standards, simply calling workers independent contractors that these multibillion dollar gig apps have been able to evade basic protections. And that's the problem that we're trying to solve here. So the pay policy that is up for a vote today will close that loophole. It will ensure basic protection for thousands of workers by ensuring that they're paid at least minimum wage with other basic protections, regardless of whether somebody is cleaning a house or delivering food . That's the goal, is to make sure that that regardless of the kind of app that they're on, we. Are protecting workers. And those who companies choose to call contract workers. So I think it's an exciting day. Seattle is leading the way by listening to gig workers, providing them what they need in these jobs, as I said, have the potential to be good paying jobs with important options for people who need flexibility. I do think it's important that rather than pass fair pay costs onto consumers, companies, some of which saw their revenues soar by close to 70%, this councilmember, Herbold said, should themselves pay the true cost of labor out of their own pockets and stop the exploitive model from becoming the new norm. I'm looking forward to supporting this, to supporting future legislation and continuing this conversation over the next year. I do want to thank my staff as well, Alexis, all of our and Silverdale who've been working on this with our colleagues and. Look forward to supporting. Thank you. Councilman Morales, I really like what you had to say, Councilor Nelson. Thank you very much. I support a minimum pay standard for delivery drivers, but I've always been concerned that setting the per delivery fee to high will lower demand, which could result in the consequences of reducing drivers overall income as well as the revenue. Of small. Businesses like restaurants. It could also disproportionately impact the most vulnerable customers, who also tend to be low income and might not be able to afford the fee. So I'm ambivalent about this legislation, but I'll be supporting it today because it's vastly improved from the bill that was introduced most significantly by Councilmember Peterson's amendment, which I supported, to remove. Marketplace companies from. Being covered by working Washington's proposal, because I believe their inclusion was an overreach. It made no sense to me to regulate ap

ps used by service providers who set their own rates and negotiate directly with the customers to provide things like home health care, child care, pet care and help with household tasks. Just because those professionals use an app to reach some of their customers in places, I just really hadn't seen. Convincing evidence that the. Majority of them make under the minimum. Wage. So I ran as a pragmatist. And quite frankly, this this proposal has a long. History. And I believed it would pass. So I submitted several amendments and collaborated with my colleagues to minimize its negative impacts. Voting no would diminish their confidence that I can negotiate in good faith to improve future legislation, whatever it is. And so, well, that's what pragmatism is. And I'll be voting yesterday. Great. Thank you, Councilmember Nelson. And I like what you said, too. So I'm going to

be supporting this. And I'll tell you why. I probably should tell everyone I like what they said, but I'll say I'll share with you. I'll be voting yes. But Councilmember Morales and Councilmember Nelson kind of hit the nail on the head for me. We have been dealing with the gig economy and I like what Morales said, and I've always felt this way. To some degree, it is a very exploitive model. And until we answer the question about whether or not a gig worker is an employee or indeed a contract worker, and we haven't addressed that straight on for the labor and for this economy and the people that actually take on these jobs. We're going to continually piecemeal in be trying to how to decide this works when we have a gig economy. I believe we're going in the right direction, that this is the shape of things to come because this is it's a labor issue and there's a surge about people who these are their jobs. And I think it is unconscionable that the and I'll just say that the bigger business companies have made billions of dollars during this during our pandemic. And if that's what it took, as you know, the pandemic has taught us many lessons, if that's what it took for us to get here, for people to recognize how much money these companies are making on people who they cannot do not have to call them employees. So what we have done as a city and a lot of other cities as well is take it upon ourselves as we should do as elected officials, to start deconstructing this economy and making sure that the people who are on the front lines, who we're delivering for, who are doing all those things, are compensated and are taking care of because that's our job. At the end of the day, is government officials, is to make people's lives hopefully better. So with that, we were handed over to you two closing remarks and then we'll call on the clerk to call the roll. Thank you so much. I really appreciate my colleagues excitement for the vote that we're about to take. In closing, I just want to read a couple sentences from the May 10th letter to counsel from the National Employment Law Project. They st

art talking about the history of the minimum wage. I quote The New Deal legislation excluded domestic, agricultural and temp workers from their wage protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act and systemically denied black people and workers of color the ability to earn the wages guaranteed to workers in industries dominated by white workers. And the legacy of this injustice continues today. More recently, venture capitalists running app based businesses deny workers the minimum pay and benefits that should be universal. As a city council itself recognize black and Latino, black and Latinx workers comprise a disproportionate share of the 40,000 individuals performing app based work in Seattle. The fact that app based workers are disproportionately immigrants and people of color reflects on the racialized exploitation within the app based delivery and marketplace industry. Indeed, the app based gig economy writ large functions on occupational segregation. Companies can get away with offering poor quality, unsafe jobs where workers have virtually zero legal protections on the job because for so many workers, there is simply no alternative. Far from offering economic opportunity, this business model deepens the desperation of underpaid black, Latin and other workers of color who have been shunted to the bottom of the economy. In closing, in addition to the stakeholder process I talked about earlier, the pay policy package has been discussed six times in a council committee, my council committee since July of 2021. I am just so honored to have had the opportunity to work with this growing workers movement who are determined to not be left behind. There's significant support for this legislation, including from the Seattle Restaurants United, a coalition of more than 240 small restaurant owners and operators. The Washington Local Housing Alliance. One America. Puget Sound Sage. Somali Community Services Al-Noor. Islamic Community Center. El Centro de la Raza Castle Latina. Asian Counseling and Referral Service. The National Domestic Workers Alliance. The National Employment Law Project. SEIU 775, SEIU six, the Transit Writers Union and the Labor Standards Advisory Commission. We will continue our work with additional legislation to cover issues such as restaurant access, anti-discrimination background checks, deactivation, and the creation of an advisory board. And I will continue to work with all stakeholders on the development of these policies. I want to thank Council. Members and their staff, specifically my co-sponsor, Councilmember Lewis and Camilla Brown from his office. I also want to thank the Office of Labor Standards, specifically Karen Le Virus and Lane Midha. I want to recognize the hard work of council central staff, specifically Carina Boal, Amy Gaw and Jasmine Marois. Finally, I want to thank Alex Clardy in my office. His work has been the driving force for the development of this legislation, and I want to thank him from the bottom of

my heart for his time, diligence and attention to detail. I hope we can vote yes on this really important legislation today. Thank you. He also a verbal thank you for I. I normally don't do a bunch of thanks but I really want to thank you and your staff and essential staff. I know what it's like to get 16 amendments and try to accommodate and keep them all moving. So thank you and thank you and your staff and Alex and central staff and all the folks that did what they did. We got a running list of what the amendments were, which ones were passed, which one people abstained, how people voted. So thank you very much for this hard work. Okay. So with that, Madam Clerk, will you please call the roll on the passage of the amended bill? Councilmember Herbold. Yes. Councilmember Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosqueda, I. Councilmember Nelson. Councilmember Peterson. Yes. Councilmember Salant. Yes. Council member Strauss. Yes. Council President Juarez. Yes. Nine in favor. Nine opposed. Yay! Thank you. The bill passes as amended and the chair will sign it. Will the clerk please affix my signature to the amended legislation? Thank you. Okay. Moving on in our agenda to the adoption of other resolutions, there are no other resolutions for introduction in adoption today. Agenda Item four Council Bill 120287 An ordinance relating to land use and zoning, updating regulations for rooftop features and amending sections of the Seattle Municipal Code. The committee recommends the bill passed as amended. Councilmember Strauss. Thank you. As Clerk, Schwinn stated, this is a comfortable one 2287 Updating Regulations for rooftop features. This legislation updates regulations for equipment and features on the rooftops of buildings. Last year, we adopted the strongest energy code in the nation for new buildings. And to comply with these new regulations, we do require new mechanical equipment, and these regulations make it easier to accomplish. So the new energy code requires more ASP aspects and features equipment on the roofs. The legislation before us today makes it easier to accommodate the needed equipment on rooftops. The legislation before us today also updates regulations specific to Pioneer Square in Chinatown International District to provide more flexibility for rooftop amenities, including rooftop bars, restaurants in certain circumstances in Pioneer Square and to allow for faster elevators because we're allowing folks to build higher. In committee, we adopted two amendments one technical corrections to the legislation and the other changes to rooftop requirements in certain zones in Chinatown International District to align with requirements for other high rise zones in the city. Elevators in which I just referenced Council president colleagues. That is the committee report. Thank you. Councilmember Strauss, are there any comments for my colleagues, for Councilmember Strauss before we move to a vote? Not seeing any councilmember strau

ss. I'm guessing you have said everything you need to say before we go to a vote or anything more. Yep. Video. Thank you, council president. Thank you. Well, the clerk please call the roll on the passage of the bill. And some member Morales. S. Council member must gather. I. Councilmember Nelson. I. Councilmember Peterson. I. Councilmember Strauss. Yes. Councilmember Herbold. Yes. Councilmember Lewis. Yes. And Councilor President Flores. I am in favor of then. Thank you. The bill passes. The chair will sign it, and I'm pleased it takes my signature to the legislation. Moving on to the Transportation and Seattle Public Utilities Committee. This is Councilmember Peterson. But Madam Clark, were you please read the short title of the item into the record. Agenda Item six Council Bill 120323 An ordinance relating to S.P. you accepting two deeds for real property acquired for the purposes of installing and operating groundwater wells or water works to provide potable water in connection with the High Line. Well, Wellfield project the committee recommends the bill pass. Mr. Peterson to Council President Council 120323 implements what is essentially a technical correction by accepting two property deeds that perfect to use property rights for those two parcels originally acquired in 1986. The legislation was unanimously recommended by our committee. Thank you. Do not cause any comments or questions. Not seen any. Then we will go to a vote. Madam, click. Will you please call the roll on the passage of the bill? Let's remember this. Yes. That's my room together. I can't remember Nelson. I can't remember Petersen. I can't remember Strauss. Yes. Councilmember Herbold? Yes. Councilmember Lewis? Yes. And Council President Juarez. I ain't in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes. The chair will sign it. And please fix my signature to the legislation. On the agenda, we will move two items regarding the consent calendar and there were no items removed with the consent calendar moving to adoption of other resolutions. There are no other resolutions on today's agenda. Other business. Is there any other business? From my colleagues? And Item seven Councilor Bill 120362 An Ordinance relating to Historic Preservation Imposing Controls upon Ingraham High School. The committee

recommends the bill pass. Thank you. Casseroles. Thank you. So Ingram High School was built in 1959. It's located in the lake. It is one of the one of actually several school buildings built by oh, shoot, A-plus. The name of the principal who became part of LBJ, a national, nationally recognized firm that controls an incentive agreement, applies to the exterior of the auditorium and to the gym structure, which preserves the sort of mid-century modern look. And the committee recommends. That the bill pass because. Or else they did not know the 1959 was mid-century. That was a good last century. In 1959 was a good year. So want to point that out. A lot of good things happened in 1959. I'm

sure they did with that. Is there any comments or questions for Councilman Morales regarding item number seven? And I'm guessing we can move forward on the vote. Cast members. Yes, please. Thank you, Madam Clerk. We please call the roll. Let's remember. Lewis. Yes. Councilmember Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosqueda. I. Councilmember Nelson. I. Councilmember Peterson. I remember Salinas. Yes. Councilmember Strouse. Yes. Councilmember Herbold. Yes. Council President. Was I nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you, Madam Clerk. The bill passes. The chair will sign it. And, madam, quick, please, to fix my signature to the bill. Onto item number eight. This will be Councilmember Herbert. But first, Madam Clerk, will you please read item number eight into the record? A report of the Public Safety and Human Services Committee Agenda Item eight Council Bill 120337 An Ordinance relating to civilian and community oversight of the police. Establishing a process for investigating complaints. Naming the Chief of police and adding sections to the municipal code. They're part of the neighborhood education, Civil Rights and Culture Committee. Agenda Item for Council Bill 120335 An ordinance relating to service animals conforming the definition of service animal to federal and state law. Establishing a uniform definition for service animal by removing similar terms and including the definition in the parks code and making technical changes to the Seattle Municipal Code. The committee recommends the bill pass. Thank you, Casper Ruiz. Thank you. Thank you very much, Jody. You did not have to read all the different parts of the code as Devin did in committee. Apologies again to Devin and myself. So this is pretty straightforward, colleagues. It is a request, actually, from the Department of Justice that we update our definition of service animal in the human rights code and in several other codes, so that we are in compliance with ADA and with Washington state law. It now reads so that there are full protections for all service animals rather than just guide dogs and avoids any possible future exclusions for service animals and people with disability. And again, just aligns our definition with federal and state law. And as Jody mentioned, we have a recommendation from the committee unanimously that we pass the bill. Thank you. So any comments or questions for Councilman Morales before we move to a vote? Somewhere else. Is there anything else you would like to say before we move forward? Yeah. Okay. Good. Thank you. And will the clerk please call a role on the passage of the bill? Councilmember Lewis. Yes. Morales. Yes. Councilmember Mosqueda i. Councilmember Nelson. I. Councilmember Peterson. Hi. Councilmember Sawant. Yes. Remember Strauss? Yes. Council member Herbold. Yes. Council president was high nine in favor and unopposed. Thank you. The bill passes. The chair will sign it. And then clerk, please fix my signature to the legislation. Moving on to item number five

, which is also Councilmember Ellis again will please read item five and to the record. Agenda Item five Council Bill 120360 An Ordinance relating to Historic Preservation Imposing controls from the original Ban Assault School. The committee recommends the bill pass as memorials.