

**Fort Lawton Community Relations Plan**  
Questions and Comments  
June 19, 2008

Comments on draft Community Relations Plan

**III. RESIDENT SCREENING AND SECURITY**

- Question: Can housing providers screen juveniles for felony convictions?
- Comment: Clarify legality of screening juveniles.
- Comment: “grounds for denial” vs. “actual denial”.
- Comment: Clarify “likelihood” of families being pursued by batterers.
- Question: What is the number of 24 hour staff at the individual facility?
- Comment: Provide security cameras at entrance to individual facility.
- Comment: Entrance doors to the individual facility should remain locked, tenants enter via a key or key card, and visitors must be let in by residents or staff.
- Comment: No free access for guests/guests must be escorted through building.
- Comment: Clarify resident and guest access during the day vs. evening hours.
- Comment: Clarify individuals in one building versus families scattered through the entire site.
- Comment: Providers need to enforce rules.
- Comment: Clarity security provisions for family housing.
- Question: Where will 24 hour contact information be posted? Onsite, YWCA & AHA offices, or responsible staff?
- Question: How many people vs. the number or units?
- Question: Who will control the keys?

Answer: This will be a function of property management.

- Question: Who is responsible for criminal activity by the residents? What does “on or near” the facility mean? What is the consequence for engaging in criminal activity?

Will the providers investigate any criminal activity by residents reported, regardless of where it happens?

#### IV. COMMUNITY INTEGRATION

- Comment: Bring in other programs/people to integrate in activities with elder housing.
- Clarify “community agrees to commitments” (tone down).
- Question: What is the impact of the homeless housing on surrounding property values?

#### V. INFRASTRUCTURE AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- Comment: School issues must keep with the law and McKinney Act requirements.
- Comment: Is the “school issues” bullet necessary?
- Question: Is there a guarantee for increased public transit?
- Question: Will residents have cars?
- Comment: “Limited” transportation-adequate? appropriate? or remove adjective?
- Comment: Daycare? Onsite or addressed as part of overall plan.
- Comment: Cost of transportation. Can residents afford the cost?
- Comment: Daybreak Star daycare option.

#### VI. ACCOUNTABILITY

- Question: What does verification/audit process look like? Include a summary.

#### I. OVERVIEW

- Question: Who are providers accountable to?
- Question: Why is Habitat for Humanity not included?

#### GLOSSARY

- BRAC definition of “homeless”
- 30% AMI

#### COMMENTS ON THE NUMBER OF HOMELESS UNITS

- Welcome it to Magnolia, spread it out of downtown.
- Strongly support Native American projects, what are the activities to provided?
- Will Habitat be included in the financial analysis? Why is it not included in the 66-100 range?
- Based on financial viability, what is the minimum number of units?
- Not comfortable.
- Support Native Americans, but not homeless.
- Financial boondoggle.
- Pleased with opportunity to have a mixed income community.
- 40 units to AHA for elder housing, YWCA doesn't seem to have a minimum for viability, provide minimal number of units. Sixty-six is arbitrary.
- Want Census Tract data-is Capehart number included/subtracted.
- Density of Site-too much?
- Crimes committed/abuse/alcoholism-acknowledge it and address it.
- Not a neighborhood issue, it's a community issue-not just Magnolia.
- Chance to do groundbreaking things-schools, architecture, parks.
- Density, rezoning, other things not pursued that may be better for site. Maybe elsewhere in Magnolia.
- Support project, wish there were more housing for more people. Compare number of people leaving (Capehart) with the number coming in. Other large projects going up elsewhere in Magnolia. Can make a difference in people's lives.

- A “hell of a chapter” in next Magnolia historic book.
- Worst thing that could happen: Army could sell to private developer who could do more development.
- 66-100 should not be concrete.
- Concerned about rezone making it possible for more units.
- Less density for all income-levels in area.
- Too much density on site.
- Less density, focus on Native Americans.
- Happy with 1/3 of population covered in CRP, worried about other 2/3 of new population.
- Developers will continue to increase density.
- Don’t want Magnolia to turn into other communities where “things run amok”.
- As density increases, number at Fort Lawton will look small.
- Not willing to give up equity in home. Prospective buyers won’t want to pay as much next to homeless housing.
- People who are homeless have not contributed to society, why are taxpayer obligated to provide free housing to these people.
- 8,000 homeless in King County is a “shame”
- Where it gets spread throughout the City is not up for debate, thinking through and creating good programs is.
- 2/3 of families in Gates Foundation program cycle out, found permanent housing.
- Daycare and early learning are very important.