

**From:** [Ron Loos](#)  
**To:** [PED Public Comment](#)  
**Date:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 12:00:50 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Landlords should have representation on any committee where a renters are being represented.

Ron Loos  
18507 42nd Ave S, SeaTac, WA

**From:** [Mike West](#)  
**To:** [PED Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Make up of Committee  
**Date:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 12:21:18 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Councilmembers,

Seriously? You can't be forming a committee to consider housing affordability without all the stakeholders represented can you? Supposedly we have a shortage of low income housing according to some . These kind of one sided tactics would only make the alleged shortage worse. Did any of you take Civics in school? We are still living in a democracy and not in a Marxist Nation. Have all the stakeholders represented on the Committee if you want to actually make some progress instead of grandstanding for your base.

Mike West ...18047 Military Rd.S.

**From:** [bhagar](#)  
**To:** [PED Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Citizens planning commission  
**Date:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 1:17:42 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Greetings,

This committee needs to have landlord and home owner representation included in the housing affordability discussion. Making it renter centric only serves to further deprive landlords of their property rights and excludes home owners from the discussion of what they want their neighborhood to look like.

Thank you,  
Brady Hagar  
Disenfranchised voter  
Seatac

**From:** [MariJo Yim](#)  
**To:** [PED Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Citizen's Planning Commission Membership - please include housing providers on the committee  
**Date:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 1:45:05 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Good afternoon. I met several Seatac housing policy staff at a recent town meeting. I asked them to include small mom & pop housing providers in policy making and to encourage more small scale, community based mom & pop rental housing providers as a strategy in your housing policy toolkit to combat our housing crisis.

I understand that the city is assembling a Citizen's Planning Commission and that membership might be limited to only include renters.

I'm asking you to please include housing providers, specifically small mom & pop housing providers and property managers.

Allowing only renters on this committee would be a serious flaw in the city's approach to enacting housing policy. Housing providers know how things work, they know about their residents' needs & challenges, and can inform policy makers on how the city can both remove barriers and encourage more of their type of housing.

It is especially important for the city to both **RETAIN** the naturally occurring affordable housing that already exists (most often owned & operated by small mom & pops) **AND** encourage **MORE**.

Small mom & pop housing providers contribute about 50% of the rental housing nationwide. You need to have significant representation from them **AND** property managers who work for small mom & pop clients.

You will not see increased housing supply by alienating the people who provide it.

Please include us in seeking solutions to our housing crisis. Please actively engage your small housing provider constituents and create opportunities for them to be proactively involved in housing policy considerations. I'm asking for this current issue and for future opportunities as they arise.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

MariLyn Yim  
small mom & pop housing provider for 19 years  
cell: 206.330.6816

**From:** [Rebecca Iwai](#)  
**To:** [PED Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Landlord representation  
**Date:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 1:48:33 PM

---

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Landlord should be on committee if a renter is

Rebecca Iwai  
14640 27th Lane S

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [kabannon@comcast.net](mailto:kabannon@comcast.net)  
**To:** [PED Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Membership Options.  
**Date:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 2:01:07 PM

---

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of SeaTac -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

I want to thank you for discussing the important topic of what makes a good planning commission member. It is important. The success of any entity depends on the character the leadership and advisors, as well as intelligence, ethics, motivation, focus, etc. as well as the quality of the governance structure. You are looking in the right direction by asking what makes the best advisory committee member.

You will note however, that though the modern trend is to find representative stakeholders, or a representation of skill sets, in fact they don't do the best, providing mediocre results, and some fail spectacularly. Just because someone has a coveted credential or is a skilled advocate for a cause, it's not enough. In fact too often those appointed on that basis score low on the attributes that really matter: honesty, good listening, intelligence and looking for a solution that works for all.

Let's look at some of the scenarios leading to failure:

1. Members appointed because of loyalty to a specific stakeholder or the senior leadership. In the first example the recommendations rendered are biased to a single interest group. In the second situation the decisions rendered instead of thoughtful and researched are just rubber stamps of the elected leadership and senior staff. Lost are opportunities to render recommendations that appeal to all interests, compromises, and recommendations that bring forward the best possible common good outcome.
2. Members appointed without the highest ethics. In these cases recommendations are rendered based on the highest offer. Whether that be financial remuneration or future favors the recommendation reflects who provides such and not at all the interests of anyone except the parties paying.
3. Members appointed lacking displayed intelligence, motivation or focus – an eye to looking for the best future for the city, and the strategies used by successful cities. Intelligent members must be aware of and checking useful metrics. Here's a list of some of the most meaningful ones:
  - a. Average or higher aggregate median income
  - b. Growing population and tax base
  - c. A bell shaped curve of demographics (some of everybody also called a normal distribution) rather than a T shaped (biased with some over-represented and others under-represented)
  - d. High employment, literacy, health. Generally a plentiful base of high skill jobs provides ample opportunity for the population to provide for their own literacy and health
  - e. Adequate infrastructure in good order.
  - f. Notable wealth generation equal or higher than the state norm.
  - g. Home ownership equal or above the state norm. Implicit in that is the expectation that

- anyone can aspire to own their own home.
- h. A small sample of rental housing that is clean and safe. The best way to insure that is to make sure investors feel safe investing in the community.
  - i. A small amount of government housing for those few old, disabled, or in temporary crises that can't provide for themselves. Note if rental housing or government housing are in a distressed status, it is a warning the other metrics such as wealth generation or median income are not being addressed well.
4. Members who are not good listeners, explainers and analyzers. Good decisions can and do fail even though the merits are manifest when the implementation road map is lacking, when there is no buy in, or when there is rejection. Easiest ways to alienate constituents is to show a lack of listening and respect. It can and does easily grow to resistance and rejection often in the form of a electoral sweep.

Using this more progressive lens, here are my answers to your 4 questions:

1. How many business positions? Not the most important factor. Instead, make sure a representation of those with a business interest are encouraged to provide input on any matter. Remember the best encouragement is to treat those giving input with respect and to listen closely. Listen to those who are engaged in our community as well as those who potentially would like to add to the wealth of the community. Make sure those on the committee are intelligence, ethical, independent, motivated to bringing the city to its potential for all and are good listeners who treat all with respect.
2. How many renters? Same as question 1. Just add, those on the committee also have an eye to making sure those who do rent, whether out of financial position or life choice, have the means to move forward to be homeowners.
3. Other personal attributes or skills for planning commission members? I'm open to term limits. If so inclined, I recommend 2 terms. Those with tenure tend to have more institutional memory and skill, but that memory can also work against them as they're inclined to look at stuff the same way. Turnover keeps alive enthusiasm and independent thinking. Some tenure allows for continuity and balance. Skill sets are too limiting as well as diminish the talents of others. Character and record first. Non residents can be an gateway to more incite. One way to accommodate that is to allow one outsider at a time.
4. Renter specific topics? I think all are valid. I will add as a caution, local governments in the past have gotten in trouble in the past in all of those areas you mention of interest to renters. I will say to that, the members of the committee must be strong in character in the areas I described, or the committee and the outcomes will fail our fellow citizens in a massive way.

One last critical item. Staff work is critical for the success of advisory committees and elected leadership. It is important to have the most professional and ethical staff available. Keep that in mind during your annual evaluations of the city manager. To that end staff must be able to do their job unfettered, which is to understand the law and the options out there and to provide elected officials the best analysis of options and outcomes. There can be a tendency of elected leadership to influence staff to promote their political agenda, particularly if it is felt the election was beholden to the support of a single interest. When that happens the citizens lose. This does not mean automatically and blindly accept everything staff suggests, after all elected officials have a sense of the community and are elected to speak. Stay in the lane of propriety. Not sure? Refer to the council

handbook. Understand the outcome must be a win for all stakeholders and not a win/lose situation.