



**Seattle LGBT Commission:
Recommendations on Seattle 2035
Growth and Equity Public Review Draft**



City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Seattle LGBT Commission

Commissioners

Lisa Love
CO-CHAIR

Marxa Marnia
CO-CHAIR

NaaSira Adeeba
Gilbert Archuleta
Luzviminda U. Carpenter
Brennon Ham
Doug Hamilton
Mitchell Hunter
Mac McGregor
Breona Mendoz
Shoshana Paget
Deb Salls
Gunner Scott
Susan Snyder
KJ Williams

Recommendations for Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan Draft: Growth and Equity Public Review Draft

- Mayor Edward B. Murray
- Seattle City Council
- Diane M. Sugimura, Director, Department of Planning and Development
- Tom Hauger, Department of Planning and Development
- Kristian Kofoed, Department of Planning and Development
- The Seattle Planning Commission
- Patricia Lally, Department Director, Seattle Office of Civil Rights

Introduction

Social Equity: Twenty years ago, the City of Seattle included *Social Equity* as one of the four core values of the *Comprehensive Plan, Toward a Sustainable Seattle*. This was bold for 1994 and it included clear statement that in promoting equal opportunity for “all of its people” the city would not tolerate discrimination, including for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual community members. (*Transgender people fall under Gender Identity and Gender Expression and while it may have been inferred then, it was not explicitly stated in the 1994 document.*) We would advocate for the explicit inclusion of Gender Identity and Gender Expression along with Sexual Orientation in any current and future policies, practices, planning, guidelines, and ordinances as it relates to social equity, non-discrimination, or any other policy that addresses equal opportunities, access, and/or participation.

In order to promote equality, justice and understanding, the City will not tolerate discrimination in employment or housing on the basis of race, color, age, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, political ideology, creed, religion, ancestry, national origin or the presence of any sensory, mental or physical disability. The City will aim for a society that gives its residents equal opportunities to participate in, and benefit from, economic growth.

Since the 1994 *Comprehensive Plan, Toward a Sustainable Seattle* document was enacted, the City has increased its focus on racial equity including equitable growth development primarily through the Office for Civil Rights. We wholeheartedly support and will continue to advocate for this bold statement though we believe it is neither strong enough nor does not go far enough.

Racial equity should be the largest lens through which any policies, practices, planning, guidelines, and ordinances are examined. Our City, our children, youth, adults, seniors, and families are as complex as we are diverse and many live at the intersections of race, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, ability, language, and income. Without an analysis that includes the diversity of these intersections, the marginalized populations, including and especially racial/ethnic individuals, are made invisible and further marginalized. Until this well-intentioned but dated analysis is conducted from a thorough intersectional perspective, these marginalized communities are forced to raise their voices and step up to challenge the systematic and institutional policies and practices that keep racial and social disparities in place.

The objective of these recommendations is to inform our elected officials, Department of Planning and Development, Seattle Planning Commission, RSJI, and the general public about:

- The need for inclusion of an *Intersectional* framework to address Social Equity in addition to the Racial Equity Lens.
- The need for explicit inclusion of language, data, and strategies, of gender, sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression, languages, and income in the framework and analysis for growth and equity in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
- The need for recommendations and subsequent adoption of policies, practices, and strategies that use an intersectional framework highlighting specific impacts and outcomes for LGBT children, youth, adults, seniors, and families.

Recommendations: Key Terms

Marginalized Populations

- Include LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) populations
- Include Disabled and Differently Abled populations

Recommendations: Overarching Analytical Framework

Inclusion of an Intersectional Analysis with traditional EIS approach and the RSJI's Racial Equity Toolkit (RET)

An *Intersectional Analysis* allows for the premise that people live multiple, layered identities, and their experiences are derived from social relations, history and the operation of structures of power. People are members of more than one community at the same time and more than one social identity therefore can simultaneously experience oppression and privilege in any community and as any social identity.¹

"Intersectional analysis aims to reveal multiple identities, exposing the different types of discrimination, inequity, and disadvantage that occur as a consequence of the combination of identities." 2

An intersectional analysis examines the manner in which racism, sexism, homophobia, biphobia, transphobia, heterosexism, classism, ableism, and other systems of oppression and discrimination create inequities that structure the relative positions of individuals and communities creating and maintaining marginalized populations. This analysis takes into account the historical, social and political contexts while still recognizing unique individual and community cultural experiences resulting from overlapping different identities and experiences.

Historical Context

LGBTQ people, like many other marginalized communities, have long-standing, historic experience of systematic and institutional discrimination. While there are many current laws in place offering legal protections, culture has not yet caught up in many cases and conditions have not changed enough--LGBT people are still invisible, marginalized, and the impact of that systemic discrimination is still felt today for LGBT youth, adults, and families. This is especially evident when issues of race, ethnicity, citizenship, economics, and age also intersect for individuals and families. Cultural images and the status quo of business-as-usual both within the City and across the State continue to be dominated by inequality and portray all too often heterosexual images and reflect heterosexual data, practices, and values as the norm.

¹ Intersectionality: A Tool for Gender and Economic Justice. (2004, August 1). Retrieved June 6, 2015, from https://lgbtq.unc.edu/sites/lgbtq.unc.edu/files/documents/intersectionality_en.pdf

² Ibid.

The City of Seattle has been an early pioneer in protecting LGBT individuals. In 1973, Seattle passed a non-discrimination ordinance protecting gay and lesbian individuals later in 1977, the Mayor declared a Gay Pride Week for June of that year. While the ADA, American Disability Act, gave protections to differently-abled citizens, there was no mention of transgender people. It was not until 1996 that the ADA interpreted "Sexual Orientation" broadly enough to encompass issues of Gender and Gender Identity.

Seattle has also had its fair share of homophobia and anti-LGBT rights proposals. The community fought to keep a 1977 ballot measure named Initiative Thirteen off the books. Not only would this initiative have overturned the existing non-discrimination ordinance, but also would have allowed the "mere accusation of homosexuality to be the basis for dismissal from a job or eviction from a residence."

In 1986, gay rights opponents in our state introduced proposals at the state level that would have banned gays and lesbians from working in schools and government offices, thankfully these proposals were defeated as well.

In 1989 the City of Seattle established by ordinance the Seattle Commission for Sexual Minorities to serve as part of the Office for Civil Rights. There have been name changes carried by ordinance since then from Seattle Commission for Lesbians and Gays to the Seattle Lesbian, Gay Bi-sexual and Transgender Commission. The duties and rules of order have changed very little if at all.

Even with protections and advocacy organizations established there was still the need for vigilance and perseverance in supporting positive policies regarding the LGBTQ community. Hands Off Washington (HOW), a project of the Washington Citizens for Fairness (WCF) was just such a state-wide advocacy organization. From 1993 to 1997. WCF, a coalition of concerned citizens and organizations, charged themselves with preserving the civil rights of all Washington citizens. HOW was created to specifically oppose initiatives 608 and 610, which sought to limit the rights of Washington citizens and legalize discrimination based on sexual orientation.

February of 2006, Governor Gregoire added protections for Sexual Orientation to the State statute RCW 49.60. Later in 2009 RCW 49.60.040 defined Sexual Orientation broadly to include Transgender and Gender Non-Conforming individuals under Gender Identity and Expression: to read:

(26) "Sexual orientation" means heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality, and gender expression or identity. As used in this definition, "gender expression or identity" means having or being perceived as having a gender identity, self-image, appearance, behavior, or expression, whether or not that gender identity, self-image, appearance, behavior, or expression is different from that traditionally associated with the sex assigned to that person at birth.

While anti-LGBT measures have been defeated, lingering sentiment against LGBT people still continues today. These sentiments may not be the majority viewpoint or as visible publically, but through stereotypes and opinions stemming from misinformation or ignorance, they still persist. It has been just a little over 40 years since the first public affirmation of LGBT people by the City of Seattle, but only nine years since the state of Washington added LGBT protections and just three years since marriage equality. In the overall arc of changing society and undoing myths, negative stereotypes, and attitudes, that is still just a short period of time.³

While many laws and policies have changed for the better, the societal and cultural changes have not kept

3 "Washington – Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Law and Documentation of Discrimination." Williams Institute. 1 Sept. 2009. Web. 10 June 2015. <<http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/demographics/washington/appendix-0909-47/>>.

pace. Today, there are still bias crimes and discrimination being committed against LGBT people, some are in the form of violence, particularly hate crimes in the Capitol Hill neighborhood, which has been a cultural and business center for the LGBT community for decades, and others are in the form of discrimination such as denying a transgender woman access to her own bank account.⁴

Demographic Trends

The lack of data inclusive of LGBT people and families at this stage of developing the 2035 Comprehensive plan and in particular in the Growth and Equity Framework draft is evidence of continued invisibility by systematic and institutional discrimination. While this may not be overt or intentional, the fact remains the needs of LGBT individuals and families are not part of the analysis.

Right now, there is a serious change happening in areas of the city that have historically housed LGBT businesses, community gatherings, and where some of the LGBT community have lived, particularly in Capitol Hill, as well as neighborhoods such as Central District and Beacon Hill that have had people of color and in particular, LGBT people of color. That is not to say that LGBT people are not in all neighborhoods of Seattle.

Today, there is more data on LGBT youth, adults, and families, while it may not be to the specificity of data on non-LGBT/straight people, it is credible and used by various non-profit advocacy organizations, the media, and state, local, and federal agencies.

- Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) ranks Seattle as #5 in the top five of cities with adults who identify as LGBT at 4.8% of the city's population and 4% for the state of Washington overall.⁵
- Over 31,000 residents identify as LGBT adults, this is not including LGBT youth or the children of LGBT families. Which is roughly compares to the population size of the Queen Anne neighborhood.
- 2010 Census data for Washington found that 12% of same-sex couples were raising children in King County.⁶ In addition, overall census data has found that "Among those raising children, 28% of householders in same-sex couples are non-White compared to 24% of householders in different-sex married couples."⁷
- More than one in five same-sex couples (20.6%) are interracial or interethnic compared to 18.3% of different-sex unmarried couples and just 9.5% of different-sex unmarried couples.⁸

A 2014 brief from the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation⁹, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found that:

"Analyses of nationally representative, population-based surveys suggest that LGBT people are more likely to face economic difficulties than are non-LGBT people. Analyses focusing on couples and controlling for demographic characteristics have found that both male and female same-sex couples are more likely to be in poverty than are different-sex married couples."

4 "Transgender Woman Says She Wasn't given Access to Own Bank..." Transgender Woman Says She Wasn't given Access to Own Bank... Web. 10 June 2015. <<http://www.kirotv.com/news/news/transgender-woman-says-she-was-refused-service-ban/nmTts/>>.

5 Gates, GJ. 2015. Comparing LGBT Rankings by Metro Area: 1990 to 2014. Los Angeles, CA: Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law.

6 *Ibid.*

7 Gates, Gary. "Same-sex Couples in Census 2010: Race and Ethnicity." Same-sex Couples in Census 2010: Race and Ethnicity. Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, 1 Apr. 2016. Web. 10 June 2015. <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-CouplesRaceEthnicity-April-2012.pdf>.

8 "Washington – Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Law and Documentation of Discrimination." Williams Institute. 1 Sept. 2009. Web. 10 June 2015. <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/demographics/washington/appendix-0909-47>.

9 *Ibid*

Analyzing data from the American Community Survey (ACS) by the Williams Institute¹⁰ some key finding nationally include:

- “Regardless of race or ethnicity, individuals in same-sex couples have higher unemployment rates and higher rates of college completion compared to their counterparts in different-sex couples.”
- “Racial/ethnic minority individuals in same-sex couples tend to live in areas where there are higher proportions of individuals of their own race or ethnicity.”
- “African-American individuals in same-sex couples report lower median incomes than African-Americans in different-sex couples.”
- “1 out of 5 Latino/and API individuals in same-sex couples are non-citizens (20%, 19%). In general, individuals in same-sex couples are more likely to be U.S. citizens (by naturalization or birth) than those in different-sex couples.”

Data from the 2011 National Transgender Discrimination Survey¹¹ included the following key findings:

- “Discrimination was pervasive throughout the entire sample of transgender respondents, yet the combination of anti-transgender bias and persistent, structural racism was especially devastating.”
- “Transgender people of color in general fare worse than white participants across the board, with African American transgender respondents faring worse than all others in many areas examined.”
- “Transgender respondents of all races lived in extreme poverty. Our sample was nearly four times more likely to have a household income of less than \$10,000/year compared to the general population.”
- “Respondents reported various forms of direct housing discrimination — 19% reported having been refused a home or apartment and 11% reported being evicted because of their gender identity/expression.”
- “Respondents reported less than half the national rate of homeownership: 32% reported owning their home compared to 67% of the general population”

Recommendations: Data Analysis

It is our strong recommendation that demographic trends include an examination of LGBT data and that the findings are part of the overall analysis and planning for the City.

In addition, we recommend the City include survey questions that allow for individuals to identify their sexual orientation and their gender identity, with additional gender categories that will capture gender beyond just male and female. We can provide appropriate questions used as best practices in national surveys. With the passage of the Affordable Care Act, medical providers and to some extent by extension insurance providers have been required to collect data on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, (SOGI) of individuals since 2014.

Recommendations: Equitable Development Framework for Growth

The Department of Planning & Development (DPD) in conjunction with the Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI) core team have developed a framework analysis that acts as a new tool to fill in the gaps unaddressed¹² by the mitigation measures derived from the Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) Principles of Equitable Development.

We understand that the Growth and Equity Analysis identifies two major issues in need of mitigation. The first major issue: Seattle’s population of marginalized peoples, defined in categorical triad as low-income, people of color, and English-language learners,¹³ lack stability and resilience in the face of displacement pressures.

10 Kastanis, Angeliki, and Bianca Wilson. "Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Socioeconomic Wellbeing of Individuals in Same-sex Couples." Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Socioeconomic Wellbeing of Individuals in Same-sex Couples. The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, 1 Feb. 2014. Web. 10 June 2015.

11 Grant, Jaime M., Lisa A. Mottet, Justin Tanis, Jack Harrison, Jody L. Herman, and Mara Keisling. Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 2011.

12 Public Review Draft (May 2015, pgs. 3-4, 10)

13 Public Review Draft (May 2015, pg. 10) and <http://www.psrc.org/assets/8720/EquityPrinciplesFinal2012.pdf>

The second major issue: Seattle is a city with an inequitable distribution of healthy and safe neighborhoods characterized as having high quality of life amenities and services. And where those neighborhoods exist they are not equitably accessible to the senior, disabled, and non-English speaking populations as they are to a younger, able-bodied, English-speaking population.

Our Concerns

The LGBT Commission is concerned that while combining a traditional EIS approach with RSJI's Racial Equity Toolkit is an appropriate first step, it is still missing a critical avenue to deeper insights that would be provided by including an intersectional analysis to the assessment matrix. We agree with racial justice as the foundation on which we must address social inequities. However, we also believe, that including intersectionality in the final analysis will not only capture the multiple identities of marginalized groups but it will also illuminate the ways institutional inequities, associated with individual identities, are reinforced and compounded to effectively lessen access to the key determinants of well-being.

The LGBT Commission takes issue with the narrowed scope of 'historically marginalized communities' as presented in the draft Growth and Equity Analysis which excludes the LGBT community as both a marginalized group and as a social and business stakeholder. The LGBT community with the GSBA--one of the largest and the longest established LGBTQ chambers of commerce in the country, has been rendered invisible at this stage of the draft analysis. Such disregard for the needs of Seattle's LGBTQ population and the recommendations made by this commission in regards to the Equity and Growth Analysis and its eventual implementation are striking and untenable. We find our absence unacceptable as we are stakeholders, citizens and intersectional communities also affected by the success or failure of the mitigation measures identified in the draft analysis.

Where PSRC envisions Social Equity to mean "...that those affected by poverty, communities of color, and historically marginalized communities have leadership and influence in decision making processes, planning, and policy-making,"¹⁴ we are clear that in addition to representing a historically marginalized community, the LGBT Commission has also been underutilized with regard to leadership and influence in decision making processes, planning, and policy-making.

Here is a prime example related to LGBT inclusion in contributing guidance to the use of parks as public amenities.

Developing Healthy and Safe Neighborhoods

We recently submitted recommendations regarding the proposed smoking ban in parks to the Department of Parks and Recreation and in-person to City Council Member Jean Godden. Our recommendation for the proposed smoking ban in parks was for a partial ban, rather than a full ban, that summarily consisted of fully marked smoking areas and revisions to the Code of Conduct language (See *Banning Smoking in Seattle Public Parks* in the appendix.) The partial ban recommendations were intended to help prevent racial and economic profiling as well as to reduce avenues for discriminatory yet legal technicalities. These recommendations represent the Commission's effort to help the development of safe and healthy neighborhoods to be more inclusive, particularly with regard to parks as public amenities. These intersectional recommendations were disregarded.

The interest of the LGBT Commission in the inclusivity of the growth planning process for the City of Seattle cannot be understated. As described previously, we believe that adding an intersectional analysis to the overarching analytical framework would create a more robust Equitable Development Framework. Our second concern is that the mitigation measures may be self-undermining.

14 <http://www.psrc.org/assets/8720/EquityPrinciplesFinal2012.pdf>

“Public investments can meet the needs of marginalized populations when the market will not and can help them benefit from future growth.”¹⁵

Using public investments as a matter of promoting and protecting the institutional willingness to invest in social equity seems a well-intentioned way to increase equitable access to services by broadening and providing more avenues to place-based key determinants of social, physical, and economic well-being for those of marginalized populations. The LGBT Commission is further concerned that the goals and mitigation measures of the Equitable Development Framework, while visionary and broadly comprehensive it may not be sustainable. Cooperation and participation by the public and private, while encouraged, cannot be required or easily managed. A proposed solution for future growth may very well be undermined by an internal dependence on strong private sector cooperation.

As indicated by its prevalence in the first 10 pages of the public review draft, it is clear that the efforts of equitable growth in terms of cultural competence and access are inextricably tied to market success. An assumption of the Equitable Development Framework is that in another circumstance, other than Seattle’s current context of rapid growth and escalating house prices¹⁶, market forces alone *would* be able to produce equitable growth. Given that the private sector is categorically pay-to-play, this assumption seems questionable.

“Achieving equitable growth will require implementation of programs and investments that are designed to create community stability and economic mobility for current residents in areas where new development could lead to displacement and where marginalized populations currently lack access to opportunity.”¹⁷

Funding for equitable growth seems to be heavily dependent on the strength of the market. The implementation of programs and community investments is requisite for success and the very real consequences of failure are palpable. At best, programming is underfunded or subjected to funding decreases with funding waning over time. At worst, elements of a highly networked plan could be cut entirely or never implemented due to funding priorities. This directly exposes these proposed growth alternatives to vulnerabilities that contradict the language and intention of equitable growth.

The Equitable Development Framework would be internalizing market instability by pegging equitable growth and access efforts to the success of the market. A deep attachment of this kind is problematic on two fronts. First, it would frustrate the feasibility of economically capturing the public benefit of the two-sector partnership. Second, tying growth equity to market success would simultaneously promote social insecurity aggravating equity and access work, which is critical to inclusion, instead of mitigating the perceptions and expectations of exclusion by these marginalized communities. Homo- bi- and trans-phobia continues to persist and is severely compounded by an individual’s status as non-white, low-income, and/or English-language learning, the LGBT Commission sees that the City of Seattle could position itself as a leader in driving municipal-level cultural shifts. The Seattle LGBT Commission asks that the City of Seattle protect its commitment to equitable growth and access from the inevitable downturn of the economic cycle. We suggest that a fund be allocated and protected from the volatilities of market-based priorities and that along these lines alternative funding sources are secured to ensure a long-term, real commitment to the efforts outlined in the draft.

Our Ask

The LGBT Commission requests a formal, written answer to the following question:

- How does DPD in concert with the RSJI Core Team intend to protect the mitigation measures specifically, and the equity and access efforts more broadly, from the well-known consequences of internalizing a reliance on market strength?
- How does the DPD in concert with the RSJI Core Team intend to include the needs of LGBT children,

¹⁵ Public Review Draft (May 2015, pg. 6)

¹⁶ Public Review Draft (May 2015, pg. 9)

¹⁷ Public Review Draft (May 2015, pg. 9-10)

youth, adults, seniors, and families as well as differently-abled/disabled children, youth, adults, and seniors in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive plan?

Recommendations: Attachment B Equitable Development Measures

1. Advanced Economic Mobility and Opportunity	Example Program
1.2 Education, training and new entry-level jobs should include outreach and training for the LGBTQ community, specifically for people of color and people who identify as transgender or gender non-conforming.	
1.3 Education and job training should include programs for outreach into the LGBTQ community, specifically for those facing employment barriers due to gender identity, expression, people of color, and those who have faced job discrimination.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seattle Transgender Economic Empowerment Project ▪ YouthCare/YouthBuild ▪ Peace for the Streets by Kids for the Streets
1.4 Removal of barriers should include increased enforcement of anti-discrimination laws, and emphasize safe workspaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SOCR
1.5 Should include programs that promote fair housing for LGBTQ, disabled persons, and people of color, and support for people in those communities in finding housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SOCR Fair Housing Campaign
1.6 Funding for financial literacy education and assistance programs that work within the LGBTQ community, especially for those in unstable housing situation or who are transitioning into housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Senior Services
2. Prevent Residential, Commercial, and Cultural Displacement	Example Programs
2.1 Explicit language and programs to protect marginalized populations including protections for LGBTQ partners, partners who identify as transgender, gender non conforming, disabled, married or otherwise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SOCR Fair Housing Campaign
2.2 Programs to preserve long-term housing affordability should support affordability for those in low-income housing, the working poor and those in the middle class.	
2.3 Funds earmarked for home repair loans and down payment assistance for LGBTQ homeowners in unstable or uncertain situations: recognizing that many LGBTQ persons, particularly transgender and people of color, face increased difficulty in gaining and maintaining employment and earning a living wage pre- post- and through transition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Habitat for Humanity - Pride Build Program
2.4 and 2.5 Community development in areas and neighborhoods recognized as safe and friendly to LGBTQ people and families. Develop and establish an LGBT Centers and a Health and Well-being Center for the LGBTQ community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greater Seattle Business Association (GSBA)
2.6 and 2.7 Explicitly include LGBTQ cultural districts, including businesses and areas that are central to the LGBTQ community in analysis and as an integral part of a sustainable growth plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seattle’s LGBT Commission ▪ Greater Seattle Business Association (GSBA)
2.8 Engage LGBTQ community leaders and organizations in analysis, planning and implementing a stronger equitable growth plan for Seattle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seattle’s LGBT Commission ▪ Ingersoll ▪ Entre Hermanos ▪ Gay City ▪ Greater Seattle Business Association (GSBA) ▪ Gender Justice League

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LGBTQ Allyship ▪ People of Color Against AIDS Network ▪ Trikone-Northwest ▪ Northwest Two Spirit Society ▪ Pride Foundation ▪ Northwest Network ▪ Senior Services
3. Build on Local Cultural Assets	Example Programs
3.1 Preserve and strengthen centers of LGBTQ community like Capitol Hill and the Central District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capitol Hill LGBT Task Force ▪ Greater Seattle Business Association (GSBA) ▪ Gay City ▪ Entre Hermanos ▪ Life Long
3.2 Specifically include LGBTQ cultural networks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gay City Arts ▪ Three Dollar Bill Cinema ▪ Flying House Productions
3.3 Specific inclusion of LGBTQ in marginalized populations, and investments in LGBTQ organizations and coalitions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seattle LGBT Commission ▪ Gay City ▪ NW Network ▪ LGBTQ Allyship ▪ Clinics providing culturally appropriate health care ▪ Coalition for Inclusive Health Care
4. Develop Healthy and Safe Neighborhoods	Example Programs
4.1 Public amenities specifically to include public safety institutions recognizing the unique risks for LGBTQ citizens, LGBTQ safe and friendly schools, and culturally-appropriate healthcare for LGBTQ persons, youth, seniors and disabled and differently-abled people. Programs to support LGBTQ safety and safety for people who identify as a part of multiple marginalized populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Country Doctor/Carolyn Downs Community Clinic ▪ Sea Mar Community Health Centers ▪ Seattle Counseling Service ▪ Community Centers (including community swimming pools) ▪ Seattle Parks and Recreation Department ▪ Senior Services and affiliated Senior Centers
5. Equitable Access to All Neighborhoods	Example Programs
5.1 Specifically include LGBTQ and people who identify as part of multiple marginalized populations, particularly people of color, those whose who identify as transgender, seniors, those who are disabled, students/apprentices, and those in specialized job training, and employment programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
5.3, 5.5, 5.6 Affordable and sustainable housing is made available for people in multiple socio-economic classes, low-income to middle class.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪

including access for the LGBTQ community, a Community Center particularly people of color, those who identify as transgender, senior, youth and disabled or differently abled persons.	
5.7 Specifically include education and enforcement of fair housing laws and anti-discrimination policy for LGBTQ persons, people who identify as transgender, people of color, seniors, youth and disabled persons.	▪ SOCR Fair Housing Campaign

Appendix



COMMISSIONERS

Lisa Love
CO-CHAIR
Marxa Marnia
CO-CHAIR
NaaSira Adeeba
Anthony Adero
Gilbert Archuleta
Luzviminda U. Carpenter
Brennon Ham
Doug Hamilton
Mitchell Hunter
Mac McGregor
Breona Mendoza
Shoshana Paget
Deb Salls
Gunner Scott
Susan Snyder
KJ Williams

City of Seattle

Edward B. Murray, Mayor
Seattle LGBT Commission

TO: Board of Parks, Office of Mayor Edward Murray, & City Council of Seattle
FROM: Seattle LGBT Commission
DATE: May 11, 2015
SUBJECT: Banning Smoking in Seattle Public Parks

Dear Board of Parks Commissioners,

We, the Seattle LGBT Commission (the "Commission"), oppose a ban for smoking in all areas of public parks in the City of Seattle (the "City"). The Commission is concerned a complete ban on smoking in parks would unfairly target homeless youth and young adults. We do support the adoption of a partial smoking ban in particular areas of the parks which could include children's play areas, picnic areas, near water fountains, and beaches.

Many of Seattle's homeless youth and adults who do not have access to private outdoor space utilize parks, particularly in the downtown area. The American Journal of Preventative Medicine reports that approximately 73% of homeless citizens report some type of tobacco use, many as a means to reduce stress. The 2015 One Night Count of homeless individuals living in Seattle found that some 2, 813 were living outside and without shelter.ⁱ Of those 2, 813 an approximate 20 to 40% identify as LGBTQ.ⁱⁱ Count Us In 2015, a survey aimed specifically at youth and young adults, found 824 homeless youth and young adults living in King County, 22% of which identify as LGBTQ.ⁱⁱⁱ

The Commission is concerned that enforcement of the complete smoking ban in City parks will be disproportionately enforced and focused in the downtown area, as evidenced by the Seattle Parks and Recreation Memorandum sent March 19, 2015. The Memorandum states that "most enforcement actions are expected to occur in the parks in the downtown core," which include Occidental Park, Victor Steinbrueck Park and Westlake Park.^{iv}

As part of the downtown core, these parks also serve a large number of Seattle's homeless population. With so many of Seattle's homeless using parks, especially downtown parks, the Commission is concerned that enforcement of a complete ban on smoking will force many out of city parks and increase the criminalization of homeless individuals because of so called "quality of life" crimes. This will also cause an undue burden on Seattle's Police department having to enforce this proposed ban.

The Commission recognizes the City's legitimate concerns regarding the health and environmental risks of secondhand smoke, and many park users' desire to visit these public spaces without encountering people smoking or using other tobacco products.

The Commission writes in support of the implementation of a partial smoking ban in all public City parks. The City of Seattle Parks and Recreation Code of Conduct (060 7.21.00, section 3.2.1), currently prohibits the "chewing, smoking or other tobacco use within 25ft of other park patrons and play areas, beaches, playgrounds or picnic areas."^v

The Commission recommends amending this rule to ban smoking in designated areas only, to remove the "within 25ft" condition and add installation of signage indicating that certain areas, including playgrounds, picnic areas, trails, p-patches, and structures, as well as,

athletic fields, water fountains, some park benches and any other areas where children, families, youth and young adults congregate, are non-smoking areas.

The Commission also suggests the development of designated smoking areas in all public parks, along with clearly posted smoking guidelines. Smoking areas should include a space to be social, for instance a covered structure or benches, and ash receptacles. Additionally, the Commission also recommends the City invest in smoking cessation programs developed specifically for LGBTQ youth, homeless youth, and homeless adults, recognizing the increased difficulty of accessing resources and the cessation of smoking while homeless.

The Commission urges the Board of Parks and Commissioners to reject a complete ban of smoking in City parks, and instead adopt a partial ban that respects the rights of both non-smokers and tobacco users to access and enjoy the City of Seattle's parks.

Thank you,

Lisa Love Marxa Marnia
Co-Chair Co-Chair

Shoshana Paget & Gunner Scott
LGBT Commission's City Planning, Neighborhood Services & City Resources Task Force

ⁱ Seattle/King County Coalition on Homeless 2015 One Night Count Results: homelessinfo.org

ⁱⁱ National Coalition to End Homelessness: <http://nationalhomeless.org/issues/lgbt/>

ⁱⁱⁱ Count Us In 2015: <https://tf008v2.storage.googleapis.com/Count-Us-In-2015-Rpt.pdf>

^{iv} Seattle Parks and Recreation Memorandum: March 19, 2015

^v Parks Code of Conduct 060 7.21.00, section 3.2.1

COMMISSIONERS

Lisa Love CO-CHAIR

Marxa Marnia CO-CHAIR

NaaSira Adeeba

Gilbert Archuleta

Luzviminda U. Carpenter

Brennon Ham

Doug Hamilton

Mitchell C Hunter

Mac McGregor

Breona Mendoza

Shoshana Paget

Deb Salls

Gunner Scott

Susan Snyder

KJ Williams

