



Seattle Mayoral Candidate Questionnaire on Housing and Homelessness, Summer 2017

Prepared By: [Solid Ground](#) and [Seattle University's Project on Family Homelessness](#), in partnership with [Housing Development Consortium](#) and [Seattle-King County Coalition on Homelessness](#)

Candidate's Name: Casey Carlisle

Campaign Address: 3815 S Othello St, Ste 100 – #335, 98118

Campaign Phone: 206-949-3384

Campaign Email Address: casey@caseyForSeattle.com

Campaign Website: caseyForSeattle.com

Candidate Photo: Attached

There are seven questions. You may choose to skip a question; if so, please indicate that you choose not to answer. Please limit your answers to 150 words each (about 1,000 characters, including spaces).

Question 1. King County and the City of Seattle have recognized that the crises of affordability and homelessness are complex, regional issues that require regional solutions, exacerbated by the threat of potential drastic HUD funding cuts. If elected, how would you work with other regional leaders and the state and federal governments to identify, enact and implement innovative, forward-thinking solutions to decrease homelessness and increase affordability?

King County and the City of Seattle, by way of their delusional, "progressive" policies, have created these crises, and these crises have been very lucrative for those governments. The mayor should work only with the city and county governments, not with the state and federal governments. City Hall is largely to blame for Seattle's cost of living and homelessness problems. If City Hall focused only on the city by focusing only on the basics – public safety, water, electricity, and roads – City Hall would need far less tax revenue, and the cost of living wouldn't be so high. Regarding homelessness, the City is aiding and abetting homelessness. The [Homelessness Industrial Complex](#) is alive and well in Seattle. \$60M will be spent on homelessness this year, but that money only enriches the NGOs that thrive on homelessness. \$60M equates to over \$19k per homeless person, but the homeless don't see that money.



Question 2. What is your position on the policies contained in the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA)? What do you agree with? Disagree?

HALA is a disaster. It tramples property rights, and it isn't economically sustainable. "Affordable housing" is a lie; diffusing the cost of housing doesn't make housing more affordable. When City Hall illegally orders developers to provide units at below-market rates, developers then must charge above-market rates on the remaining, vast majority of units. As previously stated, City Hall manufactured Seattle's affordability "crisis." Seattle is the fastest-growing large city in the country, but because of HALA, supply cannot keep up with demand, which is the reason housing is so expensive. The best way to make housing more affordable is to allow the market to build more housing. HALA is, at best, a distraction, at worst, social engineering. It is not for government to determine something as inherently subjective as "livability." Again, if City Hall focused on the basics – public safety, water, electricity, and roads – Seattle would naturally become more livable.

Question 3. How would you balance the disagreement and anger expressed by some neighborhood residents towards increased density and affordable homes in specific areas of the city, with our unprecedented growth and need for increased housing options that must be shared equitably across the city?

City Hall, in its never-ending pretentiousness, picks and chooses which neighborhoods are worthy of economic development, and when some neighborhoods are upzoned, those that aren't become disadvantaged. Again, City Hall tramples property rights. City Hall should upzone the entire city, or better yet, do away with zoning altogether. Doing this will allow growth to happen where it is most needed, and property rights will be respected. Combining that policy with a property-tax overhaul would increase the number of housing options, as well as make those options cheaper. We should tax only the land, not what is on it. This [land-value tax](#) incentivizes denser (greener) growth, and those with shared walls will have lower property-tax bills (i.e. cheaper rent). If people don't like density, then they'll be able to pay for the luxury of not having shared walls. It's not for angry residents to determine what others do with their property.

Question 4. Did you vote for the Seattle Housing Levy in 2016? Why or why not? What kind of funding mechanism do you believe is best to generate money for housing and homelessness services?

This question is based on the fallacy that government is best at generating money for housing and homelessness services, but in reality, government is best at taking money away from those who would otherwise be able to donate to housing and homelessness services. If City Hall extracts less money from residents, Seattleites will have more disposable income with which to donate. Philanthropy is not the role of government. Seattle is fortunate to have many compassionate residents, so let's allow them to care for whatever cause they deem worthy of their donations. Getting the government to do your caring for you is pessimistic, lazy, and pretentious. The City of Houston [doesn't spend a dime](#) on homelessness, and that city has seen its homelessness population rapidly decrease over the past five years. I doubt many would call Houston a "progressive" city, but they're obviously on to something that Seattle would rather ignore.



Question 5. Given that half the residents of Seattle are renters, what tenant protections -- above and beyond what the city has already done -- would you push to enact to ensure that potential tenants are being treated equitably?

I wouldn't do anything "above and beyond what the City has already done," and I'd likely undo some of the measures that the City has put into place. When government tries to be progressive, the net effect is regressive. HALA, Mandatory Inclusionary Zoning, First in Time, move-in fee restrictions, etc. were all implemented with good intentions; however, these laws have only decreased housing affordability. These laws end up hurting the very same people that the City claims to care about. Good intentions mean nothing when the results are disastrous.

Question 6. Virtually every city in Washington has responded to the growing homelessness crisis by criminalizing behaviors such as sitting, lying or sleeping in public. If elected, (a) will you work to repeal and/or mitigate the impacts of ordinances that criminalize homelessness in Seattle, and (b) will you oppose attempts to introduce such ordinances?

Seattle has suddenly outlawed homelessness? This is either false, or the Seattle Police Department isn't enforcing such rules. The homeless population is only increasing, due in large part to the City's counterproductive policies. City-sanctioned homeless encampments need to go. We already have laws against trespassing.

Question 7. The recent tragic killing of Charleena Lyles highlights the issues of police accountability and the intersecting systems of care in our community whose failures led to her death, including housing, mental health, child welfare, justice and more. How would you address the failure of these systems to work together?

This question is ridiculous. Lyles was killed because she came at police with a knife. "Intersectionality" does not apply, and your organizations should be ashamed for blaming Lyles' death on "intersectionality." Her death is tragic, and I wish the police who defended themselves were able to do so in a non-lethal manner; however, it's too easy for us to judge those policemen. We weren't there. Maybe we could have responded differently, but maybe not. The only failure I see is from Seattle's own City Council. Councilmembers wanted to make Lyles' death about identity politics, which is why no attention was given to the murder of this [policeman](#). We demand too much of police. I want the police to deal with only theft and violence. If that was their mandate, I bet they'd have a lower attrition rate, and I bet the public would respect them more, making Seattle safer.

Candidate Signature:

Cassy Carlisle
7 July 2017

