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Dear Affected Agencies, Organizations and Interested Parties:

The City of Seattle invites you to review of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) that examines the potential effects of the City’s update of its Comprehensive Plan. The update will consist of text and map amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to influence the location of 70,000 new housing units and 115,000 new jobs in Seattle through 2035. The proposal applies to the entire City of Seattle. The EIS evaluates three action alternatives and one no-action alternative (Alternative 1), each representing different approaches to allocating city-wide growth within the framework of the City’s adopted urban village strategy. Alternatives include:

1. Continue Current Growth Distribution Trends (No Action)
2. Guide Growth to Urban Centers
3. Guide Growth to Urban Villages Near Light Rail
4. Guide Growth to Urban Villages Near Transit

This Draft EIS identifies environmental impacts and mitigating strategies for each alternative. Elements of the environment evaluated in this Draft EIS include: earth and water quality, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, noise, land use, relationship to plans and policies, population/employment/ housing, transportation, public services, and utilities. The public comment period for this Draft EIS continues through June 17, 2015. Please see the Fact Sheet and the project website http://2035.seattle.gov for information on options for providing comments. In addition, the City invites your comments at:

Comprehensive Plan Update, Draft EIS Open House and Public Hearing
Monday, May 27, 2015 at 6:00 pm
Seattle City Hall, Bertha Landes Room, 600 Fourth Avenue (enter on 5th Avenue)

Additional information concerning the open house and public hearing is provided in the Fact Sheet and on the City’s project website at http://2035.seattle.gov. Following the Draft EIS comment period, a Final EIS will be prepared that addresses comments received during the Draft EIS comment period.

Thank you for your interest in the Comprehensive Plan Update and this Draft EIS. We welcome your comments.

Sincerely,

Diane M. Sugimura
Director
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