

## **Public Hearing Responses**

# CHAPTER 5 PUBLIC HEARING RESPONSES

## 5.1 Public Hearing

---

Chapter 5 of this Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) contains public comments provided on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) during the public hearing meeting.

<i>Public Comments .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Responses to Comments .....</i>	<i>3</i>

SOUTH LAKE UNION  
HEIGHT AND DENSITY ALTERNATIVES  
PUBLIC MEETING

MARCH 28, 2011

HELD AT: UNITY CHURCH  
200 8TH AVENUE NORTH  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121

REPORTED BY:  
EMILY K. NILES, RMR, CRR

□

2

1 MR. FOSTER: Good evening everyone and thank you  
2 for being here.

3 My name is Marshal Foster. I'm the city planning  
4 director with Seattle's Department of Planning and  
5 Development. And this evening is a very important milestone  
6 for the South Lake Union neighborhood. Tonight we are going  
7 to be taking your thoughts and comment on the South Lake  
8 Union Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So I want to  
9 move quickly through our program, but I would like to give  
10 you a few just sort of context setting points as we begin  
11 this evening. So bear with me and then I'm going to turn it  
12 over to our project team to kind of walk you through some of  
13 the analyses here.

14 First and foremost, I know many of you have been  
15 involved in planning South Lake Union for many years. We  
16 started really in the early 2000's with a process to update  
17 the South Lake Union neighborhood plan. That resulted in  
18 2004 with a new neighborhood plan for South Lake Union that  
19 really looked out over the next 20, 25 years at how this  
20 neighborhood could come together as a place for jobs, as a  
21 place for housing, and really most importantly as a  
22 mixed-use community that was vibrant, that really embraced  
23 its place in the city as a growing hub in Seattle. And also  
24 really connected with South Lake Union itself and the  
25 neighborhoods around it, Queen Anne, Capitol Hill, Denny

3

1 Triangle, and the downtown.

2 As you all know South Lake Union has been changing  
3 at a dramatic pace, a lot of new buildings, a lot of new  
4 people enjoying this neighborhood. And I think we're  
5 fortunate in a city that we have a pretty smart and  
6 forward-looking strategy for how we manage growth in  
7 Seattle. It really concentrates on the opportunity that

8 neighborhoods like South Lake Union present to create new,  
9 very vibrant and livable neighborhoods for the City, similar  
10 to many of the other neighborhoods that we enjoy in Seattle.

11 So I appreciate all of you who have been part of  
12 this process for many years. Also those of you who are new  
13 to this, I hope you'll bear with us as we're really going to  
14 be getting into a lot of specifics in terms of how we take  
15 some of those goals and policies and some of that vision  
16 from the neighborhood plan and begin to turn it into some  
17 more specific physical visions for the future of South Lake  
18 Union.

19 In terms of the Draft Environmental Impact  
20 Statement, what is it and what is it not? The goal of this  
21 work is to provide you and City elected officials, the mayor  
22 and the City council, with the tool to really assess the  
23 pros and cons of a range of development potentials for  
24 South Lake Union.

25 I want to be very clear on one point. What you

4

1 are going to see tonight, the range of options do not  
2 represent proposals for rezoning this neighborhood. They  
3 really represent a range of options from large to small that  
4 the city council and the mayor will have to consider as they  
5 look at what an ultimate rezoning proposal could look like.  
6 And we were very intentional about showing that range and  
7 many of you talked with me outside about your feelings about  
8 different points along that scale and I know we'll hear more  
9 from you this evening on that.

10 Second point I'll make is that while this is a  
11 very complex document, I hope you'll take the time to read

12 it, to review it. I know it can be challenging at times.  
13 Please use the City staff who are here this evening --  
14 Jim Holmes who's our project manager for South Lake Union --  
15 as a resource to help you understand it. It needs to be  
16 complex for a variety of reasons. The issues that we're  
17 facing are complex. And we'd like to do everything we can  
18 to help you understand this work so that you can also use it  
19 to inform your thinking.

20 And so with that, the last thing I'll say is as we  
21 go forward, the work that's in this Environmental Impact  
22 Statement really will be a foundation for ultimately the  
23 work that we as a city planning staff will do with you to  
24 develop an ultimate proposal for the future of this  
25 neighborhood. As I mentioned before, this is not a

5

1 proposal, but ultimately a tool that we will use over the  
2 next year as we work with you on the future of that.

3 So this isn't the last you're going to see us.  
4 You'll be seeing a lot more of us as we carry this work  
5 forward the rest of this year and early in 2012.

6 Without further ado, I'd like to introduce our  
7 project team, and I will begin with Deborah.

8 MS. MUNKBERG: Good evening. Can you hear me?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

10 MS. MUNKBERG: No?

11 Can you hear me now?

12 THE AUDIENCE: Yeah.

13 MS. MUNKBERG: All right.

14 My name is Deborah Munkberg and I am with the firm  
15 of EA|Blumen. We were the lead for preparing the EIS, which  
16 means that we are not the technical expert on all the issues

17 but we were able to pull it all together into a single  
18 document. So we're going to walk through some of the --  
19 just the high points of the EIS. We're certainly not going  
20 to try and go through everything. I'm going to try and move  
21 fairly quickly.

22 I wanted to start by first, I guess, following on  
23 what Marshal just said, emphasizing that this is a  
24 programmatic EIS, which means it is not a project level,  
25 project specific EIS.

6

1 And the similarity between a project EIS which is  
2 done for a specific development -- and you may be familiar  
3 with a programmatic EIS -- the similarity is that both are  
4 intended to disclose the potential for significant adverse  
5 impacts of the alternatives.

6 And then they start to differ after that. A  
7 programmatic EIS is typically area wide. In this case, the  
8 South Lake Union neighborhood, or even jurisdiction wide as  
9 opposed to a project EIS; it looks at a specific site. In a  
10 programmatic EIS we're looking fairly broadly and  
11 cumulatively at the impacts as opposed to, again, very  
12 site-specific impacts. And the idea is to allow the  
13 public -- interested members of the public and decision  
14 makers to be able to compare between alternatives in a fair  
15 and affordable way.

16 And then a programmatic EIS, while it's not --  
17 does not provide specific enough information to make a  
18 decision on a specific development proposal, for example, it  
19 does provide a pretty broad-based foundation of information  
20 that future site-specific proposals can sort of leverage off

21 of and use. So tonight we'll talk about this programmatic  
22 area-wide kind of broad analysis of comparison of the  
23 alternatives.

24 Just kind of an overview of the proposal. The  
25 City is trying to achieve -- there are two major goals here.

7

1 One is to allow increased height and density so that the  
2 South Lake Union neighborhood can provide the capacity for  
3 population and employees as its designation as an urban  
4 center requires, and at the same time to contribute to the  
5 overall livability and sustainability of the neighborhood.

6 And the proposal to achieve that is to use  
7 incentives that would allow development if it's able to  
8 provide certain public benefits to go above the biggest  
9 height limits in the neighborhood. The incentives aren't  
10 currently applicable in the South Lake Union neighborhood,  
11 but the existing city code could be expanded to include this  
12 neighborhood and, in addition, the urban design framework  
13 that you saw some boards on out there and may be familiar  
14 with, provide some thoughts on incentive bonuses that could  
15 be provided as well.

16 So the EIS looks at three action alternatives and  
17 one no action. The alternatives have some common features.  
18 The first being that the -- much of the area will continue  
19 to be zoned Seattle mixed, as it is right now. A portion of  
20 the neighborhood under the three action alternatives that's  
21 currently zoned IC along Fairview --

22 MR. HOLMES: Between Fairview and Westlake.

23 MS. MUNKBERG: -- Fairview and Westlake will be  
24 rezoned SM, Seattle mixed, and we'll look at that in just a  
25 minute, put the maps up.



1 In all cases the tower lot size is consistent in  
2 all three action alternatives, and that allows -- for most  
3 of the neighborhood it allows one tower per 22,000 square  
4 feet or roughly two towers per block. As you get closer to  
5 the lake, one tower per block or one tower per 60,000 square  
6 feet. we'll show that on a map in just a moment also.

7 under all the alternatives there is no change to  
8 the shoreline designation. So that 200 feet back from the  
9 shoreline that is under the shoreline master program is not  
10 affected by any of the alternatives.

11 And then the last item I wanted to mention is the  
12 Lake Union seaport flight path. Some of you may have seen  
13 that out on the boards in the lobby area. There is a flight  
14 path coming out of the general purpose airport off of  
15 Lake Union, and that does dictate some height limits. The  
16 building heights would continue to be limited by the FAA  
17 rules there regardless of what -- the City zoning proposals  
18 you see on the alternatives.

19 where do the alternatives differ? well, first  
20 here, I want to take a look at this map and just kind of  
21 orient you because all the maps are very similar. You can  
22 see the -- kind of the gridded area that's near the  
23 shoreline. That's the area where the limit is 60,000 square  
24 feet per tower, or one tower per block. If you look at the  
25 numbers and you see -- for example, you see 85/300. what

1 that means is -- the number to the left is the maximum  
2 height for commercial use and the number to the right is the

3 maximum height for residential use under the incentive  
4 zoning.

5 I think those were the key things. Oh, I wanted  
6 to just mention the flight path as well. So you see the red  
7 flight path there rising up out of Lake Union. The  
8 lowest -- the first kind of crossbar there is 125 feet and  
9 it rises up to about 225 feet as it passes out of the  
10 neighborhood to the southwest.

11 what we're looking at here is Alternative 1, which  
12 is the alternative with the greatest heights provided. The  
13 tallest buildings here would be along Denny way to the south  
14 part of the neighborhood. You can see that 400-foot  
15 residential height. There are lower heights -- generally  
16 lower heights as you go toward Lake Union, although you see  
17 the slightly taller heights there between valley and Mercer,  
18 300 feet for residential, and the lower heights in the  
19 Cascade and Fairview neighborhoods.

20 Alternative 2, again slightly lower heights. You  
21 see the tallest heights along Aurora Avenue, 300 feet for  
22 residential and moving down toward the lake. Existing  
23 zoning remaining in the Cascade neighborhood.

24 And then Alternative 3, again, this is the --  
25 going down in height again. Tallest buildings are around

10

1 240 feet, kind of around the perimeter of the neighborhood,  
2 and existing zoning is retained in the Cascade and Fairview  
3 neighborhoods.

4 And then this is the no action alternative. You  
5 can see the building heights and you can also see the IC,  
6 the Industrial Commercial zoning in the central part of the  
7 neighborhood that's rezoned under the three action

8 alternatives. So that's kind of a quick overview of the  
9 alternatives.

10 The EIS itself looks at a full range of  
11 environmental topics. We are going to touch on the four --  
12 I would say the most substantive discussion in the EIS, and  
13 that's land use, housing, aesthetics, and transportation.

14 And I think we're going to start with  
15 transportation with Chris Breiland.

16 MR. BREILAND: My name's Chris Breiland and I work  
17 with Fehr & Peers as a transportation engineer and we work  
18 with EA|Blumen and the City on analyzing the transportation  
19 impacts of the three height and density alternatives act  
20 kind of like bookends as Deborah described them and compare  
21 that against the no action alternative.

22 So when we started this process, the City  
23 presented us with a challenge, really. They said what can  
24 we do if the City's goal is to increase the height and  
25 density of South Lake Union? What can we do to accommodate

11

1 the additional folks that are going to be living and working  
2 in this neighborhood but do so in a way that doesn't  
3 continue the traditional trend of transportation analysis in  
4 the City, which has generally been to focus on what auto  
5 impacts are there at intersections and roadways and what can  
6 we do to move more cars through the neighborhood.

7 So our approach was quite a bit different. We  
8 looked at working with existing policies that the City has  
9 which focus on a thing -- many issues beyond autos,  
10 including pedestrian mobility, the idea to have different  
11 amounts of people travel by different modes, be it by

12 walking or their bike. There's goals that the City has.  
13 The City also has goals related to climate change to make  
14 sure that future development is done so in accordance with  
15 State goals to manage the amount of greenhouse gas emissions  
16 set forth. And then there's also the City comprehensive  
17 plan and other plans in place. So we wanted to really focus  
18 within those plans and implement those plans as the  
19 mitigation measures or the things that would have to be done  
20 to accommodate a new development from the transportation  
21 perspective.

22 So, again, like I mentioned, we focused on all the  
23 modes, not just traffic and cars. So we started off by  
24 looking at what's there today? what's the existing  
25 pedestrian and bicycle system which is shown up behind me.

12

1 The pedestrian system looks more at the facilities that are  
2 missing under today's condition and the bicycle map shows  
3 what's there today.

4 we took a pretty extensive look at the transit  
5 service provided in the area so that we could know what  
6 might needed -- what might need to be done to improve that  
7 in the future. And, of course, travel, traffic, freight,  
8 and good movement is an important part of South Lake Union.  
9 we certainly spent a lot of time looking at that, and the  
10 map behind me showing all the colors looks at the roadway  
11 network in our assessment of existing conditions on the  
12 roadway network.

13 So with that framework, in terms of what's there  
14 on the ground today, what are the plans for the different  
15 modes that the City has, and what are the goals that the  
16 City wants to achieve within South Lake Union, we assess the

17 impacts and develop the mitigation strategy.

18           The impact assessment method that we used, we took  
19 a different approach. A lot of times fairly suburban, what  
20 are called, traffic analyses is -- are done in these urban  
21 areas. That doesn't work in a place like South Lake Union.  
22 we developed a new model that more accurately looks at how  
23 do people travel in a dense area; for example, how do people  
24 travel in Belltown, we looked at that. They travel -- they  
25 don't drive as much. They take transit more. They walk

13

1 more than folks who live out in Issaquah.

2           So we built this model that looks at how people  
3 travel in an urban area and applied it to South Lake Union  
4 so that we could understand how people might travel there  
5 under all four of those no action alternatives and how does  
6 that change in land use character affect how people travel  
7 in the neighborhood. It's -- that's an important departure  
8 from how transportation analyses have been done in other  
9 projects in the city.

10           The approach we used is not made up. It's backed  
11 by a lot of research which showed that folks in urban areas  
12 travel differently, and it is -- has been used in a lot of  
13 environmental documents around the country. And what's  
14 showing on the screen is that compared to traditional  
15 transportation techniques, the method that we use more  
16 accurately reflects those urban travel characteristics. And  
17 those are that people drive a lot less, 30 to 45 percent  
18 less in a dense urban area. And that's important to  
19 consider when we're looking at how transportation will  
20 change when we add so many jobs and houses into the area.

21 So what did our tool which we call the MXD method  
22 consider? Consider the density of the development; the  
23 diversity of the land uses, meaning how much commercial,  
24 office, and residential space is there; the design of the  
25 pedestrian bicycle system, which is an important aspect of

14

1 how we work with mitigation as I'll describe in a moment;  
2 the distance to high-quality transit, things that are  
3 frequent transit, things like the proposed Aurora ramp, bus  
4 system, the South Lake Union street car, for example;  
5 demographic characteristics of the residents; the demand  
6 management programs, meaning what programs are there in  
7 place to try and shift how people commute to work. Seattle  
8 has a lot of demand management programs in place already and  
9 we could consider more of those; and then distance to major  
10 destinations. South Lake Union's right adjacent to  
11 downtown. A lot of people have the opportunity to walk or  
12 bike to work if they were to live there, and our model makes  
13 sure to capture that.

14 So, again, Deborah mentioned that we don't have  
15 time to get through in a lot of detail, but from an impact  
16 summary what we found is that all three of the height and  
17 density alternatives have similar impacts on the  
18 transportation system. All of them will have more traffic  
19 congestion than there's -- would be the case if nothing were  
20 done in that neighborhood. All of them add more transit  
21 demand, which is expected. More people would be riding the  
22 bus so there would be more impacts to transit capacity.  
23 There will be some short-term parking impacts as the  
24 neighborhood transforms. There will be impacts to freight  
25 mobility. More traffic slows down freight. And there could

1 be impacts to traffic safety as well.

2           So the point of the EIS is to disclose these  
3 impacts so that decision makers and you as the public can  
4 understand that, and then to come up with a way that  
5 could -- a mitigation strategy that could be done to help  
6 address or reduce the significance of those impacts. So I'm  
7 going to quickly go through the strategy that we undertook  
8 to try and reduce those impacts that I just showed you.

9           First and foremost, we proposed to improve the  
10 bike and pedestrian network in the area. And, again, with  
11 our theme of following plans, we looked to the existing  
12 planning that has already been done for South Lake Union and  
13 sought to implement all those improvements that currently  
14 have no means of getting in place. And those are  
15 outlined -- those plans are outlined on the screen.

16           We looked to expand the travel demand management  
17 strategies within South Lake Union, and those could include  
18 some restrictions on how much parking can be provided by  
19 landowners and how parking is offered to residents, and also  
20 expand these commute trip reduction programs that are  
21 already in place in South Lake Union and downtown to be more  
22 encompassing and provide folks with more resources and more  
23 options to driving in downtown. We recommended expanded  
24 transit service and we also recommended limited roadway  
25 capacity expansion and again, planned projects only and the

1 most notable one is the implementation of the Mercer West  
2 project which would complete this transformation of Mercer

3 Street to two ways from its current proposed terminus at  
4 Dexter out towards Queen Anne.

5 So automatically that's out in the lobby and the  
6 EIS lists all the mitigations that we recommend for all  
7 three alternatives. All three alternatives have similar  
8 impacts. We had similar mitigations. And here's the bottom  
9 line, with those mitigations in place, we expect that we  
10 could get about a 21 percent reduction in vehicle trips as  
11 compared to doing nothing with those alternatives. We just  
12 left them to be built as they were. And what that does is  
13 it actually allows us to get vehicle trip generations be  
14 less than doing nothing. If the mitigations are in place,  
15 if there's a more attractive way to walk or bike to work, if  
16 there's more transit service, if some of the congestion  
17 that's out there is relieved, more people can get around  
18 without their car and that's an important benefit that this  
19 project can provide. So with that, I'm going to turn it  
20 back over to Deborah.

21 MS. MUNKBERG: Okay. I'm going to just try and  
22 move quickly through land use, housing, and aesthetics so we  
23 can get to your comments.

24 For land use, the key impact that we looked at had  
25 to do with compatibility with the Lake Union seaport airport

17

1 and the size and elevation of the flight path that rises  
2 over the neighborhood as it heads out to the south and to  
3 the west. And you'll see that on the screen. The -- as I  
4 mentioned earlier, describing the alternatives, the City  
5 will continue to regulate heights based on the FAA  
6 requirements which are shown here starting at about 125 feet  
7 coming off the lake and going up to about 250 feet as you



8 exit the neighborhood.

9           The other piece that the EIS looked at was the  
10 potential for wind turbulence associated with the taller  
11 buildings as the planes are coming over the top of them.  
12 Looked at the amount of wind turbulence that's vertical over  
13 the top of the buildings as well as leeward on the downwind  
14 side. And you may have seen out in the lobby area there was  
15 some board there that showed recommended mitigation that  
16 dealt with how to make sure that both the wind turbulence  
17 and the protrusion into the flight path elevation is  
18 addressed.

19           For housing, looked at overall -- all of the  
20 alternatives will increase housing capacity in the  
21 neighborhood. For affordability issues I think the  
22 conclusions were a little mixed. On the positive side, the  
23 greater capacity, greater housing capacity in the  
24 neighborhood provides more opportunity for affordable  
25 housing to develop in a neighborhood, particularly when

18

1 there is an incentive to encourage that to happen.  
2 Similarly, because there are minimum lot size requirements  
3 for each of the new towers, as those lots are aggregated  
4 there are likely to be some remnant lots left behind that  
5 will not be large enough for tower use and could be made  
6 available for affordable housing.

7           On the sort of negative side related to  
8 affordability, we heard a lot from a number of developers  
9 that the construction types, the taller towers does not  
10 permit for affordable housing. And that there may be some  
11 increased potential for displacement of some of the smaller

12 buildings, the lower scale buildings that provide affordable  
13 housing right now.

14           You saw the mitigation strategies proposed that  
15 relate to some existing programs that the City offers as  
16 well as some potential for some new programs.

17           I wanted to touch on aesthetics. That's a fairly  
18 large section in the EIS, and it looks at four different  
19 topics: height, bulk, and scale; viewsheds; potentials for  
20 increases to shadows; and light and glare. There's a  
21 number -- or there's quite a number of view models in there.  
22 There's a few perspectives that are on the boards out there  
23 that looked at from an area-wide perspective provided both a  
24 bird's eye view and a view from Gas Works Park. There's  
25 some selected street-level perspectives, and there's 15

19

1 different viewpoint locations, some of which are from  
2 designated projected views of the City, and then there's a  
3 shadow analysis.

4           These are out in the lobby but just wanted to  
5 highlight them. This is a bird's eye view of the  
6 neighborhood. Alternative 1, again, just to mention, this  
7 is the alternative that provides for the greatest height you  
8 see existing at the top. The orange buildings that you see  
9 there are residential development and the purple are for  
10 commercial development. As you can see, the orange taller  
11 buildings are consistent with the way the alternatives are  
12 framed.

13           2031 shows what this would look like if this  
14 neighborhood were built out and met. This is an estimated  
15 housing target for the city in 2031, and build-out is if the  
16 neighborhood were to build out to full capacity. That's the

17 tallest.

18           we're showing the other action alternative that's  
19 at the other end of the scale, which provides for the least  
20 amount of height. And Alternative 2 falls in between those  
21 two. So you see existing again and then build-out under  
22 Alternative 3. You can see the difference.

23           And then Alternative 4, that's existing zoning.  
24 Again, you'll see the scale of buildings that are permitted  
25 under current zone.

20

1           And as I mentioned there were a number of view  
2 locations modeled that you can see in the EIS. This is just  
3 a map of all the different viewshed perspectives that were  
4 taken of the neighborhood.

5           So what were the conclusions? Basically, one of  
6 the major impacts of this proposal would be the visual  
7 expansion of the downtown towers to the north towards  
8 Lake Union. And we saw that in the area-wide pictures.

9           The incentive zoning would provide new building  
10 type in the neighborhood, and that is a podium with a taller  
11 tower on top of that. And I was reminded as I sat down that  
12 we needed to mention that the floor plate size for  
13 residential units would average 10,500 square feet and for  
14 commercial unit -- or commercial buildings 24,000 square  
15 feet.

16           Overall the views to designated viewpoints are not  
17 obstructed, which is not to say that they're not impacted.  
18 There is definitely some framing and some intrusion into  
19 those views, but they're not obstructive. And then in terms  
20 of shadows, there is an incremental increase in public open

21 spaces, shadows, but at midday the centers of the parks, for  
22 example, are all still in the sun.

23 Going to turn it over to you, Jim.

24 MR. HOLMES: All right. I'll be quick so we get  
25 to public comment.

21

1 I just wanted to let a lot of you know that after  
2 tonight we will take -- well, after April 11th when our  
3 comment period actually formally closes, we will take all  
4 the comments, identifying analysis, revisions necessary, and  
5 prepare our final Environmental Impact Statement which we'll  
6 release this summer. DPD as Marshal said will be working  
7 with the community to develop a rezone recommendation which  
8 we have hopefully by the end of this year, and the City  
9 Council's planning on considering this rezone proposal in  
10 2012.

11 So tonight's a public hearing and the subject is  
12 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Of course, people  
13 can offer any comment they want, but the most relevant  
14 comments will focus on the analysis of the Draft EIS, some  
15 of the conclusions, a few might disagree with some, but  
16 really focus on what's in the Draft EIS and help us to make  
17 the final EIS a strong document that will help inform our  
18 decision. You can offer comments tonight or you can offer  
19 them in writing. We have comment forms up front if you want  
20 to fill them out here and leave them here, but you have  
21 until April 11th to submit public comments. And a comment  
22 offered tonight or sent to us in writing, they carry the  
23 same weight. We will read, consider every comment.

24 Let's see. Just for tonight, speakers will have  
25 two minutes to speak and to be fair for everybody's time, we

1 will enforce that fairly strongly. About a minute in to  
2 your speaking time you'll see this sign. Lets you know you  
3 have another minute. And then when you have ten seconds  
4 left I'm going to hold this sign up, which means you have  
5 ten seconds to wrap up and then to allow the next speaker.

6 We will be calling up three or four speakers at a  
7 time, and I'm going to call them up right now to the podium.  
8 The first four are John Coney, Mike Peringer, A-P Hurd, and  
9 Don Bennett.

10 MR. CONEY: I'm John Coney. I'm co-president of  
11 the Uptown Alliance. I'm speaking for myself this evening.

12 I want to remind folks that 50 percent of the new  
13 population coming to Seattle is slated at this point to go  
14 into Seattle's urban centers. The most buildable expandable  
15 urban center is actually South Lake Union. I think that  
16 South Lake Union can provide an attractive neighborhood with  
17 a broad range -- for a broad range of residents considering  
18 a move from the suburbs or the exurbs down to the center  
19 city and that it can provide urban necessities for  
20 employment, transportation, recreation, education,  
21 healthcare, and public open space.

22 EIS documents focus on the negative impacts of  
23 development and mitigations for growth impact. I'm  
24 suggesting that the EIS study, the benefits per capita  
25 flowing from a dense urban center in the impact areas of air

1

2

1 quality, environmental health, noise, land use, housing,  
2 aesthetics, household resources, transportation, open space,

3 and recreation, you know, what are the impacts per person in  
4 a denser, therefore, more populated neighborhood.

2 cont

5 Ongoing infrastructure improvements which you've  
6 seen a little taste of but not really the totality will  
7 provide major opportunities for enhanced pedestrian, bike,  
8 transit for both South Lake Union and the Uptown Urban  
9 Center, which our Uptown Alliance is concerned with. I am  
10 concerned that the DEIS did not look at economic  
11 development. The Downtown Seattle Association has  
12 demonstrated tax benefits of mixed-use developments in urban  
13 areas. Please analyze the economic developments, impacts of  
14 these alternatives.

3

15 In 2006, 35 community stakeholders from both  
16 Queen Anne and South Lake Union were involved in a joint  
17 vision for Uptown and South Lake Union urban centers, and  
18 the outcome of that is the recommendation to locate taller  
19 buildings close to transit corridors, particularly street  
20 car routes, encourage residential density around parks, such  
21 as Lake Union Park, Denny Park, Cascade playground, Seattle  
22 Center.

4

23 Thank you.

24 MR. PERINGER: My name is Mike Peringer. I'm the  
25 founder/president of the SODO Business Association.

24

1 It was a rather warm day on Independence Day 1855  
2 when on a farm located just north of here on Fifth and about  
3 Roy, a gentleman had a picnic where he invited some 100  
4 folks that he knew in the city, about the entire population  
5 of the city at that time. Among them, of course, were names  
6 we all know, David Denny, Doc Maynard, Henry Yesler,  
7 Dexter Horton to name a few.

5

8           You made some remarks that -- this gentleman made  
9 a few remarks at that time, and he decided looking down from  
10 his property on to Lake Union to the east that he would  
11 think it would be a good idea to rename that lake from the  
12 Indian name it had been to Lake Union. And, in fact,  
13 that -- from that very day on it became Lake Union. That  
14 gentleman's name was Thomas Mercer. He was my great uncle.  
15 And from that point on, the balance of development down here  
16 from his property which started over on Fairview Lakeview --  
17 or Fairview and Eastlake all the way over to Queen Anne  
18 Avenue from where we're standing now to what is now the ship  
19 canal, which he also envisioned that day as being something  
20 to connect the two lakes together, that, in fact, happened  
21 in 1917, just a year after The Boeing Company developed its  
22 first airplane on Lake Union.

23           So there's a lot of history here that I think we  
24 need to consider, and that history is that we need to have a  
25 balance. We need to have everybody considered. Hence, the

25

1 people are here tonight to talk about it. And so when you  
2 look at your plan and your DEIS, be sure to look at all  
3 aspects of it, not just one or two.

4           Thank you very much.

5           MR. HOLMES: I'd like to call Lee Newgent,  
6 Keith Weir, Paul Chiles, and Hellmut Golde.

7           MR. NEWGENT: My name is Lee Newgent. I'm with  
8 the Seattle Building & Construction Trades Council. I'm an  
9 Irishman, recovering Catholic. So this is probably not the  
10 best venue for me.

11           I'm here today to speak on behalf of supporting

| 6

12 the expansion in South Lake Union. I think that we are a  
13 unique perspective with South Lake Union. Geographically it  
14 is a very flat, very buildable part of our city. It's a  
15 natural progression, and in looking at the environmental  
16 studies I see that there's a lot of thought that went into  
17 it.

18 And I think that we have an opportunity to build  
19 for the future and only limiting that to a 20-year vision or  
20 a 15-year vision will be our downfall. We need to have that  
21 longer expansion, that longer vision. We need to make sure  
22 that we can allow for the population in 2030 and 2040. We  
23 would like to see the increased height limits. And then we  
24 would like to see the residences that are built being able  
25 to support the industries that are being built up around

26

1 South Lake Union, specifically with U-Dub research facility  
2 coming on the line, the Amazon building and the street car  
3 and some of the Fred Hutch. We'd like to see that become a  
4 thriving economy that will be self-supporting and will limit  
5 the amount of people that have to commute to or from. We'd  
6 like to see the people that have an industry that's  
7 supported by the people that live in that residence. I  
8 appreciate your time for taking my comments.

9 MR. HOLMES: Thanks.

10 Next we want to hear from A-P Hurd and then  
11 Don Bennett.

12 And I'd like to ask everybody as their names are  
13 called to line up behind the microphone so that we can hear  
14 comments in the order that people signed in.

15 MR. HURD: Thank you.

16 I'm A-P Hurd. I'm with Touchstone, and I'm also a  
Page 22



17 Runstad research fellow and alum at the  
18 University of Washington.

19 I read the Environmental Impact Statement and as  
20 usual I'm a bit dismayed to find that environmental impact  
21 statements always equate more growth with more negative  
22 environmental impact and generally more negative impacts in  
23 every way.

24 But I think that's only part of the story. In my  
25 role as a Runstad fellow, I just got back from a week in

7

27

1 Hong Kong, which is certainly not a city that has the scale  
2 of Seattle but a city that has three great strengths. It  
3 thinks in mutual terms, it supports growth, and it preserves  
4 rural lands. Seattle is part of a globally competitive  
5 world. We're a net attractor of talent. We are growing  
6 economies and companies that are the envy of other regions,  
7 and we are poised to succeed. But we cannot succeed if we  
8 don't find a way to grow our urban center. We will not  
9 succeed if we choke out space for our growth companies and  
10 the talent that is part of their ecosystem. More to the  
11 point, my fellow Gen X and Gen Y-ers will not stay in a city  
12 that persists in clinging to Pete Seeger's 1960's Little  
13 Boxes On the Hillside.

8

14 Let's find a way to make great places for people  
15 in growth companies, lots of people and growth companies,  
16 and let's do it in a way that preserves our rural and  
17 working lands. Let's zone for something that looks like  
18 Alternative 1, a vibrant, compact, and intensively urban  
19 South Lake Union.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. BENNETT: I'm Don Bennett. I'm a member of  
22 this church as well as a member of the LUOA board of  
23 directors.

24 In reading the Environmental Impact Statement, I  
25 was disturbed by the public services section both for its

28

1 emphasis only on fire and police services as well as  
2 misrepresenting of statistics in these areas.

3 For the fire stations listed as covering  
4 Lake Union, Figure 314-3, the incident numbers for 2004  
5 through 2008, Stations 2 and 8, show a 10 percent increase  
6 by a 1-year decrease in 2009. It looks like '09 is an  
7 anomaly and there is no reason to expect that it is  
8 representative. Additionally, all the figures listed relate  
9 to all calls at fire stations and do not break out the  
10 results for calls to South Lake Union.

11 This is not a South Lake Union information about  
12 the environmental impacts. As South Lake Union is at the  
13 extreme end of the coverage districts for these three  
14 stations, it makes sense to guess the majority of the  
15 failure to meet time expectations would be in the South Lake  
16 Union neighborhood.

17 with regard to the police services, there is also  
18 no breakout of calls to South Lake Union. There is the  
19 additional noted problem that due to budget problems, the  
20 SPD has not been able to staff to current expectations. All  
21 of this is without consideration of the additional problem  
22 of responding to problems on the 30th or 40th floor of a  
23 high-rise.

24 As a recreational sailor on Lake Union, there's a  
25 large dead airspace at the side of the AGC building which is

9

10

1 only 10 stories high. I hate to think what it would be if  
2 there are 30 and 40-story buildings of indeterminate for a  
3 place along Mercer.

10 cont

4 Thank you.

5 MR. CHILES: Good evening, everyone. My name is  
6 Paul Chiles. I am a commercial real estate broker and my  
7 office is in South Lake Union.

8 I'm here tonight to speak in support of taller  
9 buildings, specifically Alternative 1. The one thing I  
10 don't want to do is be redundant. I think I've heard some  
11 very good comments from a number of people and I'm not sure  
12 that it's necessary to reiterate those, but I would agree  
13 with the speakers who have called on all of us to think  
14 about the economic impacts. Clearly taller buildings and  
15 any development in South Lake Union is going to result in  
16 jobs. And we are hopeful that we all see that and figure  
17 out a way to take advantage of this well-defined opportunity  
18 to do something right and to eliminate urban sprawl.

11

19 I'm particularly interested even though this is my  
20 business that we take advantage of the bonuses that are  
21 offered that give us an opportunity to provide for more  
22 affordable housing. And many of you may not know, but there  
23 is a budget that's been proposed for affordable housing  
24 that's currently in the legislature. Historically that  
25 number's been about \$250 million. With that budget

1 shortfall, we are going to be lucky if we're able to get  
2 half of that. As most of you know, there's no shortage of

12

3 demand for affordable housing, and the cost to the  
4 developers in South Lake Union will be to provide dollars  
5 for affordable housing and that may very well help the  
6 shortfall.

12 cont

7 Thank you for listening.

8 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to call down Marcy Golde,  
9 Bob Messina, Mike McQuaid, and Marty Bluewater.

10 And I ask that you stand in line behind the  
11 microphone. Thank you.

12 MR. WEIR: Hi. Good evening. My name is  
13 Keith Weir. I'm here representing the Seattle King County  
14 Building & Construction Trades Council. As well, I'm an  
15 IBEW member, electricians. So --

13

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Slow down.

17 MR. WEIR: We represent the folks who will build  
18 these buildings and make the infrastructure what it will be  
19 for the future and forthcoming.

20 The comment was made earlier, my feeling on this  
21 being a Seattle lifetime resident, is that you only have one  
22 chance to do it right. So let's get it right and build it  
23 so it lasts. So we're not having to come back and rezone  
24 and rezone to make it fit. It is the best way to make our  
25 city vibrant. The South Lake Union neighborhood with the

31

1 biotech corridor in there providing people with work, they  
2 don't have to walk very far to their work. They can hop on  
3 a street car. They can leave their car for the weekend.  
4 Even maybe move down without a car, reducing carbon  
5 emissions. The best thing I think will be Alternative 1.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. GOLDE: Good evening. My name is

8 Hellmut Golde. I'm a resident of the neighborhood.

9 I'd like to address two issues very briefly. The  
10 EIS should work with Metro to address precisely public  
11 transportation proposals for each of the alternatives. What  
12 I saw out there and talked to people out there on the boards  
13 is really not sufficient to understand what the future of  
14 public transportation will be, how to integrate the  
15 South Lake Union trolley into Metro, and work with Metro to  
16 give additional bus transportation.

14

17 Secondly, a vibrant neighborhood as is envisioned  
18 by the plans requires that families with children move in.  
19 I haven't heard a word said about children and where they  
20 should go to school. The EIS should specify possible school  
21 locations, possible locations for libraries, for each  
22 alternative, otherwise it would be impossible to attract  
23 families with young children to live in the neighborhood.

15

24 Thank you.

25 MS. GOLDE: My name is Marcy Golde and I'm a

32

1 resident of the Cascade neighborhood.

2 My real concern is the economic mix of the  
3 population that is going to move into this area. I hear the  
4 developers saying, and that certainly seems a reasonable  
5 assumption, that those high-rise buildings are going to be  
6 very expensive and the residents that are -- can live there  
7 will have to pay very high either condo or rentals to be  
8 there. The population estimate of increase if we stayed  
9 with what is exactly in the plans for South Lake Union as  
10 they're currently designed would be about 18,000 new people.

16

11 If you went to the larger number that someone

12 suggested to me from your staff, about 12,000 housing units,  
13 that would be about 27,000 additional people. How those --  
14 what their economic mix is is very important, and what we  
15 don't want to see is a place for 18,000 of Paul Allen's rich  
16 friends. This is not a mix. We need a mix here that at  
17 least maintains, probably your bonuses will maintain if  
18 you're lucky, the amount of mid and low-income housing.  
19 They're not going to expand it.

16 cont

20 Thank you.

21 MR. MESSINA: Hello. My name is Bob Messina.

22 I'm a frequent walker of the neighborhood as well  
23 as the downtown waterfront. So I'm approaching this from  
24 the standpoint of looking at Lake Union in the same light as  
25 we see the -- our downtown waterfront. But I see that the

17

33

1 300-foot-high buildings appear to be treating what I call a  
2 waterfront, downtown waterfront, and not a -- like a lake --  
3 like Lake Union's often described as, I see it as a  
4 waterfront. That the 300-foot height allowance is really  
5 too much and too close, especially between Mercer and  
6 valley.

7 And I'm okay with other aspects of it, probably  
8 more in favor of the Alternative 3 height limits. I can  
9 sort of live with that as I see it. But Alternative 4 is  
10 kind of a shock to me that someone would consider allowing  
11 the 300-foot-high buildings so close to, again, what I'm  
12 going to call is a downtown waterfront and not just call it  
13 Lake Union, because you've got large ships that come in  
14 there. There is a sloping character, a bowl-like profile to  
15 the neighborhood, but the build-out as you show it actually  
16 shows building heights going down and then at the end close

18

17 to the shoreline coming up again. And I think for a lot of  
18 people that's kind of a shock.

18 cont

19 And so I do support the elements of this plan in  
20 general, Alternative 3, like I said, but specifically those  
21 300-foot-high buildings I'm very much opposed to.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. BLUEWATER: Hello. My name is  
24 Marty Bluewater. I'm a current board member and former  
25 director of United Indians of All Tribes Foundation, and

34

1 we're located at the Daybreak Star Center in Discovery Park.  
2 And we were founded in the early '70s to provide  
3 educational, social, economic and cultural programs for  
4 urban natives and, of course, for the nonnative population  
5 too.

6 And we're excited about being a stakeholder in  
7 South Lake Union Park and about the quality growth that is  
8 developing in the area in general. On our piece of land at  
9 the park we are planning the Northwest Native Canoe Center,  
10 and this will celebrate the canoe culture of the northwest  
11 tribes, and this will be at the western end of the park in a  
12 real exciting building that we'll have a lot of activities  
13 and open, available for rentals and so forth as we  
14 eventually raise the money, of course.

19

15 And we're also looking forward to working and  
16 partnering with The Center for Wooden Boats and the Museum  
17 of History and Industry and, of course, the Parks Department  
18 in providing programs. Having very many citizens accessing  
19 and enjoying the park will make it a great success and a  
20 priceless resource. The area needs to be a 24-hour

21 neighborhood with large and tall enough buildings to support  
22 the necessary services for everyone, and we think that in  
23 the public good would be -- smart growth and planned density  
24 should be the priority over other issues such as the maybe  
25 the loss of some views and things like that.

19 cont

35

1 we urge the city to adopt Alternative 1 and  
2 believe it will be a best benefit, the most citizens and  
3 maximize the city resources.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. MCQUAID: Good evening. My name is  
6 Mike McQuaid. This is my wife Shannon.

7 I'm a lifelong resident of Seattle and fourth  
8 generation of my family to live in the city. Shannon and I  
9 live on Queen Anne Hill over on the east side with a  
10 beautiful view of Lake Union, downtown Seattle, and the  
11 South Lake Union neighborhood. We also have family members  
12 that live on Capitol Hill looking in the opposite direction  
13 over Lake Union and the South Lake Union neighborhood. In  
14 the community I'm a trustee with a local nonprofit  
15 organization at Lake Union Park, and I'm also a neighborhood  
16 activist and a South Lake Union Community Council member.

20

17 I'm old enough to remember the excitement in this  
18 city when we developed new modern office buildings in the  
19 '60s in downtown Seattle. The excitement that came after  
20 the world's Fair in 1962 and the excitement that came after  
21 new transportation systems were put into place to move  
22 people in and out of our city. I'm also young enough to  
23 have an open mind and to look to the future and to get  
24 excited about the opportunity that we have before us.

25 Since moving to the area twelve years ago we



20 cont

1 recently have seen an amazing amount of change in the  
 2 South Lake Union neighborhood. We can now walk to buy  
 3 groceries in South Lake Union and we meet our friends on the  
 4 streets. There are multiple new restaurants that have  
 5 opened in the neighborhood, and there are smaller  
 6 family-owned businesses, boutique stores, restaurants and  
 7 the like that we visit on a day-to-day basis and on the  
 8 weekends.

9 where once there were buildings in decline,  
 10 abandoned railroad tracks lined the streets, and concern for  
 11 our safety, there's now a wonderful community taking shape.  
 12 I'd like to share with you what I've learned. It's people  
 13 that make our community, a lot of people. To house people,  
 14 to make this work, we have to go up.

15 For my work on the community council I've learned  
 16 that taller buildings bring setback variances that actually  
 17 create a wider street level experience, and I've also  
 18 learned that there's something about the economics of  
 19 building in the neighborhood that creates opportunity for  
 20 low income housing. I'd like to consider you -- I'd like to  
 21 ask you to consider Alternative 1 and to keep an open mind  
 22 in this process as we move forward. This is an exciting  
 23 time for us.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. HOLMES: I'd like to call Dominick Lucia,

1 Jeffrey Rowe, Shefali Ranganathan.

2 MR. LUCIA: Hi. My name is Don Lucia, and I work

21

3 and reside in Cascade neighborhood, South Lake Union. And  
4 although I'm involved in some community activities here as  
5 an activist, I'm here speaking on behalf of just my own  
6 personal view. And that view is to support Alternative 1.

7 And the reasons for that, and even though they  
8 have been stated, I will have to reiterate since so many  
9 people have spoke eloquently about the advantages of  
10 Alternative 1. I think that it allows for the greatest  
11 amount of density, economic opportunity that will translate  
12 into what Seattle aspires to be, have a very vibrant  
13 community, street life. I also think it gives the largest  
14 opportunity to actually create some diversity.

15 So what I'd rather speak to since so many people  
16 spoke about the positive aspects of that, is that some of  
17 the concerns that people have for maybe some of the things  
18 that can go wrong, I think that we have to rely upon the  
19 human spirit, the entrepreneurial spirit that things such as  
20 looking for low income housing, for more economic  
21 opportunity and some comment that this neighborhood would  
22 only be for wealthy people, I want to challenge it that  
23 actually the opposite way. By having a more dense, highly  
24 populated area, I think that actually will allow a larger  
25 distribution of wealth and provide a larger opportunity for

38

1 people that may not be afforded that now. So I think that  
2 this is an exciting time for Seattle. We have a great  
3 opportunity here, and I really want to encourage everyone to  
4 support Alternative 1 for those reasons.

5 MR. HOLMES: Call on Jeffrey Rowe, Lori Mason  
6 Curran and Joe Fugere.

7 MS. RANGANATHAN: Good evening. My name is

8 Shefali Ranganathan and I am the director of programs for  
9 Transportation Choices Coalition.

10 Transportation Choices Coalition is a statewide  
11 nonprofit working to bring residents more opportunities to  
12 take the bus, the train, walk, or bike safely. I am here  
13 tonight in support of Alternative 1 in increasing zoning  
14 capacity and flexibility to maximize housing and job growth  
15 potential in South Lake Union.

22

16 South Lake Union provides the best opportunity to  
17 create neighborhoods that are connected both by great  
18 housing choices as well as great transportation choices,  
19 great walkability opportunities, access to transit via the  
20 street car, buses, as well as easy walking access to the  
21 westlake transit hub. Accommodating housing and jobs with  
22 good transportation choices will lead to reduced air  
23 pollution including greenhouse gases, lower transportation  
24 expenses, more active and healthy lifestyles, as well as  
25 better connection to jobs and homes for people at all income

39

1 levels. However, to create a great community with real  
2 transportation choices, the City has to invest in  
3 transportation. TCC strongly supports recommendations that  
4 were made in South Lake Union Uptown Mobility Plan including  
5 connecting these communities with better east-west  
6 pedestrian bike connections across Aurora Avenue as well as  
7 implementing the street car plan which would connect the  
8 South Lake Union street car with the First Hill street car  
9 as well as future expansions.

23

10 I want to thank DPD tonight as well as the city  
11 council for your attention. We should remember that

24

12 20 percent of the overall growth for the city in terms of  
13 housing and jobs is coming in this neighborhood. There's an  
14 opportunity to do it right and by allowing flexibility and  
15 strengthening your transportation choices, there is an  
16 opportunity to create neighborhood growth that leads to a  
17 higher quality of life for residents as well as  
18 environmental and societal benefits for the entire region.

24 cont

19 Thank you.

20 MS. MASON CURRAN: Hello. I'm Lori Mason Curran  
21 with Vulcan Real Estate and I am speaking on behalf of  
22 Vulcan tonight.

25

23 People, jobs, and businesses continue to come to  
24 Seattle because it really is a wonderful place to live and  
25 work. The City has dedicated South Lake Union as an urban

40

1 center, which means it is intended to absorb much of this  
2 growth. South Lake Union can continue to grow sensibly if  
3 we embrace new ideas and avoid outdated notions of urban  
4 planning.

5 Seattle needs to grow up, not out, and South Lake  
6 Union is the place to build taller buildings. Taller  
7 buildings are the graceful solution to growth. They bring  
8 the greatest benefits to the greatest number of people, and  
9 not just in South Lake Union, but throughout the city.  
10 Growing up is the best way to fight global warming, protect  
11 our historic buildings and single-family neighborhoods, and  
12 preserve views of our surrounding mountains and water for  
13 the most people. Taller buildings generate more revenue for  
14 the City to fund public services such as community centers  
15 and libraries and allow more interesting public spaces at  
16 the street level.

17           we look forward to continuing to work with the  
18 community on applying these principles and shared values,  
19 particularly on the Mercer blocks located between  
20 Mercer Street and Lake Union Park. We wholeheartedly agree  
21 it ought to be a special place for our city.

22           we have dedicated over ten years of our resources  
23 to help realize the new Lake Union Park, the new street car  
24 line that brings people to the park, and the greatly  
25 improved pedestrian and bike-friendly neighborhood

41

1 Valley Street, and we will continue our efforts to bring you  
2 the greatest benefits to our neighbors in South Lake Union  
3 and greater Seattle on those Mercer blocks.

4           Allowing taller buildings is urban planning for  
5 the greatest good. Seattle is going to get bigger; this is  
6 a chance to make sure it gets better.

7           Thank you.

8           MR. HOLMES: Call on Mike Kent, Noelle Smithhart,  
9 and Ann Art.

10           MR. FUGERE: Hi, my name is Joe Fugere. I'm an  
11 owner of a restaurant at 2200 Westlake at the Pan Pacific  
12 Hotel called Tutta Bella Neapolitan Pizzeria.

13           I'm a fourth -- like our early speaker, fourth  
14 generation Seattleite, being the great grandson of Italian  
15 immigrants. Born and raised on Beacon Hill. My mother and  
16 sisters attended school on Capitol Hill and I attended  
17 school on First Hill. I lived through the height of the  
18 post-'62 world's Fair cultural explosion here in Seattle,  
19 Boeing's booms and Boeing's busts, and the dot-com booms and  
20 busts as well.

21 I currently live in the Mt. Baker neighborhood and  
22 I'm considering a move to either downtown Capitol Hill or  
23 South Lake Union. These locations are mostly driven by my  
24 desire to be near multi-mobile transportation options and a  
25 desire to live and work in a community with walkable options

42

1 for groceries, entertainment, and essential services.

2 My experience as a business owner here in  
3 South Lake Union has certainly had its ups. Working with  
4 Vulcan is one of those ups. They're an example of a very  
5 responsible developer, and they worked with me just to work  
6 on how we can build a great neighborhood together and how to  
7 do it right. I can personally attest to their credibility  
8 as a responsible developer.

9 But in 2007, things were tough. A lot of  
10 buildings were vacant. Many of my friends and fellow  
11 business owners opened new businesses only to find  
12 themselves closing them down a few months later. It wasn't  
13 until worker and residential density increased that my  
14 business began to thrive. For three years the 2200 location  
15 was hanging on by a thread. Last year we turned the corner,  
16 began to have a positive cash flow mostly due to Amazon,  
17 Pac, U-Dub Medicine, Tommy Bahamas, and the continued  
18 increase in occupancy of residential condos, apartments, and  
19 office buildings.

20 I strongly support thoughtful and responsible  
21 height density improvements, particularly Alternative 1. I  
22 believe that the current draft proposal will continue to  
23 make South Lake Union a vibrant and exciting community for  
24 everyone. I love this city. Born and raised here. This is  
25 a neighborhood and a city that I plan on living in, playing

26

1 in, working in, and owning a business in for the rest of my  
2 life.

26 cont

3 Thank you.

4 MR. KENT: Thank you for the opportunity to  
5 testify. My name is Mike Kent, and I'm an urban planner and  
6 an actively engaged resident on Capitol Hill.

7 Seattle has the opportunity to become a model for  
8 sustainable urban development, and few neighborhoods are  
9 more central to Seattle's growth, both literally and  
10 figuratively, than South Lake Union. Therefore, we must use  
11 every opportunity to make it a vibrant neighborhood it has  
12 the promise to be. In order for the neighborhood to reach  
13 its full potential, the City must allow South Lake Union to  
14 observe higher density mixed-use development as is studied  
15 in the DEIS.

27

16 The benefits of the future rezoning go well beyond  
17 South Lake Union's borders positively impacting the entire  
18 city and Puget Sound region. Encouraging higher density  
19 development in South Lake Union is among the most beneficial  
20 measures the City can take as it aspires to become  
21 increasingly pedestrian, bicycle, and transit focused.

22 In order to limit suburban sprawl we must  
23 concentrate housing and jobs in our highly walkable urban  
24 core.

25 South Lake Union has an unmistakable opportunity

1 to accommodate this new development as it is located within  
2 walking distance of downtown and more established

3 neighborhoods like Queen Anne and Capitol Hill.  
4 Furthermore, both public and private investments have  
5 already enhanced the neighborhood's viability as a hub for  
6 housing and job growth, from the South Lake Union street car  
7 to the new Amazon headquarters to Lake Union Park. We  
8 cannot afford to squander this opportunity.

9 The impacts identified in the DEIS are largely  
10 positive. The Puget Sound Regional Council forecasts  
11 1.7 million new residents in the region by 2040 and under  
12 Alternative 1 something that could accommodate 21,000 new  
13 households. We must not sell this opportunity short.

14 I look forward to watching high-rise developments  
15 extend north from downtown through South Lake Union  
16 enhancing our city's already remarkable skyline.

17 Finally, the future rezoning would positively  
18 impact the transportation conditions, bringing more  
19 Seattleites within walking distance of jobs, retail, parks,  
20 and other destinations. Moving forward, the City must  
21 continue to provide public infrastructure, from police and  
22 fire protection, to schools, to road and sewer upgrades  
23 needed for a complete neighborhood.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. SMITHHART: Hi. My name is Noelle Smithhart.

1 I live in South Lake Union and I worked here for Vulcan for  
2 about six years. I also sit on the South Lake Union Chamber  
3 of Commerce board of directors, and today I'm speaking as a  
4 resident from my own perspective.

5 I was born in Seattle and I grew up in  
6 unincorporated King County near Covington, Washington. I  
7 moved into the city years and years ago. In my youth I



8 experienced the epitome of suburban sprawl. Since moving to  
9 South Lake Union over two years ago I've gotten rid of my  
10 car. I fundamentally believe in density. I walk the walk  
11 literally and I'm thankful the City is studying the impact  
12 of increasing density in my neighborhood. I moved here  
13 specifically for the vibrancy and vision of the stakeholders  
14 for this urban center.

15 I do wish the City would look at the benefits to  
16 the local economy and environment that is brought by  
17 offering more opportunities to live, work, and play in our  
18 urban neighborhood. I'm aware of some residents who don't  
19 fully share this vision of increased capacity, but they are  
20 not a voice for all residents. When I chat with folks  
21 around the neighborhood about increased height and density  
22 in SLU, it's a no-brainer. We're an urban center and this  
23 is where height should go.

24 We moved here for this reason. More people living  
25 and working in my neighborhood will support small local

29

46

1 businesses and arts and cultural events. I'm personally  
2 very excited about seeing more diversity in the forms of  
3 buildings in my backyard. I eagerly anticipate taller  
4 buildings with great design. As a city of [unintelligible]  
5 zoning, I also hope they will consider developing  
6 [unintelligible] design guidelines for South Lake Union.  
7 Increased height offers more flexibility and ways to  
8 incorporate great plazas and open spaces into building  
9 design.

10 I also hope the City will consider appointing a  
11 design review board more specific to South Lake Union. We

30

12 are currently part of Queen Anne and Magnolia district, and  
13 I believe that South Lake Union has a different aesthetic  
14 and future than these neighborhoods. It might make sense to  
15 also be in the same design review district as Uptown,  
16 another urban center.

30 cont

17 I love my neighborhood and I eagerly anticipate  
18 new zoning that encourages more people in South Lake Union.

19 MR. HOLMES: Marty Goodman, Marni Heffron, and  
20 Gloria Hennings.

21 MR. ROWE: Good evening, everyone. My name is  
22 Matthew Rowe. I'm an architect and a resident of Queen Anne  
23 Hill, and I'm an active participant over the last seven  
24 years with multiple stakeholder groups in this neighborhood.

25 I'd like to thank the City and this neighborhood

47

1 in its efforts to move this initiative forward. The  
2 neighborhood has rapidly outgrown the current zoning which  
3 is intended to be transitional from industrial to  
4 commercial. Clearly this place wants to be more vibrant and  
5 a more complete community.

6 The visual and aesthetic impacts shown in the  
7 Draft EIS may appear significant to the average citizen, but  
8 the EIS is required to go to the worst case and show full  
9 build-out. The reality is there is no precedent for this  
10 much development in a similar sized area, Portland, Seattle,  
11 or even Vancouver, B.C. Construction of this much  
12 development in 35 years will be remarkable. Hence the  
13 impacts scale will be far less in our lifetimes.

31

14 with that being said, it's still a lot of  
15 development even if you have the numbers. You're talking  
16 5,000 housing units and 6,000 jobs built over the no-build.

32

17 But it comes down -- all these things come with  
18 benefits. There will be an incentive system which yields  
19 tremendous public benefits paid for by developers, which  
20 would include affordable housing, day care, open space, and  
21 improved public [unintelligible]. The current zoning offers  
22 none of this.

33

23 South Lake Union has both underutilized land and a  
24 huge investment of infrastructure in a centralized walkable  
25 location. No neighborhood is better suited to accept this

34

48

1 growth, and I would say no other neighborhood is more  
2 willing to take this much responsibly for smarter growth.  
3 If not here, where? Certainly not Magnolia, Laurelhurst, or  
4 Seward Park.

5 we calculated the equivalent land required for the  
6 difference in this upzone would take four and a half  
7 Discovery Parks, single-family, suburban office park  
8 densities.

9 Finally, the GHG and VMT calculations in this  
10 Draft EIS are calculated only for the differences between  
11 the alternatives. The study should include a comparison of  
12 consequences with this growth accommodating places like  
13 Magnolia, Laurelhurst, or Seward Park. I think you'll find  
14 the outcome much less appealing.

35

15 I support Alternative 1 as it yields the most  
16 public benefits and the best outcome for our community.  
17 This is a very responsible solution for the City of Seattle.

36

18 MR. GOODMAN: Hi. My name's Marty Goodman, and  
19 I'm a real estate development consultant.

20 And over the last 20 years I've represented a

21 number of property owners and a number of construction  
22 projects in the South Lake Union area. And I think we have  
23 a tremendous opportunity here, and I think that's reinforced  
24 by reading the Draft EIS. And I'm here to support the  
25 rezone in the highest density that is put out in the EIS,

37

49

1 and I want to make a couple of comments on that.

2           You've got three alternatives. The greatest  
3 density is Alternative 1. As I look at it, I don't think  
4 that is very dense for an area like South Lake Union. Along  
5 the lakefront you have a requirement that you have to own  
6 60,000 square feet of land in order to build a tower.  
7 That's well over an acre, and in an urban environment an  
8 acre is a tremendous amount of land.

9           I also want to point out that the buildings you're  
10 proposing here are different than what's been built down  
11 here before. We're talking about bulk versus height. We  
12 were building bulk. Now you're proposing podium buildings  
13 with towers, and the towers have to be tall in order to make  
14 them financially viable. So I would encourage you to go as  
15 tall as you can. Three hundred feet is not very tall. In  
16 the downtown periphery the DMC zone, they -- buildings,  
17 residential buildings can go 400 feet. So this is a nice  
18 transition at 300 feet.

38

19           So, I guess, in a nutshell I think it's great that  
20 you're rezoning it. I strongly encourage a focus on  
21 Alternative 1, and let's make the most of this. We have an  
22 opportunity here where businesses want to move here, people  
23 want to move here, the infrastructure's already in place.

39

24           So thank you very much.

25           MR. HOLMES: Gloria Hennings, Joe Kenney, and  
Page 42

1 John Pehrson.

2 MS. HEFFRON: Good evening. My name is  
3 Marni Heffron, and I'm the principal of Heffron  
4 Transportation.

5 And for the past eight months I have been leading  
6 a preparation of what is known as the South Lake  
7 Union/Uptown Triangle Mobility Plan. This is a neighborhood  
8 transportation plan that's being sponsored by four community  
9 groups, the South Lake Union Community Council, South Lake  
10 Union Chamber of Commerce, the Uptown Alliance and the  
11 Queen Anne Chamber of Commerce. As part of this plan we've  
12 worked with DPD, with the Seattle Department of  
13 Transportation, the Washington State Department of  
14 Transportation, and King County Metro to develop a plan that  
15 integrates all prior planning, transportation planning  
16 projects, as well as updating those to account for new  
17 infrastructure of projects, such as the bored tunnel to  
18 replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct. We will be submitting the  
19 recommended plan to you as our comments on the EIS so that  
20 you can incorporate these recommendations into your  
21 mitigation measures.

22 While there's many similarities between what is  
23 listed as mitigation measures in our plan, we have much more  
24 detail related to transit service enhancements as well as  
25 infrastructure to support transit. We also worked with the

40

1 Cascade Bicycle Club to develop a complete bicycle  
2 enhancement program for the neighborhood. We agree that the

3 major infrastructure improvements that are already under way  
4 or even under construction, the Mercer East project, the  
5 Mercer West project, and the reconnected grid that will be  
6 achieved with the north portal of the Alaskan way Viaduct  
7 Replacement Program would provide what is needed for the  
8 vehicle needs in this neighborhood.

40 cont

9 But more needs to be done for the pedestrians, the  
10 transit, and bicycles. And as noted in the EIS, the  
11 combination of all of these improvements would mitigate the  
12 adverse impacts associated with the growth of any of those  
13 alternatives.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. KENNEY: Hi, I'm Joe. I've been -- wrong  
16 notes. Okay.

17 My name's Joe Kenney. I'm a resident of  
18 South Lake Union for 34 years, business owner in South Lake  
19 Union for 43 years, and so I've got to see this neighborhood  
20 from a day when it was extremely vibrant, just prior to the  
21 world's Fair, and when this community had multiple  
22 businesses that fed off one another and took care of one  
23 another.

41

24 And then in the '70s, it -- when Boeing kind of  
25 went downhill, so did our little neighborhood here. It kind

52

1 of rendered this neighborhood insignificant and -- for a  
2 number of years. And to see what's going on here now, it  
3 just -- it's a big opportunity I think for us to bring back  
4 a vibrancy that -- it's an opportunity that's unmatched.

5 So I'd like to throw my support to  
6 Alternative No. 1 personally, although I'd Accept 1, 2, or  
7 3. Just make something happen.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. HOLMES: Jeffrey Rowe, Mahlon Clements,  
10 Craig Hanway.

11 MR. PEHRSON: I'm John Pehrson. I live in  
12 South Lake Union. I'm a member of the board of LUOA. I  
13 want to cover quickly three points.

14 The impact of the huge increase in density  
15 proposed for commercial buildings has been inadequately  
16 recognized in this EIS. This proposal, all three  
17 alternatives allow a 75 percent increase in the floor area  
18 ratio or bulk of commercial buildings compared to existing  
19 limits. The only example we have of something like that in  
20 South Lake Union is the tallest of the Amazon buildings on  
21 Boren between Thomas and Harrison. This building is clearly  
22 too big to be called a breadbox. It could only be called a  
23 double breadbox. The alternatives that were studied, all  
24 three of them, would allow such buildings on 60 half blocks  
25 in South Lake Union. This must be recognized in the

42

53

1 aesthetics section and is in my view a huge negative impact.

2 Second point, in Section 1.7, in summary, and I  
3 quote here, There are no significant unavoidable adverse  
4 impacts identified in any of the elements of the environment  
5 except transportation. I don't understand that section  
6 statement and it will be used out of context.

43

7 For all of the alternative studies, buildings will  
8 impinge on actual airspace, windbreaks will make landings  
9 and takeoffs unsafe. There's huge increase, although  
10 unquantified, of shadows. Lake Union Park will be in  
11 shadows a significant number of months, and the views of

44

12 Lake Union and the Space Needle from an existing residence  
13 in this neighborhood or other neighborhoods that are  
14 currently protected by zoning will be eliminated. The  
15 statement is wrong and should be changed.

44 cont

16 Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've been a resident of  
18 South Lake Union for about four years, almost entirely in  
19 the Cascade neighborhood.

45

20 One of the things that I find most engaging,  
21 vibrant, important is the foot traffic that has come from  
22 apartments and developments in that neighborhood. And as an  
23 artist and a resident, I'm a big fan of density. More  
24 people, more interaction, more connection, and more  
25 importantly, I think, to get away from big box, big

54

1 retailers and allow mom-and-pop shops or individuals  
2 requires a certain amount of density to have them be able to  
3 sustain their environment, their work, and their ability to  
4 grow within the neighborhood. And because of that I  
5 understand the concept about view, but it seems like  
6 throwing the baby out with the bath water. It's give up a  
7 little bit, we can probably gain a lot by creating an  
8 environment that allows more people to engage with each  
9 other.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. CLEMENTS: My name is Mahlon Clements and I am  
12 a resident of Lake Union.

46

13 I live just east of Gas Works Park and I'd like to  
14 point out that the views will not be impacted by any of the  
15 scenarios of the beloved Space Needle and hopefully the  
16 views of the city will become better just as the views are



17 better now than they were in 1940. So I look forward to the  
18 growth and development.

46

19 But I'm here to speak tonight about a series of  
20 six workshops I led three years ago as an urban designer  
21 with representatives of over 40 community groups of the  
22 neighborhood. And we met in a series of three and four-hour  
23 sessions talking about what their vision for the future was,  
24 and they concluded -- they concluded that there were seven  
25 priorities: Connecting two centers; create more housing of

55

1 all types; integrate and expand transit; density around --  
2 create density around public investments that already exist,  
3 such as parks and transit; make great streets; and create  
4 shared community facilities; and, lastly, commit to the  
5 environmental sustainability.

6 This group very much understood that this long  
7 wish list required financing, and it was a conversation  
8 about -- it was a question of how, not if, and quality of  
9 the buildings and design standards, not just mass quantity.  
10 And very much endorsed the notion of a significant amount of  
11 development which would be required to create all these  
12 communities, but didn't certainly preclude the quality of  
13 life of the community. In fact, required it to grow into  
14 the place that these people wanted it. The letter -- the  
15 conclusions were endorsed in a letter to city council and  
16 signed by representatives of all 40 groups, many of who  
17 continue to support Alternative 1.

18 Thank you very much.

19 MR. HOLMES: Brandon Weber, Jerry Dinndorf, and  
20 Dan Foltz.

21 MR. HANWAY: I'm Craig Hanway. I am a Queen Anne  
22 resident and I chair the Queen Anne Community Council Land  
23 Use Committee.

24 Over the last five years I've worked on many  
25 planning efforts in South Lake Union and Uptown, including

56

1 Mercer Street Stakeholder Group, the Queen Anne/South Lake  
2 Union Envisioning Charette, the South Lake Union Urban  
3 Foreign Study, and the South Lake Union/Uptown Mobility  
4 Study.

5 Queen Anne and the South Lake Union community  
6 group have worked closely together to make connections  
7 between our two urban centers and to manage increased  
8 density. We already know that growth is coming. The  
9 citywide targets are for about 120,000 new jobs and 70,000  
10 new residential units by 2031. I support the City's policy  
11 to concentrate more than half of that density in the six  
12 urban centers including South Lake Union. We are expecting  
13 higher growth targets for the Uptown Urban Center as well,  
14 and I support that.

47

15 I feel strongly the best chance we have to manage  
16 density is to increase density in urban centers. We have an  
17 opportunity to create a real successful urban neighborhood  
18 which utilizes existing infrastructure, avoids urban sprawl,  
19 protects single-family neighborhoods, and allows people the  
20 opportunity to live closer to where they work.

21 The EIS document I think is misleading in a way  
22 because it only looks at impacts of density in South Lake  
23 Union. It would be more useful as a document if it compared  
24 the impacts in South Lake Union to the impacts if the  
25 density was in other parts of the city.

48

1 we are looking at a similar concept across Aurora  
2 in the Uptown Urban center. The deep bore tunnel allows us  
3 to connect the street grid and look at new transit  
4 opportunities. So I support Alternative 1 in order to focus  
5 density in urban centers.

49

6 MR. DINNDORF: Is there someone in front of me?

7 MR. HOLMES: Go ahead.

8 MR. DINNDORF: Good evening. My name is  
9 Jerry Dinndorf. I'm the current president of the South Lake  
10 Union Community Council.

11 As the city's designated steward of the  
12 neighborhood plan, it is our responsibility to represent the  
13 diverse interests of our community on public policy and  
14 development issues impacting the neighborhood plan, and I  
15 invite you if you're not familiar with the community council  
16 to visit our webpage and find out who we are.

17 Over the past 15 years the community council has  
18 been involved in numerous planning efforts, including  
19 development of the urban design framework that was  
20 previously mentioned earlier tonight, and which there are  
21 copies of out in the vestibule. The vision documented in  
22 the framework is for a highly livable, vibrant, urban  
23 neighborhood that capitalizes on the growth that is coming  
24 to provide neighborhood amenities currently lacking in this  
25 community. These include improved parks and increased open

1 space, streetscape improvements, a community center, market  
2 rate and affordable housing, schools and day care, green



8 David Hiller.

9 MR. FOLTZ: Good evening. I'm Dan Foltz. I am a  
10 principal of Weber Thompson so I work in the neighborhood.

11 I'm one of the -- I was one of the leads for the  
12 urban design framework for South Lake Union, and I'm a  
13 member of the board as well of the community council. I  
14 happen to live on Capitol Hill. I enjoy a fantastic view  
15 near St. Marks out towards Elliott Bay and beyond. My view  
16 will be impacted by Alternative 1, which I personally favor,  
17 but I'd rather focus on a few technical items as a member of  
18 the South Lake Union Community Council.

51

19 For many of us that reviewed the document, the  
20 Draft EIS is less technical, analytical, or concerned with  
21 detailing mitigations than expected and hoped. It actually  
22 seems to some of us to be more of a compendium of or  
23 reference to other studies over the years, definitions of  
24 terms and conditions, policy quotes, and so on. We really  
25 wanted to see more meat in the actual analysis. Among other

52

60

1 things, my colleagues and I were expecting to see much more  
2 connectivity to and reliance on the urban design framework  
3 as stated in the very same scoping documents from the city.

4 The UDF already represented a lot of heavy lifting  
5 and analysis, potential mitigations and the like, which  
6 could have contributed significantly to the EIS. The SLU  
7 community council is strongly in support of the principles  
8 of the UDF.

53

9 Height, bulk, and scale. The EIS presented  
10 numerous graphic presentations of the various proposed  
11 heights but did nothing with regards to analyzing bulk,

54

12 i.e., floor plate size options, or scale of podiums as well  
13 as of towers and their associated mitigations.

54 cont

14 The UDF worked extensively on dozens of various  
15 building typologies, tower heights, podium heights,  
16 proportions, floor plate sizes, FAR's, et cetera. The EIS  
17 simply accepted the proposed parameters and modeled them  
18 with different heights showing at times questionable views  
19 of tower development potential.

20 Thanks.

21 MR. KENNEY: My name is Mike Kenney.

22 I live in South Lake Union. I am a small business  
23 owner in South Lake Union. I'm on the board of the South  
24 Lake Union Community Council. I walk around the South Lake  
25 Union. Ride my bike around South Lake Union. I guess I got

61

1 a dog and a kayak; I'd be like the ultimate South Lake Union  
2 resident.

3 But I was going to speak first on behalf of the  
4 South Lake Union Community Council. I looked specifically  
5 at the transportation section and we felt that -- I guess  
6 our main issue was we wanted to see a mobility plan -- the  
7 South Lake Union mobility plan incorporated more into that  
8 section. I know members of the community council spent  
9 quite a few hours working on that and we just kind of want  
10 to see that incorporated more in there.

55

11 On a totally different note, just for me  
12 personally, just taking a look at the pros and cons of  
13 overall density, it's really astounding to me to see the  
14 differences in what people think. There's the density  
15 option where there's going to be bringing more people, more  
16 jobs, more commerce, more pedestrian-friendly streets versus

56

17 it's messing up my view. And then there is -- you know,  
18 with more commerce, with more cash there is the ability to  
19 create better transportation options, you know, more bus  
20 lines, more street cars. There's going to be more, you  
21 know, intelligent people coming to our community, more  
22 business professionals coming in versus it's messing my view  
23 up. To me it just makes total sense to add more density.  
24 It's a positive thing. I think overall either of the first  
25 three options look good to me. So thank you for your

56 cont

62

1 consideration.

2 MR. BLUMSON: Hello. Thank you. My name is  
3 Michael Blumson. I'm a member of the South Lake Community  
4 Council and also work in affordable housing in the  
5 neighborhood and represent many of the low income residents  
6 of our community.

7 First of all, I wanted to thank the city staff who  
8 did the work on this. I know it's a lot to put something  
9 like this together. So I wanted to appreciate that.

10 I was on the community council's housing review  
11 team for that section and I would like to highlight a few  
12 points that we'd like to bring up.

13 First of all, the community council would like the  
14 City to conduct a more complete inventory of housing in  
15 South Lake Union. Many of the buildings referred to in the  
16 Draft EIS is not rent restricted, making it attractable,  
17 affordable, and might represent opportunities for housing  
18 preservation resources. Having a more accurate snapshot of  
19 housing affordability in South Lake Union would be helpful.

20 Second, we would like to see more creative

57

58

21 solutions in the mitigation section. Let's find other ways  
22 to preserve our existing housing stock and keep them  
23 affordable, such as utilizing TDI's and making renovations  
24 easier and faster than building codes.

58 cont

25 Third and lastly, an additional level of analysis

59

63

1 to help interested parties make distinctions between various  
2 alternatives would be appropriate. The current language  
3 simply declares that all alternatives meet the City's grow  
4 targets but does not adequately describe what impacts the  
5 alternatives might have on the development potential for  
6 both market and affordable housing development. This  
7 analysis is needed because of the body that represents the  
8 interests of low income residents and workers in the  
9 neighborhood. The community council is interested in  
10 seeking policies that enhance the potential for utilizing  
11 the incentives only program.

12 we have heard from the City that there may be up  
13 to 33 million in funds generated by that program. Incentive  
14 zoning is one of the few tools of the city disposal to make  
15 sure that affordable housing is developed within South Lake  
16 Union and not pushed to the peripheries of the city.  
17 Similarly, the funds would also go to developing a community  
18 center which is one of the community council's priorities  
19 and which would fulfill an important need for low income  
20 individuals and families in the communities. The Draft EIS  
21 needs to provide guidance about which alternative would best  
22 serve these needs.

60

23 Thank you.

24 MR. HOLMES: Saintz Crossley, Patricia Kushmerick,  
25 and Giacomo Licciardi.



1 MR. HILLER: Good evening. For the record my name  
2 is David Hiller and I'm advocacy director for the  
3 14,000-member Cascade Bicycle Club.

4 I stand before you this evening to offer our  
5 support for Alternative 1, but I will mostly speak to the  
6 transportation element. Throughout the last decade Cascade  
7 has been deeply involved in the neighborhood between Mercer  
8 Corridor Stakeholder Project, the Neighborhood Vision  
9 Charette, South Lake Union Mobility Plan, and on the street  
10 car project.

61

11 We've been around. We've worked with most of the  
12 employers in the neighborhood. We worked with Fred Hutch,  
13 SBRI. We're working with Amazon, CTR people, Group Health.  
14 Thousands of our members work in this neighborhood,  
15 community group neighborhood. So when we talk about the  
16 transportation element, our little bone to pick is first and  
17 foremost it's the wrong E -- it's the wrong level of  
18 service.

62

19 Vehicles capacity isn't the level of service we  
20 use in the City of Seattle. Adopting our comprehensive plan  
21 and development is streamlined [unintelligible]. So why  
22 [unintelligible] capacity in intersections in a community  
23 where more than half the trips are done by bus and walking  
24 transit is beyond me.

25 And all the growth. We've had 46 percent growth

63

1 [unintelligible] downtown in three years. Most of that's  
2 driven by the land use in Belltown, Capitol Hill,

3 Denny Triangle. That brings us in part to our support for  
4 Alternative 1. That density brings resorts designations  
5 closer together and provides more travel options  
6 [unintelligible] travel time.

63 cont

7 Also, we're a bit disappointed in the lack of  
8 multi-mobile analysis. With having seen the Bellevue  
9 Multimodal Concurrency Study [unintelligible], Eastside  
10 Concurrency Study, the new multi -- the new urban arterial  
11 LOS and 2010 highway capacity manual, there are a number of  
12 peer-reviewed tools that could have been used to do a more  
13 fine grain analysis of travel demand in the city. The City  
14 of Seattle [unintelligible] definitely specifies  
15 improvements for the region, and with respect to your time  
16 I'll cut it short generally, but in addition to that, we  
17 have a recently completed study at the South Lake  
18 Union/Uptown Mobility Plan which we'd like included in the  
19 official record and potentially for a list of mitigations  
20 [unintelligible].

64

21 Thank you.

22 MS. CROSSLEY: Katharine Crossley, fourth  
23 generation on both sides. Seventy-five years my family on  
24 Capitol Hill.

25 This is just a warning. I've seen it from

66

1 long-term. Think about the Suez Canal being widened,  
2 Panama Canal being widened. This traffic that's going to go  
3 up in the north, which -- to the north pole. No mitigation  
4 can compensate the loss of -- to our city of a priceless  
5 inherited treasure countless cities can only dream of.  
6 Crowned cities of the world draw multitudes with our unique,  
7 magnificent architecture, London, Paris, Rome. And Seattle,

65

8 too, blessed with nature's supreme architectural  
9 achievement. Mountains, lakes, hills spread before us in  
10 views which we and visitors experience but are now  
11 threatened. A fleeting victory in property appreciation  
12 pushed by speculation which is threatened by renewal  
13 demanded by these leveraged financing should be recognized  
14 for what it is, not in the long-term interest of Seattle.

15 The Volunteer Park Water Tower as a designated  
16 view when few venture the arduous climb while below crowds  
17 gather, photo, and enjoy the view from SAM by its camels and  
18 on the wall below demonstrates to me and many examples in  
19 your report, the slanted report of the EIS.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. HOLMES: Christine Licciardi, Marty  
22 Kushmerick, and Dewey Walker.

23 MS. KUSHMERICK: My name is Pat Kushmerick. I  
24 live in South Lake Union.

25 I have read much of the EIS and some of it I

65 cont

66

67

1 disagree with, but tonight my focus is the realistic ability  
2 for families of all income brackets to live in South Lake  
3 Union. From what I have read I conclude that this urban  
4 center will realistically only be populated with singles,  
5 [unintelligible], seniors, and commuters. These groups are  
6 a valuable component of the community, but no neighborhood  
7 is complete without children of all ages.

8 what is missing from this EIS are the nonrevenue  
9 producing components of family life that include at a  
10 minimum grammar and middle schools, a library, sufficient  
11 safety services and recreational areas, community spaces,

67

12 improved public transportation, walkability, and grocery  
13 shopping in addition to whole paycheck. Currently  
14 South Lake Union is limited to one P-Patch. Nowhere in this  
15 EIS did I find mention of additional ones. Even with the  
16 current population there is a long waiting list to get a  
17 patch. Towers that might be built along the east side of  
18 Fairview will create shadows. Vegetables and flowers do not  
19 do well in shadows. My conclusion is that without these  
20 components to foster family living, South Lake Union will  
21 never meet the expectation of developers, city planners, or  
22 business investments.

67 cont

23 Finally, I have enough candles on my birthday cake  
24 that I can realistically expect never to experience the full  
25 growth of South Lake Union. I'm doing this not for me but

68

68

1 for the generations to come. For them I want in the words  
2 of the Lake Union Opportunity Alliance, it done right in my  
3 backyard.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. WALKER: Good evening. My name is Dewey  
6 walker, and I'm new to Seattle and I'm a current resident of  
7 South Lake Union area.

69

8 I am here to support Alternative 3. In  
9 particular, I want to lend my support to your preserving the  
10 long established precedent of step down heights of buildings  
11 as they go down towards South Lake Union -- down towards  
12 Lake Union. It just doesn't make sense to me to have three  
13 and 400-foot buildings right at the base of the stepdown  
14 towards Lake Union.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. HOLMES: Brian Estes, Judith Freeman, and  
Page 58

17 Lloyd Douglas.

18 MS. KUSHMERICK: Hi. Thank you for allowing me to  
19 speak.

20 I'm Marty Kushmerick. I live in Cascade  
21 neighborhood, and I have an office in UW South Lake Union  
22 campus. So I walk back and forth quite a lot.

23 The city council realizes, I believe, that the  
24 blocks around Lake Union, among short anyway, is -- are  
25 iconic to Seattle. In fact, a special Seattle water view,

70

69

1 you might say. Our part of the city has a very special  
2 feel. For me, maintaining this environment while developing  
3 an urban center means that visual access to spectacular  
4 views of the mountains and Seattle Center and Queen Anne to  
5 the west, Lake Union on the north, and the slopes to the  
6 east must be maintained. Most of the current plan with  
7 height -- with increased heights obliterates this and I  
8 believe that it should be possible to maintain, as a  
9 previous speaker said, a stepdown, maintain view corridors  
10 while consistent with greatly increased density.

11 My next point is that the density increase in the  
12 South Lake Union neighborhood is, in fact, the highest of  
13 any neighborhood at all, and so my question to council is  
14 doesn't -- is, in fact, South Lake Union going to absorb  
15 most of the increase in Seattle within the next 20 to 30  
16 years.

71

17 And lastly I want to address transportation. And  
18 you heard mitigation efforts, and Alternative 1 in  
19 particular states that it has the least impact apparently  
20 because it's planned that all people who live in Seattle

72

21 will walk. I want to know if, in fact, that's realistic.  
22 Are they -- Amazon and others, do they have some incentive  
23 to have people not drive, walk, et cetera, because as the  
24 previous speaker, if we're going to have a mixed community,  
25 they need space for families, et cetera, and all the things

72 cont

70

1 that families need.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. ESTES: I'm Brian Estes, a resident of  
4 South Lake Union and I work downtown for 30 years.

5 The EIS is inaccurate and incomplete in several  
6 areas. First, land use. The EIS statement on Page 115 that  
7 the proposed action is generally consistent with adopted  
8 city plans and policies and regulations is incorrect as the  
9 household and growth projections are substantially higher  
10 than the targets in current urban center plans. South Lake  
11 Union is only 340 acres, or 9.2 percent of the total land  
12 area of Seattle's six urban centers. It is absorbing a  
13 disproportionate share of housing and job growth especially  
14 under Alternatives 1 and 2. I think the EIS should address  
15 this.

73

16 The EIS does not adequately address the fact that  
17 land use under Alternative 1 is inconsistent with land use  
18 policies that reflect the stepdown to the water approach for  
19 building heights in Seattle.

74

20 Flight paths, the EIS is inadequate since it does  
21 not address buffers in detail and [unintelligible] the wind  
22 tunnel, wind analysis which should be completed to  
23 adequately assess land use and other impacts.

75

24 The aesthetic portion of the EIS, especially  
25 Appendix D, is incomplete and therefore misleading. None of

76

1 the graphical representations show the tons of 400-foot  
 2 towers already permitted in the Denny Triangle or other  
 3 development in Uptown, which will occur in the next 20  
 4 years, which will also alter South Lake Union's viewsapes  
 5 significantly. The EIS should address these representations  
 6 as well.

76 cont

7 The EIS conclusions that the shadow impacts are  
 8 not expected to result in significant adverse to  
 9 environmental impacts is incorrect. The close examination  
 10 of Figures 29 through 44 in Appendix D show significant  
 11 shadow effects on open space parks and protected shorelines.  
 12 The EIS should address this as well.

77

13 In closing, let's not let jumbo-sized towers that  
 14 clearly belong in downtown Seattle and the Denny Triangle  
 15 run rampant to the north all way to the lake as  
 16 Alternative 1 and 2 suggest. Let's keep South Lake Union  
 17 with unique shoreline character north of downtown, home to  
 18 future growth and density that represents smart development  
 19 but not on a human scale.

78

20 Thank you.

21 MS. FREEMAN: Hello. My name is Judith Freeman.  
 22 I live in the neighborhood and I intend to submit my  
 23 comments but I wanted to make one or two points.

24 First of all, I completely support the stepdown  
 25 Alternative 3 version. While I understand that this is

79

1 designated an urban area and it'll be dense, it seems to me  
 2 that this South Lake Union area really consists of more than

3 one area. And specifically I'm talking about the Mercer to  
4 Valley and around to the west being wrapped up into this  
5 urban density and, you know -- and I'm most concerned about  
6 that particular area. And I'd like to point out that  
7 putting my concern there makes me where I live very  
8 vulnerable to the loss of view.

79 cont

9 But my loss of personal view is not as important  
10 to me as maintaining that area around the lake. I don't  
11 know if there's a way to separate it out when they designate  
12 those areas. It's hard for me to imagine that you have an  
13 urban area that goes all the way up to the lake. So I would  
14 just urge -- I know you've taken some care with that but not  
15 sufficient care with recognizing that that's a unique zone.  
16 You only get one chance to do it right.

17 One comment on transportation, does anybody drive  
18 down Westlake at 5:00 o'clock today? Now?

80

19 MR. HOLMES: Ron -- excuse me. Lorie Groth, Chris  
20 Gemmill, and Martin Kaplan.

21 MR. DOUGLAS: Good evening. My name's  
22 Lloyd Douglas. I'm a member of the Cascade Neighborhood  
23 Council, member of the South Lake Union Community Council,  
24 and a member of the -- and board member of Lake Union  
25 Opportunity Association.

73

1 And tonight I'm going to speak about the housing  
2 portion of the study. Extreme upzone of Alternatives 1 and  
3 2 will inflate land prices beyond what could be affordable  
4 for our workforce and affordable development organizations.  
5 Since most of the half blocks are owned by several single  
6 owners, there would be few opportunities for partial block  
7 development for workforce and family housing resulting in

81



8 further homogenization of the neighborhood. The goals  
9 outlined in this section are logical and should be  
10 considered as a minimum. Requiring funds to stay in the  
11 neighborhood could also be explored.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. GROTH: Hi. My name is Lorie Groth and I'm a  
14 resident of this neighborhood and am on the South Lake Union  
15 Community Council. I'm the part of [unintelligible] board.  
16 I'm still on Cascade Neighborhood Council and  
17 [unintelligible].

18 Anyhow, tonight I want to address the Draft EIS  
19 and some of the things I'd like to see in the next version  
20 of the EIS, specifically around transportation and around  
21 the details, the metrics that we can better understand.

22 When it comes to transportation, for example, it  
23 was so complex that we actually had to hire a consultant to  
24 help us understand it. To be more exact, when we looked  
25 into the models, what the MXD model does and how it was

81 cont

82

74

1 validated against the IC model, even our transportation  
2 consultant who's been working, who's a doctor who's worked  
3 in this field for 15 years, all he could come back with was  
4 where's the meat. I don't understand how they came up with  
5 the most optimistic conclusions you see in some of the most  
6 aggressive models.

7 As a layperson in tran -- in public land and  
8 these -- building of things like that, I really would like  
9 these kind of things to be addressed in both the  
10 [unintelligible] summary so that when I read the first few  
11 pages I understand what's going to happen in my neighborhood

12 and we have open and honest conversation related to what  
13 building heights should be. I don't want to see red boxes.  
14 I also don't want to see downtown, and I think South Lake  
15 Union blocks are -- by the park are quite special.

82 cont

16 Thank you.

17 MR. GEMMILL: Good evening. My name is  
18 Chris Gemmill. I'm a South Lake Union resident, small  
19 business owner also in South Lake Union.

20 As I listen tonight as a resident here I want to  
21 point out that I've also moved here with, you know, great  
22 expectations of what South Lake Union could be. I moved  
23 here in 1999 when there was virtually nothing going on. Of  
24 all the people that I talked to, vibrancy and things like  
25 that are key issues. Nobody really likes the current zoning

83

75

1 plan, Alternative 4, and I really have yet to talk to too  
2 many people who are very excited about Alternative 1 either.  
3 Zoning's a sensitive issue and we know that's not the topic  
4 tonight, so I want to hit on other aspects of the EIS that  
5 are of concern.

6 Lorie just mentioned issues with the  
7 transportation section. There's also issues with the air  
8 quality section if the transportation section is off base.

84

9 The air quality section only addressed three  
10 intersections, all on Mercer. There's nothing in there  
11 addressing Fairview and Denny, nothing addressing Fairview  
12 and Dexter. And if the transportation study is off, a lot  
13 of the [unintelligible] emission, calculations in the air  
14 studies might be off as well. If you're traveling on  
15 Westlake tonight, I walk Dexter every day and with the  
16 addition of the red turn arrow at Dexter and Mercer due to

17 the addition of the bike lane on Dexter which made Dexter a  
18 three-lane road, I smell gas all day. Three months ago,  
19 didn't happen. So you can claim not put too much weight  
20 into the current idea that there's nothing wrong with the  
21 potential air quality damage.

84 cont

22 Additionally, I think the -- just the way the EIS  
23 is written, the taxpayers put a lot of money into paying for  
24 that and it should be -- there should be at least an  
25 executive summary that is relatively comprehensible by the

85

76

1 average taxpayer.

2 Thanks.

3 MR. HOLMES: Jim Goodspeed, Don Miles, and  
4 Mary Bacarella.

5 MR. KAPLAN: Good evening.

6 I'm going to join a lot of others tonight and tell  
7 people I'm pretty excited about Alternative 1. And my  
8 name's Martin Kaplan. I'm an architect. I'm a Queen Anne  
9 resident, a long-time member of the community council. I'm  
10 a member of our Seattle Planning Commission, the stewards of  
11 our comprehensive plan. And I will join my colleagues in  
12 the next few weeks to issue our complete comments on the EIS  
13 where we'll look at every single section, give you our  
14 detailed comments soon, but tonight I'm speaking as an  
15 individual in my own opinions, not representing anybody but  
16 myself.

86

17 For years I and scores of other concerned  
18 citizens, professionals, neighbors, together with city hall  
19 worked tirelessly together in analyzing and identifying  
20 where best to focus our forecasted future growth in jobs and

21 housing. People and jobs are coming to Seattle and we're  
22 pretty excited. It is our future. The most critical step  
23 in protecting and enhancing our future is to strategically  
24 and smartly plan for this route within dense and diverse  
25 neighborhoods that are close to all services and supported

77

1 by 21st century infrastructure.

2           The focus of our future growth in housing and jobs  
3 will be within our six urban centers. Among those six,  
4 South Lake Union by far possesses the greatest adjacencies  
5 to downtown jobs, multimodal transportation choices, active  
6 urban open spaces, and tremendous future land use and  
7 transportation opportunities for businesses, housing, parks,  
8 and families.

9           The completion of the north portal will knit  
10 together -- knit back together our grid, provide fabulous  
11 connection to the Center and beyond for walk, bike, and  
12 ride.

13           In conclusion, following months there will be time  
14 to visit seriously about land use regulation, building  
15 height, incentive zoning, and other related opportunities,  
16 but today we should all agree that South Lake Union is the  
17 one urban center that can and should accommodate the largest  
18 growth in jobs and housing and we should embrace the  
19 incredible opportunities that lie ahead. We cannot afford  
20 to be shy about pushing new envelopes and inspiring the  
21 growth of what may be our largest neighborhood and providing  
22 the supporting incentives necessary to actually achieve our  
23 dreams in one very right and ripe place in Seattle.

87

24           Thank you.

25           MR. GOODPSEED: Hi. Jim Goodspeed. Resident in  
Page 66

1 the neighborhood and I am an architect.

2 I would like to say -- kind of reiterate the past  
 3 couple comments that I think the summary is written a little  
 4 big. It's a 600-page document and I think the goal would be  
 5 to educate the public with it. To expect the public to read  
 6 through the 600 pages -- I mean, I'm glad that meat is  
 7 there, but for the layperson who doesn't work in this area,  
 8 they should be able to read a summary that has more depth to  
 9 it, such as there's statements that say the shadows or the  
 10 glare in Version -- Alternative 4 versus Alternative 1 are  
 11 much different. That's what it says in the summary and I  
 12 think that can -- I think that's just too vague for comment,  
 13 people to read that.

88

14 Also, as an architect I think that the models  
 15 shown in the aesthetic section don't appear to be accurate,  
 16 from what I'm seeing. Looking at the idea of the two towers  
 17 per block. So we, the community, have actually modeled that  
 18 ourselves using Google Earth, and that is available to you  
 19 if you contact us, LUOA.org. And I would urge that the City  
 20 also makes your model available to people to zoom around or  
 21 select the views that are relevant to them. I think that  
 22 the views are kind of vague and from a bird's eye  
 23 perspective or they're right down in the street.

89

24 I also have noticed that some of the shadows are  
 25 rendered incorrectly. Particularly in Appendix D, Figure 29

90

1 on 12:00 a.m. for Alternative 1. The shadows on the Mercer  
 2 blocks don't look correct. I would like to look at the

3 rest, but if I could get -- see the model, see what the rest  
4 of the mistakes are.

90 cont

5 And one last point I'd like to make is that dense  
6 cities such as Chicago and New York build their urban  
7 centers naturally around rapid transit stops. The EIS  
8 states that there not only is no rapid transit stop now,  
9 which we know, but there isn't even one planned in the  
10 future. So -- I know. I questioned, though, that point and  
11 that the traffic talked about in the traffic section says  
12 that it's not going to be that much more traffic in  
13 Alternative 1 than Alternative 4. I could believe that if  
14 there was going to be a rapid transit stop, but with a  
15 Manhattan-like neighborhood density that's proposed in  
16 Alternative 1, I doubt that would happen.

91

17 Thanks.

18 MS. BACARELLA: Good evening. My name is  
19 Mary Bacarella. I'm the vice president of Brand Management  
20 for the Space Needle. And I want to thank you for the  
21 opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS.

22 This urban forum study is a vital interest to us  
23 as some alternatives could severely impact the Space Needle.

92

24 The Space Needle attracts 1.3 million visitors a  
25 year and generates \$280 million per year in economic benefit

80

1 to the region. This needle is the city's most recognized  
2 symbol of Seattle. The Space Needle's landmark status is  
3 due in part to its unique hourglass shape, its tripod legs,  
4 and the fact that it's the only one of two steel towers in  
5 the world. The other being the Eiffel Tower in Paris.

6 We're very concerned because the visual depictions  
7 in the Draft EIS show that views to the Space Needle will be

8 impacted by Alternative 1 and 2. Yet, the language of the  
9 Draft EIS concludes that there's no significant adverse  
10 effect to the views of the Needle. The thinking behind the  
11 Draft EIS conclusion seems to be that, well, it's okay to  
12 cut off our legs. I urge you to re-read the landmark  
13 nomination of our iconic structure and you'll see that the  
14 totality of our beloved Space Needle and its tripod legs  
15 make it an icon. Lopping off a significant portion of this  
16 view is an adverse impact that must be recognized in the  
17 final EIS. Mitigation measures and perhaps new alternatives  
18 must be developed to avoid this impact. We believe that  
19 growth in the South Lake Union neighborhood should occur in  
20 a way that preserves the prominence of our city's premier  
21 landmark.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. HOLMES: Catherine Benotto, Steven Wood, and  
24 Chris Masson.

25 MR. MILESON: I'm Don Miles. I'm a 35-year

92 cont

81

1 resident of Queen Anne. One of my daughters went to the  
2 Center School, was a graduate of Center School. I'm a  
3 member of The Wooden Boat Center. I've been involved in  
4 most of the stakeholder groups that have been discussed, and  
5 I've also been involved in the design guidelines for the  
6 Uptown Urban Center and the urban village at the top of  
7 Queen Anne.

8 I wanted to stress that the EIS and -- is really  
9 not a design document. And the design guidelines that was  
10 something that was mentioned earlier and the involvement of  
11 the community in the design guidelines is what's really

93

12 important. The characterization of towers and podiums and  
13 so forth don't really describe the level of design detail  
14 and the opportunity for wonderful design in the South Lake  
15 Union area that we're all anticipating.

16 I very strongly support Alternative 1. Taller  
17 tower buildings ensure higher quality construction and  
18 design and give us the flexibility to create the intimacy,  
19 the pedestrian orientation, the stress on the public realm  
20 and not the car that we've heard so much about tonight.  
21 That kind of approach to maxing will give us the maximum  
22 amount of opportunity to create the public realm that is so  
23 important to the district.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. BENOTTO: My name is Catherine Benotto. I'm

93 cont

82

1 principal at Weber Thompson here in South Lake Union. I  
2 have a sister on the planning commission but my comments are  
3 not on behalf of the planning commission; they are my  
4 opinions only.

5 I have two comments both related to open space.  
6 And the first one is related to the distribution of open  
7 space through South Lake Union. The EIS notes a couple gaps  
8 of some areas that are poorly served, but I urge you to have  
9 a finer grain analysis in looking at the open space to some  
10 of the smaller areas that are needed, and particularly  
11 looking at the city's need for neighborhood development  
12 documentation for South Lake Union. And that neighborhood  
13 development criteria relates to the livability of an area,  
14 and South Lake Union currently falls short in providing  
15 those smaller open spaces, parks and plazas in close  
16 proximity, very close proximity to where people live and

94



17 work.

18 I should add that Weber Thompson assisted the City  
19 in looking at that analysis and I saw generally one was  
20 needed on about every block.

21 which is related to my second point, which is on  
22 public open space as an amenity for increased density. The  
23 3D models assumed that that would not be as an option and  
24 the pedestrian-level views, it showed that it wasn't really  
25 building height that was the most impactful but the

95

83

1 [unintelligible] relentless unbroken base of the building  
2 because none of them assumed that the open space would be an  
3 option. So my point would be -- is should -- if that is the  
4 worst-case scenario going forward, then perhaps the open  
5 space should be a requirement for the increased density a  
6 nonoption.

7 MR. HOLMES: Brian Ramey, Renee Staton, and  
8 Alan Hart.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to thank you for  
10 providing this forum for us to give public comment. I guess  
11 I really wasn't aware that this was going to be a big vote  
12 for your favored alternative.

13 But I work here in South Lake Union. I have a  
14 middle-to-low income here. I've heard lots of talk about  
15 affordable housing; I've heard lots of talk about tall  
16 highrises, which mean very expensive housing; I have heard a  
17 whole lot of talk about something, I can afford to have my  
18 family live here, get rid of my car, and stop supporting  
19 urban sprawl. So that's something I think that really needs  
20 to be addressed very, very seriously.

96

21 If we're going to have an overall community, this  
22 involves -- I heard talk about some kids. I heard talk  
23 about schools, you know, to really make a rounded community.  
24 Also heard somebody else mention about, you know,  
25 thousands of people commuting to work, which is probably why

96 cont

84

1 because, you know, you really can't afford to live here.  
2 And it would be nice. I'd love to help contribute to  
3 greening up our city and not driving a car into work or  
4 taking up parking spaces and that type of thing.

5 The second thing I'd like to address is the  
6 pictorial view of what the density is going to look like.  
7 I'd like to see it in a more fair end scale with each other  
8 comparing the different alternatives. And it'd even be  
9 nicer to see it in a 3D format that was to scale, Queen Anne  
10 Hill and Capitol Hill beside it so we could have a true  
11 picture of what that was really going to look like.

97

12 And time is up. Thank you very much.

13 MR. REMY: Hi. My name is Brian Remy. I live in  
14 Eastlake.

15 And I'm going to stick to the environmental  
16 impacts here. The State of Washington Shorelines Management  
17 Act recognizes that the shorelines of the waters in the  
18 state are among the most valuable, fragile of the state's  
19 natural resources, and the State requires that the cities  
20 recognize the importance of this and protect the shorelines.  
21 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement states that birds  
22 and fish species dependent upon the lake will be adversely  
23 impacted by the build-out. The Draft EIS fails to explain  
24 how during the development of South Lake Union the City will  
25 protect against the adverse impacts to public health, the

98

1 land, the vegetation, the wildlife that are part of the lake  
2 environment.

98 cont

3           The Draft EIS states that there will be  
4 unavoidable combined sewage and storm water overflows into  
5 the lake. None of these negative impacts have been  
6 adequately addressed for mitigation proposed in the  
7 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft EIS fails  
8 to explain how development will be placed to prevent  
9 interference with air, water, navigation in Lake Union.  
10 This includes seaplanes and sailboat navigation.

99

11           The DEIS ignores the rights of recreational and  
12 commercial users of the lake for reliance upon wind currents  
13 which provide public enjoyment of sailboat, recreation, and  
14 tourism. The proposed height, bulk, and numbers of  
15 buildings allowed under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 will have a  
16 major impact on the future viability of the Tuesday's Duck  
17 Dodge due to major buildings shielding natural wind currents  
18 over the lake, creating a deadzone where none existed  
19 before.

100

20           The creation of shadows will have a major  
21 environmental impact on public spaces in the Denny Park,  
22 Cascade, and Lake Union park. No mitigations are proposed.

101

23           We are not going to be creating a vibrant retail,  
24 recreational, residential community here with Alternatives  
25 1, 2, and 3, and I urge you to go back and look again at the

102

1 way this is planned out. I am for density but maybe without  
2 parking garages in work, okay?

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thanks.

MS. STATON: Hi. My name is Renae Staton. I'm a member of Leadership for Great Neighborhoods.

Leadership for Great Neighborhoods appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DEIS. LGN is a broad-based coalition of neighborhood leaders, residents, business members, and other stakeholders. We're dedicated to affecting change and achieving the greatest possible social, economic, and environmental benefits for all Seattle neighborhoods.

Some of our comments -- and I've included -- I've given you a letter that's more extensive than my comments right now, but some of our comments do not address the specific impacts of the DEIS; rather, they suggest alternative ways of measuring, quantifying, and reporting impacts of the various alternatives.

103

Although there's no requirement for an EIS to examine positive benefits of an action, LGN recommends identifying in the document how each of the growth alternatives can help address adopted goals for carbon reduction and for growth management through compact urban neighborhoods.

104

A second concern is that the DEIS does not look at

105

87

economic development. You are encouraged to analyze economic development impacts of the alternatives.

Thank you.

MR. HART: My name is Allen Hart. I am an architect and planner and have been a resident in Lower Queen Anne for the past ten years.

Before that, I lived in Vancouver,  
Page 74

□

8 British Columbia, and the type of development that's being  
9 considered in this area is very similar to one that we were  
10 involved in out there. I'd just like to share some of the  
11 experience there, and that's at Falls Creek, which is -- was  
12 a transitional area in a bowl very similar to this around a  
13 body of water.

14 And at the time it was first planned, the body of  
15 water was seen really as an asset but for people in other  
16 communities. But what has developed over time is the bike  
17 paths and the access to the waterfront and the number of  
18 people. It has really become a hotbed of activity. If  
19 you've been up there, it's pretty much a success.

20 But some of the things that's really important,  
21 it's not just a focus on height and density. It's looking  
22 at form and character and the rules of engagement that are  
23 identified somewhat in the EIS but really should be looked  
24 at more carefully and be more specific about the aspects of  
25 the podium, the towers, and so on. Because of that, I think

106

88

1 Option No. 1 is the right option but with the right rules.

2 The other thing is livability. And from the  
3 standpoint of having a facility such as schools and day care  
4 and community centers, it's really important to have that as  
5 the heart, and that will get you the mix that you need.  
6 It'll draw the people from all ages.

107

7 And the last thing is that the quality of  
8 development is really the most important in public spaces.  
9 In order to make it successful, it has to be the  
10 investment -- private investment to be able to continue  
11 those -- kind of that quality of environment and again that

108

12 SLU DEIS Public Hearing Comments.txt  
will create the livability.

13 Thanks very much.

14 MR. HOLMES: Kevin McCarthy, Brock Howell, and  
15 Michael Hall.

16 MR. MCCARTHY: Hello. My name is Kevin McCarthy.  
17 And this study uses the most aggressive  
18 methodology to come up with the most optimistic conclusions.  
19 And as a board member of the Lake Union Opportunity  
20 Alliance, I have some specific concerns.

21 I'm going to be talking about groups that are  
22 disenfranchised by this EIS. The EIS states the wildlife in  
23 this study is limited -- is likely limited to species  
24 adapted to urban areas and birds migrating through the study  
25 area. That is incorrect. It further states that the

109

110

89

1 Mercer valley focus area wildlife is likely limited to  
2 highly urbanized species and that this proposal will not  
3 directly result in an enhanced or planned animal habitat.

4 This is incorrect. I'm very familiar with the  
5 blue herons, wood ducks and freshwater turtles that reside  
6 in the south end of South Lake Union. And I can tell you  
7 for sure that 300-foot towers rimming Westlake as well as  
8 Valley would create a permanent shadow zone in that area and  
9 my daughter and I wouldn't get to enjoy freshwater turtles  
10 sunning when there is no sun.

11 The EIS states that affordable housing, from 2004  
12 to 2009 housing unit growth for people making 0 to  
13 80 percent of the median income range grew at 19 percent, as  
14 opposed to the City's existing goal of 37 percent. That  
15 means we're already failing by 50 percent to the affordable  
16 housing goals that we're trying to hit. And by upselling

111

17 this land, it's going to be so expensive that any affordable  
18 housing dollars that come into this area, that come into the  
19 South Lake Union area will not end up spent in this area.  
20 So it is my contention that affordable housing will not  
21 happen in this area because the price of land will go up so  
22 high when you take land that is currently 85 feet and move  
23 it to 300 feet.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. HOWELL: Thank you. My name is Brock Howell.

90

1 I'm the King County program director for Futurewise, a  
2 statewide advocacy nonprofit working to protect our rivers,  
3 lakes and sound, save local parks and habitats and build  
4 great, healthy communities. We are often seen as the  
5 defenders of the Growth Management Act and Shoreline  
6 Management Act, but we are also very active in promoting  
7 smart policy from federal legislation to individual  
8 projects.

9 South Lake Union presents an unmatched opportunity  
10 to create an urban center that creates new housing and jobs  
11 while fostering low carbon lifestyles. I'll make a few  
12 points in that direction.

13 First, South Lake Union represents about 2 percent  
14 of the city's land area, but according to the City's  
15 comprehensive plan it is expected to accommodate about  
16 20 percent of the growth. Upzoning presents an unparalleled  
17 opportunity to both provide more housing and jobs in  
18 South Lake Union and [unintelligible] as well.  
19 High-performing transit-oriented communities typically have  
20 60,000 jobs and more than -- houses and more than 50,000

21 jobs on a 300-acre area. This project -- or this is  
22 projected to have a -- sorry. The projected 2020 housing  
23 availability for this area is supposed to be about 10,000.  
24 The upzone capacity for another 21,000 units if the  
25 Option No. 1 is picked. In addition, it would provide

112 cont

91

1 another 31,000 or so jobs.

2 Next, this will provide opportunity to decrease  
3 transportation trips, not increase as DEIS shows. Building  
4 high-performing transient-oriented communities such as this  
5 typically decreases it. We have seen over the past decade a  
6 reduction in the EMT and we would consider that to continue.  
7 The DEIS uses projections based off of current transit -- or  
8 past experience, not future.

113

9 I'll make one -- two final points. One, that this  
10 is an opportunity to reduce global warming, pollution, not  
11 increase it. One of the major feelings of the DEIS is that  
12 it only focuses on existing development without --  
13 concerning a comparison to development elsewhere. And so it  
14 looks like it's increasing global warming, pollution, when,  
15 in fact, the net effect is reducing it.

114

16 And, second, that the way to solve housing  
17 affordability isn't to decrease the number of housing units;  
18 it's to increase it. And so we would urge support for  
19 Option No. 1.

115

20 MR. HOLMES: Michael Hall, Ann Pearce,  
21 Dick Wagner.

22 MS. PEARCE: Hello. My name is Ann Pearce, and  
23 I'm representing the Greater Queen Anne Chamber of Commerce  
24 this evening.

116

25 we have had the pleasure of working with the



1 South Lake Union community on many shared issues for the  
 2 past eight years. From the Mercer Corridor Stakeholder  
 3 Committee to the Joint Visioning Charette, and most recently  
 4 on the mobility plan. We have worked collaboratively with  
 5 the South Lake Union Community Council, South Lake Union  
 6 chamber, and the Uptown Alliance. The Queen Anne business  
 7 community looks forward to the day when our two urban  
 8 centers can be reconnected through Mercer/Harrison, Thomas  
 9 and John Streets and to expand an economic development  
 10 resulting for more people working and living in South Lake  
 11 Union. We see a bright future in our dynamic duo urban  
 12 centers and urge the City to continue to think of Uptown and  
 13 Queen Anne in the planning of South Lake Union.

116 cont

14 Thank you.

15 MR. HOLMES: Jeff Gundlach Goodluck, Blaine Weber,  
 16 and Sue Pruner.

17 MR. WAGNER: I'm Dick Wagner, founding director of  
 18 the Center for Wooden Boats. Center for Wooden Boats is a  
 19 nonprofit organization. Our mission is to teach people  
 20 about their maritime heritage through direct experience,  
 21 putting your hands on the helm of a boat and sailing it,  
 22 putting your hands on the tools and learn how to build it.  
 23 Our maritime history comes alive through direct experience,  
 24 and it's passed on to our younger generations. Especially  
 25 we teach about 5,000 kids to sail every year and about 2,000

1 adults. Young is good.

2 As a resident of South Lake Union for over 30

3 years, The Center for Wooden Boats has seen many changes in  
4 the neighborhood, and we were encouraged by and excited by  
5 what is on the horizon. When we first came to our site at  
6 the south end of the lake it looked like it was a -- a war  
7 had just completed and everybody was using flame throwers.  
8 So it's a big difference for us that we were planning -- or  
9 hoping for.

10 The board of trustees of The Center for Wooden  
11 Boats is pleased to express its support for the South Lake  
12 Union urban design framework and for the proposed height and  
13 density Alternatives 1 and 2 included in the draft  
14 environmental statement.

15 Visitors to The Center for Wooden Boats come from  
16 all around the area and the world. The most important thing  
17 is our local community. Engaging them makes The Center for  
18 Wooden Boats a place that helps keeps us all afloat for year  
19 to year. So really looking forward to increased residents  
20 as well as increased people working there. A strong and  
21 vital community means healthy businesses, a diverse  
22 residential population, active and welcoming pedestrian  
23 environments. And they are essential to the health of any  
24 organization that endeavors to preserve our cultural  
25 heritage.

117

94

1 We are excited about the dense, vital  
2 pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use visions of the future  
3 growth of South Lake Union. It's a -- we appreciate the  
4 emphasis on visual and physical access to Lake Union through  
5 open space strategies, view corridors, and pedestrian links.  
6 We appreciate the view corridors along Terry and Boren, the  
7 pedestrian-oriented retail use on Valley Street, and the

8 proposed festival street designations for valley and Terry  
9 streets as well as the focus on green storm water  
10 infrastructure to help improve water quality and the aquatic  
11 habitat in Lake Union.

117 cont

12 My time is up? Thank you.

13 MR. WEBER: Good evening. My name is  
14 Blaine Weber. I'm a founding principal of Weber Thompson  
15 Architects.

16 We are close to celebrating our 25th anniversary  
17 in the South Lake Union neighborhood, and I love this  
18 community. I'm a former downtown design review board chair,  
19 but I'm here to speak for myself this evening in support of  
20 Alternative No. 1. South Lake Union is one of our most  
21 important urban centers. We have an opportunity of a  
22 lifetime to create a fantastic, vibrant community, but we  
23 must ensure zoning that affords adequate development  
24 capacity to meet growth targets, and also to ensure excess  
25 capacity to accommodate growth into the future.

118

95

1 For this reason I support Alternative No. 1 as a  
2 means for achieving the kind of density that is appropriate  
3 for South Lake Union. This is the right choice for our  
4 community, for our city. It is the responsible choice from  
5 a sustainability perspective. It is the right choice for  
6 the greater good of our region.

7 There's nothing more sustainable than density, but  
8 density cannot be accommodated everywhere. South Lake Union  
9 is one of the few areas of the city that can indeed allow  
10 for real urban density. Let's do it right in a manner that  
11 promotes livability.

12 I'd like to promote the continued incentivization  
13 of residential. Vibrant communities are diverse. They are  
14 symbiotic. They create uses that support each other. They  
15 are 24/7. They accommodate young and old. We have, again,  
16 the opportunity of a lifetime to create a spectacular  
17 community. This is the right choice for our region.

119

18 I'd like to close with a comment on the  
19 superblocks of the Fairview corridor area and encourage the  
20 implementation of an overlay district that will accommodate  
21 appropriate employment goals. Those blocks are capable of  
22 supporting the larger floor plates, provided there is open  
23 space as well.

120

24 Thank you.

25 MS. PRUNER: Good evening. My name is Sue Pruner

96

1 and I'm a resident of 2200 Westlake North Tower, which was  
2 one of the first projects that Vulcan built down here in  
3 South Lake Union. And I'm here tonight to explain to you  
4 why I'm dead set against Alternative No. 1.

121

5 In late 2004, Vulcan held a preview party, presale  
6 party for condominium units in the 2200 Westlake project,  
7 and at that preview party was Michael Milton who was the  
8 original developer on Vulcan's behalf of this project, as  
9 well as Julie McAvoy and her team from the Urban Realty  
10 Group who were the sales agents. And I'm speaking on behalf  
11 of not only myself but several of my neighbors in the North  
12 Tower in telling you that we all asked questions at that  
13 party and after as well as to what was going to happen with  
14 our views because all of us have terrific views, from -- 180  
15 views from North Lake Union all the way to the Space Needle,  
16 Seattle Center, and downtown. Now, I think we all got the

17 bait and switch from vulcan and that's why I am against this  
18 particular alternative.

121 cont

19 I'd also like the people on your planning  
20 commission to reexamine the FAA flight pattern. No one has  
21 seemed to come up with this tonight. One person mentioned  
22 the float planes, but I strongly disagree with your flight  
23 plan in your diagrams up there. I have a view of watching  
24 Kenmore take off and land all day from my kitchen window,  
25 and I've never once seen vulcan use that flight -- or I'm

122

97

1 sorry, Kenmore use that flight plan. So, please, maybe talk  
2 to the folks at Kenmore and determine whether these building  
3 heights will affect their coming and going out of  
4 Lake Union.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. HOLMES: Dan Munro, Cyrus Khambatta, and Fred  
7 Herb or Herb.

8 MR. GUNDLACH: Good evening. I'm Jeff Gundlach, a  
9 homeowner [Unintelligible] condos of Dexter, and I moved in  
10 here about two years ago, you know, young. I live, I work  
11 in downtown.

12 And the reason -- what attracted me so much to  
13 South Lake Union is it's growing. It's exciting. I want to  
14 be a part of it. That's what I was looking for. Just even  
15 tonight before this, you know, going to the restaurants and  
16 it's a very vibrant neighborhood. You know, looking at, you  
17 know, where else can these highrise -- you know, where else  
18 can we do this zoning at. So I just want to come and say  
19 that I'm pro, you know, high zoning and I support it.

123

20 So thank you.

21 MR. KHAMBATTA: Hi. I'm Cyrus Khambatta, the  
22 artistic director of the Khambatta Dance Company.  
23 And we're the organizers of the Seattle  
24 International Dance Festival which takes place in South Lake  
25 Union every June. As part of the dance festival you may

98

1 have seen the Art on the Fly that features dance  
2 performances happening along the street car line, including  
3 2200 Plaza and the open space in front of Pac. It's quite a  
4 treat for the public to be able to enjoy free performances  
5 by world-renowned dance companies and dancers alongside  
6 local artists right here from Seattle along the streets and  
7 open spaces in South Lake Union.

8 This year we're thrilled to bring back Art on the  
9 Fly and even expand its reach up to the new McGraw Square  
10 Park and all the way down to Lake Union Park.

11 I must say, there were many reasons that we  
12 decided to re -- to locate the festival in South Lake Union,  
13 but one that's most particular to and relevant to the public  
14 hearing today. Without the varied plazas and open spaces  
15 created by new development in the area, the Art on the Fly  
16 would not have been able to take place on all these great  
17 built-in stages.

18 I understand that if the buildings in the  
19 neighborhood are allowed to go taller, that would create  
20 more flexibility provided in the space at the ground level.  
21 That is a tremendous public benefit from my perspective, as  
22 opposed to seeing buildings where there's no space and  
23 they're right up against each other.

24 I would encourage a stronger community feeling  
25 where things like our festival can happen and bring people

124

1 together. I myself have lived in three major metropolitan  
 2 areas: Washington, D.C., New York City, and Paris, France.  
 3 And the thing that's really the common feature that creates  
 4 a sense of community in all of those places is the people  
 5 themselves.

6           Creating an aesthetic and pleasing environment  
 7 that provides places for people to meet, chat, meet with  
 8 friends, have a bite to eat and, of course, seek cultural  
 9 events is important to that community. People like to be  
 10 around other people and the more densely populated areas  
 11 with aesthetically carved spaces are where people like to  
 12 be.

13           In addition, dense urban neighborhoods like  
 14 South Lake Union are very effective at attracting supporters  
 15 for the arts. As a lifelong dancer and choreographer, I've  
 16 spent a great deal of time visualizing aesthetics and I  
 17 think taller, more slim buildings are aesthetically more  
 18 pleasing than the boxy, squat buildings.

19           Thank you very much.

20           MR. MUNRO: I'm so impressed I haven't seen any of  
 21 you yawn tonight and I don't know how you manage that.

22           My name's Dan Munro along with my wife Suzanne and  
 23 our two daughters. We own Nollie's Cafe over in the Cascade  
 24 neighborhood.

25           And I may be one of the few people in this room

124 cont

1 tonight who remember what South Lake Union was like in the  
 2 1970's. I met John Wayne on Republican Avenue when he was

3 filming here in 1973. My family has worked on a property in  
4 this neighborhood for four decades and three generations. I  
5 recently decided to start my own family business where my  
6 parents did after they immigrated to this country. Compared  
7 to what I recall as a kid, South Lake Union has transformed  
8 into a vibrant neighborhood on its way to reaching its  
9 highest potential. I remember what it was like when this  
10 area was mostly industrial and manufacturing. The  
11 neighborhood was essentially different shades of gray. But  
12 today you see bursts of color in the neighborhood coming  
13 alive with people walking in the streets, dining at outdoor  
14 cafes and restaurants like ours.

15 As a small business owner in Cascade, we rely on  
16 steady foot traffic. Thanks to the major employers who  
17 decided to stay or to relocate in South Lake Union, we're  
18 doing pretty well on weekdays. However, evenings and  
19 weekends, business is still not enough. If the City wants  
20 the family businesses like Nollie's to thrive in South Lake  
21 Union, then we need to stay committed to increasing the  
22 overall population and density here, especially a healthy  
23 residential base that could support evening and weekend  
24 business.

25 Our family has seen South Lake Union change over

125

101

1 generations from a gray, dusty light industrial hub into an  
2 exciting modern neighborhood, but I think there's still a  
3 lot of work to be done. If we don't get the zoning right,  
4 if we fail to capture the maximum opportunity or lose sight  
5 of South Lake Union's priority as an urban center, then I'm  
6 afraid South Lake Union will fail to fulfill its potential.

7 Please incorporate as much of Alternative 1 as  
Page 86



8 possible in the preferred alternative. It will enable more  
9 family businesses like ours to open and, more importantly,  
10 to stay open in South Lake Union.

125 cont

11 Thank you.

12 MR. HOLMES: John Little and Brandon Weber.

13 MR. HERB: Good evening. I'm Fred Herb, and I  
14 currently a resident of South Lake Union. Prior to that I  
15 lived 18 years in Belltown.

16 And during that time I've noticed some good zoning  
17 from the City and some poor zoning. Good specifically was  
18 the stepdown approach from Capitol Hill along Pike Street to  
19 Elliott Bay. Poor planning was the concrete towers along  
20 Elliott and western where condominiums were elbow to elbow,  
21 and if you walked along those areas you'd never seen the sun  
22 shining on the street.

23 I'm concerned that some of the higher density  
24 plannings in the EIS will duplicate that problem with regard  
25 to eliminating sun and air and open spaces, and I'm not

126

102

1 against high towers but I think they should be limited to  
2 one per block.

3 And in particular, I noticed that there was a  
4 ten-foot setback along some of the streets, and I think that  
5 should be increased significantly. I mean, I'm 6 feet tall  
6 and another 4 feet, that seems awfully small setback in my  
7 judgment. So I would implore the City to consider reducing  
8 the number of towers, make them taller and lots of space  
9 between them.

127

10 Another thing I'd like to suggest is the bonus  
11 points that you provide for extended height, that those be

128

12 spent in South Lake Union.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. LITTLE: Good evening. My name is  
15 John Little. I'm a resident of the Highland Park  
16 neighborhood in West Seattle, and I'm the regional director  
17 for the carpenters union here in the northwest.

18 For many years the Seattle carpenters have  
19 followed South Lake Union's redevelopment with great  
20 interest. We share the community's vision for South Lake  
21 Union as a commercial and residential urban center. As  
22 such, we have supported public and private investment in the  
23 South Lake Union street car line, Mercer Corridor Project,  
24 and Lake Union Park. This investment has set the stage for  
25 zoning changes to allow a greater intensity of jobs in

103

1 housing units in this vibrant community.

2 You are encouraged to take the following factors  
3 into consideration as you prepare the final Environmental  
4 Impact Statement. Taller buildings and moving away from  
5 tight, flat construction will result in higher quality  
6 structures. Incentive zoning can bring additional resources  
7 for community identified civic infrastructure and more  
8 affordable housing.

129

9 Height increases can increase the housing supply  
10 and generate public benefits to make housing more  
11 affordable. Increasing jobs and residences adjacent to  
12 significant public investment in transportation and parks  
13 will make sure the city and region benefits from its  
14 investment in the community. And height and density will  
15 allow more people to locate in this urban center and live a  
16 healthier and more environmentally friendly lifestyle. We

17 have an opportunity to do it right in South Lake Union. we  
18 should take advantage of this opportunity for all Seattle.

129 cont

19 Thank you.

20 MR. WEBER: I think I'm last.

21 My name's Brandon Weber. I was recruited by  
22 Microsoft from the east coast and that's why I'm in Seattle.  
23 I left Microsoft because I didn't want to be in Redmond, and  
24 I -- as a young person, I -- you know, I highly value being  
25 in an urban center where I've got all of my amenities, my

104

1 work, my play within walking distance. I ran here. Live  
2 just down the street.

3 And I think what we're thinking about here, we're  
4 not talking about what buildings are we designing; we're  
5 creating what I would call kind of an opportunity maximum.  
6 And I feel like we need to build an opportunity maximum  
7 that's as high as possible, which is why I'm for Alternative  
8 1.

130

9 It gives us an envelope to design within, but I  
10 think really gives us the best opportunity for the next 20  
11 years to see the next Amazon and support the next Amazon,  
12 kind of all these great local businesses that are going to  
13 flourish around it. So as someone who works just down the  
14 street, who lives just down the street, I really feel like  
15 now is our opportunity to look out for the next 25 years and  
16 create a design space that's going to give us a place to  
17 make South Lake Union pretty special. So, again, I'm for  
18 the Alternative 1, and I really appreciate you guys taking  
19 your time tonight. Thank you.

20 MR. HOLMES: Is there anyone who has not spoken

21 who would like to speak?

22 Anybody want to add to their comments?

23 You may.

24 MR. FOLTZ: Dan again.

25 A couple of points I didn't make -- I didn't get

105

1 to.

2 Tower spacing, there is -- appears to be no  
3 meaningful reference to or study of tower spacing in the  
4 documents. Having a minimum of four parcels satisfying the  
5 22,000 square foot minimums for towers may limit towers to  
6 two per block, but it does nothing to control which four or  
7 more contiguous lots are developed. What if a neighbor  
8 wants to develop the very same four lots directly across the  
9 alley from another? What if they're both mid block sites?  
10 It appears that we are all left to hope the two same block  
11 towers will always get developed on opposite ends of the  
12 block from each other. But that seems like quite a guessing  
13 game.

14 In addition, the Seattle Times/Whole super blocks  
15 are approximately 110,000 square feet. What then?

16 Fred Lowe's versus towers. We've been debating  
17 this for some time. Fred Lowe's or otherwise midrise  
18 buildings are synonymous with local relief as they are  
19 assumed to be for the most part built out to their respected  
20 property lines to maximize their yield. Conversely, towers  
21 have been synonymous with not only vertically but also with  
22 creating open spaces or providing other public benefits in  
23 exchange for being able to go higher than the underlying  
24 zoning. Podiums, there seem to be a lack of attention in  
25 the documents towards aesthetic in building bases, or lack

131

132

1 of podiums, i.e., open space.

2 Reorienting of blocks. In the UDF there was great  
 3 early support for having the ability to rotate how blocks  
 4 are oriented, allowing buildings to two towers per block to  
 5 orient in an east-west axial relationship instead of north  
 6 to south like most of Seattle; thereby, improving solar  
 7 angles, increasing space between towers, and having other  
 8 positive benefits such as greater veracity towards the Space  
 9 Needle and the sound. Why has this issue not been addressed  
 10 in the EIS? Is it that it is no longer being considered?

133

11 And then lastly, someone had just touched on this  
 12 recently, a notice that there wasn't really any reference  
 13 tonight I think much to the Lake Union flight operations,  
 14 which is the latter third of Chapter 3.8, Land Use. The EIS  
 15 reports that this flight -- quote, this flight path  
 16 represents a refinement by Wash DOT of earlier flight path  
 17 information that was available, unquote. It's regrettable  
 18 that this information was not known before the EIS options  
 19 were created, let alone very late before publishing the  
 20 document. The flight path envelope now looks much wider  
 21 than previously shown, but I'm told that it is not.

134

22 That said, there are several -- five to be  
 23 exact -- additional factors that could intensify its newly  
 24 represented volume. One, a vertical safety buffer will  
 25 likely get added in lowering heights which has not been

1 quantified and is not reflected in the diagrams. Two, a  
 2 wind shear buffer will likely get added, presumably widening

3 the flight path diagram further, which has also not been  
4 quantified yet. Three, a turbulence buffer may likely get  
5 added presumably widening the flight path further. It too,  
6 again, has not been quantified. Four, the 25-foot height  
7 increments that you see in the flight path diagram are based  
8 on the lake elevation, so as the envelope rises so does the  
9 ground, thereby diminishing the amount of actual height  
10 under the envelope. And five, the zoning heights typically  
11 have a 10 percent or so additional height allowance for  
12 rooftop, mechanical, et cetera.

13 The final flight envelope and its buffers will be  
14 absolute numbers. So subtractions from potential tower  
15 heights will need to be made for rooftop appurtenances.  
16 What does the flight path envelope and its buffers mean  
17 moving forward? If the west side of the neighborhood is  
18 challenged to support appropriate density due to the final  
19 flight path envelope, which we don't -- I'm not sure when  
20 that will be, and if the Cascade neighborhood doesn't  
21 particularly want density, is it possible that the  
22 alternatives might need to be modified? We ask that this  
23 section be brought back for public comment if the changes to  
24 the buffer areas become substantially different from what's  
25 presented in the EIS.

134 cont

108

1 Thank you.

2 MS. GROTH: Hi. I left something out of my  
3 earlier comments.

4 A lot of the times especially in the  
5 transportation section of the EIS and the other ones, the  
6 metrics that were presented are not actually apples to  
7 apples metrics, and I would urge those who are revising the

135

8 EIS or finding the final draft of the EIS to actually  
9 provide us apples to apples metrics.

135 cont

10 For example, when it is studied, let's say  
11 Alternative 1, the difference between the mitigations that  
12 would suddenly come into play when it comes to  
13 transportation. Those mitigations are not even studied with  
14 the no alternative [unintelligible]. So, again, furthering  
15 it for all sections of the EIS, give us a real strong apples  
16 to apples comparison in addition to coming to the aesthetic  
17 side of things, give us views that would actually -- could  
18 be seen not from a seaplane but from actual people on the  
19 ground or real estate viewpoints. I'd love to see a lot  
20 more viewpoints so we really understand where our  
21 neighborhood's going.

22 Thanks.

23 MR. BENNETT: For the record that was Lorie Groth.

24 I'm Don Bennett. I've been a participant in the  
25 process for about five, six years now, and my original

136

109

1 thought coming into this five years ago was it looks like  
2 we're going to have a trade-off of either affordable housing  
3 in this neighborhood or height development. It -- and from  
4 everything that I have heard tonight it sounds like it is  
5 still absolutely that trade-off; that if there -- if they go  
6 with Alternative 1, with the maximal development, there will  
7 be a lot of money going into the Seattle housing fund,  
8 affordable housing fund, which will be spent places other  
9 than South Lake Union because of the economics of the land  
10 grants.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. HOLMES: All right. That is our final comment  
13 of the night. The comment period remains open until  
14 April 11th, 5:00 p.m.

15 Thank you.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

□



Table 5-1  
Public Comments Received During the Comment Period

Comment Number	Response
1	<b>Future Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
2	<p><b>Benefits of Growth.</b> The comment is noted. As the commenter states, the EIS does not discuss the environmental benefits of the proposal. As required in WAC 197-11-402, EISs are required to identify potential significant adverse impacts, but are not required to address beneficial environmental impacts.</p> <p>With respect to climate change, it should be noted that the GHG analysis does incorporate a per capita analysis. As shown in Draft EIS Table 3.7-6, the analysis concludes that on a per capita basis the three action alternatives produce transportation GHG emissions that are about five percent lower than the No Action Alternative. Compared to a typical suburban employment center along Bel-Red Road in Bellevue and Redmond, the action alternatives would result in GHG emissions that are about 15 percent lower per capita.</p> <p>In addition, many of the policies cited in the Plans and Policies analysis of the proposal describes the benefits of the proposal in the context of the City's adopted comprehensive plan.</p>
3	<p><b>Economic Development.</b> The City issued the Scoping Notice for this Draft EIS on November 18, 2008 and invited comments on the EIS scope through December 18, 2008. Through 2009, the City worked with neighborhood stakeholders to address concerns raised by the scoping comments. Based on this process, the City revised the EIS alternatives and finalized the scope of the EIS. Economic development was not included as part of the EIS scope.</p> <p>This Final EIS includes a summary of applicable economic development policies contained in the City's comprehensive plan and the South Lake Union Neighborhood Plan. Please see Final EIS Section 3.2.</p>
4	<b>Prior Planning.</b> The comment is noted.
5	<b>Neighborhood History.</b> The comment is noted.
6	<b>Support Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
7	<b>Focus on Negative Impacts.</b> As required in WAC 197-11-402, EISs are required to identify potential significant adverse impacts, but are not required to address beneficial environmental impacts.
8	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
9	<b>Public Services.</b> Table 3.14-3 of the Draft EIS illustrates the incident responses for fire stations that serve the South Lake Union Neighborhood and are representative of annual activity for the Seattle Fire Department in this area. As described on Draft EIS pages 3.14-9 and 3.14-10, the Seattle Fire Department calculated the projected number of EMS service calls that could occur in the South Lake Union Neighborhood under the

Comment Number	Response
----------------	----------

Action Alternatives and No Action Alternative and determined that additional EMS companies could be required for the South Lake Union neighborhood with or without development under the Action Alternatives.

Draft EIS Table 3.14-6 illustrates the number of calls for the West Precinct between 2005 and 2009. The West Precinct is divided into 12 sectors/beats and the South Lake Union Neighborhood generally comprises the D1 and D2 sector areas. The D1 sector generally includes the western portion of the South Lake Union Neighborhood, while the D2 sector generally includes the eastern portion of the South Lake Union Neighborhood. Refer to the table below for a breakdown of calls for service in the D1 and D2 sector areas.

**2005-2009 Calls for Service – D1 and D2 Sector**

	D1 Sector	D2 Sector
2005	12,114	7,959
2006	12,735	7,440
2007	12,583	6,995
2008	9,448	7,753
2009	9,141	8,189

**Source: Seattle Police Department, 2010.**

Draft EIS Page 3.14-12 acknowledges that the hiring of new officers under the *Neighborhood Policing Staffing Plan* has been delayed due to recent budget issues. However, the Seattle Police Department anticipates that the remaining new officers identified in the *Neighborhood Policing Staffing Plan* would be hired prior to the assumed buildout date under the Action Alternatives (2031).

**10      *Recreational Sailing.*** . The City issued the Scoping Notice for this Draft EIS on November 18, 2008 and invited comments on the EIS scope through December 18, 2008. Through 2009, the City worked with neighborhood stakeholders to address concerns raised by the scoping comments. Based on this process, the City revised the EIS alternatives and finalized the scope of the EIS. The potential impact of wind wake on recreational sailing on Lake Union was not included in the scope of the EIS.

**11      *Support Alternative 1.*** The comment is noted.

**12      *Affordable Housing.*** The comment is noted. Draft EIS Section 3.9.2, Housing, describes that incentive zoning provisions, including developer financial contributions to affordable housing, may be used to achieve increased residential building heights. Through use of these incentives, the action alternatives may have the potential to result in an increased number of affordable units than the No Action Alternative.

The discussion in Draft EIS Section 3.9.2 states that there are a number of factors that impact the potential for affordable housing, including development costs, property values, market demand, individual property owner goals, and opportunities for financing affordable housing. Under any of the alternatives, these factors will affect the actual number of affordable units that are built in the neighborhood.

Comment Number	Response
13	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
14	<p><b>Public Transportation.</b> The Draft EIS transportation analysis includes a review of existing transit service based on load factor, the ratio passengers to seating capacity during the peak hour. This is the key performance measure identified by King County Metro for this study. Load used to evaluate impacts of the proposal on transit service. The analysis also includes mitigation strategies to address transit impacts.</p> <p>It is true that King County Metro is the transit provider and the current funding picture for King County Metro is constrained. However, the Draft EIS is a forward-looking document, and assumes the regionally accepted levels of future transit as directed by the Seattle Department of Transportation and defined by the Puget Sound Regional Council. It should be noted what while transit funding fluctuates on the short-run, transit funding and service over the last 20 years has expanded substantially in the Puget Sound Region.</p>
15	<b>Schools.</b> Please see Final EIS Section 3.5 for a discussion of schools.
16	<p><b>Economic Mix.</b> EIS Section 3.9.2, Housing, describes that incentive zoning provisions, including developer financial contributions to affordable housing, may be used to achieve increased residential building heights. Through use of these incentives, the action alternatives may have the potential to result in an increased number of affordable units than the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The discussion in Draft EIS Section 3.9.2 states that there are a number of factors that impact the potential for affordable housing, including development costs, property values, market demand, individual property owner goals, and opportunities for financing affordable housing. Under any of the alternatives, these factors will affect the actual number of affordable units that are built in the neighborhood.</p>
17	<b>Height Near Lake Union.</b> The comment is noted. Alternative 1 considers residential tower heights of 300 feet between Mercer and Valley streets. The remaining alternatives consider lower building heights in this area.
18	<b>Support Alternative 3.</b> The comment is noted. Please note that Alternative 4 is the No Action Alternative, which would maintain a maximum building height of 40 feet in the area between Mercer and Valley streets. Alternative 1 would allow a tower height of 300 feet for residential uses in this area.
19	<b>Support Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
20	<b>Consider Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
21	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
22	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
23	<b>Support South Lake Union/Uptown Triangle Mobility Plan.</b> The comment is noted. The South Lake Union/Uptown Triangle Mobility Plan was ongoing during preparation of the Draft EIS and has been incorporated in the comments and responses to the Draft EIS.

Comment Number	Response
	Please see the Comment Letter 90, which includes the Mobility Plan.
24	<b>Future Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
25	<b>Support Taller Buildings.</b> The comment is noted.
26	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
27	<b>Support Higher Density.</b> The comment is noted.
28	<b>Support Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
29	<b>Benefits of Growth.</b> Please see response to Comments 2 and 3, above.
30	<b>Design Review Board.</b> The comment is noted.
31	<b>Visual Analysis.</b> The commenter is correct in stating that the scope of the EIS required analysis of views and urban form at a buildout stage of development. This analytic approach was established in the EIS scope.
32	<b>Future Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
33	<b>Incentive Benefits.</b> The comment is noted. The specific benefit package associated with the proposed incentive zoning package has not been determined.
34	<b>Capacity for Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
35	<b>Greenhouse Gas Analysis.</b> For a greenhouse gas analysis, please refer to Draft EIS Section 3.7. This analysis concludes that on a per capita basis the three action alternatives produce transportation GHG emissions that are about five percent lower than the No Action Alternative. While a comparison is not provided to other Seattle neighborhoods, a comparison to a typical suburban employment center along Bel-Red Road in Bellevue and Redmond, shows that the action alternatives would result in GHG emissions that are about 15 percent lower per capita.
36	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
37	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
38	<b>Support Increased Height.</b> The comment is noted.
39	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
40	<b>South Lake Union/Uptown Triangle Mobility Plan.</b> The comment is noted. Please see the Comment Letter 90 related to the South Lake Union/Uptown Triangle Mobility Plan.
41	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
42	<b>Height and Bulk.</b> The Draft EIS analysis was based on a buildout development scenario, which assumes that all undeveloped and underdeveloped properties will redevelop in the future. Underdeveloped properties are defined as those that contain development square footage at 40 percent or less than currently allowed by zoning. Please see the discussion of development assumptions in Draft EIS Section 3.10.2.

Comment Number	Response
	<p>In addition, the aesthetics analysis has been updated to respond to Draft EIS comments, clarify assumptions and revise images. In general, the revisions to the images are to ensure that all figures are as technically accurate as possible, but do not change the overall analysis or conclusions of the aesthetics section of the Draft EIS. For example, in the Valley/Mercer blocks, two towers per block were shown, when in fact only one tower per block is proposed in the action alternatives. This correction, which results in less building bulk than shown in the Draft EIS, ripples through many of the images. Please see the revised Aesthetics section, including images, in Final EIS Section 3.4.</p>
<p><b>43</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.</b> The referenced statement is a summary statement based on the analyses contained in the Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS and accurately represents the conclusions of the analyses as stated in the “Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts” section for each element of the environment. Please refer to the analysis of each element of the environment for a discussion of impacts, mitigation and significant unavoidable adverse impacts.</p>
<p><b>44</b></p>	<p><b>Aircraft Safety and Shadows.</b> Regarding airspace, this programmatic EIS included a qualitative analysis of potential wind impacts. From a quantitative perspective, numerous factors will affect wind patterns in an urban area. The most critical of these relate to: building height, location, orientation, and massing. At the subarea level of analysis, it is impossible to accurately forecast these factors for all development that may occur within the subarea. Therefore, the programmatic analysis that is contained in the EIS describes a range of potential vertical and horizontal impact areas, depending on the type of development that may occur.</p> <p>At the same time, it is agreed that it is essential to conduct a quantitative wind analysis of individual development proposals to ensure that wind impacts on the Lake Union Seaport Airport are mitigated. Therefore, an additional mitigation measure is recommended -- requiring a project-level analysis of wind impacts for all new development above the base height permitted under the Seattle Mixed zoning. It is anticipated that the approach to this analysis would include the following steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construct a physical scale model of the proposed project and/or the maximum building envelope allowed at the site, with the surrounding physical context (i.e., existing buildings, topography, etc.);</li> <li>2. Install the model into a boundary layer wind tunnel and measure velocities and turbulence levels along the prescribed flight path with and without the proposed project;</li> <li>3. Test for prevailing wind directions and/or wind directions that are expected to have an impact on the flight path;</li> <li>4. Present resulting data in a form to allow for quantitative comparison between existing and proposed conditions;</li> <li>5. Provide a written report summarizing the methodology, results and interpretation of the results against any available published aviation standards for shear layers and turbulence levels. Analysis results would require interpretation by an aviation specialist who would assess the acceptability of these specific results for the aircraft</li> </ol>

Comment Number	Response
	<p>actually used at this location.</p> <p>In addition, the City may consider requiring additional analyses to address the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional review to address potential future adjacent development (i.e., a future configuration which may augment or mitigate predicted impacts in the future); and/or</li> <li>• Testing of mitigation schemes if the project results are unacceptable (i.e., the wind tunnel study could be then used to help define a height, size and location on that site that could be acceptable).</li> </ul> <p>Regarding shadows, a discussion of shadow impacts of each alternative on neighborhood parks, including Lake Union Park, can be found in Final EIS Section 3.4. This programmatic analysis does not quantify shadow impacts by square footage. Such an analysis would be developed as part of the project-level SEPA review for specific development proposals</p>
45	<b>Support Density.</b> The comment is noted.
46	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
47	<b>Support Density in Urban Centers.</b> The comment is noted.
48	<b>Consider Density in Other Parts of City.</b> As described in EIS Chapter 2, the potential use of incentive zoning as a strategy to achieve neighborhood plan goals and other public benefits. Incentive zoning would allow increased height and density if public benefits defined in City code are provided. Review of this proposal does not require an analysis of potential growth impacts in other neighborhoods of the City.
49	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
50	<b>Support Incentive Zoning.</b> The comment is noted.
51	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
52	<p><b>EIS Analysis.</b> The analysis in the Draft EIS is consistent with the programmatic scope of review established for this project. It is acknowledged that the analysis provides an area-wide review of the elements of the environment, which is appropriate for review of a subarea-wide analysis.</p> <p>The Draft EIS references the Urban Design Framework in Chapter 2, where the overall framework of the UDF is described and incentive strategies are described. The UDF is further referenced in the Draft EIS aesthetics analysis. In addition, Final EIS Section 3.4 provides further incorporation of UDF recommendations into the aesthetics analysis.</p>
53	<b>Urban Design Framework.</b> The comment is noted. Please see the response to Comment #52, above.
54	<b>Height Bulk and Scale.</b> The comment is noted. It is acknowledged that the UDF considered a variety of building typologies. The analysis was based on the assumptions established for the podium and floor plate size established in the alternatives.

Comment Number	Response
55	<b>South Lake Union Mobility Plan</b> The South Lake Union/Uptown Triangle Mobility Plan was ongoing during preparation of the Draft EIS and has been incorporated in the comments and responses to the Draft EIS. Please see the Comment Letter 90, which includes the Mobility Plan.
56	<b>Support Density.</b> The comment is noted.
57	<b>Inventory of Housing.</b> Resources were not available in the Draft EIS process to conduct a complete housing inventory. However, based on comments on the Draft EIS, the housing inventory has been updated. Please see Final EIS Section 3.3.
58	<b>Housing Mitigation.</b> The comment is noted. Please see Comment #6, Comment Letter #17.
59	<b>Housing Market.</b> The Draft EIS housing analysis provides a programmatic review of housing affordability goals; growth in affordable housing in the neighborhood, and a qualitative discussion of the difference between the alternatives in the potential for affordable housing development. Reliable data is not available to develop a quantitative 20-year forecast of affordable housing development under each alternative. In addition, because Alternatives 1 and 2 are similar with respect to development potential, it is unlikely that impacts on the affordable housing market would be significantly different. Alternative 3 differs from Alternatives 1 and 2 in that it provides less overall development capacity and a relatively greater emphasis on residential development.
60	<b>Use of Incentive Benefits.</b> The use of funds associated with incentive zoning programs is a policy decision to be determined by the City as part of adoption of an incentive zoning program. Any of the action alternatives could support an incentive zoning program, so the alternative, or combination of alternatives, that is ultimately selected, would not be a determining factor in how funds would be used.
61	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
62	<b>Level of Service.</b> As pointed out by the commenter, an intersection level of service analysis may not be an appropriate approach for South Lake Union. Because of this, the transportation analysis used a corridor-based analysis. Please see the discussion of methodology on page 3.13-25 of the Draft EIS.
63	<b>Future Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
64	<b>Multi-modal Analysis.</b> The transportation analysis was based on a multi-modal approach that incorporated consideration of transit, pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation. Mitigation strategies focused on improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network, expanding travel demand management strategies, expanding transit service and roadway capacity enhancements. Please see the transportation analysis in Draft EIS Section 3.13.
65	<b>View Impacts.</b> The comments are acknowledged. The aesthetics analysis included viewpoints from designated viewpoints, such as the Volunteer Park water tower, as well as numerous additional public view perspectives.

Comment Number	Response
66	<p><b>Demographics.</b> The comment is noted. Please see the South Lake Union Neighborhood Plan, which includes the following neighborhood character goal:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Goal 1: A vital and eclectic neighborhood where people both live and work, where use of transit, walking and bicycling is encouraged, and where there are a range of housing choices, diverse businesses, arts, a lively and inviting street life and amenities to support and attract residents, employees and visitors.</p> <p>As described in Final EIS Chapter 2, a fundamental objective of the proposal considered in the EIS is to use incentive zoning to achieve public benefits, including facilities for children. Please see Draft EIS Section 3.16 for a discussion of open space and recreation facilities and Final EIS Section 3.5 for a discussion of schools.</p>
67	<p><b>Community Services.</b> As described in Final EIS Chapter 2, a fundamental objective of the proposal considered in the EIS is to use incentive zoning to achieve public benefits, which could include a pea patch and other similar amenities. Please see Final EIS Section 3.4 for a revised discussion of shadows.</p>
68	<p><b>Future Neighborhood Character.</b> The comment is noted.</p>
69	<p><b>Support Alternative 3.</b> The commenter's preference for decreasing heights moving toward Lake Union are noted. However, it should be noted that the City of Seattle does not have a formal or informal policy of stepping down in building heights toward shoreline areas.</p>
70	<p><b>View Preservation.</b> The comment is noted. The City of Seattle does not have a formal or informal policy of stepping down in building heights toward shoreline areas.</p>
71	<p><b>Growth Capacity.</b> As one of the six urban centers in the City, it is anticipated that South Lake Union will continue to absorb more growth than neighborhoods that are not designated as urban centers. Formal City action to establish a growth target will occur in the future based on an analysis of the capacity of all of the urban centers and other areas of the City. Consistent with the Washington Growth Management Act, the South Lake Union growth target that is ultimately proposed and adopted by the City will reflect an understanding of overall citywide development capacity.</p>
72	<p><b>Transportation Analysis Assumptions.</b> The comment is noted.</p> <p>The transportation analysis uses a mixed use development (MXD) model to analyze future transportation impacts of different land use scenarios. This approach supplements conventional trip generation methods to capture effects of density, diversity of land use, destinations, development scale, distance to transit and demographics on trip generation. This method avoids overestimating the number of vehicle trips that infill projects generate and provides a more realistic picture of how travel characteristics change over time.</p> <p>The MXD methodology has been reviewed and validated by academics as part of submissions to peer-reviewed scholarly journals. As part of this academic review process, the methodology, validation, and applicability of this model to a variety of environments was deemed to be adequate. In addition to this academic review, the MXD tool has been officially adopted by the San Diego Council of Governments and the US EPA as their</p>



Comment Number	Response
	<p>preferred methods of calculating trip generation for mixed use developments in urban and suburban settings. MXD has also been successfully applied in several Environmental Impact Reports in California.</p>
<p><b>73</b></p>	<p><b>Growth Capacity.</b> As one of the six urban centers in the City, it is anticipated that South Lake Union will continue to absorb more growth than neighborhoods that are not designated as urban centers. Formal City action to establish a growth target will occur in the future based on an analysis of the capacity of all of the urban centers and other areas of the City. Consistent with the Washington Growth Management Act, the South Lake Union growth target that is ultimately proposed and adopted by the City will reflect an understanding of overall citywide development capacity.</p>
<p><b>74</b></p>	<p><b>Step Down to Lake Union.</b> The comment is noted. The City of Seattle does not have a formal or informal policy of stepping down in building heights toward shoreline areas.</p>
<p><b>75</b></p>	<p><b>Wind Analysis.</b> This programmatic EIS included a qualitative analysis of potential wind impacts. From a quantitative perspective, numerous factors will affect wind patterns in an urban area. The most critical of these relate to: building height, location, orientation, and massing. At the subarea level of analysis, it is impossible to accurately forecast these factors for all development that may occur within the subarea. Therefore, the programmatic analysis that is contained in the EIS describes a range of potential vertical and horizontal impact areas, depending on the type of development that may occur.</p> <p>At the same time, it is agreed that it is essential to conduct a quantitative wind analysis of individual development proposals to ensure that wind impacts on the Lake Union Seaport Airport are mitigated. Therefore, an additional mitigation measure is recommended -- requiring a project-level analysis of wind impacts for all new development above the base height permitted under the Seattle Mixed zoning. It is anticipated that the approach to this analysis would include the following steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construct a physical scale model of the proposed project and/or the maximum building envelope allowed at the site, with the surrounding physical context (i.e., existing buildings, topography, etc.);</li> <li>2. Install the model into a boundary layer wind tunnel and measure velocities and turbulence levels along the prescribed flight path with and without the proposed project;</li> <li>3. Test for prevailing wind directions and/or wind directions that are expected to have an impact on the flight path;</li> <li>4. Present resulting data in a form to allow for quantitative comparison between existing and proposed conditions;</li> <li>5. Provide a written report summarizing the methodology, results and interpretation of the results against any available published aviation standards for shear layers and turbulence levels. Analysis results would require interpretation by an aviation specialist who would assess the acceptability of these specific results for the aircraft actually used at this location.</li> </ol> <p>In addition, the City may consider requiring additional analyses to address the following questions:</p>

Comment Number	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional review to address potential future adjacent development (i.e., a future configuration which may augment or mitigate predicted impacts in the future); and/or</li> <li>• Testing of mitigation schemes if the project results are unacceptable (i.e., the wind tunnel study could be then used to help define a height, size and location on that site that could be acceptable).</li> </ul>
76	<p><b>Visual Analysis.</b> The visual analysis contained in this EIS accurately represents building heights and estimated development patterns at full buildout of the neighborhood.</p> <p>In addition, the aesthetics analysis has been updated to respond to Draft EIS comments, clarify assumptions and revise images. In general, the revisions to the images are to ensure that all figures are as technically accurate as possible, but do not change the overall analysis or conclusions of the aesthetics section of the Draft EIS. For example, in the Valley/Mercer blocks, two towers per block were shown, when in fact only one tower per block is proposed in the action alternatives. This correction, which results in less building bulk than shown in the Draft EIS, ripples through many of the images. Please see the revised Aesthetics section, including images, in Final EIS Section 3.4.</p>
77	<p><b>Shadow Impacts.</b> The EIS accurately addresses and characterizes shadow impacts, consistent with the City of Seattle SEPA policies (SMC 25.05.675.Q).</p>
78	<p><b>Unique Character.</b> The comment is noted.</p>
79	<p><b>Support Alternative 3.</b> The comment is noted.</p>
80	<p><b>PM Peak Hour Traffic Congestion.</b> The comment is noted.</p>
81	<p><b>Housing Analysis.</b> The comment is noted. Draft EIS Section 3.9.2, Housing, describes that incentive zoning provisions, including developer financial contributions to affordable housing, may be used to achieve increased residential building heights. Through use of these incentives, the action alternatives may have the potential to result in an increased number of affordable units than the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The discussion in Section 3.9.2 states that there are a number of factors that impact the potential for affordable housing, including development costs, property values, market demand, individual property owner goals, and opportunities for financing affordable housing. Under any of the alternatives, these factors will affect the actual number of affordable units that are built in the neighborhood.</p>
82	<p><b>Transportation Analysis.</b> Please see the responses to comments from the transportation consultant in Comment Letter #13, responses 91 through 94. It is acknowledged that transportation analysis in an urban environment is complex. However, the Draft EIS clearly defines the existing conditions for traffic congestion, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian travel. The most accurate trip generation methodology available was used to estimate trip generation and potential "with action" transportation impacts, and a series of mitigation measures to reduce the significance of the impacts was identified. The final conclusion of the Draft EIS is that there will be significant and unavoidable transportation impacts as a result of the height and density increase.</p>

Comment Number	Response
83	<b>Zoning Alternatives.</b> The comment is noted.
84	<p><b>Air Quality.</b> As described in the Draft EIS, carbon monoxide (CO) is used as an indicator of potential air quality issues related to transportation sources. EPA guidance indicates CO assessments that consider conditions at up to the three most project-affected intersections are adequate for evaluating potential impacts. This was the approach used in the air quality review, and the potential for air quality impacts at all other less-affected locations would be lower than indicated by this worst-case evaluation. Consequently, no additional analysis is necessary or warranted.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that trends in CO concentrations in the Puget Sound region have been downward for many years. As stated in the Draft EIS, there have been no measured violations of the CO standards in many years, and the former CO problem is thought to have been resolved. It is therefore highly unlikely that project-related traffic would result in any CO issues at any affected intersections in the project area. Currently, the focus of EPA and other air quality agencies is turning towards other transportation-related pollutant emissions such as NO<sub>2</sub>, fine particulate matter, and other substances emitted in engine exhaust. But there are as yet no requirements or guidelines for assessing such emissions or resulting concentrations, and air quality monitoring has not detected any problems with these pollutants in the Puget Sound region except as discussed in the Draft EIS.</p>
85	<p><b>EIS Summary.</b> The summary section is intended to be just that – an overview of the project and salient points with regard to impacts of the alternatives. As noted at the beginning of the section, the information is intentionally brief and the reader is encouraged to refer to Chapters 2 and 3 for more detailed information. To the extent that quantitative data is available, the summary section attempts to incorporate such data. In other cases, the qualitative and comparative conclusions of the analyses are included.</p>
86	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
87	<b>Support Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
88	<p><b>EIS Summary.</b> The summary section is intended to be just that – an overview of the project and salient points with regard to impacts of the alternatives. As noted at the beginning of the section, the information is intentionally brief and the reader is encouraged to refer to Chapters 2 and 3 for more detailed information. To the extent that quantitative data is available, the summary section attempts to incorporate such data. In other cases, the qualitative and comparative conclusions of the analyses are included.</p>
89	<p><b>Aesthetics Images.</b> Please see the Comment Letter #13, response 59 for specific comments on the figures in the aesthetics analysis. The aesthetics analysis has been updated to respond to Draft EIS comments, clarify assumptions and revise images. In general, the revisions to the images are to ensure that all figures are as technically accurate as possible, but do not change the overall analysis or conclusions of the aesthetics section of the Draft EIS. For example, in the Valley/Mercer blocks, two towers</p>

Comment Number	Response
	per block were shown, when in fact only one tower per block is proposed in the action alternatives. This correction, which results in less building bulk than shown in the Draft EIS, ripples through many of the images. Please see the revised Aesthetics section, including images, in Final EIS Section 3.4.
90	<b>Shadow Analysis.</b> Please see response to Comment #89, above.
91	<b>Urban Densities and Potential Transit Service.</b> The comment questions the findings of the transportation analysis because of a perceived lack of existing and future transit service in the area. The results of the transportation analysis, with respect to mode split, are not dissimilar to other neighborhoods in the area. Capitol Hill, for example, has the highest residential population densities in the City (based on US Census Bureau data) and achieves mode shares of 25 percent transit and 42 percent walk/bike for commute trips. Capitol Hill's mode shares occur in an area with similar transit characteristics that are similar to those expected in South Lake Union (no light rail, no BRT). Note that existing transit use and walk/bike mode share in Capitol Hill are considerably higher than what is forecast for South Lake Union under 2031 conditions. Given these existing conditions results, the future mode share forecasts for South Lake Union are reasonable.
92	<b>Space Needle Impacts.</b> The concern is noted and it is acknowledged that the Space Needle is the most recognized historic landmark in the City. It is also acknowledged that South Lake Union is one of the City's six designated Urban Centers where future concentrations of employment and housing are planned to occur. The City recognizes that it is unreasonable to expect that views of the Space Needle are to be protected from all of public locations without consideration of City policies regarding Urban Centers and the concentration of employment and housing. As noted in the <i>Seattle's View Protection Policies, Volume One</i> , <sup>1</sup> "[c]ompeting policy objectives– require that we consider the merit of protecting a particular view corridor with other objectives for growth management, housing development, transportation and utility infrastructure and open space."
93	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted. It is acknowledged that the EIS is not a design document.
94	<b>Open space Analysis.</b> It is acknowledged that the open space analysis was conducted on an area-wide basis. Resources were not available for a more detailed review of block-by-block open space needs.
95	<b>Open Space Incentives.</b> The comment is noted.
96	<b>Affordable Housing.</b> Section 3.9.2, Housing, describes that incentive zoning provisions, including developer financial contributions to affordable housing, may be used to achieve increased residential building heights. Through use of these incentives, the action alternatives may have the potential to result in an increased number of affordable

<sup>1</sup> Seattle, city of; Department of Design, Construction and Land Use and the Strategic Planning Office. 2001. *Seattle View Protection Policies, Volume One – Space Needle Executive Report & Recommendations* and *Volume Two – Space Needle View Inventory & Assessment*.

Comment Number	Response
	<p>units than the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The discussion in Section 3.9.2 also states that there are a number of factors that impact the potential for affordable housing, including development costs, property values, market demand, individual property owner goals, and opportunities for financing affordable housing. Under any of the alternatives, these factors will affect the actual number of affordable units that are built in the neighborhood.</p>
97	<p><b>Images of Density.</b> The bird's eye and Gasworks Park images are intended to provide a view of the South Lake Union neighborhood as a whole in context with the surrounding area. Based on comments on the Draft EIS, these images have been updated. Please see Final EIS Section XX.</p>
98	<p><b>Shoreline Habitat.</b> Please see Draft EIS Section 3.4.3, Plants and Animals, which contains proposed mitigation measures for plant and animal impacts.</p>
99	<p><b>Combined Sewer Overflows.</b> As described in the Draft EIS Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) not a function of development density. The amount of storm water discharged from the area to the combined sewer system is a function of the area of the basin and the amount of rainfall in a given storm, neither of which will change in these development scenarios. There is no baseline CSO volume for this area and review of King County annual reports for Combined Sewer Overflows reveals no patterns to the size and frequency of overflow events.</p> <p>Under current stormwater regulations, the stormwater load on the public sewers will likely be reduced by redevelopment. New development will be required to provide stormwater flow control in the area collected by the Combined Sewer. Flow control systems can take the form of Green Infrastructure (green roof, rain gardens, cisterns, etc.), or conventional underground tanks, or a combination of systems. Whichever system is used, these methods will hold collected storm water on-site longer, allowing the public piped system to flow at lower volumes, reducing the likelihood of a CSO. Each individual redeveloped site that is over 10,000 sf will be required to reduce the peak flow rates from the site to approximately 25% of the uncontrolled flow rates. The existing, older, development in this area generally has no on-site flow control facilities.</p>
100	<p><b>Recreational Sailing.</b> The City issued the Scoping Notice for this Draft EIS on November 18, 2008 and invited comments on the EIS scope through December 18, 2008. Through 2009, the City worked with neighborhood stakeholders to address concerns raised by the scoping comments. Based on this process, the City revised the EIS alternatives and finalized the scope of the EIS.</p> <p>The potential wind wake impact on recreational sailing was not included as part of the Final EIS scope.</p>
101	<p><b>Shadows.</b> A detailed and specific account of the shadow impacts of each alternative can be found in the Aesthetic Shadows section (3.10.9 – 3.10.12). Project specific mitigation strategies are identified in Draft EIS Section 3.10.11.</p> <p>Additional mitigation strategies to reduce shadow impacts have been identified based on policy guidance contained in the Urban Design Framework and are included in Final</p>

Comment Number	Response
	EIS Section 3.4.
102	<b>Reconsider Approach.</b> The comment is noted.
103	<b>Alternative Ways to Evaluate Impacts.</b> The comment is noted. Please see Comment Letter #16.
104	<b>Benefits of Proposal.</b> As the commenter states, the EIS does not discuss the environmental benefits of the proposal. As required in WAC 197-11-402, EISs are required to identify potential significant adverse impacts, but are not required to address beneficial environmental impacts.
105	<b>Economic Development.</b> The City issued the Scoping Notice for this Draft EIS on November 18, 2008 and invited comments on the EIS scope through December 18, 2008. Through 2009, the City worked with neighborhood stakeholders to address concerns raised by the scoping comments. Based on this process, the City revised the EIS alternatives and finalized the scope of the EIS. Economic development was not included as part of the EIS scope.  This Final EIS includes a summary of applicable economic development policies contained in the City's comprehensive plan and the South Lake Union Neighborhood Plan. Please see Final EIS Section 3.2.
106	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted. It is acknowledged that the EIS analysis was conducted on an area-wide basis.
107	<b>Livability.</b> As described in Final EIS Chapter 2, a fundamental objective of the proposal considered in the EIS is to use incentive zoning to achieve public benefits, including those listed in the comment. Please see Draft EIS Section 3.16 for a discussion of open space and recreation facilities and Final EIS Section 3.5 for a discussion of schools.
108	<b>Public Spaces.</b> The comment is noted. As described in Final EIS Chapter 2, a fundamental objective of the proposal considered in the EIS is to use incentive zoning to achieve public benefits, including those listed in the comment.
109	<b>EIS Methodology.</b> Although the specific methodology that the comment refers to is unknown, the Draft EIS generally incorporated conservative assumptions and methodologies intended to ensure that potential adverse impacts were not minimized. As relevant, specific methodologies for the corresponding element of the environment are described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS.
110	<b>Shoreline Shading.</b> Although the proposal does not include any changes to land use designations in the designated shoreline areas, Draft EIS Appendix D shows the potential for shading along the Lake Union shoreline. Shadows are discussed in Draft EIS Section 3.10.9 and shading impacts to plants and animals in Section 3.4.2.  In addition, the aesthetics analysis has been updated to respond to Draft EIS comments, clarify assumptions and revise images. In general, the revisions to the images are to ensure that all figures are as technically accurate as possible, but do not change the overall analysis or conclusions of the aesthetics section of the Draft EIS. For example, in

Comment Number	Response
	<p>the Valley/Mercer blocks, two towers per block were shown, when in fact only one tower per block is proposed in the action alternatives. This correction, which results in less building bulk than shown in the Draft EIS, ripples through many of the images. Please see the revised Aesthetics section, including shadow images, in Final EIS Section 3.4.</p> <p>Consistency with the Shoreline Management Act will be considered by the City in determining the future policy and regulatory direction.</p>
<p><b>111</b></p>	<p><b>Affordable Housing.</b> It is acknowledged and disclosed in the Draft EIS that the affordable housing goals in the South Lake Union are not currently being met.</p> <p>Section 3.9.2, Housing, describes that incentive zoning provisions, including developer financial contributions to affordable housing, may be used to achieve increased residential building heights. Through use of these incentives, the action alternatives may have the potential to result in an increased number of affordable units than the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The discussion in Section 3.9.2 also states that there are a number of factors that impact the potential for affordable housing, including development costs, property values, market demand, individual property owner goals, and opportunities for financing affordable housing. Under any of the alternatives, these factors will affect the actual number of affordable units that are built in the neighborhood.</p>
<p><b>112</b></p>	<p><b>Future Growth.</b> As one of the six urban centers in the City, it is anticipated that South Lake Union will continue to absorb more growth than neighborhoods that are not designated as urban centers. Formal City action to establish a growth target will occur in the future based on an analysis of the capacity of all of the urban centers and other areas of the City. Consistent with the Washington Growth Management Act, the South Lake Union growth target that is ultimately proposed and adopted by the City will reflect an understanding of overall citywide development capacity.</p>
<p><b>113</b></p>	<p><b>Transportation Analysis.</b> The conclusions of the transportation analysis are that, with mitigation, trip generation under all of the action alternatives would be lower than the projected no action alternative.</p>
<p><b>114</b></p>	<p><b>Global Warming.</b> The Draft EIS GHG analysis does compare South Lake Union to a typical suburban employment center along Bel-Red Road in Bellevue and Redmond. Comparatively, the action alternatives would result in GHG emissions that are about 15 percent lower per capita.</p> <p>The analysis also incorporates a per capita comparison of the alternatives. As shown in Draft EIS Table 3.7-6, the analysis concludes that on a per capita basis the three action alternatives produce transportation GHG emissions that are about five percent lower than the No Action Alternative. Compared to a typical suburban employment center along Bel-Red Road in Bellevue and Redmond, the action alternatives would result in GHG emissions that are about 15 percent lower per capita.</p>
<p><b>115</b></p>	<p><b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.</p>
<p><b>116</b></p>	<p><b>Consider Queen Anne and Uptown.</b> The comment is noted.</p>

Comment Number	Response
117	<b>Support Alternatives 1 and 2.</b> The comment is noted.
118	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
119	<b>Support Residential Incentives.</b> The comment is noted.
120	<b>Fairview Blocks.</b> The comment is noted.
121	<b>Against Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
122	<p><b>Flight Path.</b> Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, additional review of the flight path was conducted (see Appendix F). This analysis included a review of how seaplane lanes are utilized (including runway utilization, flight tracks, and piloting techniques), an evaluation of the aircraft fleet used by floatplane operators, and documentation of the performance characteristics of the various floatplane aircraft. Several Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) planning documents that have applicability in the establishment of approach/departure protection boundaries for curving approach and departure procedures such as those used on Lake Union were also reviewed.</p> <p>Based on this analysis, and in coordination with WSDOT Aviation, a revised flight path was identified (see Section 3.2 of this Final EIS). This revised flight path differs from that shown in the Draft EIS in that portions are narrower than the previous flight path, the curvature is more gradual, and the east-west legs of the flight path have shifted slightly to the north. Specifically, the southern boundary has shifted 400-500 feet north so that the southern boundary lies north of Valley Street and is generally aligned with Broad Street. The southern boundary now crosses Aurora Avenue North at about Mercer Street. Similarly, the northern boundary of the flight path shifted 200-300 feet north, crossing the Lake Union shoreline at roughly Highland Drive and crossing Aurora Avenue just north of Ward Street. Please see Final EIS Chapter 2 for a description of the revised flight path.</p> <p>An additional mitigation measure has been recommended in this EIS – that a project-level analysis of wind impacts be required for all new development above the base height permitted under the Seattle Mixed zoning.</p>
123	<b>Support Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
124	<b>Support Density and Tall Buildings.</b> The comment is noted.
125	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.
126	<b>Tower Spacing.</b> The comment is noted.
127	<b>Tower Setbacks.</b> The comment is noted.
128	<b>Use of Height Bonuses.</b> The comment is noted.
129	<b>Benefits of Height and Growth.</b> The comment is noted.
130	<b>Support Alternative 1.</b> The comment is noted.



Comment Number	Response
131	<b>Tower Spacing.</b> The comment is noted.
132	<b>Podium Aesthetics.</b> The comment is noted. Because individual future design choices are unknown and in order to focus attention on building massing, the EIS intentionally did not include design features on the podiums.
133	<b>Reorienting Blocks.</b> Comment noted.
134	<p><b>Flight Path and Buffers.</b> Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, additional review of the flight path was conducted (see Appendix F). This analysis included a review of how seaplane lanes are utilized (including runway utilization, flight tracks, and piloting techniques), an evaluation of the aircraft fleet used by floatplane operators, and documentation of the performance characteristics of the various floatplane aircraft. Several Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) planning documents that have applicability in the establishment of approach/departure protection boundaries for curving approach and departure procedures such as those used on Lake Union were also reviewed.</p> <p>Based on this analysis, and in coordination with WSDOT Aviation, a revised flight path was identified (see Section 3.2 of this Final EIS). This revised flight path differs from that shown in the Draft EIS in that portions are narrower than the previous flight path, the curvature is more gradual, and the east-west legs of the flight path have shifted slightly to the north. Specifically, the southern boundary has shifted 400-500 feet north so that the southern boundary lies north of Valley Street and is generally aligned with Broad Street. The southern boundary now crosses Aurora Avenue North at about Mercer Street. Similarly, the northern boundary of the flight path shifted 200-300 feet north, crossing the Lake Union shoreline at roughly Highland Drive and crossing Aurora Avenue just north of Ward Street. Please see Section 3.4 Aesthetics for revised images associated with the revised flight path. Please see Final EIS Chapter 2 for a description of the revised flight path.</p> <p>This programmatic EIS included a qualitative analysis of potential wind impacts. From a quantitative perspective, numerous factors will affect wind patterns in an urban area. The most critical of these relate to: building height, location, orientation, and massing. At the subarea level of analysis, it is impossible to accurately forecast these factors for all development that may occur within the subarea. Therefore, the programmatic analysis that is contained in the EIS describes a range of potential vertical and horizontal impact areas, depending on the type of development that may occur.</p> <p>At the same time, it is agreed that it is essential to conduct a quantitative wind analysis of individual development proposals to ensure that wind impacts on the Lake Union Seaport Airport are mitigated. Therefore, an additional mitigation measure is recommended -- requiring a project-level analysis of wind impacts for all new development above the base height permitted under the Seattle Mixed zoning. It is anticipated that the approach to this analysis would include the following steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construct a physical scale model of the proposed project and/or the maximum building envelope allowed at the site, with the surrounding physical context (i.e., existing buildings, topography, etc.);</li> </ol>

Comment Number	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Install the model into a boundary layer wind tunnel and measure velocities and turbulence levels along the prescribed flight path with and without the proposed project;</li> <li>3. Test for prevailing wind directions and/or wind directions that are expected to have an impact on the flight path;</li> <li>4. Present resulting data in a form to allow for quantitative comparison between existing and proposed conditions;</li> <li>5. Provide a written report summarizing the methodology, results and interpretation of the results against any available published aviation standards for shear layers and turbulence levels. Analysis results would require interpretation by an aviation specialist who would assess the acceptability of these specific results for the aircraft actually used at this location.</li> </ol> <p>In addition, the City may consider requiring additional analyses to address the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional review to address potential future adjacent development (i.e., a future configuration which may augment or mitigate predicted impacts in the future); and/or</li> <li>• Testing of mitigation schemes if the project results are unacceptable (i.e., the wind tunnel study could be then used to help define a height, size and location on that site that could be acceptable).</li> </ul>
<p><b>135</b></p>	<p><b>Transportation and Aesthetics Analyses.</b> With respect to transportation, it is acknowledged that transportation analysis in an urban environment is complex. However, the Draft EIS clearly defines the existing conditions for traffic congestion, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian travel. The most accurate trip generation methodology available was used to estimate trip generation and potential "with action" transportation impacts, and a series of mitigation measures to reduce the significance of the impacts was identified. The final conclusion of the Draft EIS is that there will be significant and unavoidable transportation impacts as a result of the height and density increase.</p> <p>With respect to aesthetics, the views analyzed in Section 3.10 include viewpoints designated by SMC 25.05.675.P, additional locations in and near the neighborhood that provide public or quasi-public views of the neighborhood, and designated scenic routes. As shown in Draft EIS Figure 3.10.22, a total of fifteen viewpoint locations were analyzed. It is acknowledged that the bird's eye view is not a view that would normally be seen. The bird's eye view perspectives, together with the perspectives from Gasworks Park, were only intended to provide an overview depiction and cumulative perspective of the South Lake Union neighborhood in the context of the surrounding area.</p>
<p><b>136</b></p>	<p><b>Affordable Housing.</b> The comment is noted. The incentive zoning program being considered by the City is intended to create additional housing opportunities.</p>