

4.4 RESPONSES TO VERBAL PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

Exhibit 4-4 Commenters Providing Comments by Verbal Public Hearing Comment

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Anderson	Ben	
Appelman	Ira	Eastlake Fair Growth
Barker	Deb	Morgan Community Association
Barnes	Kim	
Bates	Tawny	
Berner	Miranda	
Best	Brooke	Historic Seattle
Brookler	Megan	
Cocking	Penni	
Dlugosch	Deborah	
England	Kim	
Gould	Tim	
Guetta	Myani	Puget Sound Sage
Henry	Velma	
Honore	AJ	
Jaquith	Deb	Crown Hill Urban Village Committee for Smart Growth
Kirsh	Andrew	
Klatte	Phillip	
Koltreit	Berit	
Leman	Chris	
Lin	Susanna	Seattle Displacement Coalition
McCulloch	Garrett	
Momoda	Ron	
Pasciuto	Giulia	Puget Sound Sage
Prussing	MaryAnne	
Rees	Janine	
Richard	Marguerite	
Sawyer	Amanda	
Scarlett	Jennifer	

Exhibit 4-4 Commenters Providing Comments by Verbal
Public Hearing Comment (cont.)

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Thaler	Toby	
Trohomovich	Tim	Futurewise
Ward	David	
Ward	Susan	
Warouw	Ratna	Crown Hill Urban Village Committee for Smart Growth
Williams	Bonnie	
Williams	Natalie	
Zimmerman	Alex	

Anderson, Ben

1. **Supports Alternative 3 to provide more housing and growth in areas with higher access to opportunity.**

Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Please see the Preferred Alternative.

Appelman, Ira (Eastlake Fair Growth)

1. **Concerning parking impacts and mitigation.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response regarding parking impacts and mitigation. Please also see written comment response to Appelman, Ira.

2. **Concerning piecemeal approach.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response regarding cumulative impacts.

Barker, Deb (Morgan Community Association)

1. **Extend the comment period.**

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. **Concerns about conflicts with the neighborhood plan.**

Comment noted. As noted in the EIS, a part of the proposed action is to docket amendments to certain neighborhood plan policies for amendment.

3. **Concerns that MHA affordable housing units would not be located in Morgan Junction.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning location of MHA affordable housing units.

4. **Supports Alternative 1.**

Comment noted.

Barnes, Kim

1. **Extend the comment period.**

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. Comments about how the social discourse of different alternatives is set up.

Comments noted. Please see response to written comment, Noah, Barbara-11 comment 1.

3. Need for capital and infrastructure investments in Westwood-Highland Park and other urban villages at the edges of the city.

Comments noted. Please see discussion in Section 3 including mitigation measures.

4. Prefers Alternative 1.

Comments noted.

Bates, Tawny

1. Extend the comment period.

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. Concern that rapid development in a localized areas would have greater impacts.

Comments noted. Please see response to written comment, Noah, Barbara-11 comment 1.

3. Relying on existing codes does not mitigate impacts.

Comments noted. Please see the FEIS Section 3.3 Aesthetics and Section 3.6 Biology and other sections for discussion of updates or revisions to codes that may provide mitigation of impact.

4. Analysis in certain areas is lacking.

Comments noted. Please see written comment response to Bates, Tawny-1.

Berner, Miranda

1. Extend the comment period.

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

Best, Brooke (Historic Seattle)

1. Background on Historic Seattle.

Comment noted. Thank you for commenting on the DEIS.

2. Concern about the lack of affordable housing.

Comments noted.

3. Older structures can provide affordable housing and commercial space.

Comments noted. Please see additional Section 3.5 Historic Resources, including addition of text concerning affordable rents in historic structures. See discussion of affordability in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics. Please see also response to written comment Woo, Eugenia.

4. Analysis of historic resources is inadequate.

Comments noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning historic resources. Please see also response to written comment Woo, Eugenia.

Brookler, Megan

1. Concerns about the affordability of housing in Crown Hill and potential displacement.

Comments noted. Please see discussion of direct, economic and cultural displacement in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics including additional analysis of potential economic displacement.

2. Consider incentives for development without displacement.

Comment noted. Please see mitigation measures concerning displacement in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

Cocking, Penni

1. Concerns about loss of trees and yards in South Park.

Comment noted. Please see response to written comment Cocking, Penni-8.

2. Prefers Alternative 1.

Comment noted. Please see the Preferred Alternative. In consideration of environmental constraints and other limitations in South Park, the Preferred Alternative would apply the minimum capacity increases necessary to implement MHA in South Park.

Dlugosch, Deborah

1. Assumptions regarding tree canopy coverage under the alternatives are wrong.

Comment noted. Please see response to written comment Kirsh, Andrew comment 1, and other comment responses in the written comment response to Kirsh, Andrew and to Early, Tom.

England, Kim

1. The document downplays displacement effects. The analysis should look at various income bands.

Comment noted. Please see Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics including additional analysis of direct, economic, and cultural displacement in the FEIS. Please see additional correlations exploring the relationship between development and gain or loss of households at a range of income levels.

2. The EIS should evaluate neighborhoods individually. A Neighborhood planning approach should be taken.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning individual urban village review.

3. Analysis of demolition and replacement of housing isn't adequate and the potential for increased speculative activity.

Comments noted. Please see estimations of demolition under all alternative in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

Gould, Tim

1. Review the regional context. Denser development in Seattle will provide environmental benefits.

Comment noted. Please see Section 3.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions for discussion of greenhouse gas emissions under the alternatives.

2. When looking at access to opportunity also look at investments needed to increase opportunity in low-access areas.

Comment noted. Thank you for your comments. Please see Section 3.1 including additional mitigation measures discussed in the FEIS.

Guetta, Myani (Puget Sound Sage)

1. Background on Puget Sound Sage.

Thank you for your comments on the EIS.

2. Center outcomes on displacement and ensure that communities most impacted by displacement are driving the policy solutions.

Comments noted. Please see response to written comment Pasciuto, Guilia. Please see also frequent comment response concerning impacts on racial and cultural minority groups.

3. Concern about the lack of analysis in the DEIS of cultural displacement.

Comments noted. Please see expanded discussion of cultural displacement in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics, including additional mitigation measures.

Henry, Velma

1. **Concern about displacement.**

Comment noted. Please see discussion of direct, economic and cultural displacement in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

2. **Prefers Alternative 3.**

Comments noted.

Honore, AJ

1. **Need more time. Extend the comment period.**

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. **Concern that the Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) is a giveaway for developers.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning MHA affordable housing requirements. See also discussion in comment and response to Bertolet, Dan.

Comments noted.

Jaquith, Deb (Crown Hill Urban Village Committee for Smart Growth)

1. **Concerning infrastructure investments to support growth in Crown Hill.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment responses concerning stormwater and sanitary sewer infrastructure. Please See Section 3.4 Transportation. Please see Section 3.7 Open Space and Recreation, including additional discussion of mitigation measures in the FEIS. Please also see written comment response to Krueger, Ingrid-1.

2. **DEIS does not consider development in the pipeline.**

The growth estimates in the EIS consider pipeline development. Please see Appendix G for discussion of growth estimates.

3. **Prefers Alternative 2 for Crown Hill.**

Comment noted.

Kirsh, Andrew

1. **Assumptions regarding tree canopy coverage under the alternatives are wrong.**

Comment noted. Please see response to written comment Kirsh, Andrew comment 1.

2. Canopy is overestimated for Lowrise zones and other zones.

Comment noted. Please see response to written comment Kirsh, Andrew comment 4. And other written comment responses to Kirsh, Andrew.

Klatte, Phillip

1. Extend the comment period.

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. There is not enough analysis of the ability of single family homes to house more people.

Comment noted. Please see discussion in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics. See also written comment responses to Klatte, Phillip-4.

Koltreit, Berit

1. Concerns about defining quality of life.

Comments noted.

2. Concern about the amount of MHA requirements.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning amount of the MHA affordable housing requirement.

Leman, Chris

1. Concerns about the community engagement process. It has been secret.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning community engagement. Please see also Appendix B.

2. The EIS should evaluate neighborhoods individually. A Neighborhood planning approach should be taken.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning individual urban village review.

3. MHA would only provide affordability to people who are at the lowest level of income. The middle class would be shut out.

Comment noted. MHA affordable housing units would primarily serve households earning 60 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) or below. However, see discussion of other aspects of housing affordability in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

4. There is nothing in the proposal to improve livability.

Comment noted. Please see mitigation measures in Chapter 3 sections including 3.2 Aesthetics, 3.3 Land Use, and 3.7 Open Space and Recreation.

Lin, Susanna (Seattle Displacement Coalition)

1. The DEIS does not include alternatives to MHA.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning alternatives that could meet the objective.

2. Study higher MHA affordable housing requirements.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment responses concerning MHA affordable housing requirements. Please see discussion in response to written comment, Bertolet, Dan.

3. Other suggestions to address housing affordability.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning alternative that could meet the objective.

4. Impacts of cultural displacement are not looked at.

Comment noted. Please see expanded discussion of cultural displacement impacts in the FEIS.

McCulloch, Garrett

1. What will be the effect of the proposal on family-sized housing? Family sized housing is needed.

Comments noted. Please frequent comment response concerning family-friendly housing.

2. The action alternatives will do more to address housing affordability than no action.

Comment noted. Thank you for your comments.

Momoda, Ron

1. Prefers alternative 3 as it would apply to the Othello Urban Village, because it factors in consideration of displacement risk.

Comment noted. Thank you for your comments. Please see the Preferred Alternative in the FEIS, which includes aspects similar to Alternative 3.

Pasciuto, Giulia (Puget Sound Sage)

1. Limiting growth in areas with high displacement risk does not in and of itself mitigate displacement risk.

Comment noted. Please see the Preferred Alternative, which includes concepts described in the comment. Implementation of MHA requires increases to development capacity to put affordable housing requirements into effect. Therefore, the pattern and distribution of growth through choices about zoning designations are a key element of the proposed action. Please see also expanded discussion in the FEIS regarding cultural displacement, and expanded mitigation measures.

Please see also written comment response to Pasciuto, Giulia.

Prussing, MaryAnne

1. Concerns about the affordability of housing

Comments noted. Please see discussion of housing affordability in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

2. Concerns about traffic congestion on N. 45th St. and N. 50th St.

Comment noted. Please see Section 3.4 Transportation.

Rees, Janine

1. Extend the comment period.

Comments noted. The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. Concern relationship to other environmental review.

Please see frequent comment response concerning cumulative impacts.

3. Concern about lack of analysis in police, fire and schools. Concern about outdated information about schools.

Please see Section 3.8 public services and utilities. Please see expanded analysis of public schools capacity in the FEIS. Please see corrections to school names in the FEIS.

4. Comments regarding the Final EIS.

The FEIS indicates what has changed since the Draft EIS was published. There is a 14-day appeal period for appealing the adequacy of the Final EIS.

Richard, Marguerite

1. **Concern about housing affordability.**

Comments noted. Thank you for your comments.

Sawyer, Amanda

1. **Urban villages should have individual environmental review.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning individual urban village review.

2. **Mitigation measures do not seem achievable.**

Comment noted. Please see updated discussion of design review in FEIS Section 3.3 Aesthetics.

Scarlett, Jennifer

1. **Comments concerning community engagement.**

Comment noted. Please see Appendix B and frequent comment response concerning community engagement.

2. **Concern regarding use of TRAO data to gauge displacement impacts.**

Comment noted. Please see response to written comment Fox, John comment 5.

3. **Design review.**

Comment noted. Please see updated discussion of design review in Section 3.3 Aesthetics.

4. **Concerns about the amount of the MHA affordable housing requirement.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning the MHA affordable housing requirement amount.

Thaler, Toby

1. **Concern about the amount of the affordable housing requirements relative to the capacity increase.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning amount of the MHA affordable housing requirement.

2. **DEIS does not support how it will improve housing affordability for middle income people.**

Comments noted. Please see discussion in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

3. **Comment about inadequate community engagement.**

Comments noted. Please see Appendix B and frequent comment response concerning community engagement.

Trohomovich, Tim (Futurewise)

- 1. Background on Futurewise, a statewide non-profit that works to make cities and towns great places to live, and to protect farms and forests.**

Thank you for commenting on the EIS.

- 2. Include all areas within a 10-minute walk to frequent transit in urban villages in the preferred alternative.**

Comment noted. Please see the Preferred Alternative, which includes the requested feature.

Please see also response to written comments, Yadon, Bryce.

Ward, David

Please note that a hard copy comment was submitted by Mr. Ward, and is appended to these public hearing minutes. Responses to the hard copy comment begin at 7 below.

- 1. Extend the comment period.**

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

- 2. Consider more alternatives, and higher MHA requirements.**

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment responses concerning alternatives that could meet the objective and MHA affordable housing requirements.

- 3. Include pipeline development.**

Comment noted. The growth estimates in the EIS reflect pipeline development.

- 4. Baseline for analysis.**

Comments noted.

- 5. New housing development is luxury housing.**

Comments noted. Please see discussion of housing affordability levels in Section 3.1 Housing and Socioeconomics.

- 6. Assessment of impacts outside of urban villages.**

Comments noted. Please see response to written comment, Ward, David-5.

- 7. Broader action alternatives should have been included. Higher MHA requirements should have been studied.**

Comments noted. Please see 2 above.

8. Suggests other housing strategies identified in the housing caucus report.

Comments noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning alternatives that could meet the objectives.

9. Include pipeline development in the analysis.

Comments noted. Growth estimates, which are the foundation for analysis of each alternative include pipeline development.

10. Determine the current situation. Various elements of the environment noted.

Comments noted. Please see the Affected Environment subsection of each Section in Chapter 3.

11. Luxury units.

Comments noted. Please see 5 above.

13. Affordability requirements for MFTE housing units expire after 12 years. What are the effects of expiration of those units.

See discussion of MFTE housing under subsidized housing at page 3.36, and 3.38 of the FEIS. Please note that MFTE units are considered in the analysis of economic displacement, but are not included as subsidized housing units due to their relatively shorter term of affordability. It is expected that housing produced using the MFTE would continue under all alternatives.

14. Transportation comments regarding long commutes.

Comments noted.

15. Comments regarding tree canopy.

Comments noted. Please see Section 3.6 biological resources.

16. Comments regarding use of decennial census data and ACS census data.

Comments noted. Best available data is used. There are limitations to ACS datasets. In some instances use of decennial census data provides more complete data, more accurate data, or historical data.

Ward, Susan

1. Opposes rezoning of a street in the Northgate urban village to Lowrise 2.

Comment noted. Thank you for your comment. Comment noted. Please see the Preferred Alternative, which would include MHA implementation with the Residential Small Lot zone designation, which would provide a transition at the edge of the urban village, and includes height limits and development standards more similar to the existing single family land use, than Alternative 2 for the block discussed in the comment.

Warouw, Ratna (Crown Hill Urban Village Committee for Smart Growth)

1. Concerning pedestrian safety.

Comment noted. Please See Section 3.4 Transportation.

2. For urban village expansion areas, villages with light rail should be treated differently from those with only bus service.

Comment noted. The urban villages studied for expansion are those considered in the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan process. The criteria for very good transit service, is having frequent transit service to more than one additional urban village.

3. Concern about stormwater drainage and flooding.

Comment noted. Please see discussion in Section 3.8 Public Services and Utilities. Please see also frequent comment response concerning stormwater infrastructure.

See also written comment response to Krueger, Ingrid-1.

Williams, Bonnie

1. Extend the comment period.

The DEIS was published on June 8, 2017 with a 45-day comment period. A DEIS public open house and hearing was held on June 29, 2017. The comment period was extended an additional 15 days to August 7, 2017, for a total 60-day comment period.

2. Prefers Alternative 1.

Comment noted.

3. The upzones are a giveaway to developers.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response concerning MHA affordable housing requirements.

4. Concern about greater height bulk and scale. There is a need for family-sized homes.

Comment noted. Please see frequent comment response regarding family-friendly housing. Please also see Sections 3.2 Land Use and Section 3.3 Aesthetics.

Williams, Natalie

1. Inadequate assessment of shading and view impacts.

Comments noted. Please see response to written comment Bricklin, David-6. Please also see written response to written comment Noah, Barbara-17.

Zimmerman, Alex

Comments noted.