

**LIVABLE SOUTH DOWNTOWN PLANNING
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
SCOPING MEETING – JUNE 1ST, 2006**

Summary Notes

Gordon Clowers, DPD, presented an overview of the relationship of the proposed environmental review to Livable South Downtown planning, and introductory remarks about which topics are assumed in the City's preliminary scope. After that overview, there was a question and answer session and then further comments on scoping. All questions and comments are recorded here and considered to be scoping comments.

Summarized Range of Topics Raised in Comments and Questions

Questions and comments about process:

Gaining more input, extending the comment period, working with the community, not rushing the process.

Range of environmental study topics expressed in comments and questions:

Comments covered a broad spectrum of the possible topics that can be studied in an environmental impact statement (EIS). A summarized range of topics cited includes:

- Should study all of the listed topics
- Effects of zone changes and large shopping centers on small businesses
- Promote growth of quality jobs and housing opportunities
- Land Use: What are the growth assumptions?
- Land Use: Effects of stadium area activities on industrial businesses
- Land Use: Effects of zone choices on Port and industrial operations
- Land Use: Suggest strategies supportive of housing in all of Chinatown
- Traffic and pedestrian safety
- Historic Preservation: Are there additional buildings eligible to be landmarks?
- Historic Preservation: Study effects of future development adjacent to landmark districts
- Air Quality: Pollutant emissions and greenhouse effects
- Shadows on Public Spaces
- Light/Glare and "wind tunnel" effect at street level
- Fire and Police Protection
- Seismic and liquefaction hazards
- Plants and Animals: nesting hawks and a variety of habitats

Questions/Answers and Scoping Comments

Tina Bueche: Where is a list of the basic assumptions that went into the planning? Specifically, with regard to future residents—where will this growth come from, who will they be, and how do those assumptions relate to other assumptions made for Downtown planning and similar efforts? [Gordon indicated that growth assumptions are being formulated, and it is important to understand what those are in relation to other growth forecasts.]

Stella Chao: What are the outreach plans with respect to non-English speaking residents and stakeholders, to get their input? Will the scoping period be extended so these groups can be informed about the process and alternatives for study? [Gary Johnson, DPD, indicated we will meet with various groups to provide that information, as requested. Also, we will continue to accept comments even after June 15th, though a decision on extending the comment period has not been made.]

Susan Ranf: You indicated a rather quick timeline for EIS preparation. If this is such a big effort with huge implications, why are you doing it in haste? [Gordon indicated that we won't conduct the analysis in a hasty manner. However, the study process needs to continue to keep moving. The general timeframe is influenced by the desire to have proposals related to Comprehensive Plan changes ready in approximately one year, to proceed in the 2007 plan amendment process.]

Bob Gillespie: There are obviously influences of stadium event traffic and interactions that have an effect on the existing businesses. However, I support the concept of a stadium transition area as it currently is, because growth in the transition area can help take pressure off of land speculation on industrial land in the Lander Street vicinity, near the rail station. Any development in the transition area will reduce the demand for development elsewhere in SODO. May want to encourage density increases all the way down to Holgate Street.

Christine Palmer: So far, have you identified any eligible buildings that could be newly designated as landmarks? Will that be studied in the EIS? Also, look for eligible buildings outside the historic districts. [Gordon indicated two possible candidates, churches east of I-5. We can include that as part of the study of historic preservation in the EIS.]

[Name not recorded]: Since alternatives have not been circulated so far, can the scoping period be extended?

Tom Im: Will DPD staff be working with the community to develop mitigation strategies, and if so, how will that occur? [Gordon indicated that DPD will work by sharing preliminary drafts and continuing to meet with interested parties to discuss and develop specific mitigation strategies.]

Quang Nguyen: With respect to impacts on small businesses and specifically the Goodwill site proposal, will the EIS study the effects of big-box retail on small businesses? [Gordon indicated that since we have indicated we will study business impacts, it would make sense to cover this topic in this EIS.]

Susan Ranf: Looking over the list of topics that are not included so far in the scope, how can any of those topics be eliminated for this large complex proposal? For example, there are wildlife considerations such as nesting hawks in the area. Should study all of these topics.

Stella Chao: Agree that all topics should be studied. I don't see that traffic and its effects on pedestrian safety are listed here. That would be of interest to the residents of this community.

Elana Dix: Our group, SAGE, is interested in living wage jobs, housing, smart growth, and adequate health care benefits for workers. You should study what kinds of jobs will be created by future development, and whether those will have good wages and benefits.

Tony To: Following up on the Goodwill site proposal, it appears their EIS will not include sufficient analysis of economic impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods. The types of economic impacts on local businesses are among the most critical types of impacts on the community. There is a need for that kind of analysis to understand the big picture of the impacts of such a large proposal. Also, is there a broader effort by the City to study Industrial Lands? [Gordon, Gary and Susan indicated there is a study with a first phase done, but funding for the next phase is not certain—it is currently being requested in the budget process.]

Bob Gillespie: Reiterating a point I made earlier, the sports facilities do have impacts on the neighboring industrial businesses on busy game days. That type of impact should be considered and studied.

Howard Wu: I'm on the Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board. The issue of pedestrian safety for pedestrians crossing streets should be studied in this document. Also, you should include analysis of shadows on public places and related environmental comfort topics such as light and glare and the potential "wind tunnel effect" of large buildings.

Steve van Oehl: I'm a resident of the Jackson Place neighborhood. I'm concerned about air quality—the effects of carbon emissions and relationship to greenhouse effects at a global level. This document should study those impacts.

Howard Wu: I'm also interested in the study covering the topic of pedestrian network connectivity, which would be a great help in facilitating connections and walking. [Gordon indicated that pedestrian connectivity has been one of our major planning themes, and is expected to be reflected in our urban design and land use analyses.]

Becky Frestedt: For this large proposal, you should be sure to look closely at fire and police protection. This could address the subject of coverage levels that should be provided to serve future populations in the different growth scenarios.

Susan Ranf: Another issue of interest is the potential for liquefaction during earthquakes and the damage that could occur. [Gordon indicated that will be included in the earthquake-related topic we've included in the preliminary scope.]

Joan Enticknap: I agree that all topics not yet included in the scope should be studied. Also, I wanted to make sure that the topic of relationship to Port and industrial activities is planned to be discussed. [Gordon indicated that will be provided in the broad discussion of land use impacts and compatibility.]

Sarah Sodt, Department of Neighborhoods: I wanted to reinforce what Gordon said earlier about the importance of not changing height limits in the landmark districts. Also, I want to

suggest that the study look at the impacts of growth in areas adjacent to those landmark districts. It would be good to know what kinds of impacts might result—shadowing, compatibility, etc.

Ted Choi Tam: I want to express interest in considering changes—such as height increases and other strategies—that might provide incentives for new housing development throughout the Chinatown district. Included would be consideration of transfer of development rights (TDR) strategies. [Gary Johnson asked that Ted submit his request in writing during the scoping period.]

Tony To: I wanted to ask a clarifying question. What is the extent of possible TDR use right now? [Gordon indicated that TDRs cannot currently be used except in Downtown zones. Thus, the area east of I-5 is not currently eligible for TDR transactions. However, that is a topic that we anticipate mentioning in the EIS in relation to defined alternatives.]