

# Mukilteo Housing Action Plan

## Public Comments

This document is intended to help the reader review public comments received on the Housing Action Plan project as easily as possible. It includes comments received by Community Development Department staff between January 2020 and 4 PM on December 31, 2020, however it may not include all emails or correspondence sent to the City of Mukilteo.

Each of the four (4) sections is intended to help the reader find information a different way:

### 1. What We Heard

This section will be updated prior to the Planning Commission public hearing in Spring 2021 and include the overall themes of comments received.

### 2. Comment Threads

Comments, questions and staff responses are grouped alphabetically by last name. Each set of comments in an email thread or threads is in the order received. Any errors are the authors own. Greetings and transitory records are not included unless they provide context to the email thread.

Personal information is redacted where requested or appropriate.

### 3. Summary of Public Comments by Date

Comments, questions and staff responses are listed in date / time order, with a brief summary of each comment.

### 4. Index

Common topics are indexed by page number.

Each section and comment thread in this electronic document is also “bookmarked” to help the reader easily find information. In Adobe, there is an arrow on the left side of the screen. Toggling this arrow will show the bookmark icon:



Clicking on the bookmark icon will open the bookmarked items and allow easy navigation throughout the document:





# Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
What We Heard	5
Comment Threads	6
1. Albright, Eric	6
2. Arp, Drew	8
3. B, Adrian	9
4. Bauer, Gerald	10
5. Beamis, Christopher	11
6. Benoit, Ken	12
7. Blankenship, Charlene	13
8. Boyer, Ray	14
9. Burt, Casey	27
10. Carter, Cathy	28
11. Chun, Tina	29
12. Collier, Chris (Program Manager, Alliance for Housing Affordability)	31
13. Conger, Marianne	35
14. Davis, Richard	38
15. Everett, Ross	39
16. Field, Melanie	40
17. Fisher, Georgia	43
18. Flores, Derek	44
19. Foltz, Richard	46
20. Gold, Morgan	47
21. Goodrich, Matthew	48
22. Goosman, Gene	49
23. Gregg, Leslie	50
24. Grimes, David	60
25. Johnson, Joan	61
26. Johnson, Kyle	62
27. Keller, Patrick	63
28. Kirkwall, Scott	64



29.	Kirsch, Shaina	65
30.	Knapp, Elaine	66
31.	Kunthara, Joseph	69
32.	Labarre, Cheryl	70
33.	Laroche, Amy	71
34.	Lin, Ly	72
35.	Lynn, Daniel	73
36.	MacFarland, Melinda	74
37.	Malaska, Barbara	75
38.	McBroom, Lisa	77
39.	Morgan, Matthew (Matt)	97
40.	Nayak, Dilep	98
41.	Nicoll-Henry, Kris	100
42.	Nielson, Justin	101
43.	Palu-Benson, Fabienne	102
44.	Pancerzewski, Charlie	103
45.	Patrick, Dana	106
46.	Preserve Mukilteo	107
47.	Rafter, Leanne	119
48.	Reilly, Mike	120
49.	Riley, Shirley	121
50.	Ripley, Donald	123
51.	Ripley, Renee	124
52.	Rocca, Paolo	126
53.	Rogers, William	127
54.	Sanchez, Daniel	128
55.	Sarno, Anthony	129
56.	Schumacher, Jeff	132
57.	Sellentin, Jeff	136
58.	Silver, Brent	137
59.	Smith, Armandina and Covie	141
60.	Taber, Paul	142
61.	Tapert, Alan	144
62.	Townsend, Rob	145



63.	Vago, Donna	146
64.	Zaretsky, Boris	156
65.	Zieve, Peter	162
Public Comments by Date		177
Index		186



## What We Heard

This section will be completed prior to the Planning Commission public hearing in Spring 2021.



## Comment Threads

### 1. Albright, Eric

*June 5, 2020 11:08 AM – Cathy Rizzo*

Eric Albright would like information emailed to him regarding the above topic. There are so many rumors going around and he would like to read documents himself. He said he did the "ask Mukilteo" beginning of this year but did not receive a response.

*June 5, 2020 2:18 PM – Lauren Balisky*

I checked our AskMukilteo system and found your request from May 19, 2020:

"I've read about the Housing Action Plan grant in the Beacon, and have now received flyer in the mail from "Preserve Mukilteo." This flyer, as well as several letters to the editor in the Beacon, have cited the content of the grant proposal, and I suspect they may be misrepresenting the referenced content, taking statements from the document out of context, etc. If possible, I'd like to be able to read the grant proposal for myself. "Preserve Mukilteo" implies in their flyer that they have a copy of the grant proposal on their website, so I assume it is possible to obtain a copy. The flyer offers access to the document, but an email address is required to gain entry, and I'm not willing to give them that information. I've search the City website, and was unable to find the document there, though I did find the September 2015 Affordable Housing Profile. I would appreciate it if you could please send me, via email, a link to the document, or an electronic version of the document itself; if a FOIA, or similar request mechanism is necessary, please send me the form(s) and all pertinent information. Thanks for your time. "

I am not sure what happened, but do want thank you for letting us know and giving us another opportunity to provide you with the information. I have attached the grant instructions, grant application, and Mayor's letter of authorization for you.

Council discussed whether to accept the grant on January 21, 2020. The agenda bill and video are available here: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&clip\\_id=837](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&clip_id=837)

The Council's Land Use and Economic Development Committee reviewed the consultant's proposed scope of work at their June 2, 2020 meeting. The packet and minutes are available online here: <https://mukilteowa.gov/city-council/mukilteo-commissions-committees-boards/economic-development-committee/land-use-economic-development-minutes/>



Council is also scheduled to discuss whether to approve a consultant contract with BERK Consulting on July 6, 2020. The agenda bill and all materials will be available in advance of the meeting here:

<https://mukilteowa.gov/city-council/council-meeting-agendas-minutes-audio-video/>

Please let me know if anything additional would be helpful to you, and I do apologize for not being able to provide this to you sooner.

*July 1, 2020 2:53 PM – Lauren Balisky*

The City Council will be discussing the consultant contract for the Housing Action Plan this coming Monday evening if you are interested.

The meeting materials and link to participate online are available on the City's website: [https://mukilteowa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteowa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736).



## 2. Arp, Drew

### *December 10, 2020 5:37 PM – Allen Arp – Via HAP Comment Form*

Mukilteo is/was a wonderful, almost quaint community to live in. So why would anyone want to transform this town into another crowded dysfunctional concentration of individuals that rely on public assistance? At this moment there are thousands of apartments being constructed in Snohomish county, many which are subsidized housing. Understand the real reason we are being confronted with this issue are large national investment and construction firm that make big bucks doing this work. These special interest do not care what happens in Mukilteo in the future. They are pushing this as it is easy money being made on the emotional issue of social equity. I saw this first hand as a consultant in the construction biz.

Low income apartments become blight. For my two cents the city should outlaw apartments and only allow condos.

Want to help lower income families? Set up a no-down entry program to home ownership. People gaining ownership build wealth and are positive forces in the community .

No, No No to low income apartment ghettos.

### *December 13, 2020 4:31 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for joining us at Planning Commission on Thursday night. I hope you found it informative; please feel free to let me know if I can answer any additional questions you may have.

I want to make an important distinction about the Housing Action Plan (HAP), which is that the purpose is to look at strategies aimed at market-rate affordable housing, since that is what the City has the most influence and control over. What this means is we are interested in housing that is affordable to people generally making between 80-120% of Mukilteo's median income.

For this project, one important definition is that **affordable housing** is housing that is affordable to whoever is in it – meaning that household, at that point in time, is not paying more than 30% of their income on rent/mortgage plus utilities.

**Low-income housing**, on the other hand, is housing that is subsidized in some way for people making 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI). This can be in the form of programs (such as Section 8 vouchers) or places (like Vantage and Carvel, which both offer a portion of their apartments at below-market-rate rents).

I hope you had a lovely weekend, and please feel free to submit additional comments or questions to the HAP website at any time.





### 3. B, Adrian

*September 1, 2020 4:16 PM – Adrian B – Via HAP Comment Form*

Each residential unit has two bound parking spots. Density should not exceed 22 units per acre. Height should not exceed 35 feet. No criminal background.



#### 4. Bauer, Gerald

*November 4, 2020 10:14 AM – Gerald Bauer – Via HAP Comment Form*

The City of Mukilteo Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) code intentionally limits the availability of affordable housing by requiring large lot size, requiring 700 square foot maximum floor area, requiring no more than one bedroom, requiring off-street parking and requiring that the owner occupy one unit. Mukilteo's approach to ADUs is almost completely opposite Seattle, which can be seen by comparing the attached ADU brochure to this summary of Seattle's approach: <http://www.seattle.gov/sdci/permits/common-projects/accessory-dwelling-units>. I own a home in Old Town Mukilteo which was built with an interior ADU (mother-in-law apartment) that was previously used as a rental but does not meet the current ADU code due to floor area square footage and lack of off-street parking. If my home was located in Seattle, the apartment could be used as affordable housing. I believe that Mukilteo has a supply of affordable housing that would be available immediately if the Mukilteo ADU code was aligned with the Seattle ADU code.

*November 5, 2020 11:44 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for your comment; we will take a look at Seattle's ADU language as we consider recommendations for code updates. You have been added to our Parties of Interest list so you will receive notifications about Housing Action Plan moving forward.

We are also holding a community meeting this evening at 7 PM if you are interested in joining:  
<https://mukilteowa.gov/news/community-meeting-1-for-the-housing-action-plan-on-11-5/>

*November 5, 2020 1:08 PM – Gerald Bauer*

Thank you Lauren. I plan to join the meeting this evening.



## 5. Beamis, Christopher

*December 3, 2020 10:57 PM – Christopher Beamis – Via HAP Comment Form*

I strongly oppose adding low income housing units in Mukilteo. It would be a great dis-service to residents and business of the city to make their nice town more crowded and increase crime and litter/pollution. Lets not go down the road that has proved so disastrous for other communities.

*December 30, 2020 11:27 AM – Christopher Beamis – Via HAP Comment Form*

I don't want any low-income housing developments in Mukilteo. I moved here because it is low crime and relatively uncrowded, with relatively bearable traffic. No apartments above 2 stories, and each of them must have adequate parking.



## 6. Benoit, Ken

### *September 4, 2020 12:00 PM – Ken Benoit – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am very concerned about plans for new developments in Mukilteo. Specifically, it's vital that adequate parking be included for these developments: at least two parking spaces for each new unit built. It's completely unrealistic to assume that residents will take the bus, and it wouldn't be good if they had to park on streets away from their units. To avoid congestion, density shouldn't exceed 22 units per acre and the height of buildings shouldn't exceed 35 ft. Although change is inevitable, change need not bring negative consequences with it and ruin the character of a community.

Thank you for your attention.

### *December 30, 2020 2:12 PM – Ken Benoit – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am making this comment to express my opposition to the proposed development of the Boeing Tech Center for high-density housing. There is already quite a bit of high density housing in the Harbour Pointe area, and this new development potentially threatens to degrade the quality of life in the city. We certainly don't want to see anything like the Vantage Apts just outside the city limits. Any changes to zoning laws should be decided in a democratic manner by kindly informing the city residents and sincerely asking for their input before any changes are made. Anything less than this would be disappointing to say the least and cause residents to lose trust in their elected officials.

### *December 30, 2020 4:24 PM – Lauren Balisky*

There are currently no proposals to develop the Boeing Technical Center into multi-family development.

In early 2019, there was a request on the preliminary docket to change the future land use designation and zoning to allow for housing at the Boeing site. The preliminary docket is a process where anyone from the public, staff and City Council can make suggestions for changes to land use designations, zoning, or development regulations. City Council holds a public hearing, and determine which items warrant further study. These items are then placed on the "final docket" for formal application and review. For this particular request, City Council voted to **not** place the request on the final docket, and it did not move any further (see minutes for the [April 1, 2019 City Council Meeting](#)).

The property has since sold to [Systima Technologies](#), and we do not anticipate that they would request a rezone for a use incompatible with their business.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.



## 7. Blankenship, Charlene

*December 31, 2020 12:16 PM – Charlene Blankenship – Via HAP Comment Form*

So many concerned if these are within city of Mukilteo<sup>1</sup>. Not sure why. When I moved there in '87 non of Harbour Point was Mukilteo. Lots of racism evident in Nextdoor site.

---

<sup>1</sup> Staff understands the term “these” to be in relation to the Vantage Apartments in response to an email sent by Preserve Mukilteo on December 30, 2020.



## 8. Boyer, Ray

*July 6, 2020 2:07 PM – Ray Boyer*

Comments concerning High Density / Low Income Housing in Mukilteo Study by Berk Consulting

Mukilteo is overcrowded and overdeveloped.

I urge you to stop this proposed study by Berk Consulting and the proposed changes to population density in Mukilteo.

I have lived in Mukilteo for a long time and have seen Mukilteo change a great deal.

Mukilteo was a very small town with happy friendly residents when I first moved to unincorporated Harbour Pointe. Mukilteo is no longer that small town.

After Mukilteo annexed Harbour Pointe, where I live, population density increased a great deal as Harbour Pointe was developed.

I believe that annexation and development in Harbour Pointe hurt the quality of life for the people of Mukilteo including those who live in Harbour Pointe.

Most of the changes made after annexation have not been good for our community in my opinion. We are overcrowded and overdeveloped.

I fear these proposed high density housing changes will further deteriorate Mukilteo. The small town mentality that I remember might not even be known to most people living here now but it was a great mentality. We still retain a bit of that friendly mentality but it is gradually going away. It seems this proposal could turn Mukilteo into more of an urban environment which is not what I desire or what I believe is good for anyone.

Honest public discussions should take place before this study begins so that the reasons behind this study and these proposed changes can be fully understood by all. The possible effects of these proposed changes should also be publicly discussed along with possible alternative solutions to any perceived problems.

After public discussions take place these proposed changes should then be voted upon in a referendum as these are major changes to Mukilteo.

Please change your minds.

Please at least postpone this study until discussions can be held and all views can be heard and evaluated.



### *November 6, 2020 12:18 PM – Ray Boyer – Via HAP Comment Form*

I have a few questions: A) I listened to the presentation on 11/5/2020 and was amazed by some of the data presented as it seemed to be very sensitive confidential data. Where did all the data about residents of Mukilteo (like how many people who live in each house) come from? B) If the data came from the United States census, or tax returns, I thought that information was secret and would not be shared, is that true? C) Is this very sensitive information (like how many people per household, income per household, ages, occupations, etc.) publicly available and if not how did the consultants, or city planning department, get it? D) If this data is not publicly available was an exception granted to the consulting firm and how is the information protected? E) Is the use of this data used to steer decisions later by the City? F) Would have the city planners obtained the same data or would there be differences possible between the consulting data and city planner data? G) Does the State later check the data (consultants said the city is obligated to follow state laws with regards to population density) so that city planners couldn't affect the outcome by making it easier for a city to meet State requirements? H) What are the state laws that Mukilteo must comply with and what are the penalties for not complying? I) Specifically are there low cost housing state law, or federal law, requirements and what are the penalties for not complying?

### *November 9, 2020 11:00 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for sending in your questions to the City of Mukilteo and for chatting with me this morning! As with all comments we receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and again to City Council as the Housing Action Plan (HAP) process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like, and we would encourage you to use the [comment form on the HAP website](#).

I will do my best to respond to your questions, below:

- A) I listened to the presentation on 11/5/2020 and was amazed by some of the data presented as it seemed to be very sensitive confidential data. Where did all the data about residents of Mukilteo (like how many people who live in each house) come from?**

A complete list of data sources is available in Appendix A of the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#) (HNA), most of which is publicly available in aggregate form. In other words, we do not have specific data for any individual household.

- B) If the data came from the United States census, or tax returns, I thought that information was secret and would not be shared, is that true?**

This is a very valid concern! None of the data we have available to us is from tax returns, though the report does rely on US Census data. None of the information is available to us at an individual level – only by Census tract, zip code, or places (like Mukilteo as a whole, Snohomish County as a whole, the King-Snohomish-Pierce area as a whole, etc.).



- C) Is this very sensitive information (like how many people per household, income per household, ages, occupations, etc.) publicly available and if not how did the consultants, or city planning department, get it?**

Census data is publicly available on their website, here: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>

Other data, such as from Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Snohomish County Point In Time homeless counts, etc. are all also publicly available. I believe the only one that may not be publicly available as a big block of data is the Zillow data (BERK – please correct me if I am wrong).<sup>2</sup>

- D) If this data is not publicly available was an exception granted to the consulting firm and how is the information protected?**

The data is publicly available.

- E) Is the use of this data used to steer decisions later by the City?**

Yes – the City is required to understand its housing needs as part of its long-range planning process. The goal is to plan for Mukilteo's proportionate share (relative to Snohomish County) of projected population, housing units, and employment in a way that meets the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act. For housing, we are required to adopt a "housing element" in our long-range planning document for the City, also known as [Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan](#).

Specifically [the law states that](#):

*... Each comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design for each of the following:*

*...*

*(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that:*

*(a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth;*

*(b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences;*

*(c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and*

*(d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.*

---

<sup>2</sup> The Zillow data is publicly available at: <https://www.zillow.com/research/data/>. Commenters were provided with this information.





*In counties and cities subject to the review and evaluation requirements of RCW [36.70A.215](#), any revision to the housing element shall include consideration of prior review and evaluation reports and any reasonable measures identified.*

The draft Housing Needs Assessment helps us start meeting the above requirements, particularly in Items (2)(a) and (d). The current Comprehensive Plan, linked above, walks through each of the above items in turn for the growth projected through 2035.

We are currently waiting for updated growth allocations for 2044, though at this point I do not expect the trends for Mukilteo to be drastically different due to existing limitations of the natural environment here.

The City, through a public process, then gets to decide how it wants to accommodate the growth. An important nuance here is that the City is required to demonstrate that it can accommodate the growth, not to force the growth to happen. In other words, we decide how we want to set the stage, and the market decides when it wants to join in.

**F) Would have the city planners obtained the same data or would there be differences possible between the consulting data and city planner data?**

We would be using much of the same data, although I would note that since BERK is working with this type of information regularly (as opposed to once every 5-8 years) they are more aware of and familiar with the data sources than I am.

**G) Does the State later check the data (consultants said the city is obligated to follow state laws with regards to population density) so that city planners couldn't affect the outcome by making it easier for a city to meet State requirements?**

Yes and no. Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan is certified by Snohomish County and PSRC. We are required to demonstrate compliance with the growth allocations for population, housing units and employment, and those numbers come to us through a series of processes:

- First, the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) develops forecasts for the entire state.
- Then, Puget Sound Regional Council (our regional planning agency) allocates growth to King, Snohomish, Pierce and Kitsap counties.
- Each County then goes through a process to determine where and how to allocate growth to itself and to individual cities. Cities can negotiate some on this number some, but does need to comply with whatever the final numbers are.

I hope that makes sense – let me know if more explanation would be helpful.

**H) What are the state laws that Mukilteo must comply with and what are the penalties for not complying?**

Technically we are required to comply with all of them, but I am assuming you asking about penalties for not complying with the Growth Management Act. You can find a list of sanctions in RCW 36.70A.340 and 345 here:



<https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=36.70A&full=true#36.70A.340>

In short, if the City does not have a certified Comprehensive Plan, and refuses to bring it into compliance, there are two main consequences:

- 1) The state can withhold tax revenues from the City; and
- 2) The City is not eligible to apply for grant funding to complete projects, such as sidewalks, the promenade, or for planning / policy work, such as help with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update or updates to other plans, like the Bike Transit Walk (BTW) Plan.

**I) Specifically are there low cost housing state law, or federal law, requirements and what are the penalties for not complying?**

Unfortunately, I am not as familiar with these laws. My understanding is that we legally cannot stop or make it difficult to build any essential public facility (including low-income housing), that we cannot forbid the use of Section 8 vouchers, etc. There is some additional information on the [City's housing website](#), if that is of use.

Other resources you may find helpful, based on our conversation:

- A glossary from PSRC about housing terms. I've attached some excerpts for you for your convenience.
- Municipal Research Services Center (MRSC) does a great job of summarizing [Comprehensive Planning](#), the [Comprehensive Plan Update Process](#). I've also linked to [Mukilteo's 2015 Comprehensive Plan](#) (minor updates have been completed since) if you want some more reading.
- The Department of Commerce provides a "Short Course on Local Planning." They have a series of videos (and an online class, if you would prefer to Q&A) on their website (scroll halfway down): <https://www.commerce.wa.gov/serving-communities/growth-management/short-course/>

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance, and I hope you have a great week.

*November 9, 2020 12:47 PM – Ray Boyer*

Thanks Lauren for these answers to my questions submitted on the website. And thanks for the additional information and many insights you provided to me over the phone.

You do an excellent job of listening and explaining and our city is incredibly lucky to have you working here!

You made me feel much better about the whole process as well as everyone in our local government. You helped me regain trust which is invaluable.

Thanks again Lauren and God Bless You and Your Family,

Ray



To Mayor Gregerson:

Lauren Balisky is an incredible employee!

I don't know if the City of Mukilteo has an employee of the year award but she deserves that award if we do.

Although I am still against growth in Mukilteo (we are too crowded) she did an excellent job of explaining this process to me and making me understand the reasons for this planning and possible changes that may occur in the future (and I'm sure there are many others she is helping in the same way). I feel much better about our whole city after talking to her. She shows compassion to everyone's needs and listens as well as anyone I have ever talked to.

### *November 10, 2020 10:18 PM – Ray Boyer – Via HAP Comment Form*

I have not noticed in the HAP any reference to possible adverse effects of affordable housing (and different adverse effects due to each type of affordable housing solution). I believe I have read that affordable housing at some specific rate is required per the growth management act and that there could be penalties imposed by the state if the city does not meet the Growth Management Act requirements. With that in mind possibly this study isn't the place for specifying the adverse effects of allowing for more affordable housing so that the many different options of meeting state requirements could be looked at that accounted for positive and negative effects associated with all possibilities. When I refer to possible adverse effects I mean possible negative effects to schools (based upon a study I did a few months ago I believe for instance that Kamiak High School is ranked approximately 25th in our state while Mariner High School is ranked approximately 125th in our state, I believe Mariner High School is associated with a more affordable housing environment), traffic delays, quality of life issues, capacity of our local infrastructure such as schools and fire departments, and possible crime rate changes to list a few examples. When and will these type of trade offs be discussed in this planning process and shouldn't your data include this type of information based upon state data? Thanks

### *November 11, 2020 3:12 PM – Ray Boyer*

Yesterday (11/10/2020) I submitted another comment and a question (I submitted the question twice since I didn't think the submission worked the first time as I never received an email like I did when I submitted the question below). Can you tell me if the question and comment were received since I didn't get an email saying the HAP question and comment were received?

### *November 11, 2020 5:04 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Yes, I received all three submissions, and thank you for letting me know – I will see if I can figure out what is going on with the back end of the website as well as respond to your question as soon as I am able.



*November 11, 2020 5:23 PM – Lauren Balisky*

I believe I fixed it – if you would be willing to send in a “test” I would greatly appreciate it!!!

*November 11, 2020 7:03 PM – Ray Boyer*

My second test try worked

My first try I had made an error in confirming my email (I didn’t catch it for a while, I only noticed the error after waiting 5 minutes for a confirmation email from city) so if you got two test comments it may have been errors by me all along preventing a city confirmation email.

*November 12, 2020 7:47 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for alerting me to the issue, testing the system, and letting me know that you received the confirmation email – I am glad it is working like it should!

*November 12, 2020 6:15 PM – Lauren Balisky*

There are a few complex topics in your question, so I am going to do my best to parse them out and respond to them below:

**1) Why are the impacts (positive or negative) of various housing types not addressed in the draft Housing Needs Assessment?**

The draft HNA is looking at demographic, employment, and housing data for Mukilteo, and it is not appropriate for staff to opine on the various merits of different types of housing. There are examples of thoughtful high-density housing all over the world, and there are just as many examples of poorly executed housing.

One distinction that is important to understand is that affordable housing and low-income housing are not the same:

- Affordable housing is housing that is affordable to whoever is in it – meaning that household, at that point in time, is not paying more than 30% of their income on rent/mortgage plus utilities.
- Low-income housing is housing that is subsidized in some way for people making 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI). This can be in the form of programs (such as Section 8 vouchers) or places (like Vantage and Carvel, which both offer a portion of their apartments at below-market-rate rents).

High-density housing is not necessarily affordable, and low-income housing is not necessarily dense.

We trust that Mukilteo as a whole will indicate what housing forms are acceptable. I would note I find it



personally interesting that the high-density housing here is usually of such quality that people do not notice that Mukilteo has a higher proportion of multi-family than other parts of Snohomish County.

## 2) Is affordable housing required at a specific rate per the GMA?

The GMA itself does not specify a rate – that depends on the actual population characteristics and population forecasts. Mukilteo is required to demonstrate it has the capacity in its zoning and development regulations to allow for a proportionate share (proportionate to Snohomish County) of housing for all income levels, not to force the market to build the housing.

## 3) About negative impacts of [low-income] housing on schools.

You have managed to hit on one of the inadvertent gaps in long-range planning in Washington state, much of which has to do with how schools function as a political subdivision of the state.

Similar to many utilities, hospitals, libraries, and even fire departments, most schools are in a special purpose district rather than being part of a city's government. This changes how schools plan and how integrated (or not) they are into the overall planning process. While schools also plan under the Growth Management Act, their planning requirement is limited to a "Capital Facilities Plan" (CFP). Schools plan for projected student enrollment vs. school capacity over a six-year planning period (instead of the 20-year planning period for cities / counties and the 30-year planning period for the regional metropolitan planning organization, Puget Sound Regional Council, or PSRC). This helps schools determine if additional school facilities are needed to accommodate growth from new development.

Due to their nature, schools are in many ways at the mercy of the community around them, including spatial limitations that come with being in an urban environment. Many cities, including Mukilteo, collect impact fees on new housing units to help the school district offset the costs of additional enrollment. For 2020, the impact fee for a single-family home was \$4,342; and for a multi-family unit with two or more bedrooms the fee was \$5,883.

You have also inadvertently gotten into the subjects of [generational poverty and education](#), [equity in education](#), [equity in housing](#), [regressive taxation](#), and more. But these topics are all really beyond the scope of the HAP. This is not to say that these topics do not matter – they do matter, and they matter for the strength of Washington's economy long-term.

A common misperception about multi-family housing in any form, however, is that it does not generate as much in taxes as multi-family development. While there are outliers to this argument, this is generally not true since multi-family structures are typically treated as *commercial* structures rather than *residential* structures for tax purposes. One helpful resource (though older) is the [National Multifamily Housing Council's 50-State Property Tax Comparison Study](#). Municipal Research Service Center (MRSC), which provides assistance to governments throughout Washington State, also has an article covering the topic: "[But What About Multiple Family Housing: Does it Pay for Itself?](#)"

## 4) About infrastructure capacity and planning.



In addition to land use planning, the GMA also requires infrastructure planning to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure capacity for all of the forecasted growth. Similar to the CFP for schools, Mukilteo also completes transportation planning (see the [By The Way Plan](#)), parks planning (see the [PROSA Plan](#)), utilities (for Mukilteo, this is only stormwater – see the [Comprehensive Surface Water Management Plan](#)), and more.

Once the City gets its growth targets, each of these plans is reviewed and updated, with as much public input as we can muster, to address potential impacts.

I hope that I understood and was able to answer your questions, or at the very least point you to some helpful resources. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

*November 13, 2020 12:52 AM – Ray Boyer*

Your answers were very helpful although I am still concerned about possible negative effects of any proposed housing/density changes in the future.

The fact that Kamiak Highschool is ranked so much better scholastically than Mariner Highschool (located just a few miles apart and both part of the Mukilteo School Dist. with possibly the main difference being housing density and income levels) bothers me. The other possible adverse effects still bother me as well. I will study the articles and plans you mentioned as well as research for other possible helpful information using the internet.

I will have to do some studying before I can develop any meaningful questions and/or comments though.

*November 13, 2020 5:00 AM – Ray Boyer – Via HAP Comment Form*

As a follow on comment to my last question(s) concerning possible adverse effects of possible changes to population density of Mukilteo, or possible affordable housing accommodations changes, made through zoning changes (made on Nov 12, 2020) I wish to show a news article I found concerning the difference in scholastic aptitude between Kamiak High School and Mariner High School and the possible demographic reasons specified (both located in the Mukilteo School District only miles apart).

I researched this as I had found an article previously (about 2 months ago) that stated Kamiak High School was rated number 24 in Washington State, while Mariner High School ranks number 123 in Washington State, for academic performance and I wondered if proposed zoning changes could affect the scholastic aptitude of Kamiak High School (per this ranking system reported by US News <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-high-schools/search?state-urlname=washington&ranked=true> ).

After receiving Lauren Balisky's response about whether the HAP report would address these types of possible adverse effects (it will not) I did some research and decided to include this information for the record, and so other interested parties could see this information, even though it will not be addressed by the HAP report in detail. I added it as it seems very pertinent. The article includes the following statements: "...Although governed by the same school board and overseen by the same superintendent, the schools differ dramatically in student



achievement, as measured by the benchmark Washington Assessment of Student Learning. On the spring 2003 WASL, scores at Mariner ranged from a low of 22.9 percent of 10th-graders meeting the standard of proficiency in math to a high of 56.2 percent in listening, with reading and writing scores falling in between. Kamiak's 10th-graders started where Mariner's left off: 56.8 percent cleared the bar in math, rising to 87.9 percent in listening. The test is administered annually in grades four, seven and 10.

To Rick Robbins, the district's director of secondary education, the results are not surprising. "If you look at the demographic data, both schools are performing about where you would expect," he said.

The key piece of demographic data is the relative wealth, or socioeconomic status, of the families living within the attendance zone of each school, a factor that ranks as one of the most telling indicators of academic performance..."

I realize the article also includes other data that I have omitted in the quotes above that are very pertinent. I also acknowledge that these topics are complex and can be looked at very emotionally so I wish to state that I am not trying to offend anyone or make judgements upon anyone or any demographic. I am just trying to start a conversation about the possible effects of changing zoning regulations in Mukilteo as I am concerned. I hope our City Council and Mayor address these concerns before making any changes and allow for comments from all concerned parties. The article website is:

<https://www.seattlepi.com/news/article/Mariner-and-Kamiak-represent-the-highs-and-lows-1123346.php>

Finally, I'll add that I do not have any answers for what to do with more people if they come to the Seattle area and that I realize there are many complex fairness issues involved with this subject. I also do not have any answers for how to help under achieving schools or how to help the children in those schools. My heart goes out to everyone.

*November 15, 2020 9:09 AM – Ray Boyer*

Hello City Council Members and Mayor Gregerson,

I thought I'd bring a comment I submitted to the Housing Action Plan website, about the HAP interim report, to your attention since many possible adverse effects of any zoning changes will not be addressed by the HAP.

I understand that only the City Council and Mayor can address all possible adverse effects of any zoning changes. I believe this means that no study will be done similar to the HAP that provides data concerning the detrimental effects of the proposed changes with regards to education, crime rates, infrastructure, and quality of life. No demographic information or historical data concerning the effects of the proposed zoning changes will be provided by the city, or the state, to help citizens understand the effects of the proposed changes. I see this lack of studies into the adverse effects of possible zoning changes required to meet the Growth Management Act as an obvious failure of the Growth Management Act (including any requirement for Affordable Housing included in this law). I see this as an obvious oversight in the Growth Management Act.

The possible adverse effect I am commenting on in this email is the lowering of academic performance of Mukilteo schools due to increased population density, and the possible addition of more affordable housing, in Mukilteo. I don't believe the citizens of Mukilteo realize that the lowering of academic performance of our schools seems to





be a given if zoning laws are changed as proposed. The amount of degradation to the academic performance of Mukilteo Schools is an unknown. It seems it could be a gradual degradation over time as more and more adjustments happen over time if these proposed zoning changes are implemented and if they continue over time. However, it is possible that a significant degradation in academic performance would occur quickly after zoning laws are changed.

I believe most people who live in Mukilteo take pride in the academic performance of our schools. Excellent schools help maintain housing values in Mukilteo as well as contribute to the overall quality of life. I believe parents with children going to Mukilteo public schools see maintaining the excellence of the schools in Mukilteo to be an imperative.

Based upon standardized testing (WASL testing) Kamiak High School performs much better than Mariner High School academically. One overall academic ranking showed Kamiak High School to be ranked 24<sup>th</sup> in our state while Mariner High School ranked 123<sup>rd</sup> in our state (see US News article internet site referenced below that was included in my HAP interim report comment). Since these schools are both in the Mukilteo School District, and are located just 5.7 miles apart, it seems worthwhile to investigate why there are these dramatic academic performance differences. It also seems logical to take the reasons, that cause the differences in academic performance, into account when planning any zoning changes to Mukilteo.

In a 2003 Seattle PI news article (see Seattle PI news article internet site referenced below that was included in my HAP interim report comment) the Mukilteo School District's Director of Secondary Education at the time, Rick Robbins, stated the academic performance difference was predictable and was based upon socio-economic reasons. He stated specifically that comparing relative wealth of families in the attendance zones of the two schools was the causation (the relative wealth of Mukilteo families will be reduced by increasing population density and by making housing more affordable).

With that in mind does Mukilteo really want to make changes to our zoning laws that could reduce families relative wealth in our city and thereby detrimentally effect schools academic performance and detrimentally effect the children in Mukilteo? Also, why doesn't Mukilteo insist that data be collected, and a study be performed, concerning the effects of the proposed changes on Mukilteo's schools and children. The data collected and study should be based upon effects to other communities that are similar to Mukilteo where similar changes have been made in the past? If there are no examples of this being done in the past doesn't it seem very risky to make these changes to Mukilteo zoning laws without knowing what might happen?

In addition, aren't there other ways to help solve the problems perceived by the state with regards to population density and housing costs without hurting the people now living Mukilteo? Aren't there other ways to help the academic performance of Mariner High School without disrupting the high performance of Kamiak High School and the children who live in Mukilteo? I know I would like to see both schools improved.

Since the HAP study doesn't include effects of affordable housing on education I wonder whether law makers have studied this issue or care about Mukilteo's schools. I wonder if it was decided by state lawmakers to attempt to make all public schools perform equally and if that requires the lowering of performance of schools which now excel. Will you bring these issues up with state lawmakers and will you attempt to study the effects of proposed





zoning changes on education in Mukilteo?

Personally I am confounded by the lack of regard to these issues in the Growth Management Act. I had assumed the Growth Management Act attempts to improve all citizens life's but it seems unlikely that it does. I am also confounded by the logic of how affordable housing enhances all schools as it seems it would only lead to the lowering of performance of top performing schools without helping schools located in areas where families relative wealth is low based upon the causation stated by the Mukilteo School District's Director of Secondary Education (Rick Robbins).

I'm hoping you can provide some feedback as to your feelings regarding this issue. I am also hoping you can provide insights into how you plan to account for the many other possible adverse effects to proposed zoning changes such as infrastructure and quality of life.

I'll end by saying that I assume there are many possible adverse effects of the proposed zoning changes that I am not commenting on in this email but that require study by the City Council, Mayor and people of Mukilteo to avoid problems in the future. Although I am trying to help, I am not an expert and these are complex issues that seem to have not been adequately studied or discussed as of this time. I am unsure if there are plans to adequately study and discuss these issues.

*December 22, 2020 10:32 AM – Jennifer Gregerson*

I just realized I hadn't written back to you- I just wanted to let you know I had received your message back in November, and was glad to see that it went to our staff, as well. I understand that they have let you know that your email is included for consideration with all the public comment on the Housing Action Plan process.

*December 22, 2020 11:22 AM – Ray Boyer*

Hello Mayor Gregerson,

Thank you for responding to my November 15th email.

Unfortunately my understanding, based upon conversations with Lauren Balisky, is that planners will not address adverse effects of the Housing Action Plan they develop. It is my understanding that the Housing Action Plan only uses historical and demographic data to establish a Housing Action Plan for the city that satisfies the Growth Management Act requirements. I would have thought the Growth Management Act would have required any plans to focus on possible adverse effects to changes I don't believe it does that. I know that any planning I have been involved with usually included an analysis of possible negative effects so that they could be avoided.

I was told that only the City Council and Mayor can address adverse effects such as those I included in my November 15th email. So having my November 15th email included in the Housing Action Plan comments doesn't seem to me to address my concerns. Since you and City Council members will evaluate the City's HAP later it is up to you and the City Council. So I am wondering how you feel about hurting the children who live in Mukilteo by



adversely effecting the schools they attend due to proposed zoning changes to allow higher population density and possibly to allow for affordable housing? Increasing housing density will adversely affect housing values and families relative wealth. Higher density would directly effect supply and based upon supply and demand concepts family's relative wealth will be decreased versus not having density increased based upon some changes to present zoning requirements. Density changes will also effect relative wealth as desirability to live in Mukilteo will be reduced. This doesn't even mention the direct consequences of affordable housing which is directly designed to adversely effect relative wealth of families in Mukilteo.

I listed several questions in my original letter and included historical basis for my concerns about adverse effects to Mukilteo Schools.

I listed an analysis by a Mukilteo School District's Director of Secondary Education which clearly states that if the relative wealth of Mukilteo Families is reduced school performance will be adversely effected. Those adverse effects are dramatic as specified in my November 15th email when comparing Kamiak High School to Mariner High School (On the spring 2003 WASL, scores at Mariner ranged from a low of 22.9 percent of 10th-graders meeting the standard of proficiency in math to a high of 56.2 percent in listening, with reading and writing scores falling in between. Kamiak's 10th-graders started where Mariner's left off: 56.8 percent cleared the bar in math, rising to 87.9 percent in listening.). This comparison is frightening to me and I would think this should be discussed as soon as possible. I would think a study should be conducted to determine possible adverse effects to education in Mukilteo due to any HAP proposal along with studies on other issues as well.

Hopefully you can address my questions. I also hope City Council Members can address my questions so that a conversation can begin. If only the City Council and Mayor can address adverse effects of the HAP I feel it is your job, along with the City Council members, to address my concerns for the children of Mukilteo. Further, I can see no higher priority for leaders of Mukilteo than ensuring Mukilteo's children are not hurt by the proposed changes which seemingly will adversely affect Mukilteo Schools based upon the analysis provided by Mukilteo School District's Director of Secondary Education stated in my November 15th email.



## 9. Burt, Casey

*May 30, 2020 4:19 PM – Casey Burt*

Hello City Council,

I have been a member of the Mukilteo community for over two years now and plan on attending the June 1st City Council meeting. I received a 'Preserve Mukilteo' flyer in the mail this past month where a group of community members are urging others to join their cause. The cause is to prevent Mukilteo from adopting an Affordable Housing Plan (AHP) so that the community does not have low-income housing. The flyer alludes that low-income housing "could bring in crime and drugs" to the community.

Overall, I am baffled by the flawed and overtly racist logic displayed by these community members. Generally, low-income families in the greater Seattle area are families of color. This flyer is drawing a clear and erroneous association between a specific demographic and crime and drugs.

I am requesting that council address this topic on Monday evening. Please provide some background on the AHP proposal.

- Why did the major submit a grant application to Olympia?
- Why did the city council vote to accept the grant without seeking approval of voters?
- Any other pertinent information?

Once everyone has a strong understanding of the background, please address the city council's position on the 'Preserve Mukilteo' community group. Is this type of elitism and exclusion something that our community stands behind?

Thank you and I look forward to Monday's council meeting!



## 10. Carter, Cathy

*December 4, 2020 1:45 PM – Cathy Carter – Via HAP Comment Form*

In this year of Covid, increasing density seems against better judgment. Social distancing is a challenge in crowded spaces.

The current leadership that espouses pro science and distancing seems hypocritical when it comes to housing spaces. Amassing more people in closer quarters is opposite of what schools, clinics, airlines are doing and being recommended to do.

I moved to Mukilteo for its small town feel, green spaces and businesses among the variety of housing options already in the area.

With climate change . . The loss of more green spaces again counter intuitive or hypocritical at best.

Our streets, schools and community are stretched already. Higher density housing is a poor option. What is it's purpose? Bring more workers to the area? I thought that was light rails purpose. Sadly this seems poor planning for the long term.

What is the goal? Maybe the city is at a good population base. Again what is the purpose?



## 11. Chun, Tina

*December 30, 2020 11:22 AM – Tina Chun*

Greetings Dave,

I hope you're enjoying your holidays. Some homeowners on Harbour Heights Parkway, Mukilteo, in the Waterton and Sundance communities are inquiring about residential/apartment/condominium building development plans in their community. Has anyone submitted any plans, requests or exploratory plans to build homes of any sort in the lots located between or near the gated community of Waterton and Sundance Townhomes? If so, could you please provide any information that I can share with the residents who are inquiring?

*December 31, 2020 8:15 AM – Dave Osaki*

I cannot think of any residential apartment or condominium building development proposals for that part of the City (i.e. Waterton/Sundance), especially between the Waterton and Sundance.

As you may know, in 2019, the (then) owner (now former owner) of the Harbour Technical Center property made an application to the City to amend the Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and to change the zoning for part of the Harbour Technical Center from industrial to multi-family residential.

The City Council did not approve allowing that proposal to go forward.

Since that time (and pretty recently), that property owner has sold the property.

Here is some information about the sale and the new property owner.

<https://www.systima.com/blog/systima-purchases-harbour-pointe-tech-center/>

<https://www.bizjournals.com/seattle/news/2020/09/22/systima-technologies-moves-hq-to-mukilteo.html>

I have not been approached by the new property owner yet for any detailed discussion of their plans. But the articles indicate that the company that purchased the property, Systima Technologies, intends to relocate their business from Kirkland to that site.

You might ask those who are inquiring of you what is generating their interest in the question at this point in time. If it is, by chance, the recent sale, then the attached links may be helpful.

I am also copying our Planning Manager, Lauren Balisky, on this email. If she is aware of any other type of residential development in the Sundance/Waterton area, then she can follow up.

I hope this helps.



*December 31, 2020 8:26 AM – Tina Chun*

Thanks Dave for your quick response. Your response will be a relief to members of this community.



## 12. Collier, Chris (Program Manager, Alliance for Housing Affordability)

*July 5, 2020 1:16 PM – Chris Collier*

I would like to submit written public comment for the Mukilteo Council discussion on the City's proposed adoption of a housing action plan (agenda item AB20-53 for the 7/6 Council meeting). The comments are considerably longer than 400 words, so please only submit them in writing to Councilmembers (and the public if that is appropriate)– do not read the comments aloud to Council during the meeting.

I am not sure what, if any, background is typically provided with public comment. If no information is needed, great. If some information is appropriate for a preamble to the written comment, please feel free to use the below passage:

*As the Program Manager for the Alliance for Housing Affordability, of which Mukilteo is a member, it is in my professional interest to advise the city on this issue and with this public comment. The Alliance for Housing Affordability's purpose is to support its members in all matters related to housing and housing affordability, so it is within my scope and responsibilities to comment on this subject. I welcome any questions and follow up requests for information from the Council, if there are any.*

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.



## Attachment

As the Council and the residents of Mukilteo consider whether or not to select the consultant to create a Housing Action Plan, I encourage you to think of ways in which housing relates to other issues you may care about, and why it is in the City's best interest to create a Housing Action Plan.

Fundamentally, this housing action plan is a choice between planned and unplanned growth. Given that our cities have almost no undeveloped land left, unplanned growth is another way to say urban sprawl in Snohomish County, and that is the lens through which this comment is made – how does sprawl in communities outside of Mukilteo negatively impact Mukilteo residents, and the issues they care about?

The environment is clearly impacted by sprawl. Whether it is as simple as loss of untouched natural space, or the multifaceted impacts of runoff from impervious surfaces that pollute streams and impact salmon stocks that our beloved Southern Resident Killer Whales need to survive, one of Washington State residents' leading concerns is protecting the environment. Keeping development located in land already developed will directly help to protect the environment that is one of Washington's defining, most cherished, characteristics.

Related to the environment, many of us enjoy being in unspoiled nature, or prize produce grown locally and sold at farmers markets. A Housing Plan that allows for Mukilteans to find homes in your City means they will not be forced to move farther and farther away. Rejecting a housing plan in Mukilteo will increase the existing pressure to develop those lands for housing and take this environmental benefit away from Mukilteo residents. The value of open green space near where we live cannot be overstated – the positive impacts on mental and physical health brought by proximity to nature are numerous. The economic, cultural, and public health value of supporting local farmers is of equal value.

The impact on Mukilteo's workforce by making sprawl the chosen solution to housing can be summed up in one word: commuting. Time spent on the road is time not spent bettering oneself or participating in the fabric of the community to make it stronger – it is just time spent in a car, on the road, contributing to climate change from automobile emissions. Transportation is a deeply complex issue, and I would invite further discussion and opinion from transportation experts on the challenges presented by placing housing further and further away from job centers.

Education and healthcare are not spared the impact of rejecting a housing plan. Anecdotally, housing assistance is one of the top requested services for school district staff, as families struggle more and more to continue living in communities they settled in years ago. One way to measure this are the number of families who are cost-burdened already in our community. There are at least 2000 and perhaps as many as 2800 Mukilteo households who pay more than 30% of their income on housing. Allowing housing of different types and configurations in our community today will immediately reduce the number of households that struggle financially. Take a moment to think about the impacts that a financially strapped household has on the educational attainment of its children. There is something to be said for overcoming life's adversities, of course. But there is something to be said, too, about communities that clearly have the power to act in reducing barriers to a good education for its children and choosing to not do so.

Healthcare, too, benefits from housing that is both affordable, so families can afford to seek preventative medical care (instead of emergency treatment), and the ability to provide quality out-patient care. The challenge of maintaining one's health when unstably housed cannot be overstated – allowing urban sprawl would either mean needing to build more healthcare facilities further afield, or





leaving patients with stretched income to find a way to make health maintenance trips over further and further distances. And again, the onus of maintaining one's health falls squarely on the individual or household, but what sense is there in making it unnecessarily difficult when we know how we can improve health outcomes?

There is also the issue of control over the planning process. Rejection of this housing action plan will, in effect, signal to the Legislature the City's lack of interest in planning for housing and invite state intervention. This assertion is not pulled out of thin air – House Bill 1923, the bill the housing action plan stems from, was originally written as a mandate to adopt a housing action plan or other measures. Ultimately, HB1923 was turned into the grant money we are discussing today; but it is an open secret that the Legislature is watching HB1923 utilization by municipalities as a sign of commitment to local planning for housing. Failure to meaningfully implement a plan, or rejection of the planning process, will be a clear signal to the Legislature that their intervention is needed in the next Legislative Session. Cities interested in maintaining local control should keep this in mind: The Legislature is watching the outcome of votes like this with great interest.

Finally, I hope it goes without saying that our communities, in knowable and unknowable ways, benefit from having diversity: diversity of race, gender, religion; diversity of background, life experience, and country of origin; diversity of income and occupation. Foregoing an opportunity to plan community housing growth, thereby allowing sprawl and its accompanying impacts, in effect rejects the notion of diversity, because the economic filtering, dare I say the economic segregation, that occurs when every home in Mukilteo requires more than \$100,000/year of household income to afford, is profound.

In closing, I encourage the Mukilteo City Council to vote in favor of pursuing a housing action plan, with the understanding that in so doing your vote will help lead Mukilteo and Mukilteans into a future that has good healthcare, schools and roads; ample natural space and a healthy, thriving environment for us all to enjoy; and a strong and vibrant community for us to be a part of, no matter our income, our age, or our background.

Thank you

Chris Collier  
AHA Program Manager

*July 6, 2020 9:50 PM – Chris Collier*

One thing on the “Why more” question when it came to Section 8 – the City can't control the presence or lack of Section 8 utilization in the city. A Section 8 voucher is used on the private market with a private market landlord. “Why more Section 8 housing” profoundly misunderstands the nature of the Section 8 program, because any voucher holder can live in any housing that passes inspection and doesn't charge ridiculously above-market rates.

If the question morphs into “Well what about income-restricted, or government subsidized housing” – Mukilteo doesn't really have any of that, either. Carvel being the one exception which, as you know, was purchased on the open market by HASCO.



Good work overall, hang in there for the public comments. I'm listening in solidarity.

PS – Lauren, excellent job steering responding to CM Emery's questions.



### 13. Conger, Marianne

*November 5, 2020 3:04 PM – Marianne Conger – Via HAP Comment Form*

We have read the Housing Action Plan and have some background in this type of planning. My husband was on the Planning Commission in the City of Sammamish where they had similar issues they had to address. Could you please respond to the following?

- How much of an affordable housing deficit do we have? How does that compare to neighboring communities?
- We don't have to accept the entire plan or solve for the entire deficit. Let's look at ways to mitigate the solution. (Mitigate - make less severe, serious, or painful.)
- Let's not look just at the revenue this would bring the City of Mukilteo – especially short term, but also look at the total cost of the solution. Once all built, the units will not be bringing in as much revenue, and we will have to provide additional services.
- Are there locations/areas that we look at where we can do a little of residential over commercial to solve for this area, but make it into some nice community area AND some additional revenue for the city.
- Look at benchmarking with other communities in the greater Seattle area.
- Look at sharing the weight with other communities.

*November 9, 2020 9:48 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for sending in your questions to the City of Mukilteo. As with all comments we receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and again to City Council as the Housing Action Plan (HAP) process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like, and we would encourage you to use the [comment form on the HAP website](#).

I will do my best to respond to your questions, below:

- 1. We have read the Housing Action Plan and have some background in this type of planning. My husband was on the Planning Commission in the City of Sammamish where they had similar issues they had to address.**

It sounds like you and your husband are familiar with the Comprehensive Planning process, as well as the [Stickney v. City of Sammamish](#) case. It certainly strengthened the obligation of cities planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to ensure they could provide for their proportionate share of housing for all income levels.



The Housing Action Plan (HAP) itself has not been drafted at this time. You may have instead read the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#) (HNA), which takes a look at who lives and works in Mukilteo now, and what housing gaps exist for the City's current residents. The HAP is intended to be a strategic plan and set of recommendations for actions to take in the future around housing needs in Mukilteo based on the HNA and community input. It will supplement work on the city's major Comprehensive Plan update (due in 2024), but does not replace it or adopt any policies or zoning changes.

As an aside, the Planning Commission will have a vacancy at the beginning of this year and the City is accepting applications: <https://mukilteowa.gov/news/planning-commission-vacancy-jan2021/>

**2. How much of an affordable housing deficit [do] we have? How does that compare to neighboring communities?**

This is a straightforward question that I wish had a straightforward answer, in large part because we no longer have access to great rental data (the firm that used to do this work for the area dissolved for a well-earned retirement).

The most recent numbers we have for our fair share of affordable housing is from [Snohomish County's 2025 Fair Share Housing Allocation](#) (see page 2), which states that Mukilteo's fair share of low- to moderate-income housing units is 1,537 in 2025. This also gives a snapshot of Mukilteo in comparison to neighboring communities.

For rental households, the draft HNA estimates that as of 2016, there are 1,480 units affordable to households making less than 80% of Area Median Income, or a gap of 57 units that needs to be made up by 2025 under our growth allocation (see document page 46). Unfortunately, we do not have access to similar data for homeowner households, however I would guess that the number of units affordable to those income levels has shrunk since then.

Snohomish County is in the process of updating their allocations, including fair share of housing, and we expect to receive new targets by the end of 2021.

**3. We don't have to accept the entire plan or solve for the entire deficit. Let's look at ways to mitigate the solution. (Mitigate - make less severe, serious, or painful.)**

You are correct that the City has some opportunity to work with the County to adjust targets, and a lot of leeway for how it chooses to meet GMA requirements. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan is required to demonstrate capacity to meet the growth targets, however GMA does not require market manipulation to ensure the growth targets happen as planned (especially since so many factors for development are beyond any city's control).

Snohomish County also recognizes affordable housing as a regional issue with its Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). This will be looked at in more detail once we start work on the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, likely in late 2021 or 2022.



4. **Let's not look just at the revenue this would bring the City of Mukilteo – especially short term, but also look at the total cost of the solution. Once all built, the units will not be bringing in as much revenue, and we will have to provide additional services.**

The HAP makes recommendations for strategies to evaluate further, including whether the adopted strategy makes financial sense. We can note financial analysis as part of the future work for any recommended strategies.

5. **Are there locations/areas that we look at where we can do a little of residential over commercial to solve for this area, but make it into some nice community area AND some additional revenue for the city.**

Potentially – this will be part of Snohomish County's Buildable Lands Report analysis, where they look at existing capacity for housing and jobs under existing zoning. We expect to have preliminary maps later this week. I have let the County know I want to make the maps publicly available as part of the HAP process, so hopefully they can be put on our website shortly.

6. **Look at benchmarking with other communities in the greater Seattle area.**

We will add this to the list of suggested HAP strategies, as well as for whether Council wants to take on benchmarking for the Comprehensive Plan update. It is extremely helpful when implemented well.

7. **Look at sharing the weight with other communities.**

In addition to the countywide policies above, the City does work with the Snohomish County Affordable Housing Alliance (AHA) as well as contributing some funds to affordable housing in the area. You can learn more about how Mukilteo works with AHA on the City's Housing webpage:

<https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/housing/>

I hope that answers your questions, however if I misunderstood please let me know. Have a great week,



## 14. Davis, Richard

*December 30, 2020 9:23 AM – Rich Davis – Via HAP Comment Form*

The multifamily building in Mukilteo is getting out of hand. Traffic, schools, parking and other areas are all impacted negatively. Was there an adjustment to roads and schools to compensate for these large additions? It was it just fine for property tax gain for the city? What mitigations were put in place for this impact? I'm not in agreement with this.



## 15. Everett, Ross

*October 21, 2020 9:50 AM – Ross Everett*

As a Mukilteo resident and father I am slightly concerned about the future of Mukilteo. I read most, not all of the Housing Action Plan from the website and I just want to make sure that Mukilteo doesn't turn into Seattle. Yes I agree the housing prices are high and some people will not be able to afford living here. If you can't afford to live in Mukilteo then you can't afford to live in Mukilteo. We couldn't afford to buy a house so we bought a condo instead. Before that we paid \$500 more a month to live in an apartment in Mukilteo rather than live in North Everett for much cheaper. People will pay more to live in a safer community. Ever since the lower income housing was built across from Safeway on Mukilteo Blvd, my friends and family that live near the complex has seen a significant increase in theft and property damage. It's the old saying you get what you pay for. Lower income units leads to more crime, it doesn't take a genius to know that. We lived in North Creek Apartments in Everett for a year paying substantially less than in Mukilteo, we called the police probably 10 times in that year for people breaking into our cars, or stealing, or fighting. We decided to move to Mukilteo, pay more for a smaller place to have the safety and peace of mind. To know that our son can walk down the sidewalk and not have to worry about a meth head homeless person harassing him. I just hope and pray the Mukilteo City Council doesn't turn Mukilteo into Seattle or Everett. Otherwise we will move somewhere else.

Thank you for taking your time to read my concerns,

*October 21, 2020 6:08 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Your email was forwarded to me today by Ms. Arrington. First, thank you for sending in your comment to the City of Mukilteo. As with all comments we receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the Housing Action Plan (HAP) process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like, and we would encourage you to use the [comment form on the HAP website](#).

It sounds like you may have read the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#), which takes a look at who lives and works in Mukilteo now, and what housing gaps exist for the City's current residents. There are two opportunities coming up to learn more about that document:

1. **Listen to the next Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting:** The next meeting is scheduled for 4 PM on October 29, 2020. The agenda will be online in the [HAP Project Library](#) by the end of the week.
2. **Join us at the November Community Meeting:** We will be hosting a community meeting at 7 PM on November 5, 2020, where you can ask questions and give feedback on the draft Housing Needs Assessment.

There will, of course, be additional opportunities to participate throughout the project. I believe we have you on our mailing list already, but please also keep an eye on the City's website and Facebook page for updates.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance and I hope you have a good week.

## 16. Field, Melanie

### *November 7, 2020 11:04 PM – Melanie Field*

I am not quite sure to whom I am supposed to be sending this. Hope it gets to the right place/person. I should have sent you these right after our meeting. Unfortunately, I got tangled up in other things . . . thus my need to move along. The consultants may have already caught all of these corrections and of course these are based on the version we reviewed at our last Planning Commission meeting (dated Oct 7), so the pages may be hard for them to track at this point. Anyways, I hope that these can be helpful/useful. Below are my corrections/comments:

1. Covid - This is not addressed until page 3, Section 1 - after the executive summary and the introduction. The note at the start of Section 1, on page 3 should appear right at the very beginning of the document.
2. Throughout the document the term median is used. Median family income, median housing price etc. Many people are not really familiar with the concept of median and will assume you mean average/mean. This subtle difference is important and this term should be defined and explained.
3. In the Glossary, Income-Restricted Housing, the first sentence, last word should be "rate" - or "a" just before "below-market" should be deleted.
4. On page 6, Exhibit 3, the bars are not proportional/aligned/accurate. The dark blue Mukilteo bars for 40-49, 50-59 and 60-69, all say 16% but are not at the same height. The two 11% bars, Mukilteo 30-39 and Snohomish County 60-69 are different heights. Same issue with the 14% bars, they are not all at the same height.
5. On page 8, Exhibit 5, has the same kind of problem. 19% in 2015 is less than 19% in 2020 which is less than 19% in 2025, which is less than 18% in 2030. Further, in the first two columns, 20% plus 7% in column one should be higher than 19% plus 6% in column two and it is not.
6. Again, similar problems with Exhibit 6 on page 9. 2% in 2018 is more than 2% in 2010.
7. On page 10, Exhibit 8 uses 4 colors but only two are defined in the key. The two gray tones should also be defined.
8. On page 22, Exhibit 19 includes color coding which is not defined/explained. Also in the key, the Older Adult Family definition is not lined up with the other definitions. I found this particular table difficult to process/follow. Perhaps it is too much information summarized in one chart.
9. On page 24, Exhibit 21 shows the number of homeless people who are permanently housed. I do not understand this term in this context. What does this mean? Are they homeless or do they have permanent housing? How can it be both at the same time?
10. On page 29, the note re Boeing employment might also belong at the beginning of the report. (See





comment 1 above.) Do we have any information about not covered employment? Can that be incorporated into this section in a meaningful way?

11. The "travel to work" section, beginning on page 29, deals with commuting distances. While Boeing is officially in Everett, it is adjacent to Mukilteo. When commuting distances are calculated, is the distance figured as the actual distance to the plant or is some average central Everett distance used? Is Boeing considered "outside" of Mukilteo in Exhibit 29?

12. Can telecommuting be factored into the discussions in this section?

13. On page 40, Exhibit 36 the note indicates that the solid line is information based on Snohomish AND King Counties. The key identifies it as Snohomish County information. The key should be corrected.

14. The rental housing gap section beginning on page 45 determines that there is a gap based on the needs presented in Exhibit 42. There is a discussion that because there is a shortfall of 325 units at the >80% AMI, there is additional pressure for the more moderate priced units putting even more pressure on the lower priced units. I understand this logic. However, the shortfall is 325 units and the next less expensive category shows a surplus of 665 units, far in excess of the shortfall. Therefore, I do not see how this trickles down to additional pressure on the 30-50% AMI category. Furthermore, the Exhibit shows 210 unoccupied units. How does this correspond to the gaps shown in the last column?

15. In Appendix A, Data Sources, the description of the OnTheMap Application mentions sex. I believe gender is a more appropriate term.

16. In Appendix A, Data Sources, the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is included twice. One should be deleted.

17. In Appendix A, Data Sources, the use of abbreviations in parentheses is inconsistent. Parentheses are used correctly in the case of the Washington State Employment Security Department (ESD). This same approach should be used for (ACS), (OSPI), (PSRC), (WCRER), (OFM) etc. The convention is to spell out the full name the first time it is used, followed by the abbreviation in parentheses. From then on, the abbreviated name can be used on its own.

18. Exhibit 2, at the end of the document, should have a different name to distinguish it from Exhibit 2 on page 5. Perhaps it could be titled Appendix B, which could be added to the list of Appendices on page 57.

19. Exhibit 2, at the end of the document, page 2, Summary, third bullet, second sentence "necessary" should be "necessarily".

20. Exhibit 2, page 15, Project Concerns, last bullet, re the school district, the word "note" should be replaced by the word "not".

21. Exhibit 2, page 16, Potential Solutions to Increase Development Capacity, second bullet. I realize that you are summarizing what someone has said, so I am not suggesting that you change the text. However, I feel that I must take issue with their opinion that midtown does not have a unique character. I live there and I can



attest to the fact that midtown does indeed have it's own character.

Thanks for passing these thoughts/notes along.



## 17. Fisher, Georgia

*December 30, 2020 4:41 PM – Georgia Fisher – Via HAP Comment Form*

Mayor, city council and planning not showing positive regard for quality of life/ living environment of Mukilteo home owners. How can city officials betray our trust to build 4 and 5 story apartments within our city? The Vantage Apartments in Harbor Point and soon coming new high density apartments bring congestion, crowded conditions, noise, pollution, increased crime and put a strain on all community services. Mukilteo, the beautiful city by the sea, is being harmed by those with bad intentions.



## 18. Flores, Derek

*December 1, 2020 11:42 PM – Derek Flores*

Provided here are a few general suggestions

### 1) Affordable Housing FHA Requirement

The FHA Loan program is a huge bridge for first time home buyers and renters seeking a home.

You would be surprised how many HOA's don't bother to apply to be FHA approved simply out of laziness.

The city of Mukilteo should make it a requirement for all HOA Condos and Townhomes to be FHA approved or there shall be an annual \$5,000 dollar financial penalty.

### 2) Affordable Housing HOA Rental Cap Termination.

The City of Mukilteo should work with the WA State elected officials to encourage the right for cities to outlaw HOA Rental Caps.

An HOA Rental CAP to allow only a certain percentage of renters to live within an HOA community greatly discriminates against Renters and limits housing affordability.

### 3) Dog Leash and Waste enforcement

The City of Mukilteo should allow the Mukilteo Police, Mukilteo Animal Control, Parking Enforcement, City Park Employees, and even Volunteer citizen patrols to have the authority to fine Dog Leash and Dog Waste Violators.

The current regulations are outdated, There should be an increase in fine for Dog Leash and Dog Waste violators as well

Dog waste is a huge toxin for the health of the community and the Puget Sound Waters.

On the City of Mukilteo Website, please provide this critical WSDA link of information on how citizens can report Asian Giant Hornets.

In general citizens need education regarding the dangerous Asian Giant Hornets as they threaten the lives of Bee Hives and citizens. Citizens need to know how to report sightings.

See link from [www.agr.wa.gov](http://www.agr.wa.gov)

<https://agr.wa.gov/hornets#:~:text=There%20are%20several%20ways%20to,The%20hotline%20is%20backed%20up.>

*December 5, 2020 4:11 PM – Lauren Balisky*

I wanted to acknowledge receipt of your suggestions for the Housing Action Plan (HAP). As with all comments we



receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and again to City Council as the Housing Action Plan (HAP) process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like, and we would encourage you to use the [comment form on the HAP website](#).

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

*December 7, 2020 3:49 PM – Derek Flores*

A BIG THANK YOU !



## 19. Foltz, Richard

### *September 2, 2020 6:08 AM – Richard Foltz – Via HAP Comment Form*

Will all construction under HAP be in accordance with current building guidelines in Mukilteo - i.e. no more than 35 feet in height, max. 22 units per acre, two parking spaces per unit, etc.?

### *September 3, 2020 11:13 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for your question. The Housing Action Plan (HAP) does not have any development applications associated with it. This means that no housing construction is proposed nor will any housing construction be approved as part of the HAP itself.

That said, anyone who submits an application to the City must demonstrate that the proposal meets all current regulations, including height, setbacks, density, parking and landscaping as well as minimum building and fire safety standards.

Currently, only one zone permits 22 dwelling units per acre, which is the MR Multi-Family Residential Zone. As you can see on our online [Zoning Map](#), this zone is depicted in dark brown. These areas are already fully developed, so we do not anticipate additional development in these areas in the near future.

Please let me know if we can be of any further assistance.



## 20. Gold, Morgan

*December 1, 2020 12:29 PM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form*

Think you should rezone midtown from 12.5 to 9.6 or 7.5. Then allow people to build a stand alone detached accessory dwelling unit on their 12.5 lot. These would be more affordable than regular homes but would keep the neighborhood feel of midtown intact. Plus the owner of the home has the most to lose with bad tenants, so they would screen renters better.



## 21. Goodrich, Matthew

*September 7, 2020 4:56 PM – Matthew Goodrich – Via HAP Comment Form*

Hello, I'm writing now to voice my objection to further residential development where there will be fewer than 2 parking spaces per unit. Parking spaces should also be titled with the unit to avoid the potential of separation from the unit during a sale. I'm also opposed to residential development of greater than 22 residences per acre as well as building being over 35 feet tall.





## 22. Goosman, Gene

*December 4, 2020 9:56 AM – Gene Goosman – Via HAP Comment Form*

I live at {redacted} in Mukilteo. About a year ago there was a city council meeting to discuss the growth of Mukilteo, especially the ex-Boeing facility. At the time the developer (?) made a very lame appearance and was somewhat insulting. The city board did not dig into the speakers real intentions. Now it appears that the change of use for this property was snuck through. Is someone getting paid off? I just don't get the boards intentions. That entire area should be made into a park for future families to enjoy. The speedway is getting loaded up with apartments and traffic is just going to get worse. Why do this to Mukilteo?

*December 5, 2020 4:06 PM – Lauren Balisky*

You are correct that there was a request on the preliminary docket to change the future land use designation and zoning for the Boeing Technical Center last year. The preliminary docket is a process where anyone from the public, staff and City Council can make suggestions for changes to land use designations, zoning, or development regulations. City Council holds a public hearing, and determine which items warrant further study. These items are then placed on the "final docket" for formal application and review.

For this particular request, City Council voted to **not** place the request on the final docket, and it did not move any further (see minutes for the [April 1, 2019 City Council Meeting](#)).

The property has since sold to [Systima Technologies](#), and we do not anticipate that they would request a rezone for a use incompatible with their business.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

*December 6, 2020 9:48 AM – Gene Goosman*

Thank you for your quick response and for explaining the process and what happened.

## 23. Gregg, Leslie

### *December 7, 2020 1:54 PM – Leslie Gregg – Via HAP Comment Form*

I provided multiple comments to the extent possible in the Zoom format at the November 5, 2020 meeting on the draft Housing Needs Assessment. However, it is uncertain as to any actions taken in regard to the comments previously provided by the multiple attendees. I will attempt to once again summarize concerns I presented, as well as additional concerns the format did not permit an opportunity to present.

1. Approximately 500 Mukilteo residents have gone on record as opposing the HAP. Many of these residents (or perhaps all of them) hold financial investments in Mukilteo in the form of ownership of a single-family home, and they do not approve of the HAP or any changes in zoning requirements which will increase the density of housing or introduce low cost housing in the future. Past investments in this community were made by existing residents because the single-family home nature of the community. For many people, the purchase of their home will be their biggest investment of a lifetime. Changing zoning requirements to turn this community into more of an urban area in lieu of a suburban area will decrease the value of the existing single family home properties, thereby harming people already invested in this community. We are already dealing with the adverse impact on home prices as a result of the increased noise from the Paine Field Commercial Airport expansion. Changing the housing nature of the community will only worsen the financial adverse impact.
2. Just because a person wants to live in Mukilteo, does not mean that the current property owners must financially subsidize these people (by accepting conditions that lower their property value and quality of life) so they can make that move. There are many cities to choose to live in from the immediate surrounding Metropolitan area within reasonable commute distances. This community is not responsible for assuring that every individual in every economic category who desires to live in Mukilteo has a cheap enough abode to live in. Individuals are responsible for their personal finances and for living within their means.
3. The draft Housing Needs Assessment was outdated the day it was published. Major factors influencing the needs assessments can wildly swing the final answer, particularly in this volatile time. The prices and available inventory of homes are significantly influenced by the number of high-wage employment opportunities in the area, as well as the credit and interest rate markets. There will be wild swings in affordability of housing in the near future, depending on how these factors play out. COVID-19, Boeing relocation of certain aircraft production lines out of state, Federal Reserve's artificial influences on mortgage interest rates, and the unfettered violence and blight permitted in Seattle (causing relocation of city dwellers to suburbia) all will dramatically impact the answer of Mukilteo Housing Needs up or down. A highly volatile time governed by today's highly impactful, yet mostly transient, challenges is a bad time to make long-term plans on housing for this community, especially when multiple, major influencing scenarios are not considered.
4. The draft Housing Needs Assessment needs to specifically address how the "needs" were derived. Residents should not be expected to accept the recommendations on pure "faith." I addressed this in the ZOOM meeting, but the consultant said we can look at the State requirements which are required to be used. I believe the report should be self-contained so that the residents of Mukilteo can fully understand how the conclusions were derived



without spending their personal time and energy. The taxpayers, who paid for the consultant report with their tax funds, should not be expected to try to “reverse engineer” the report to figure out how the requirements were determined. The residents of this city are not paid to do this research – therefore the report should serve us – not the other way around.

5. Hasn't the Federal Government already reversed the specific Federal Fair Housing Rules that drove this so-called requirement and needs study? If this is true, then why are we proceeding when the community is not in favor of it? Shouldn't the entire community be inventoried to determine how many more residents, in addition to the original 500 cited in item #1 above, do not agree with the HAP before spending any more time and funds on this?

6. Why doesn't the draft Housing Needs Assessment focus on availability in the greater metropolitan area surrounding Mukilteo? If surplus and/or affordable housing is available within a reasonable commute, why does Mukilteo need to waste our funds on this? In addition, as the needs are determined, it must also be factored in that many people who work in Mukilteo will not want to live here. They may wish to live with their family members, all of whom may work in multiple locations outside of Mukilteo.

7. Draft HAP report Key Finding – Page viii – “Despite this slow growth, housing inventory in Mukilteo is below a balanced market, with a homeowner vacancy rate of 0.0%.” With an average annual growth rate of 0.3% in Mukilteo, the “below a balanced market” seems insignificant. It would also appear that normal market forces will work this out within Mukilteo, along with the surrounding Metropolitan area influences. In addition, such a small imbalance hardly seems worth the adverse financial impact to existing residents invested in this community.

8. Draft HAP report Key Finding - Page xi – “About 3,130 residents in Mukilteo, or 15% of the population are currently adults over the age of 65. Over the next ten (10) years, a little over 4,000 residents, or 19% of the population, will become older adults. 36% of existing older adult households in Mukilteo are cost-burdened and 36% are low income households. If residents want to stay in Mukilteo as they age, many will be unable to meet their housing needs under current market condition.” Is it a right for people who cannot afford to stay in Mukilteo to stay in Mukilteo, or do they need to move to a location they can afford? As people age, they will most likely move in with family if they are unable to care for themselves in their own home. Furthermore, not every elderly person will want to move out of their existing home. Some elderly who are financially stressed will choose other options, such as staying in their homes and renting out a room to make ends meet. Given the high average income per residence in Mukilteo, it is hard to believe that most of the elderly will not be able to make their own decisions on their living arrangements in their advanced years without assistance from the city.

*December 8, 2020 11:47 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for sending in additional comments regarding the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#) (HNA) and the Community Meeting on November 5, 2020. We have posted a meeting summary, including responses to comments in the chat box, on the [HAP Project Library webpage](#). We are waiting to see if any updated data is released in early 2021 before posting an updated draft of the HNA.



In response to your specific comments:

**1. RE: Investment in single-family community.**

Staff does not anticipate that the HAP will recommend rezoning any property based on community feedback to date. It is important to note that the HAP itself does not change any zoning, development regulations or long-range policies of the City – it is a set of recommended future actions to facilitate construction and retention of market-rate housing.

**2. Mukilteans not responsible for ensuring housing is available for every income level.**

Mukilteo is required to plan for our proportionate share of housing for all income levels under Washington State law. For housing, we are required to adopt a “housing element” in our long-range planning document for the City, also known as [Mukilteo’s Comprehensive Plan](#).

Specifically [the Growth Management Act states that](#):

... Each comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design for each of the following:...

(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that:

(a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth;

(b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences;

(c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and

(d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

In counties and cities subject to the review and evaluation requirements of RCW [36.70A.215](#), any revision to the housing element shall include consideration of prior review and evaluation reports and any reasonable measures identified.

Additional information on proportionate share can be found in the response to Chat Question 6 in the [Community Meeting #1 Summary](#).

**3. The draft Housing Needs Assessment was outdated the day it was published.**

You are correct that the data in any study is outdated the moment it is published; our role is to use the best available information to make the best possible decisions we can at any point in time. Staff has directed BERK to check for data updates for the HNA prior to completing the draft HAP for public review, and to better explain what information is (and is not) available. At this point in time, no organization has



enough information to know with certainty how the pandemic and decisions by Boeing will impact the region.

**4. Residents should not be expected to “reverse engineer” the report.**

We took this under consideration, and at this time felt it was best not to duplicate the requirements of state law, the grant documentation, or the guidance for completing the work within the Housing Needs Assessment or Housing Action Plan documents. All of this guidance is available in the HAP Project Library webpage and easily accessible.

**5. Hasn’t the Federal Government already reversed the specific Federal Fair Housing Rules that drove this so-called requirement and needs study?**

The opportunity to use grant funds for a Housing Needs Assessment and strategic Housing Action Plan stemmed from the Washington State legislature, not the federal government. The specific requirements in state law ([RCW 36.70A.600\(2\)](#)) are:

(2) A city planning pursuant to RCW [36.70A.040](#) may adopt a housing action plan as described in this subsection. The goal of any such housing plan must be to encourage construction of additional affordable and market rate housing in a greater variety of housing types and at prices that are accessible to a greater variety of incomes, including strategies aimed at the for-profit single-family home market. A housing action plan may utilize data compiled pursuant to RCW [36.70A.610](#). The housing action plan should:

- (a) Quantify existing and projected housing needs for all income levels, including extremely low-income households, with documentation of housing and household characteristics, and cost-burdened households;
- (b) Develop strategies to increase the supply of housing, and variety of housing types, needed to serve the housing needs identified in (a) of this subsection;
- (c) Analyze population and employment trends, with documentation of projections;
- (d) Consider strategies to minimize displacement of low-income residents resulting from redevelopment;
- (e) Review and evaluate the current housing element adopted pursuant to RCW [36.70A.070](#), including an evaluation of success in attaining planned housing types and units, achievement of goals and policies, and implementation of the schedule of programs and actions;
- (f) Provide for participation and input from community members, community groups, local builders, local realtors, nonprofit housing advocates, and local religious groups; and
- (g) Include a schedule of programs and actions to implement the recommendations of the housing action plan.



The grant allows the City to get a head start on meeting requirements (2)(a) and (d) of the Housing Element and start community outreach as part of the major Comprehensive Plan update required in 2024.

**6. Why doesn't the draft Housing Needs Assessment focus on availability in the greater metropolitan area surrounding Mukilteo?**

This information can also be found in the response to Chat Question 6 in the [Community Meeting #1 Summary](#).

**7. A 0.0% housing imbalance hardly seems worth the adverse financial impact to existing residents invested in this community.**

Having a balanced vacancy rate is extremely important for affordability. When vacancy rates are low, it drives up competition and costs for housing. In turn, higher-income earners take over a larger share of the market, and rather than occupying a unit that meets their preferences or needs, are occupying what would normally be a lower-income unit, making those formerly affordable units either unaffordable and/or unavailable.

UW provides rental market data for counties and the Snohomish County rental vacancy rate is 5.2%, which is typical of a healthy housing market. When vacancy falls below 5% it is considered a tight housing market, and when vacancy falls below 3% this is characterized as an acute shortage of rental units. It is likely Mukilteo's vacancy rate is even lower than in the County.

The goal of the HAP is not to develop low-income or subsidized housing, it is to try to find strategies around market-income housing units in order to reduce the downstream pressure on otherwise affordable units.

**8. RE: Housing choice for seniors, and whether it is a right for people who cannot afford to stay in Mukilteo to stay in Mukilteo, or do they need to move to a location they can afford?**

You are correct that there will always be an element of personal choice in market-rate housing. The BERK team is updating the draft HNA to reflect this feedback.

The other piece to this is not whether the City is subsidizing the ability of seniors to stay (at this point, it is not and there are no plans to). It is whether there is adequate variety and availability of housing for seniors to be able to stay should they choose to and can afford to.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

*December 8, 2020 12:40 PM – Leslie Gregg*

Thank you, Lauren, for your comments. I realize it takes time to respond, and I appreciate your efforts. I have a few follow-up comments for the city to consider, listed in the same order you presented your comments. If these can be posted as supplements to my official public comment, I would appreciate it.



1. I was aware that the HAP does not change zoning (this was discussed in prior meetings), however, to deal with HAP recommendations, zoning changes will inevitably have to occur. That is the concern of residents, and we are apparently suppose to just take it on "faith" that rezoning won't occur. Most of us understand that rezoning will have to be the final outcome when recommendations are implemented, and we have no way of knowing today how that will impact us. If there is to be no rezoning, then the study is a waste of time and funds, because its objectives will not be achieved.
2. I understand the need to have a variety of housing, but my intended point was that the existing residents already invested in this community should not have their investments adversely impacted by building high density units within single family neighborhoods. Perhaps I could have expressed my point better.
3. Perhaps requirements should be determined under a number of different scenarios, because the future could be drastically affected positively or negatively in our highly uncertain environment. Then the community could express opinions on which scenario is most likely to occur.
4. I looked at some of the guidance on the Library prior to attending the last meeting on Nov 5, and I have to say expecting the residents to reconstruct all the rationale in deriving the report recommendations is unreasonable. If the work was done by the hired consultants, providing the analyses as appendices to the report should not be a problem. Establishing realistic future requirements is essential to determining appropriate future decisions by City Council.
5. I was aware of the State requirements, as I read it prior to the Nov 5 report. However, wasn't the former Federal requirement driving the State requirement? If so, isn't it all moot?
6. Again, your response seems to further confirm my concern that the HAP is useless for making decisions today that will drive future activity in this community. I sincerely do not mean for the following statement to be sarcasm, but there is a saying - "Garbage in, garbage out."
7. It is difficult to believe in the first place that Mukilteo has a 0.0% homeowner vacancy rate. Even if true, with only a 0.3% growth rate (a rate that cannot be proven to continue given today's extreme conditions), I still believe market forces within Mukilteo, along with the surrounding communities, will work things out. Mukilteo cannot be looked at as a self-contained municipality when so many cities surround us with multiple housing options.
8. If there are multiple options within the surrounding metropolitan area for the elderly to consider, building more units within Mukilteo would be a waste as we cannot guarantee they would be occupied. We have no idea who would stay and who would go, so allotting units for this purpose, could result in overbuilding beyond what the market will truly bear. These requirements must be very carefully, and realistically considered.

Thank you for your consideration,

*December 8, 2020 7:09 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for expanding on your comments, I hope I can clarify some more in turn. I do want to thank you for taking the time to read the documents and provide detailed feedback.

To ensure we are speaking the same language in this conversation:

- Zoning is the zoning designation assigned to any particular parcel;
- Development regulations are the what and how that is allowed on any particular parcel;
- Affordable housing is housing that is affordable to the person or household in it (spending 30% or less of income on direct housing costs – relative to yourself);
- Subsidized housing is housing that has some kind of rent subsidy, whether that is voucher (Section 8) or a place with subsidized units (Carvel, Vantage).

**1. Zoning changes are inevitable with the HAP.**

I respectfully disagree – the City currently has capacity to meet its existing 2035 growth targets, and while I certainly expect the City will be assigned more growth as part of the 2021 Buildable Lands update and Snohomish County 2044 growth target allocation process, as of today I do not expect it to be an astronomical change from where we are today.

Until we have those growth allocation numbers at the end of 2021, Mukilteo will not know whether it needs to consider any rezones. I would also expect that capacity can be absorbed with tweaks to existing development regulations rather than wholesale rezones. The County is in the very early stages of that process so at this point I do not have a good idea of what that will look like for Mukilteo.

I also respectfully disagree that it is a waste of funds – we are required to do the work in the Housing Needs Assessment and public outreach as part of the 2024 update, and this gives us a significant head start on a complicated conversation. I am personally glad we have more time and support to do this work, even though the conversation is hard.

**2. Existing residents should not have their investments adversely impacted by building high density units within single family neighborhoods.**

I can absolutely empathize with the concern behind this, and why it is a touchpoint for many. I want to be clear that staff has no intention of proposing anything so drastic as rezoning low-density single-family into high-density multi-family.

If anything, and if the growth allocation warrants it, I would expect a very scaled-down version of this to be discussed with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update.

**3. Perhaps requirements should be determined under a number of different scenarios, because the future could be drastically affected positively or negatively in our highly uncertain environment. Then the community could express opinions on which scenario is most likely to occur.**

We have asked BERK to address this uncertainty with the next update of the HNA, to the extent possible. The scenarios conversation will be ongoing through the 2024 update, as we get into a much higher level of detail than the HAP.



**4. The rationale in deriving the report recommendations is unclear.**

If I understand correctly, you are asking for a clearer a) requirement; b) data; c) analysis; d) recommendation path for the items in the HNA? I think it is reasonable to provide a clearer walkthrough, along with links to additional information for those who want it. We will work with BERK to see what we can do.

**5. I was aware of the State requirements, as I read it prior to the Nov 5 report. However, wasn't the former Federal requirement driving the State requirement? If so, isn't it all moot?**

I am assuming that you are referring to the rollback of requirements around low-income / subsidized housing and equity reporting for jurisdictions receiving HUD funds? If you are referring to something else, please let me know.

Again, the short answer is no – states have significant control over their local planning efforts. The Washington State legislature has been very active the last few years around trying to make housing more affordable and available. The initial version of the law that resulted in Mukilteo pursuing a HAP included a list of mandates. Ultimately the legislature adopted a version that included either mandates or the HAP, with a grant funding incentive. Mukilteo chose the HAP to facilitate a housing conversation instead of being required to complete an update that the community may not want or support.

**6. Again, your response seems to further confirm my concern that the HAP is useless for making decisions today that will drive future activity in this community. I sincerely do not mean for the following statement to be sarcasm, but there is a saying - "Garbage in, garbage out."**

The HAP does not focus on providing subsidized housing for the greater metropolitan area because that is not the focus of the legislation or the grant funding. Mukilteo is required to plan for itself and demonstrate it meets the requirements of the Growth Management Act. The HAP is focused on how to improve our existing regulations, policies and programs for market-rate housing, since that is what the City can influence without significant subsidy.

**7. It is difficult to believe the vacancy data. Even if true, I still believe market forces within Mukilteo will work things out.**

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment data does not currently support this – the region has been underproducing housing for some time now. I would recommend the [PSRC Regional Housing Strategy website](#) as a great resource for more information on this topic.

**8. There are opportunities for seniors elsewhere – why would we build senior-specific housing?**

I would like to clarify that I was not talking about senior-specific housing (e.g. age restricted, supportive housing, retirement housing, etc.) – more about other housing types (without such restrictions) that people may find more appropriate for their lifestyle or a different stage in their life. So far the public comments received around senior housing have more to do with having options. I have yet to meet anyone in my professional or personal life who wants to be in a “home”!



Have a great evening, and please let me know if I misunderstood any of your responses or if you have additional questions.

*December 9, 2020 9:36 AM – Leslie Gregg*

I provide the following comments in the same sequential order:

Comments 1 and 2 - The residents are being asked to accept a leap of faith on the final outcomes with changing higher level requirements (county/state). I doubt residents will feel comfortable with any discussions in this matter when we have so many changing baseline requirements (pushed down from county/state) and we ultimately do not know the "end game."

Comment 4 - Yes, I feel the report should reflect exactly how the requirements were derived. To come up with the requirements, the consultant had to do an analysis, and we would like to see the details of the analysis in order to understand if the conclusions reached are correct and reasonable. We must be comfortable that the requirements are defined correctly before we can assess if any city decisions in addressing the requirements are reasonable. In addition, as this report projects into the future, we need to understand if the base assumptions/data supporting the recommendations have changed, and hence, the requirements should change as time goes on. Due diligence must be made to assure the City Council does not make decisions based on outdated or incorrect information as time goes on.

Comment 6 - Requirements must be correctly defined before meaningful decisions are made to address the requirements. If the requirements are incorrect based on dramatically changing impacts as previously discussed in my comments, then any decisions made to address potentially falsely defined requirements will push this city into actions that are meaningless. That is my reference to "garbage in, garbage out." Perhaps addressing multiple scenarios will help move the city in the right direction, but that is yet to be seen.

That's all, and thank you again.

*December 9, 2020 4:24 PM – Lauren Balisky*

I believe I am understanding your first comment better. There are lots of leaps of faith right now, which I suppose can make this particular leap of faith one too many. Knowing that it is a normal part of the long-range planning process does not necessarily make it any easier either. So while the requirements (and our communities) are always changing, and sometimes uncomfortably so, we have a choice: will we be proactive, and will we focus on what we can control?

Staff's goal is to be as transparent and communicative about this project and the upcoming 2024 Comprehensive Plan update as possible. I do not expect everyone to agree with everything, but I would hope that there is plenty of opportunity for awareness and input. That input, disagreement and discussion ultimately makes the set of recommended future actions in the HAP better. I find it extremely unfortunate that so many of this project's resources have been put to managing misinformation rather than on the conversation itself.



Given that Mukilteo is required to plan for its future, to me the HAP is about better understanding what is even on the table for the 2024 Update – our resources are so limited that we will need to focus on what we *can* accomplish. Ideally, Mukilteo is making the changes it wants to on the timeline that makes sense for the City, rather than scrambling to meet a mandate. “We have met the intent of this requirement in other ways – see examples A, B, and C” is much more compelling to the Legislature than “we don’t want to” when trying to argue for flexibility on a proposed mandate.

With that in mind, and as we move towards discussing potential strategy recommendations, we would love to hear from you what kind of adjustments you would be willing to support. The Stakeholder Advisory Group will be going over some preliminary ideas at their meeting tomorrow (open to the public to watch live or as a recording); and we will also be seeking feedback at a Community Meeting in mid-January.

I will make sure BERK has a copy of your clarifications on Comment 4 and Comment 6.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance, and I hope you have a lovely evening.



## 24. Grimes, David

*February 16, 2020 2:48 PM – David Grimes*

I'm a mukilteo resident and read in the beacon the city got a grant for studying housing aspects in our community. I believe my neighbor and i have a unique situation, but one that might translate to something pertinent the city might find helpful in thier study. This might include not really a "mother in law" housing situation, but possibly "little houses" and air b&b rental.

I am discussing some options with my neighbor currently.

If the company or group doing the study has not already decided on the report they are going to produce, and they do decide to utilize our situation in the study, i would appreciate a way be found where the city could get some of the grant moneys to us community residents for our efforts and involvement.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

*February 18, 2020 8:32 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for reaching out and letting me know of your interest. The City is still in the process of selecting a consultant, so in the meantime I have made a note to bring this up once we get started.

*July 1, 2020 2:52 PM – Lauren Balisky*

The City Council will be discussing the consultant contract for the Housing Action Plan this coming Monday evening if you are interested.

The meeting materials and link to participate online are available on the City's website: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736).



## 25. Johnson, Joan

*September 2, 2020 9:05 AM – Joan Johnson – Via HAP Comment Form*

Parking will be critical if you wish to increase the amount of apartments in Mukilteo. Besides being unattractive buildings, have you included parking for the residents? There should be 2 parking places for each apartment, and there should be attractive landscaping surrounding the buildings you wish to put in our lovely town.

*September 3, 2020 11:24 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for your question. The Housing Action Plan (HAP) does not have any development applications associated with it. This means that no housing construction is proposed nor will any housing construction be approved as part of the HAP itself.

Currently, the Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) requires the following parking for multi-family development:

**17.56.040 Spaces required.**

The required number of off-street parking spaces is as set out in Table 17.56.040.

**Table 17.56.040: Off-Street Parking Requirements**

Use Classification	Number of Spaces Required
21. Multiple-family dwellings, except retirement housing	2 per dwelling unit *1.5 per studio or 1 bedroom unit; 2 per 2 or more bedroom units; plus 1 per every 4 units for guest parking

All new multi-family developments are also required to provide landscaping. The amount of landscaping depends where on the property the landscaping is located, and what use(s) are adjacent. In general, 25 ft. of landscaping is required at the street, 10 ft. is required between multi-family and single-family zones, and additional landscaping and screening is required around storage, parking and garbage/waste areas. Our landscaping requirements can be found in [MMC Chapter 17.58](#) if you want to read more.

Please let me know if we can be of any further assistance.



## 26. Johnson, Kyle

*July 6, 2020 1:16 PM – Kyle Johnson*

Dear City Council,

Mukilteo already has enough multifamily projects and a housing density that is too high.

As a tax paying citizen (own a home and pay property taxes), with 3 kids in the Mukilteo School District, I strongly oppose paying an outside consulting firm with no ties to Mukilteo to study our housing needs..

Hiring a consulting firm (Berk Consulting) is an absurd waste of money in a time when the city needs to focus its spend on other important initiatives. There is an opportunity cost for this wasteful spend. Let's spend the money working on our parks, our trails, and our waterfront.

I oppose any additional measures to bring more multifamily projects to the city. Please vote against this wasteful spending and stop the Housing Action Plan now.

Thank you for the time.



## 27. Keller, Patrick

*December 30, 2020 9:15 AM – Patrick Keller – Via HAP Comment Form*

Please stop all of the high density housing in Mukilteo. Not only are they an eye sore for the city, there is no space. Existing locations have vehicles spilling all over the side streets. This is NOT Seattle, stop making a mess of our community. This needs to end! If you insist upon creating housing in Mukilteo when it is not asked for by the citizens here, please put it up for vote.



## 28. Kirkwall, Scott

*November 3, 2020 2:38 PM – Scott Kirkwall – Via HAP Comment Form*

With all our housing challenges it seems very wasteful to have parts of the city zoned for only 3 houses per acre. Changing that to 5 or 6 units per acre would make more housing but not change the character of our single family neighborhoods.





## 29. Kirsch, Shaina

*July 6, 2020 11:17 AM – Shaina Kirsch*

Dear Mayor Gregerson and the members of City of Mukilteo City Council,

Please reconsider moving forward with hiring Berk Consulting or any company for HAP. The people and homeowners of Mukilteo have not had the opportunity to vote on this project, and something like this that would ruin the culture and value of Mukilteo should be voted on by the people.

Affordable housing is already available in our area at The Vantage Apartments across from Safeway (formerly Albertsons) and they are adding on to those. Those apartments have brought more children to our already crowded schools, crowded our streets, crowded our stores, depleted resources, you see people holding signs begging on the street corners, not to mention crime, drugs, including needles being found in area parks, homeless living in the surrounding woods, and theft are up. A murderer even lived there. We do not need to provide affordable housing in Mukilteo, because unfortunately all of the mentioned things above come with affordable housing. Our area is already over saturated. Furthermore, we want to keep the value of our homes and live in a safe city.

I understand that you may have your own opinions about this project, but you have been entrusted by the people of Mukilteo to involve them and make good choices for our city. Please involve citizens of Mukilteo with the opportunity to make the decision and add the HAP to the November 2020 ballot to be voted on by the people so the majority of the vote can determine which direction this project goes.

I have lived in Mukilteo since 1999, I graduated from Kamiak High School in 2003. I have stayed in Mukilteo to raise my own children, because of the good schools, safety, character, and culture here. I worked hard as a single mother to be able to afford a home in this area. If people want to live here I suggest they do the same. I'd hate to see the value and safety of Mukilteo decline.

Please take all of this into consideration.



### 30. Knapp, Elaine

*January 29, 2020 5:01 PM – Elaine Knapp*

Can you help me with more information about the affordable housing grant that was mentioned in the Beacon today?

I would like to see more affordable housing in our city.

*January 30, 2020 12:15 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for contacting the City of Mukilteo about the affordable housing grant. Director Osaki forwarded your email to me for a response. I am going to provide a summary about what the grant is for; however if you have additional questions please feel free to ask.

The 2019 Legislature provided the opportunity for local jurisdictions to obtain grant funding to evaluate housing availability, affordability, and other issues through a Housing Action Plan (HAP). The City applied for, and received, the maximum \$100,000 grant from the Washington State Department of Commerce for this project.

The legislation encourages the HAP to:

- Research existing and projected housing needs for all income levels;
- Analyze local population and employment trends;
- Review existing plans, policies, and regulations adopted by the City;
- Provide for participation and input from the community;
- Develop a prioritized list of recommended actions and strategies that could:
  - o Increase the supply and variety of housing;
  - o Minimize displacement of lower-income residents due to redevelopment; and
  - o Reduce barriers to development in the permitting process.

The City is required to adopt the HAP by June 2021. Individual recommendations from the HAP, such as specific changes to development regulations, would then be implemented over the upcoming years, with their own public process.

If you would like to be added to the list for notifications for this project, please let me know and I will make sure you are added.



*January 30, 2020 2:16 PM – Elaine Knapp*

I would like to be added to the invite list.

If we were awarded the grant, then it would seem to me that we need to utilize the funds. But the article in the Beacon made it appear that if some of the Council object, we could not do so. Can you explain next steps?

*January 30, 2020 2:26 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Consider yourself added to the list.

When the City is awarded grant funds, City Council is required to authorize the Mayor to accept the funds when it is over a certain dollar threshold. In this case, Council voted 4-3 to accept the funds. Next steps would be getting a consultant on board (with Council approval) and then beginning the work.

Theoretically, if 4 Councilmembers reject the consultant, we would be unable to move forward with the project. They could also choose not to adopt the HAP by the state deadline, which may result in some consequences from the Department of Commerce. Both scenarios are unlikely.

At this point, we are still working on getting a consultant on board. Once that happens, we hope to do a lot of public outreach in addition to research and evaluation of existing plans and regulations to think through what may be the best strategies for Mukilteo.

*January 30, 2020 5:17 PM – Elaine Knapp*

Thank you for the explanation,

*February 4, 2020 1:01 PM – Elaine Knapp*

I don't mean to be a pest, but have had some email communication from some down my way that this grant or requesting it, was not run by the general public.

I am in favor of affordable housing, and perhaps, there wasn't a need to run it by the public. or will it be run by the public in the future?

Can you shed any light on this for me?

*February 4, 2020 2:26 PM – Lauren Balisky*

You are always welcome to ask questions, and I sincerely appreciate that you are taking the time to ask!

It is not typical for jurisdictions to request input on whether to apply for grant funding, or to hold public hearings



on whether to accept funding. Many, but not all, projects that receive grant funding require a public input component in order to qualify for the funding. Many projects (especially land use and large construction projects) would also require public input as part of the plan update or permitting process, regardless of whether or not there were grant dollars involved.

For the HAP specifically, we plan to seek public input before drafting the plan, and then again through the public hearing process with the Planning Commission and City Council. There will be multiple opportunities and methods for participation; however until we have a team on board I cannot tell you with certainty what that will look like.

Initial public outreach is tentatively scheduled to begin this summer and will continue throughout the process, until a final Council decision in June 2021.

It may also be helpful to know that the HAP itself does not change any of the development regulations already in place – the goal is to evaluate existing conditions and make recommendations for ways to reduce barriers to affordable and market rate housing. Any future changes to development regulations would also have a separate public process and opportunities to participate.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can answer.

*February 4, 2020 3:17 PM – Elaine Knapp*

Thank You.

I will use this information to respond to neighbors here in Old Town.

*July 1, 2020 2:50 PM – Lauren Balisky*

The City Council will be discussing the consultant contract for the Housing Action Plan this coming Monday evening if you are interested.

The meeting materials and link to participate online are available on the City's website: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736).



### 31. Kunthara, Joseph

*December 6, 2020 12:59 PM – Joseph Kunthara – Via HAP Comment Form*

My name is Joseph Kunthara a long time resident of Mukilteo. My family and I care about Mukilteo and the community around us. We also care about the affordable housing for the needy citizens of our community.

But, I question about the HAP project the city is going to introduce into our community. The projects of this kind is well suited for larger cities with larger areas and population. Besides, the projects for this kind should be well thought out and planned because once it's implemented the impact it will have on the community is irreversible for the existing community. Hence, I urge the city to abandon the idea of introducing HAP in our city.

*December 8, 2020 8:27 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for your comment. I would like to clarify what the Housing Action Plan (HAP) is, and what it is not.

The HAP is intended to be a strategic plan and set of recommendations for actions to take in the future around housing needs in Mukilteo based on the Housing Needs Assessment and community input. It will supplement work on the city's major Comprehensive Plan update (due in 2024), but does not replace it or adopt any policies or zoning changes. The HAP also does not have any development applications associated with it. This means that no housing construction is proposed nor will any housing construction be approved as part of the HAP itself.

One distinction that is important to understand is that affordable housing and low-income housing are not the same:

- Affordable housing is housing that is affordable to whoever is in it – meaning that household, at that point in time, is not paying more than 30% of their income on rent/mortgage plus utilities.
- Low-income housing is housing that is subsidized in some way for people making 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI). This can be in the form of programs (such as Section 8 vouchers) or places (like Vantage and Carvel, which both offer a portion of their apartments at below-market-rate rents).

The HAP is focused on strategies around market-rate housing, not low-income housing.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance, and I hope you have a great week.



## 32. Labarre, Cheryl

*November 5, 2020 5:14 PM – Cheryl Labarre*

As a resident of Mukilteo, I strongly agree that our community should offer affordable housing solutions to all those in need. What a difference it would make to many of those holding down jobs in Mukilteo to be able to live in Mukilteo and to send their children to our excellent schools. What a difference it would make for less traffic on the speedway. And yes, it is crucial to plan for lower income elderly housing. We can't afford to wait until the last minute. The elder affected might be someone you love.

Why not become a model city that wants to fight and prevent homelessness? Why not show empathy and understanding during these difficult times? Lower income housing can and should be designed as beautiful and functional. Let us step up to the plate and welcome all who make Mukilteo a fine city.



### 33. Laroche, Amy

*September 12, 2020 4:31 PM – Amy Laroche – Via HAP Comment Form*

For Mukilteo is planning to build more income qualified housing units. My first concern is you will destroy the distinguish as "Mukilteo" for it character and it's historic scenery. Secondly, if there are not adequate parking spaces for the new housing, It is a Real Nightmare. A couple years ago, my husband came back home around 2:00 am after a business trip, but couldn't find a packing space ( At On The Green Apartment). Finally, he found a spot next to a handicap. So he parked his car, a bit over the handicap line. He was so tired after a long trip, and it was raining and he had driven around most of the parking lots, but with no luck for a empty slot.

Next morning, my husband got up at 8am to move his car. A ticket was sitting at the front windshield. The ticket was issued at 2:40am. The price was \$400. Thanks for the police working so hard as well. So, if you can't provide adequate parking space, Nightmares will come soon.



### 34. Lin, Ly

#### *September 6, 2020 6:19 AM – Ly Lin – Via HAP Comment Form*

Please hear my important concerns listed below:

- 1) I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have less than two parking spots per residence. The parking spots must be bound to the residence by title and not legally separated from ownership of the residence.
- 2) I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that has more than 22 residence per acre of land.
- 3) I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have a building height of greater than 35 feet.

#### *December 30, 2020 6:33 AM – Ly Lin – Via HAP Comment Form*

Horrible development in the Vantage apartment complex on the Speedway.

Note it is 5 stories! We don't want more than 2 stories in Mukilteo. The height is about 70 feet off of the low side.

We don't want more than 30 feet. The density (residence per acre) is hard to calculate but I will when I can. There is almost no parking. Note that another similar monstrosity is going up on the Bev Park side to completely obliterate the parking lot. We don't want this to be the future of Mukilteo. Please HEAR us out!!





### 35. Lynn, Daniel

*July 6, 2020 10:24 AM – Daniel Lynn*

Dear City Clerk and City Council Members,

It was only 7 months ago when the \$240 million capital bond proposition for Mukilteo School District passed (increasing taxes). One of the main reasons the proposition was brought to voters was that the schools were crowded and needed expansion. Why would additional housing (HAP) even be considered for this reason alone?

Please delay any action, including consulting assessment with Berk; bring this decision to voters in the community.

*September 9, 2020 10:48 AM – Daniel Lynn – Via HAP Comment Form*

I DO NOT support and oppose the HAP proposed residential projects. The voters just approved a new grant for school expansion due to over crowding. Mukilteo is over crowded and additional non-property tax paying residents will not help this. Additionally, there are major parking and traffic concerns with proposed projects.

This project should go to a VOTE of the residents of Mukilteo. Let Democracy decide.



### 36. MacFarland, Melinda

#### *December 15, 2020 10:28 AM – Melinda MacFarland – Via HAP Comment Form*

We're totally opposed to the HAP. This can do nothing positive for my husband & I. It can cause a lot of problems - ask our local Mukilteo Police Dept. They deal a lot with people in this type of housing. In addition, we don't want our property values going down, nor do we want our safety compromised. I have been approached by druggies in the QFC & Safeway parking lots, asking for \$. I'm almost 70 yrs old & don't need more of this harassment. Look at what Seattle is going thru. We moved to Mukilteo by choice becuz we don't want to live in terror like the residents there do. Our city has both low income & reasonably priced family apts, condos & single family homes - a nice mix. Don't topple the apple cart with hair brained ideas. We elected you to represent us. Pls don't let us down.

#### *December 30, 2020 4:34 PM – Melinda MacFarland – Via HAP Comment Form*

We live in Mukilteo & can't tell you how unhappy we are with the new construction of the Vantage apts across from the Safeway. The apt complex was fine before they built the newest ones, but with the height of 4-5 stories, these new apt buildings look monstrous along Mukilteo Speedway. We can't imagine what the traffic is going to be once the apts are fully occupied. The parking in the complex was a problem before they built these new ones. Where are the new resident's guests going to park their cars? Please don't approve any more of these horrible looking apts in our city. We moved here to get away from high density housing.



### 37. Malaska, Barbara

*May 21, 2020 4:33 PM – Lauren Balisky*

This email is in regards to our conversation today and your request for additional information in writing.

I first want to thank you for contacting the City about the Preserve Mukilteo flyer you received in the mail. This flyer was not sent by the City, and it understandably has created significant confusion and concern in the community. I do sincerely appreciate your taking the time to ask questions.

By way of background, the City received a State grant to prepare what is called a Housing Action Plan (“HAP”). The State made these funds available to cities throughout Washington in response to many households being impacted by rising housing costs the past several years. The City is in the process of hiring a consultant to work with the community in preparing the HAP.

I think it’s important for Mukilteo residents to know what the HAP is and is not. The HAP will allow the City to update our current housing data, review our current housing policies and create a public process to see how the City might implement code changes or develop strategies to encourage construction of affordable and market rate housing. Per the law that authorized the grants, this includes developing strategies for the “for-profit single-family home market.” So the plan is to look at the broad spectrum of housing needs and supply, and not just for any specific segment. As we discussed, many components of this project are required in order to complete the upcoming Comprehensive Plan update as well.

As the HAP is intended to address housing affordability, and unfortunately, some people have interpreted that to mean that the City is making an effort to build low income housing. That is not the case. The HAP is not:

- a) A low-income housing program;
- b) A financial assistance program for low-income households (or any household for that matter); or
- c) Approval of low-income housing construction permits.

I hope you find this information helpful. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions.

*May 28, 2020 12:58 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for your call again today. If you would like to submit a public comment on the Housing Action Plan consultant contract being discussed by City Council on July 6, 2020, you may submit an email to City Clerk Carol Moore at [cmoore@mukilteowa.gov](mailto:cmoore@mukilteowa.gov). Public outreach will begin after the consultant contract is approved by the Council. After that, everyone will have a chance to weigh in over several months. If you would like to be directly included on any outreach efforts, we can add you to our email list to ensure you are notified.

As promised, here are some resources for you on the Growth Management Act and local comprehensive plans:



- More information about the Growth Management Act: <http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Planning/General-Planning-and-Growth-Management/Comprehensive-Planning-Growth-Management.aspx>
- More information about Comprehensive Planning: <http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Planning/General-Planning-and-Growth-Management/Comprehensive-Planning.aspx>
- Mandatory elements of the Comprehensive Plan can be found here, in Revised Code of Washington Section 36.70A.070: <https://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=36.70a.070>
- City of Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan: [https://mukilteowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Reduced\\_Comp-Plan-Final-20180610.pdf](https://mukilteowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Reduced_Comp-Plan-Final-20180610.pdf)
- City of Snohomish Comprehensive Plan: <https://snohomishwa.gov/184/Comprehensive-Plan>
- Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan: <https://snohomishcountywa.gov/2139/Comprehensive-Plan>

The information provided in this week's Beacon by the Mayor is correct. Planning for housing for all income levels is required under state law, and the City will be required to complete this work as part of the major periodic update to the Comprehensive Plan. There are minor adjustments completed as part of the annual docket process that we discussed.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

*July 1, 2020 2:51 PM – Lauren Balisky*

The City Council will be discussing the consultant contract for the Housing Action Plan this coming Monday evening if you are interested.

The meeting materials and link to participate online are available on the City's website: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736).

## 38. McBroom, Lisa

*February 3, 2020 4:55 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Dear Mukilteo City Council -

Please consider my opinions and I ask you to urgently reconsider and change your City Council collective opinion on allowing or encouraging or permitting "Affordable Housing" in Mukilteo.

I write to you to express views opposed to your decision in favor of government subsidized housing to be mandated or allowed within Mukilteo City limits and near Mukilteo outside of City limits.

I respectfully request you cancel your acquiescence to any groups or persons, agencies, developers, or agencies desiring Section 8 housing in or near Mukilteo.

WHY "NO" and Why Do I Voice a Strong "NO"?

Because I lived in a home I owned across the street from Section 8 housing and also near different small to huge Multiuse Housing complexes (Section 8 in only portions of the units or in nearly all or all of it) that were older, newer and very new that were close to me. I was part of a community action and safety group (neighborhood community and safety groups) in my neighborhood and we all were different in our beliefs and backgrounds but we all in the group unanimously found that many of the drug users and drug dealers and derelict/ dangerous/ desperate types of homeless person residents and relatives and friends of official residents lived at and frequented all these complexes. This is what was going on at all of them in that community and those that were newer had about a 3 year time of nicer before all the persons without police records moved out and the places were literally filled with fairly dangerous persons or families related to or closely related to persons who were who lived there with them. The police community liaison officer and other officers who were assigned to the area met with our neighborhood group on many occasions and we all had the multiple times per week to call the police to request help or report crimes or potential issues going on that concerned or alarmed us.

WHAT IS THE PATTERN OF THE "CULTURE" at and near a Multiuse Housing Complex (which includes some Section 8)

The pattern that we in our neighborhood group (where I lived before) studied and researched was that if you allow government assisted Section 8 housing rules to control the housing in an area you have a lot of crime, needles on the ground, yelling, foul smells, garbage, car crashes in the night and drug deals happening in front of you on a daily basis. We had a large developer come to our mayor and put up signs that they were going to build the largest yet of these Multiuse (softly called "Affordable Housing") complexes in our neighborhood, and we said "NO, PLEASE". We met with our Deputy Mayor and said we didn't want it, and we brought a letter, that it would hinder the improvement and safety of our neighborhood and the safety of our children and the values of our homes, and the Deputy Mayor listened to our petitions and he brought another person from that City with him as witness and he then told the developer afterwards that the neighborhood community would not allow it and we would fight it. So that Deputy Mayor went to bat for us and we appreciated it and he represented our wishes, our



ideas and the police department's idea on the best interest for our neighborhood, and the result was that the developer decided not to go ahead. So our neighborhood did not worsen. There were about 6 drug dealers who were based at or across the street from the closest "Affordable Housing" Multiuse Housing complex to me, across from my house! The police shut down 4 while we lived there, but it was hard work for them. That was just within a half block radius. The Multiuse Housing complex was visually nice on the exterior but it created horrible safety and standard of living compromises because of the crime it attracted.

Now for our City of Mukilteo, surely none of you will allow that to happen to Mukilteo. Do any of you think the "Affordable Housing" project that went up recently across from the Albertsons is a good thing for Mukilteo? Have you noticed the different persons that sit and stand for hours, even all day, selling drugs from the roadside there, from time to time? Have you noticed the persons walking into traffic from there and the multiple fender benders that occur near the complex. Or how about at another nearby, newer complex, the Alderwood Fred Meyer location: how much crime and stealing out of the Alderwood Fred Meyer you can easily observe since the large, nice looking, Multiuse Housing complex (again, folks, it's "just" "Affordable Housing" the developers will say and push the governments for because they get a lot of benefits and helps to build these things and developers love to put them in because the governments, in general, favor them and subsidize their building) --- this nice looking, newer complex brings in dozens more desperate and law breaking persons who steal at that Fred Meyer and at times the Fred Meyer may have 20 to 50 of them inside trying to distract workers in order to steal. It is an unseemly, unsafe and not good element that this type of "Affordable Housing" brings. This is not good family, safe, nice neighborhood culture.

When I chose to move to Mukilteo, I moved here instead of every other nearby area I studied out because it was safe, wholesome, friendly and clean and quiet and there was a good police to resident ratio. Our crime here has been lower than other nearby areas.

Helping persons in need is not the same as ruining a neighborhood.

Punishing those who are quiet, own their homes and do not break the law and deal in or buy drugs, by making us pay in taxes or by downgrading our neighborhood in the trashy direction - this is not a fair thing - to punish me for not being a person in tremendous need by allowing the Section 8 allowances of filth, crime and lack of safety at my expense. I don't agree with punishing the person who owns a home or who has a job and making me support the Section 8 downside. I don't agree that we have to allow the crime doers and the drug users to be enabled.

The best way to help those in need is to get them into help programs and help them to stay in them and get into individual solutions. Section 8 persons who are not derelict persons would also appreciate not living in the current arrangement of the government that loops them in with all the undesirables.

Have any of you directly worked with homeless and needy persons to effect change? I have. I have many experiences. It is hard work to help them because they come out of the obstacles of many crises and their path to improvement is not overnight or simple.

Let's keep Mukilteo a nice place to live, and keep Multiuse Housing complexes out, and their regulations. Let's not enable or invite more crime and garbage strewn around and the smells of a seedy neighborhood.



Please listen to the voice of the majority of the City of Mukilteo and stop this unfair allowance of wrecking our nice City.

If you want to help the homeless and the truly needy, don't give them free everything, don't turn a blind eye to no regulations and enablement of the unseemly lifestyle of many, not all, but many of them. Don't turn us into what downtown Seattle is becoming, that is not good - what Seattle is enabling now is not working and is getting worse rapidly. PLEASE DO NOT INVITE THAT ELEMENT HERE. If you want to help those in need, come alongside them and retrain and teach and physically help them, on a one on one basis, for several years, until you have effected change - because handing them more free and unseemly areas to not climb out of, will actually do the opposite and yes, I am saying that past experience personally helping various homeless and other persons in need, that giving housing in these places is not the solution to help them improve and it is a breeding ground for unseemly elements that hinder them further and will wreck our City culture.

And to our Councilwoman who is newer and voted in favor of this: please spend some considerable time with the needy and homeless, give them money and watch them go back into debt and into drugs, feed them, clothe them, love them and come to understand what tough love is and what types of enablement do help or do not help anyone. Your heart is perhaps very large to care, but you do not see the reality of what works and what does not work to help those in need, and all the ramifications of the types of help that are effective. Do not be offended for me having a differing view, but please consider the heart of these comments and understand the other side because you are on the City Council not to promote your personal agenda but to help our City of Mukilteo and represent our people and our good interests. If you want to help people in need, do it through helps groups or churches, not trashing our City to help your conscience.

Thank you for your consideration, all of you, to do your best to help our City of Mukilteo be the best it can be.

*February 3, 2020 5:16 PM – Anna Rohrbough*

Thank you for your email. This grant was sprung on the council without much discussion.

The way to change the vote from 4-3 in favor of accepting the grant is to have one of the Council-members who voted for it, bring it back up for a vote. The council President Emery and Vice President Kneller both voted in favor and would be a good place to start. I did not vote for it for many of the reasons you stated.

Thank you for speaking your voice. I appreciate it immensely.

*February 3, 2020 10:26 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Dear Mayor Gregerson:

Please see my email attached below and the response from Councilmember Rohrbough here indicating, with a comment from Mr. Zieve after tonight's meeting that you have personally ramrodded this through without consulting or discussing adequately with all City of Mukilteo Councilmembers. As I am sure you are aware, the



majority of Mukilteo residents and homeowners are NOT in favor of trashy Multiuse housing complexes aka "Affordable Housing" in the form of Section 8 allowances and regulations that are against other homeowners - that the majority of the people who live in Mukilteo are not in favor of what you are trying to do with you single person subcommittee headship on housing affordability with Dick Emery as a part-time substitute listed on last year's job assignment areas. You have two other committees related to affordable housing issues that were not involved adequately with your personal desire to tank Mukilteo with low income housing projects.

You may have your personal views, but I'd like to request that you represent the proper course of business and lead and represent the people of Mukilteo on this issue, not try to do your own thing. IT IS NOT OKAY to bring Section 8 housing projects (aka pretty looking ghetto projects) into our city, veiled as lovely attempts to give lower income people (from other locations who do not live here currently) free and subsidized housing.

PLEASE MEET with your entire City Council to revisit this whole extremely important issue and have a Re-Vote after sufficient discussion and review and suggestions from people who live in Mukilteo who are VERY OPPOSED TO THIS CONCEPT. Please take the time to read what I have tried to clearly detail out below which are the problems with the Section 8 concepts, showing that "Affordable Housing" in the form of Multiuse Housing in Section 8 does not fit with or benefit our City and the people who live here, but rather will seriously damage and ruin it.

Thank you for your consideration.

*February 4, 2020 10:25 AM – Jennifer Gregerson*

Thank you for your message. I wanted to share some information below about the Housing Action Plan, which will allow for a robust public process, many opportunities to comment and provide input. I also wanted to assuage your concern about housing complexes or section 8 eligible units- it is not a plan to build that.

The Action Plan will look at many different tools. Some tools might allow residents to develop accessory dwelling units, sometimes called mother-in-law units, on their property. We allow these units today, but not many people choose to build them. Perhaps we can learn about how to make it work better. They might allow families an extra income, or a way to stay on their property longer in a smaller space.

It will also look at market rate housing- housing that is affordable to people making the average income in our city.

The Action Plan might also help us look at our permitting processes—is it easy and not confusing to work with the City when developing one's property? How can it be better and work more smoothly? The Action Plan could make recommendations about this topic.

The Action Plan might look at the types of housing in our community. We have mixed use in the Harbour Pointe Village area near Thai Rama and on 5<sup>th</sup> Street near Red Cup. These provide studios and 1-3 bedroom units for those that aren't looking for private open space. Are there other commercial areas that might benefit from condos or apartments on those parcels? Perhaps we can think about whether to consider it.

It is not a plan to develop affordable housing. Some residents have expressed concern to me and the Council about





The Vantage, a development outside our city limits in the County (across from Albertsons) which has subsidized units. There is no plan to pursue something similar in Mukilteo.

Some residents have expressed concern about school crowding. The City collects an impact fee for our schools, which is transferred to the School District. Under state law, this funding amount is set by the district and helps to fund new school facilities.

I look forward to a public conversation this year. For me, this is about our seniors' and our kids' abilities to make their home in this community.

*February 4, 2020 12:28 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Mayor Gregerson:

Thank you so much for responding to my emails about plans you have as Mayor and plans or recommendations from you and the Mukilteo City Council, as well as whomever you will have working with you to discuss and formulate any Housing Action Plan regarding "Affordable Housing" in Mukilteo. I really appreciate your response and good information that you share in your email. I have a few questions and ideas for your consideration below. Thank you for your time to read this and work on these issues.

If you continue, going forward, to communicate openly and be sure to include all your City Council in good discussions, as well as listen to the business owners and residents of our City regarding these related issues, you will achieve, with that kind of careful and good leadership, a more comprehensive and better thought out approach to these affordable housing issues.

Who is on your committee for this Housing Action Plan?

Are you open to a Re-Vote by the Council about accepting this grant? Does the acceptance of this grant mandate legal consequences or specific use for it or not? Can it all be used for research, such as the research you mention?

If the grant can be used, without exception, for research regarding these matters, that is a good thing. However, if acceptance of the grant requires Mukilteo to provide more "affordable housing" with certain limitations, then it is not good, and you should do a Re-Vote and vote against it. You and the Council, in that case, would be better to Re-Vote against the grant while also voting to specifically discuss these issues and set up a committee(s) with many qualified persons of differing backgrounds and diverse views so that you can still do the reasonable studies and research, while engaging members of the public and business who are part of Mukilteo to bring in good information regarding these issues.

To speak to one way to provide more affordable housing:

RENTAL UNIT PRICE CONTROL OR MANDATES: Not an answer as it limits business.

Firstly, requiring owners of rentals to lower rates is unfair and not a good business practice for economic reasons. It is not a solution to penalize the business capability of others to accommodate other financial levels that

do not fit with their business plan. This limits free enterprise and puts business owners out of business. Keeping business owners in business is a good practice. It is unfair business to require that prices be controlled completely. Price gauging of extreme nature such as with recent medical prescription pricing new helps - some new helps of differing kinds are now helping to lower the prescription range for one item which could range from \$10 up to \$2000 for the same item - this is one extreme example of price gauging where it IS something that should be dealt with: but regarding rental units, requiring businesses to loose money because people want free rides or want to take advantage of others is not good for Mukilteo. That rental pricing control is a type of government control on profitability and sustainability and limits and restricts business success and improvement capabilty.

ADU's: Accessory Dwelling Units CAN be the solution or can be a large solution help in residential areas to population increases accomodation in Mukilteo, IF regulations not too tight, IF parking issues solved, IF comprehensive plan recreated.

If ADU's were to be more available to those with financial limitations who already live in Mukilteo, this could fix a large portion of the entire desire to provide some methods of greater affordability to persons who do not have enough money to live here independently at the present time. Let me explain - to broadly generalize, regarding ADU's:

Currently, the ADU regulations are so tight that very few homeowners could create an ADU on their property, whether it be an add-on, exisiting building interior modification, or stand-alone addition to the property. Many of us have overarching PARKING CONCERNS that, regardless of the growth our City experiences in the future, we would want that there would continue to be adequate parking for residents and reasonable amounts of resident guests, wide enough residential streets that are not overrun by stacked parking of many cars, adequate parking but not too crowded - on the street, residential parking and safe and clean parking conditions, and also so that loiterers or transient types of vehicles or abandoned vehicles or derelict vehicles cannot be parked or remain or camp at or near our residences. But these are issues specifically regarding parking and parking issues could be readdressed and these parking concerns and desires accomodated by building and planning committees well versed in these planning matters who work with a new, larger committee to study this out.

*We want our City to remain a lovely and quiet City and we want to intelligently and comprehensively provide for appropriate future growth. We want any growth that makes good sense. However, if it doesn't improve our City, but downgrades it or detracts from anything in our present good City look and culture, we don't want it.*

Current City of Mukilteo ADU requirements ask for far too restrictive sizing requirements, for huge setbacks, or walkway and parking particulars and for occupancy and rental requirements that are impossible to meet for most properties. If you would wisely set up a large and diverse committee to look into, as you have already suggested, how to best modify or overhaul the existing ADU laws and permitting process, without allowing on the street parking problems (see above), then you could, to broadly generalize, enable 10 percent or more of the residential homes to be able to modify their home, or/and add on to their home or/and add 1 or more smaller, very nice and attractive tiny homes or dwellings on their properties, and if so, new regulations that allowed more freedom within a good framework of requirements would accomodate quite a bit of City growth. That would increase homeowner income as they could rent out one or more of these for lower amounts - for any amount they wished,



not for regulated rental amounts - or allow persons to live in them free of charge. And this would help the students and the elderly, as well as others.

Right now Mukilteo ADU's restrictive code does not allow me to add, modify or build something on my property to house an elderly person or friend in need, but I would like to be able to do that.

*If there could be far more ADU's in Mukilteo (in residential areas) which looked very good in appearance, and did not adversely affect street parking optimal needs and desires (see above regarding parking), then the persons living here who owned the ADU's would make additional money with some of the rentals, which would give the City more money in taxes because of increased dwelling unit property value, while also providing a substantial amount of "affordable housing" for elderly, students, guests and other housing needs and desires. This type of "affordable housing" would not come with government requirements or restrictions to be monitored or paid for (or dealt with on higher levels) on the City and so it would be an overall business and income boost for residents and the City.*

*Along with the ADU issues the new diverse and comprehensive committee to study this out could look into cottage business laws loosening, particularly regarding bed and breakfasts being allowed in residential areas - simply examine the issue thoroughly, whether it may be something good for parts or all of the residential areas.*

There are nice communities elsewhere who have allowed ADU's in a variety of ways, which have created attractive and cottage housing industries for many persons, and which allow for school and student housing and paid rental housing and affordable elderly housing and personal elder care and vacation and guest housing that is upscale and profitable for both the property owners and the occupants/ renters.

Mayor Gregerson, I am so encouraged by your email response this morning, in which I read a sincere desire to dialogue wisely about these things and seek the best solutions carefully. Just as I am writing to you, right now, rather than speaking face to face yet, in my experience I can communicate more effectively and thoroughly in writing in just one email than if there would simply be one or two town meetings about this subject. One or more community meetings about these issues would not be the tip of the iceberg whatsoever to begin for a committee to dialogue, research and discuss to formulate wise planning about these things. A meeting of a few hours in which multiple persons speak only a few sentences each or for a few minutes cannot possibly make any adequate plan for these matters. I know you realize that. I hope that you have or will be talking openly about setting up a committee to discuss and bring recommendations about these matters. Please do not take specific action at all about these matters, before you have facilitated a goodsized and diverse committee group who has had the time to talk and research and come up with a well-thought out recommendation(s), prior to any plan implementation.

Thank you again for responding to my email. I am thankful for your response and I greatly appreciate your help to make our City of Mukilteo wisely better, without losing any of its wonderful aspects.

*February 4, 2020 1:09 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Mayor Gregerson and City Council Members and Mr. Zieve:



See my prior emails attached, including a response today from Mayor Gregerson (thank you, again, Mayor for reaching back out to me), and my response to her today.

Mayor Gregerson expresses specific interest to help elderly and students in her email this morning to me. I addressed that in my response to adding general housing accommodations, however, specifically re:

#### ELDERLY HOUSING

As to housing for elderly, setting up new, senior ONLY housing could be a great thing in Mukilteo. This is not low income housing and is a totally separate concept. But it would need a new committee to extensively study this out, comparing upscale successes in nearby Bothell, etc., and what would fit within the culture of Mukilteo to enhance our city and not detract from it. This could be done.

#### STUDENT HOUSING PROVISION, OR HOUSING FOR NEW GRADUATES

We don't really need the extensive student only housing accommodation within Mukilteo because we are a smaller bedroom community and do not currently have a large college campus here. *Studies published and mailed to Mukilteo residents have shown that a large percentage of Mukilteo's public high school students graduate and go on to make fairly high incomes with fairly good jobs, broadly compared with the outcomes of high school graduates elsewhere.* There are already a lot of Multiuse Housing low income projects in nearby local areas for any students in colleges elsewhere nearby who do not live in a dormitory situation, and also there are housing subsidies for any housing anywhere which are available to students by multiple grants which should not affect any need to create low income housing here particularly for students.

*February 4, 2020 1:20 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Mr. Osaki:

Please see this email chain (which I started yesterday) regarding "Affordable Housing" in Mukilteo and the new grant to research and do whatever regarding these issues.

I am copying you on this email chain and hope that you will be working with Mayor Gregerson and all of our City Council to carefully and comprehensively address all these issues with a large and diverse group of new committee members. IF the acceptance of this \$4million grant requires Mukilteo to adhere to ANY specific mandates or quotas or regulations on what Mukilteo does with housing, Section 8, new regulations on rent prices and business owner powers/lack thereof, I hope you will be in favor of a Re-Vote by City Council against acceptance of this grant, and be part of better addressing these issues by committee research and adequate dialogue to come up with good recommendations to the Mukilteo residents.

Thank you for your efforts.



*February 4, 2020 1:25 PM – Jennifer Gregerson*

Thanks again for your message.

There is no committee established. Once an RFP is issued and a consultant is scheduled, that person will work with staff to start and implement the public process. The state law requires: "(f) Provide for participation and input from community members, community groups, local builders, local realtors, nonprofit housing advocates, and local religious groups." My vision is that we use lots of techniques to get that input- open houses, mobile open houses (at other locations, like coffee shops, the library, YMCA, and other places to reach people where they are at already), online inputs, etc. I wouldn't necessarily expect that we establish one committee to work on this, but more like a series of focus groups and open meetings.

I am not open to asking Council to vote again. I believe it is important to honor the process of City Council- they vote, we move forward and implement the action. Not all votes result in unanimous approval, but that is the process we use.

To speak to another issue you mentioned- I would not imagine that rent control policies will be among the menu of policy options we address, but thank you for sharing your view on it. I agree with many of your points on ADUs- they are not the only solution but can be a good one that is positive for a neighborhood. It is probably something that we will look into during the action plan process.

*February 4, 2020 1:34 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Mr. Osaki - fyi.<sup>3</sup>

*June 24, 2020 12:15 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Dear Mayor Gregerson, City Councilmembers and Dave Osaki:

I would like to start by thanking you all for your open dialogue on this issue, and your countless hours of time to work on everything good for our great City of Mukilteo, and also to express strong appreciation for your diligence to care about people here and other people in need and to do your best to make the best and wisest decisions for Mukilteo. Please do not misconstrue any of this or former dialogue to mean that any of us are opposed to helping those in need, to partnering, to caring, loving and standing with others and being brothers and sisters, hand in hand. Do not think that we are opposed to other, effective "affordable housing" concepts and provisions. Please urgently consider what is written here - thank you so much, and God bless you as you carefully consider this:

A few months ago there was dialogue with and amongst many persons by email as well as letters to the Mukilteo Beacon, as well as persons attending and speaking at City Council meetings, regarding the unique, mandated version of Affordable Housing that was going to be coming into the City of Mukilteo, per Mayor Gregerson's letter

---

<sup>3</sup> Forwarded email from Mayor Gregerson sent February 4, 2020 at 1:25 PM.



to request a grant for that purpose, prior to and without the consent of the City Council and the knowledge of the people of Mukilteo. There has continued to be some dialogue about this, and the City Council and Mayor have been told that persons were going to be gathering a petition(s) and/or that increasing numbers of persons in Mukilteo were opposed to this whole concept. Mayor Gregerson, after being given the grant, later explained her interest in this to the City Council and the City Council voted in favor of the grant, which grant includes required adherence to the findings of the results of the grant study. Mayor Gregerson's support of the HAP largely focuses on making future housing more affordable for young persons and elderly in the City, while our study of the background reasons for the whole, complex program and what it is designed to do, show otherwise. It is fine to disagree peaceably, but the issue is a large problem because the HAP is flawed, for the purposes of good for affordability in housing. We do not believe that the purpose of this HAP is good, that the purpose is not to make housing affordable at all, but to bring down a society and bring it into a state of subjection, and need and ultimate financial dependence on government, as it has been carefully crafted to do so.

Many people in Mukilteo, more and more people in Mukilteo, are having a big problem with this "Affordable Housing" grant issue and results or HAP. What are the overarching problems to persons about it?

The general, and glaring, and unacceptable problems with this whole issue are twofold: 1. The Citizens of Mukilteo had nothing do to with this before it all started, and it was imposed on us prior to our knowledge and buy in or ability to participate in preconsideration of this issue, and 2. This particular HAP is absolutely not your run of the mill program to just help make housing more affordable, but this particular HAP is in fact an unconstitutional while intelligent, comprehensive plan to usher in complete housing and rental practices, laws and controls that can change the freedoms of a society overnight and that also prefer large quantities of low and zero income housing over any other types of housing, which will destroy a socioeconomic viability and safety and also is designed to change the dynamic of people groups rapidly to become a higher proportion of low income than other types: i.e. they will not ever bring this specially crafted HAP into a Medina or a Mercer Island because this particular HAP is a specifically crafted plan to WRECK a city on purpose, to destroy it from within and quickly and turn it into a slum or ghetto.

Many persons wrote emails about this issue in recent months and expressed strong interest and Mayor Gregerson explained that the HAP was just something (inferring of not such big consequence) that will make the tiny percentage of persons who cannot afford Mukilteo able to move into this new, (government sponsored or semicontrolled) housing so they afford to be here. Nevermind that this is not a city that people come to or want to come to to have low income housing - this is not currently a ghetto or a predominantly low income city, but rather largely and logically a bedroom community to the Boeing and tech jobs very nearby. Well, this grant concept for this version of creating "more Affordable Housing", or a Housing Action Plan (HAP), while multiple terminology has been used for the same thing, this HAP is sponsored by our own very well meaning and talented, City Planning Department head Dave Osaki, who is interested in the 2015 United Nations global housing plans which proceed until we could achieve the ultimate peace of the United Nations plan for 2030 with their one world government plans and trying to bring all that into Mukilteo singlehandedly. So Mr. Osaki, whom I understand does not live inside Mukilteo, by the way, but he himself wants very much and is planning to change Mukilteo, he has a staff that agrees with him in the City and has worked with Mayor Gregerson to try to change Mukilteo from currently being a fairly lower crime residential area into a different type of place that has unlimited HAP accommodation to please

every possible liberal official and bring in as many homeless and political refugees from outside our community as possible and as fast as possible, so that we may be a poster child of a city to look great as the first and largest failure of an economy to Governor Jay Inslee, County officials, and advance a lowering of safety and lowering of freedoms and mix everything up to just make things more equal for everyone so the rich can have tons more regulation and taxes and fail more and the middle class can pay more and sink completely and the poor can have it easy and the no income can have it really, really great, and the organized crime can come in here and have it easy. Then we can have a lot more social services and a lot more drugs and theft and that will make everything just so comfy in Mukilteo with all the innercity feel that everyone really needs and everyone wants it so we can all be equal and noone can do well and then we will just all feel great about everything? Really, is that what we want? No, but that is what this plan is actually, specifically designed to do. You may of course, disagree, but that is exactly what a large number of us believe and so it is a huge problem for us.

We are not going to be "getting over our misconceptions about this" by having a couple meetings or townhalls to have a few questions answered so our fears go away. You cannot just talk to us briefly and tell us that we have it all wrong. We simply disagree with those of you who think this HAP is a lovely thing, and our disagreement with you will not be changing. Because we are at an impasse of two opposing ways to view this HAP, the issue then is not the disagreement between us and you, but that you in government and in the planning department have a right to listen to us and stop this particular grant result and HAP process entirely, because so many, many persons in Mukilteo do not want it, PERIOD. We CAN peaceably disagree on this, and disagreement is fine and can even add richness and improvement, but it is NOT OKAY for you to proceed with it against a really large and larger number of Mukilteans who are strongly opposed to this. It is not ethical for you to impose this on us when so many of us do not want it. Does that make sense? We need you to hear and represent our views, even though you have some other views. We are totally fine with you having other views. But we are not fine with you imposing this particular HAP on us, because we think it is such a huge thing. That is good government - to hear and act when the people are in an uproar about something, to not impose something a LOT of people are really, really not happy about.

So, while we can and should respect the views of the Mayor and Mr. Osaki that this will simply make housing more affordable, to many of the rest of us, we believe that this is more complex, more dangerous and will bring ruin and downgrade our City, and that actually, we have this twisted insanity going on in the name of HAP for Mukilteo without any say of the citizens of Mukilteo, and it really has been against constitutional values and laws, and we do not agree with it and we would like it stopped.

Again, we respect your views, but we disagree and ask you, to respect ours and also to recognize and respect that this is not a small issue to us, that this is very important, that you here listen to us and respect that a large number of people living here do not want this plan and are asking you to respect our growing numbers - see here only some of the people opposed to this - this is not just a few of us, a tiny handful - this is a pretty big number of us who are absolutely, who are completely opposed to this. Do you get this? How many of the adult residents of Mukilteo are registered voters? And of that high number, look at how many of us, just some, not all, are herebelow asking you to stop this - this is a goodsized number below who are opposed to this. Please stop this HAP thing entirely, and let's start over and get community involvement in some things that are NOT connected in any way whatsoever to this HAP to discuss and craft affordability and planning for the future for our City. Dave Osaki has





awesome abilities. Let's work together as a City on something else that can be great for community growth. Please scrap this complex, dangerous and unwanted HAP Affordable Plan. We do not want it and it is not good. Thank you again for listening and please stop proceeding with this.

Please don't be offended that we disagree with you. If you are offended you can't make progress for our City. We disagree with you but we need you to not take this personally and to work with us and not be offended by us disagreeing. We need you to separate disagreement and preference for the greater good. We think this HAP is horrible. You think it is good. Okay, so we are stronger in our view than you are, so listen to that and let's start over and stop this HAP and in the future talk about somethings that are entirely different to achieve improvement and planning goals we can all or far more agree on. This one is too problematic, and the whole thing must be stopped now. We respect you and we are asking you to respect that there is mounting, increasing huge opposition to this, so we ask you to stop this whole HAP thing now.

When there is a big opposition to something you do not lose face if you change your direction or stop something you like. You have a perfect and very real excuse: "There was somehow incredible and increasing opposition to it, so we needed to listen to the City and we felt that stopping it was the right thing."

Attached is our letter opposed to your continuing pursuit of the newer, specialized Affordable Housing Plan outlined by special groups under Governor Jay Inslee, also known as the Housing Action Plan, AHP and HAP. This letter represents more than one letter, in our peaceful but growing and strong opposition to mandated changes, against our wishes, without registered citizen ballot voting, to housing practices, preferences, conditions, restrictions and changes in the City of Mukilteo. The recent number of those registered citizen voters living in Mukilteo who are opposed to this include the following names which are attached. As you can see, this number represents a substantial percentage of all the persons living in Mukilteo who are both citizens and registered voters. Since there is a growing number of us residents of Mukilteo who are opposed to the HAP being spearheaded by Dave Osaki, we respectfully request that the Mayor, the City Council and Mr. Osaki and his department do not proceed with the plans adopted by the City Council for the HAP.

There are other methods to create more housing that is affordable, but this whole plan is a mask for ruining our city with additional, burdensome and unwanted mandates and regulations that we do not want and which do not fit with our City. If other cities elsewhere like this kind of control and mandated, sweeping lowering of culture and freedoms for free enterprise (excessive rental and pricing controls coming), let those people elsewhere embrace it, but we, in Mukilteo DO NOT EMBRACE THIS HAP and we do not want any part of it and we want it stopped now.

We are not asking you to agree with us - it is okay to disagree - but we are asking that for the good of our City you can now understand that a very large number of us are incredibly opposed to this whole HAP and so, for us, because you want to serve the good of all of us, so you, in goodness, will honor the greater good, and stop the HAP because you see that so many really, really do not want it.

We do not want to come across without support for our Mayor, for Mr. Osaki and for our City Council and all your good efforts and hard work. We can disagree with your majority on this issue and still come together in support for you and your incredibly good intent and your awesome abilities. We are just asking, pleading with you to hear us and recognize, that although you may disagree, many, many, many of us see huge problems to us that we do not



like with this particular HAP and we really hope you will honor us by saying, "okay, let's stop this particular whole thing because our City that we represent has a lot of people who are super uncomfortable with this, to say the least". We know you all mean well. We have this great City of a diverse group and background and we are thankful for it. Please, please be careful to not force or proceed with things huge like this that a big portion of us are super, super opposed to.

We appreciate your heartfelt representation of our City and we ask you to stop the HAP proceedings, because proceeding with the HAP is in opposition to us, as well as a great and growing number of others not yet listed and others who live in this City.

See our letter and those signed in opposition below.

Thank you for your diligent attention to matter, which is a very serious matter to so many of us.

*June 24, 2020 12:43 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Here are the remainder of names listings:

Jeffrey & Brenda LaSorella	11803 59th Ave W
Pierre & Amy Laroche	5528 104th Pl SW
Deborah & Robert Larsen	4556 Finch St
Rebecca Larson	4824 Pointes Dr
Mike & Linda Lechnar	13117 Harbour Heights Dr
Joann Lee	11801 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 409
Chong & Shin Lee	5228 107th St SW
John & Carol Levandowski	5678 95th Pl SW
David & Nancy Levy	908 10th St
Raphael & Aprille Libut	10808 53rd Ave W
Ly Lin	12574 Eagles Nest Dr
Brian Loomis	1241 S Ridge Ln
Patricia & Paul Luczyk	704 9th Pl
Amanda & Daniel Lynn	1505 Mukilteo Blvd
Janice Macfarlane	10725 Marine View Dr
Teija Mackie	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd
Michael Mahar	8814 52nd Pl W
Paul Marshall	1702 Washington Ave
Sean & Ann Martin	4406 85th Pl SW
Brian Mayer	5631 88th St SW



Peter Mayer	6006 96th St SW
Chester & Lisa McBroom	10121 64th Pl W
Sean & Tracy Mccarron	12411 61st Ave W
Mary & Gerald Mcginley	9227 50th Pl W
David & Sherry McGowan	11018 60th Ave W
Darren & Raelene McIntosh	12811 56th Pl W
Charles McIntyre	12568 Hummingbird St
Keith & Michelle Mcspadden	8804 53rd Pl W
Chelsea Meggitt	5618 N Grove Dr
William Mellon	12701 54th Ave W
Shane Michaels	1495 Mukilteo Speedway
Corneliu,Simona,Renee,Jeremy Michaels	4635 88th St SW
Donald & Dawn Millard	12260 Championship Cir
Mason Miller	4801 Hunttings Ln
Mohammad Miri	629 Cornelia Ave
Leslie Moch	1241 S Ridge Ln
Parul Mohan	4685 Arbors Cir
Brianna Moore	9511 49th Ave W Apt 17J
Rachel Morgan	4409 130th Pl SW
Maria Moroseos	11006 60th Ave W
Ralph Munson	6107 91st Pl SW
Stacey Murphy	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt G302
Dilep Nayak	12420 Double Eagle Dr
Brianna Nelson	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit FF105
Sandra Newgard	4817 131st St SW
Steele Newman	10720 58th Ave W
Jane Ng	4832 Bridgeport Pl
Nam Nguyen	8817 56th Pl W
Tuan Nguyen	4720 Northport Dr
Justin & Kael Nielson	12815 52nd Pl W
Marjorie & Mark Nordlie	5702 95th Pl SW
Mary,Madison,Rick,Patrick Norman	6204 93rd Pl SW
Maryannn O'brien	9137 50th Pl W
Christine O'Donnell	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit Y203



Ronald & Sally Osborn	619 Park Ave
Walter Osick	6020 122nd Pl SW
Eric & Patricia Otness	9306 61st Ave W
Fabienne Palu-Benson	4801 Hunttings Ln
Saoirse Palu-Benson	4801 Hunttings Ln
Timothy Parish	4786 Arbors Cir
Edwin Park	11801 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 409
Dana and Bruce Patrick	5919 117th Pl SW
Charles Peter	4809 72nd Pl SW
Jeannette & Arlin Peters	12529 Hummingbird Ln
Vin Pham	2373 Mukilteo Speedway
Mai & Duy Phan	4417 80th St SW
Stephen Phelan	5529 101st St SW
Gregory & Donna Poulsen	809 7th St
Barbara & Chris Prentki	10627 53rd Ave W
Jordan Prudnick	1517 Debreton Ln
Muhammad Qazi	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit Y207
Ming & Xianzhi Quan	12577 Hummingbird St
Ronald & Leanne Rafter	6252 Harbour Heights Pkwy Apt C4
Caitlynn-Jasmine & Cielo Ragas	12928 50th Pl W
Madhavadas Ramnath	12620 Hummingbird St
Darshan,Poonham,Sarwesh Rauniyar	1477 Mukilteo Ln
Mike and Connie Reilly	10911 59th Ave W
Rosalie Remick	8221 53rd Ave W Unit 42
Elizabeth Richardson	13412 45th Ct W
Micah & Zoe Riggs	9415 61st Ave W
Donald & Renee Ripley	914 4th St
Dylan Ritchie	9511 49th Ave W Apt 17J
Paolo Rocca	9041 Hargreaves Pl
Cynthia & Mark Roesler	4201 130th Pl SW
William & Mari Rogers	9403 61st Ave W
John & Gang Ruan	10401 53rd Ave W
Ulla Rudd	8221 53rd Av W Apt 49
Rebecca & Jason Rudzinski	4811 Bridgeport Pl



Sheila Sampatacos	5400 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit C201
James Sanchez	7008 49th Ave W
Ron & Wanda Sapp	875 Goat Trail Loop Rd
Anthony Sarno	5426 111th Pl SW
Amy Schaper	13102 Harbour Heights Dr
Henry Schilling	5632 107th Pl SW
James Schmitt	5829 94th St SW
Leslie,Rolf,Eben Schumann	4932 99th St SW
Jeremy Seager	5400 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit A103
Nancy Seager	8714 54th Pl W
Sunshine Self	5116 81st Pl SW Apt 4
Edward & Lynda Sergoyan	5500 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt F202
Christy & Richard Sewell	7085 47th Ave W
Jeri & Frank Sexton	637 Cornelia Ave
Tieyan Shang	10523 62nd Pl W
Jasmine Sidhu	5131 126th St SW
Devinderjit & Navneet Sidhu	12553 Hummingbird St
Deeann & Robert Simon	610 Front St Apt 304
Narinder Singh	12423 61st Ave W
Manveer & Harninder Singh	12413 Ironwood Ln
Armandina & Corie Smith	8221 53rd Ave W Unit G22
Robert & Evy Sola	12031 Possession Way
Qi Song	630 Loveland Ave
Anna & George Sotolongo	13312 46th Pl W
Amanda & Mark Spell	11623 Grove Dr
Mark Stevens	4802 Hunttings Ln
Marcie Stoetzel	1495 Mukilteo Speedway
Satich Subramaniam	6824 St Andrews Dr
Paula & Daniel Sullivan	1128 3rd St
Angeline & Charles Summey	5109 125th Pl SW
Sharon Swann	12512 54th Ave W
Paul Taber	4815 Hidden Forest Dr Apt 4G
Songsong Tao	10401 53rd Ave W
Tieying & Alan Tapert	5230 102nd St SW



Hugh Taylor	10423 Marine View Dr
Tim, Carol, Natalie Tento	6203 Bayview Dr
George Thomas	13416 45th Ct W
Christine Thompson	5228 92nd St SW
Jeanne Thompson	4912 90th Pl SW
Rachel Thompson	5631 88th St SW
Harpinder Tiwana	8610 44th Ave W
Natalie Tolliver	5526 107th St SW
Brian & Joal Tolmie	11518 W Oakmont Dr
Rob and Corky Townsend	6001 St Andrews Dr
Keegan Trester	5029 84th St SW Unit 406
Richard & Shirley Troppman	8311 45th Pl W
Lillian & Carl Truby	11332 58th Ave W
Charles Tung	10702 62nd Pl W
Linda & Stuart Turner	8708 53rd Ave W
Judith & James Underwood	9764 Marine View Dr
Donna Vago	9728 49th Pl W
Connie & Arnie Valeriano	12928 50th Pl W
Lisa & Mitchell Vallins	10625 Marine View Dr
Diana & James Vandusen	1429 Scurlock Ln
Jennifer & Daniel Verheul	8910 56th Pl W
Nicole Veto	5029 84th St SW Unit 302
Shirin & Rosalio Villegas	8009 47th Pl W
Scott Wade	6317 Central Dr
Jeff Wakeman	10969 Villa Monte Ct
Terri & Eric Wallin	5630 104th Pl SW
Susan & Samuel Watkins	10610 53rd Ave W
Christopher Watmore	10029 50th Pl W
Mary & Ronald Wehde	12918 50th Pl W
Zhanna White	912 4th St
Deborah Willcut	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd
Lorenzo & Corey Williams	4714 Hidden Forest Dr Apt 10C
Tracy Wilson	6006 96th St SW
Michael, Kyong, Acadia Wong	8825 56th Pl W



Byron & Cathy Wright	6278 Harbour Heights Pkwy
Eric Wu	10523 62nd Pl W
Lorna & Brian Wuellner	5600 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 1-407
Brian Wyrick	10907 59th Ave W
Danya & Chris Youngblood	847 Goat Trail Loop Rd
Yanlin Yu	12577 Hummingbird St
Nick Zandi	4836 Ellis Way
Andres Zapata	4676 Camden Pl
Erica Zapata	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt C103
Boris Zaretsky	6016 122nd Pl SW
Ya Zhou	10720 58th Ave W
Peter & Maria Zieve	10517 62nd Pl W
Musaka & Salome Zimba	1035 17th Ct
Patricia & Fred Zimbelman	5008 Holyoke St
Alan Zugel	834 2nd St

### *July 2, 2020 8:00 AM – Lauren Balisky*

City Council will be discussing the consultant contract for the Housing Action Plan this coming Monday evening if you are interested.

The meeting materials and link to participate online are available on the City's website: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736).

### *July 2, 2020 9:04 AM – Lisa McBroom*

Thank you so much for letting us know about the meeting.

### *July 6, 2020 6:24 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Dear Mayor Gregerson and City Council:

I respectfully request you table your vote tonight to appoint Berk Consulting as consulting firm to receive the grant and perform the Housing Action Plan study which states that the City of Mukilteo agrees to adopt the study result and conclusions of the consultant chosen by the City.

As you are well aware, you all represent the City in a representative capacity, and you have both (1.) Been elected (or chosen as replacement by City Council) to uphold existing City, County, State and National laws.



And (2.) You all also have a responsibility to represent the wishes and interests of the citizens of Mukilteo who live in Mukilteo today.

For the City of Mukilteo to select a designated consultant company tonight, i.e. Berk Consulting, who will come up with a plan for housing affordability which MUST be adhered to and followed by Mukilteo is to force, to impose, to inflict an unwanted, and socialist (not free enterprise) form of housing regulation concepts, and which will also contain some unconstitutional set of conditions, upon us for which we have not voted or consented to. And so you will tonight, if you select them now, be willingly trying to subjugate yourselves and your authority and ourselves and our wishes, preferences and rights to the end result they come up with, no matter what it is.

What you are trying to do is NOT a sound business practice because the City of Mukilteo, with the selection of a consulting firm, is to lose all present and future control over many of these related housing issues, which is ludicrous and foolish.

Please honor the written signatures of almost 500 registered voters so far in Mukilteo who are all very strongly opposed to you taking any action on this tonight, and please return these issues to preconsultant selection public discussions and voter ballot considerations.

Thank you very much for your careful considerations.

*July 6, 2020 6:20 PM – Jennifer Gregerson*

Lisa,

If the Council approves the selection of the consultant, nearly their entire task will be to do outreach to the community to understand our housing needs and what we want our future to look like.

I do not support the concept of an advisory vote on a decision that is delegated as part of the legislative authority of the City Council. In addition, the HAP does not exist to vote for or against.

Finally, the preparation of the Action Plan will be that opportunity to gather public input and feedback. Preparing it will help the City respond to state pressure to address this issue, whether it's the mandated housing review in 2023/24 or the possibility of future state legislative action.

*July 6, 2020 6:42 PM – Lisa McBroom*

Mayor Gregerson -

Thank you for your quick, preprepared response to my email regarding selecting a consultant tonight or not.

The people of Mukilteo realize that you are personally interested in proceeding with selection of the HAP consultant in order to change quite a few housing regulations in Mukilteo and that do NOT personally want, as you clearly indicate here in your response, any ability of the citizens of Mukilteo to have impact on final



recommendations by the consultant, only that citizens would be informed and told how things will be in the future.

We understand a socialist concept of things being imposed us and we do not want that.

We are asking you, professionally, to honor a very strong opposition to selecting the consultant now, due to overwhelming public outcry.

We think it is ethical for you to do what the people of Mukilteo want, and we hope you will decide to represent our wishes in these matters.

Thanks for your open dialogue and considerations.

*July 6, 2020 6:56 PM – Lisa McBroom*

It is interesting and presumptive that Berk Consultants today lists the City of Mukilteo as one of their current client. Does anyone have a problem with this? I don't think you all voted to accept them yet. Sounds like something is being ramrodded again, just like the secretly agreed upon HAP grant. This is not the way to run matters for the City of Mukilteo.





### 39. Morgan, Matthew (Matt)

*July 6, 2020 2:39 PM – Matthew Morgan*

Hello. I just want to voice my concerns about potential housing changes. Living in Possession Bay I have already been impacted by changes allowed by local government (flights from Paine). I want to protect my home value and living standard. We have already had low-cost housing constructed across from the old Albertsons. Please shelf your new housing plan. Please preserve the nice Mukilteo we worked hard to live in.

*September 5, 2020 6:42 AM – Matt Morgan*

Hello and thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. I am concerned about the potential of higher density housing in Mukilteo. I chose to move to Mukilteo because of its livable attributes. Over the years changes have led to a decline in living conditions. I feel more high-density housing would lead to continued decline. Please don't go down that path. Thank you.



## 40. Nayak, Dilep

*November 2, 2020 1:26 PM – Dilep Nayak – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am very against the HAP initiative. I would like the city government to provide the rationale for accepting and proceeding with the Housing Action Plan when adjacent cities such as Everett and Lynnwood who have much more resources rejected the approach. We are a small community with very limited resources and being a resident it concerns me that our local government does not put more effort towards the current homeowners. We don't have a single public park in the harbour pointe area for the children for instance. Most or all activities locally were being cancelled or downgraded pre-pandemic such as the farmer's market and the lighthouse festival. I would like specific answers to these questions please. Thank you for your time.

*November 2, 2020 2:22 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for submitting your comments on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) to the City. I am unsure from your comments what your questions were, however per your request will do my best to respond to them here.

- The Housing Action Plan (HAP) will be a set of recommendations for how to address current and future housing needs. These recommendations will be based on available data about existing residents and employees as well as community input. Recommendations could include things like programs, policy changes, or future development regulation changes that, for example, could help rehabilitate existing homes, adjust the requirements for accessory dwelling units, or improve permit processes.
- The HAP has not been written or adopted at this time. We are currently in the process of completing the Housing Needs Assessment, which is that data piece that takes a look at our existing residents and employees, existing housing, and identifies where issues may exist based on available data.
  - o If you would like to learn more about the Housing Needs Assessment and the HAP process, please join us this Thursday at 7 PM for a Community Meeting. A link and an agenda will be available on our HAP webpage later this afternoon: <https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/planning-long-range/housing-action-plan/housing-action-plan-project-library/#community>
- Adoption of the HAP also does not automatically mean the recommendations are in effect; it simply means that the City Council agrees that the recommendations are worth pursuing in the future. The City Council can adopt some or all of the recommendations in the HAP. Any future changes to development regulations or the long-range vision for the City, called the [Comprehensive Plan](#), would have a separate public process and opportunity for input.
- The City of Everett and the City of Lynnwood both received grant funding from the Washington State Department of Commerce to complete a Housing Action Plan (see [Commerce's March 2020 List of Grantees](#)).



- You can find out more about Everett's HAP here: <https://wa-everett.civicplus.com/2536/Rethink-Housing>
- You can find out more about Lynnwood's HAP here: <https://www.lynnwoodwa.gov/Services/Development-Business-Services/Planning-Zoning/Ongoing-Planning-Projects/Housing-Action-Plan>

Thank you also for sharing your concern about a lack of public playgrounds in Harbour Pointe. I have cc'd Parks Director Jeff Price so that he may answer your comments about that and the events more directly.

If you have any further questions or comments, feel free to contact us.

*December 5, 2020 12:27 PM – Dilep Nayak – Via HAP Comment Form*

The City of Mukilteo should conduct urban planning, however the Housing Action Plan as it's currently constructed will only cause harm to a fine city who's standard of living is slowly degrading. This is a very small city with limited resources and the HAP is attempting to abuse those limited resources further by over crowding and removing the single family way of life. I am opposed to low income housing dictated by local government in a city so small and with such limited resources. As it is there are no parks available for children in the Harbour Pointe area and almost all of the functions (Lighthouse Festival and Farmer's Market) that we were used to having in this community have lost the resources to continue. The way of life is trending down and HAP will only continue to trend it further down.



#### 41. Nicoll-Henry, Kris

*May 21, 2020 11:21 AM – Kris Nicoll-Henry*

I just want to congratulate the Mukilteo City Council for their efforts in receiving the Affordable Housing Plan grant. I support this construction in Mukilteo 100%. I am appalled by the flyer I got in the mail yesterday from the "Preserve Mukilteo" group. I am saddened and angered to know some of the people on their list of supporters. I will be contacting them with my disapproval.

Thank you and please continue your work in Mukilteo.

*May 21, 2020 11:29 AM – Nancy Passovoy*

Thank you very much for your feedback and support of this grant, which is to address housing affordability in Mukilteo. It's appreciated.

*July 1, 2020 2:54 PM – Lauren Balisky*

The City Council will be discussing the consultant contract for the Housing Action Plan this coming Monday evening if you are interested.

The meeting materials and link to participate online are available on the City's website: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736).



## 42. Nielson, Justin

*September 28, 2020 12:50 PM – Justin Nielson – Via HAP Comment Form*

I have learned the Housing Action Plan may result in changes allowing higher density residential areas or a reduction in the required number of parking spaces per residence. I live in Discovery Crest which has had problems with the residents of the condominiums across Harbour Pointe Blvd parking in our neighborhood.

I am opposed to changes that would result in fewer required parking spaces per residence or housing with higher density. These changes have implications beyond just the new development. Mukilteo is a great place to live and should not allow higher density housing. These changes will likely reduce the quality of life for many current residents. One of the reasons I live in Mukilteo is because of the neighborhoods: single family houses with a reasonable amount of space.



### 43. Palu-Benson, Fabienne

*September 2, 2020 2:38 PM – Fabienne Palu-Benson – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am concern about the rumors regarding the city wanting to add a lot of low income housing. First of all this will completely change the way Mukilteo is and the reason why people live in Mukilteo. If I wanted to live with a lot of low income housing I would have bought a house in Everett. These extra homes will put a huge strain on our schools as they are already filled to capacity. In the HS students are having classes in Trailers!! Kamiak HS is what brings people with children to Mukilteo. The reputation of the school is why people purchase a home here. Change this dynamic and there will be an exodus towards Lake Stevens or Bellevue. I will not stay in Mukilteo if the city changes too much from where it is now.



#### 44. Pancerzewski, Charlie

*October 13, 2020 9:35 PM – Charlie Pancerzewski – Via HAP Comment Form*

How was the stakeholder group selected, who selected them and what are their names? Are they all Mukilteo residents? What are the qualifications to be a stakeholder?

Why was I not given an opportunity to be a stakeholder?

*October 14, 2020 8:46 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for your questions regarding how the Housing Action Plan (HAP) Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) was chosen. I will answer each of your questions, below:

**1. How was the stakeholder group selected, who selected them and what are their names?**

BERK asked the City to consider a group of 10-12 community members who would provide focused review, input, and idea testing at four meetings between October and February. Suggestions for who could be on the panel included:

- Local community members – with diverse perspectives, including typically under-represented groups
- Key regional partners
- Private sector housing interests
- Nonprofit housing advocates
- Developers
- Financial experts in housing
- Real Estate representatives
- Student or Youth voices

Staff asked for nominations from City Councilmembers, the Mayor, and the Chamber of Commerce. Staff also reviewed our list of housing developers and who had been participating regularly in the HAP process. We wanted to ensure both a range of voices, as well as voices that were not as familiar with the City processes.

The names of the participants on the SAG can be found on the City's Housing Action Plan website here: <https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/planning-long-range/housing-action-plan/housing-action-plan-faq/#Q12>.

**2. Are they all Mukilteo residents?**



All of the community members are Mukilteo residents. I do not know where the business and housing representatives on the SAG live; however they are all invested in this community.

### **3. What are the qualifications to be a stakeholder?**

There are no formal qualifications to be a participant on the SAG, other than being in one of the categories listed above and having an interest in housing in Mukilteo.

### **4. Why was I not given an opportunity to be a stakeholder?**

While you were not specifically nominated, understandably we were unable to invite everyone in the community to participate on the SAG. This does not preclude you from participating in the HAP process.

Other ways to participate in the near future include:

- Watch the first SAG Meeting at 4 PM on October 15, 2020
  - The agenda is available online in the [Stakeholder Advisory Group](#) portion of the [HAP Project Library](#) webpage.
  - The public is welcome to view but unable to comment, since the SAG is a focus group and not a formal body making recommendations.
  - The meeting will be available live via the [City's Facebook page](#) and Zoom (link in the agenda), or as a Facebook recording.
- Watch or submit public comment at the upcoming [Planning Commission meeting](#) (links to agenda), at 7 PM on October 15, 2020
  - Planning Commission will provide staff and the project team initial feedback on the draft Housing Needs Assessment (also available on the [HAP Project Library](#) webpage).
  - No decisions or formal recommendations will be made.
  - The public is welcome to view and comment live via Zoom (link in agenda).
  - Planning Commission meetings are all recorded and will be uploaded to the City's website.
- The SAG will also be reviewing the draft Housing Needs Assessment at its late October meeting, which you will be able to watch live or as a recording.
- There will be a community meeting in November so that people can provide direct feedback to staff and the BERK team – please keep an eye out for notices on this
- As you are aware, anyone can submit a comment or question at any time on the City's HAP Comment webpage.

There will be additional opportunities through Spring 2021 to participate in community meetings, Planning





Commission review, the environmental review process, and the public hearing process.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.



#### 45. Patrick, Dana

*December 10, 2020 5:26 PM – Dana Patrick – Via HAP Comment Form*

I have been a Mukilteo homeowner since 1989. My husband and I chose this community because of it's charm, quality of education, and neighborly small town appeal. I write today, expressing my opposition to HAP. I feel that affordable housing options currently exist and that the need for us to create further options is not essential in any way. I have 4 adult children who have chosen other communities to live in based on their personal financial situations. I am fine with that. There was a time when I too had to live in other communities. Our schools are already overly crowded (pre-Covid/distance learning), stressed for resources, and having difficulty meeting the needs of our existing population. Newly retired, I feel burdened by my property taxes & am fearful of increasing levels that I feel imminent with HAP . Please, let us drop these HAP pursuits & focus on our "current business at hand"--Mukilteo's existing families and youth, local businesses (who contribute greatly to our community welfare), our first responders & the safety of our residents & visitors, traffic issues, waterfront development, etc., etc., etc. Thank you for your consideration, Dana Patrick



## 46. Preserve Mukilteo

### *June 23, 2020 1:59 PM – Preserve Mukilteo*

Preserve Mukilteo (PM) is a registered PAC with 442 members, all signed and verified voters of Mukilteo and listed below. We think Mukilteo is perfect the way it is and does not need any changes. We want to maintain the character of Mukilteo.

- We implore the City Council not to study or adopt a Housing Action Plan (HAP).
- We are opposed to the \$100,000 HAP grant that was accepted by a 4:3 vote on January 21, 2020 without community notice, comment or debate.
- In reference to the action scheduled for July 6 we disapprove of the City Council hiring Berk Consulting for the development of a HAP. Berk Consulting is a downtown Seattle firm and does not understand the values and culture of a community like Mukilteo.
- The HAP will not benefit the residents and voters of Mukilteo.
- The HAP when implemented will draw on and over burden services, infrastructure and schools.
- The HAP in any of its potential forms will cause discontent in Mukilteo. The widespread construction of auxiliary dwelling units (ADU) will cause discontent. A high-density housing zone will cause discontent. A large housing project (i.e. Vantage apartments) will cause discontent. The best option is to leave Mukilteo the way it is.
- Preserve Mukilteo demands that any zoning changes proposed to implement the HAP be subject to a vote of the people.

The 442 voters listed below have signed the membership to Preserve Mukilteo and have reviewed and approved of this email.

Nazmy Abdelmalek	6016 Championship Cir
Chip & Bentley Adams	4524 73rd Pl SW
Hyong N & Keumja Ahn	1002 Washington Ave
Emma & Bongbong Alfaro	11108 Chennault Beach Rd Apt 1822
Karen Allison	5404 101st St SW
Brijan & Samira Badshah	9811 Marine View Dr
Amit Bakshi	4840 Village Ln
Eric,Douglas,Anthony Baldrige	9330 60th Ave W
Jack Barrass	7061 47th Ave W



Brandon Bates	4515 73rd Pl SW
Christopher Beamis	4407 130th Pl SW
Ken Benoit	5614 114th St SW
Edward Benson	4801 Hunttings Ln
Jeanmathieu Bernard	5735 94th Pl SW
Kanwalpreet & Bhupinder Bhangu	4538 Finch St
Bonnie Bishop	12701 54th Ave W
Gary & Sandra Bland	8815 46th Pl W
Terry Boaz	10803 56th Pl W
Sharron Boepple	7713 Island View Ct Apt B
Loretta & Jonathan Bolduan	660 Campbell Ave
Guy & Carita Boswell	8523 46th Pl W
Andrew Bowen	4500 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt 206
Raymond Boyer	10603 56th Ave W
Ronald Bradshaw	9000 44th Ave W
Donna Brashler	7621 49th Ave W
Marcia & Michael Broude	10105 48th Ave W
Catherine & William Cardillo	12710 60th Ave W
Marina & Todd Carroll	11619 E Oakmont Dr
Catherine Carter	8221 53rd Ave W Unit 38
Cecil Chapman	5911 112th Pl SW
Eva Chapman	5911 112th Pl SW
Edward Chesnutis	4921 131st St SW
Young Choi	6615 Waterton Cir
Chang & Yoon Ju Chung	5500 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt C202
Daniel Clark	13302 42nd Ave W
Daria Cline	6113 128th St SW
Robert & Huei Clinton	1720 Washington Ave
Robert & Marianne Conger	10981 Vista Dr
Beihua & Brehden Conover	4601 Camden Pl
Anna Davidson	6317 Central Dr
Jill and Chris Davidson	10302 62nd Pl W
Sean and Wendy Davidson	10021 48th Ave W
Richard & Quentin Davis	5209 102nd St SW



Janet Delorey-Lytle	9035 Hargreaves Pl
Victoria Devine	13017 47th Pl W
Yonglian Ding	12540 Hummingbird Ln
Andrey & Olga Dimnin	10032 50th Pl W
Peter & Helen Drummen	5416 93rd Pl SW
Devin Durbin	10015 48th Ave W
David & Chaviess Durocher	13124 47th Pl W
Melissa Eckstrom	4758 Park Dr Apt 108
Shirley Ellstrom	1408 Crownmill Ave
Susan Erak	5500 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt B201
Harold & Roxanne Erickson	920 8th St
Ross & Katherine Everett	1514 Debreton Ln
Rebecca & Timothy Faulk	8405 54th Ave W
Juanita Favor	11108 Chennault Beach Rd Apt 2511
Jon & Deborah Fazekas	9752 Marine View Dr
Sally & Glen Feters	6200 93rd Pl SW
Richard Feuer	10300 53rd Ave W
Terry Firestone	8830 46th Pl W
Georgia Fisher	5107 87th Pl SW
Kevin Flynn	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt B202
April Folkesson	1315 Goat Trail Ct
Rick Foltz	8230 53rd Ave W Unit C
Deanna Francisco	912 4th St
Johnny Francisco	912 4th St
Anthony Fung	1941 Clover Pl
Margaret Gallo	5300 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 301C
Gemma Garber	629 Cornelia Ave
Mary & Mark Garrett	9116 50th Pl W
Lee Gompf	10531 59th Ave W
Shirley Gompf	4715 Bridgeport Pl
Anna & Matthew Goodrich	6007 128th St SW
Gene Goosman	10967 E Villa Monte Dr
Jaynbe & Todd Gracom	11009 E Villa Monte Dr
Gwynn Graika	10231 50th Pl W



Rochelle Gray	5600 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 2-408
Robert & Leslie Gregg	1530 Washington Ave
Parmjit Grewal	8610 44th Ave W
Ralph Griffin	9020 61st Pl W
Sherry Grosso	9814 Marine View Dr
Kathryn Grounds	10614 62nd Pl W
Marie Gudgel	610 Front St Apt 203
Wei Guo	1593 Lumley Ave
Jason Hallowell	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit FF105
Klaus & Adele Hann	8457 Smugglers Cove Ln SW
Ron Hansen	13519 47th Pl W
Owen Haugen	5116 81st Pl SW Apt 1
Levi Haupt	5131 87th Pl SW
Bruce Hays	4431 92nd St SW
Richard & Troy Hess	4604 80th St SW
Vicki & Anthony Hewlett	693 Washington Ave
Candace Hicks	12406 61st Ave W
Frederick & Christine Hill	610 Front St Apt 403
Jeffrey & Cynthia Hill	12916 49th Ave W
Malin Holcomb	8809 56th Pl W
Eric and Debra Hovland	5219 92nd St SW
Patricia & Paul Hughes	11613 E Oakmont Dr
Adam & Linda Humfleet	6276 Harbour Heights Pkwy
Damandeep & Navdeep Hundal	8629 45th Pl W
Melissa Huynh	5307 125th Pl SW
Bill & Renee Irwin	8032 53rd Ave W Unit A
Norman & Eunice Ishii	511 15th Pl
Yolanda Jackson	4921 131st St SW
Mary & Joseph Jackson	402 5th St
Rhonda Jansen	10915 59th Ave W
Gordon Jensen	7621 49th Ave W
Dennis Johnson	829 2nd St Ste 1
Joan Johnson	610 Front St Apt 205
Clifford & Ruth Johnson	610 Possession View Ln



Kyle & Christy Johnson	11923 Preswick Ln
Myrna & Daniel Jones	9139 50th Pl W
Cinthia & Kris Jorgensen	1205 8th Dr
Rafiqullah Kakar	1519 Mukilteo Ln
Daehyun,Shadon,Sungmee Kang	4804 80th St SW
Harbans Kaur	12413 Ironwood Ln
Harleen Kaur	12413 Ironwood Ln
Kevin & Mary Keeley	4768 81st Pl SW
Patrick Keller	5300 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 305E
Chanroeun Khiev	5828 111th St SW
Mike,Jacob,Lori,MikeJr Kibler	9445 57th Ave W
Shaina Kirsch	12064 Minor Way
Judy & Ronald Kissler	10120 Marine View Dr
Sharon Kocik	1341 Crownmill Ave
Navin & Rashmi Kumar	11869 Possession Way
Joseph Kunthara	6135 St Andrews Dr
Jeffrey & Brenda LaSorella	11803 59th Ave W
Pierre & Amy Laroche	5528 104th Pl SW
Deborah & Robert Larsen	4556 Finch St
Rebecca Larson	4824 Pointes Dr
Mike & Linda Lechnar	13117 Harbour Heights Dr
Joann Lee	11801 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 409
Chong & Shin Lee	5228 107th St SW
John & Carol Levandowski	5678 95th Pl SW
David & Nancy Levy	908 10th St
Raphael & Aprille Libut	10808 53rd Ave W
Ly Lin	12574 Eagles Nest Dr
Brian Loomis	1241 S Ridge Ln
Patricia & Paul Luczyk	704 9th Pl
Amanda & Daniel Lynn	1505 Mukilteo Blvd
Janice Macfarlane	10725 Marine View Dr
Teija Mackie	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd
Michael Mahar	8814 52nd Pl W
Paul Marshall	1702 Washington Ave



Sean & Ann Martin	4406 85th Pl SW
Brian Mayer	5631 88th St SW
Peter Mayer	6006 96th St SW
Chester & Lisa McBroom	10121 64th Pl W
Sean & Tracy Mccarron	12411 61st Ave W
Mary & Gerald Mcginley	9227 50th Pl W
David & Sherry Mcgowan	11018 60th Ave W
Darren & Raelene McIntosh	12811 56th Pl W
Charles McIntyre	12568 Hummingbird St
Keith & Michelle Mcspadden	8804 53rd Pl W
Chelsea Meggitt	5618 N Grove Dr
William Mellon	12701 54th Ave W
Shane Michaels	1495 Mukilteo Speedway
Corneliu,Simona,Renee,Jeremy Michaels	4635 88th St SW
Donald & Dawn Millard	12260 Championship Cir
Mason Miller	4801 Hunttings Ln
Mohammad Miri	629 Cornelia Ave
Leslie Moch	1241 S Ridge Ln
Parul Mohan	4685 Arbors Cir
Brianna Moore	9511 49th Ave W Apt 17J
Rachel Morgan	4409 130th Pl SW
Maria Moroseos	11006 60th Ave W
Ralph Munson	6107 91st Pl SW
Stacey Murphy	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt G302
Dilep Nayak	12420 Double Eagle Dr
Brianna Nelson	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit FF105
Sandra Newgard	4817 131st St SW
Steele Newman	10720 58th Ave W
Jane Ng	4832 Bridgeport Pl
Nam Nguyen	8817 56th Pl W
Tuan Nguyen	4720 Northport Dr
Justin & Kael Nielson	12815 52nd Pl W
Marjorie & Mark Nordlie	5702 95th Pl SW
Mary,Madison,Rick,Patrick Norman	6204 93rd Pl SW





Maryann O'brien	9137 50th Pl W
Christine O'Donnell	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit Y203
Ronald & Sally Osborn	619 Park Ave
Walter Osick	6020 122nd Pl SW
Eric & Patricia Otness	9306 61st Ave W
Fabienne Palu-Benson	4801 Hunttings Ln
Saoirse Palu-Benson	4801 Hunttings Ln
Timothy Parish	4786 Arbors Cir
Edwin Park	11801 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 409
Dana and Bruce Patrick	5919 117th Pl SW
Charles Peter	4809 72nd Pl SW
Jeannette & Arlin Peters	12529 Hummingbird Ln
Vin Pham	2373 Mukilteo Speedway
Mai & Duy Phan	4417 80th St SW
Stephen Phelan	5529 101st St SW
Gregory & Donna Poulsen	809 7th St
Barbara & Chris Prentki	10627 53rd Ave W
Jordan Prudnick	1517 Debreton Ln
Muhammad Qazi	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit Y207
Ming & Xianzhi Quan	12577 Hummingbird St
Ronald & Leanne Rafter	6252 Harbour Heights Pkwy Apt C4
Caitlynn-Jasmine & Cielo Ragas	12928 50th Pl W
Madhavadas Ramnath	12620 Hummingbird St
Darshan,Poonham,Sarwesh Rauniyar	1477 Mukilteo Ln
Mike and Connie Reilly	10911 59th Ave W
Rosalie Remick	8221 53rd Ave W Unit 42
Elizabeth Richardson	13412 45th Ct W
Micah & Zoe Riggs	9415 61st Ave W
Donald & Renee Ripley	914 4th St
Dylan Ritchie	9511 49th Ave W Apt 17J
Paolo Rocca	9041 Hargreaves Pl
Cynthia & Mark Roesler	4201 130th Pl SW
William & Mari Rogers	9403 61st Ave W
John & Gang Ruan	10401 53rd Ave W



Ulla Rudd	8221 53rd Av W Apt 49
Rebecca & Jason Rudzinski	4811 Bridgeport Pl
Sheila Sampatacos	5400 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit C201
James Sanchez	7008 49th Ave W
Ron & Wanda Sapp	875 Goat Trail Loop Rd
Anthony Sarno	5426 111th Pl SW
Amy Schaper	13102 Harbour Heights Dr
Henry Schilling	5632 107th Pl SW
James Schmitt	5829 94th St SW
Leslie,Rolf,Eben Schumann	4932 99th St SW
Jeremy Seager	5400 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit A103
Nancy Seager	8714 54th Pl W
Sunshine Self	5116 81st Pl SW Apt 4
Edward & Lynda Sergoyan	5500 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt F202
Christy & Richard Sewell	7085 47th Ave W
Jeri & Frank Sexton	637 Cornelia Ave
Tieyan Shang	10523 62nd Pl W
Jasmine Sidhu	5131 126th St SW
Devinderjit & Navneet Sidhu	12553 Hummingbird St
Deeann & Robert Simon	610 Front St Apt 304
Narinder Singh	12423 61st Ave W
Manveer & Harninder Singh	12413 Ironwood Ln
Armandina & Corie Smith	8221 53rd Ave W Unit G22
Robert & Evy Sola	12031 Possession Way
Qi Song	630 Loveland Ave
Anna & George Sotolongo	13312 46th Pl W
Amanda & Mark Spell	11623 Grove Dr
Mark Stevens	4802 Hunttings Ln
Marcie Stoetzel	1495 Mukilteo Speedway
Satich Subramaniam	6824 St Andrews Dr
Paula & Daniel Sullivan	1128 3rd St
Angeline & Charles Summey	5109 125th Pl SW
Sharon Swann	12512 54th Ave W
Paul Taber	4815 Hidden Forest Dr Apt 4G



Songsong Tao	10401 53rd Ave W
Tieying & Alan Tapert	5230 102nd St SW
Hugh Taylor	10423 Marine View Dr
Tim, Carol, Natalie Tonto	6203 Bayview Dr
George Thomas	13416 45th Ct W
Christine Thompson	5228 92nd St SW
Jeanne Thompson	4912 90th Pl SW
Rachel Thompson	5631 88th St SW
Harpinder Tiwana	8610 44th Ave W
Natalie Tolliver	5526 107th St SW
Brian & Joal Tolmie	11518 W Oakmont Dr
Rob and Corky Townsend	6001 St Andrews Dr
Keegan Trester	5029 84th St SW Unit 406
Richard & Shirley Troppman	8311 45th Pl W
Lillian & Carl Truby	11332 58th Ave W
Charles Tung	10702 62nd Pl W
Linda & Stuart Turner	8708 53rd Ave W
Judith & James Underwood	9764 Marine View Dr
Donna Vago	9728 49th Pl W
Connie & Arnie Valeriano	12928 50th Pl W
Lisa & Mitchell Vallins	10625 Marine View Dr
Diana & James Vandusen	1429 Scurlock Ln
Jennifer & Daniel Verheul	8910 56th Pl W
Nicole Veto	5029 84th St SW Unit 302
Shirin & Rosalio Villegas	8009 47th Pl W
Scott Wade	6317 Central Dr
Jeff Wakeman	10969 Villa Monte Ct
Terri & Eric Wallin	5630 104th Pl SW
Susan & Samuel Watkins	10610 53rd Ave W
Christopher Watmore	10029 50th Pl W
Mary & Ronald Wehde	12918 50th Pl W
Zhanna White	912 4th St
Deborah Willcut	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd
Lorenzo & Corey Williams	4714 Hidden Forest Dr Apt 10C



Tracy Wilson	6006 96th St SW
Michael,Kyong,Acadia Wong	8825 56th Pl W
Byron & Cathy Wright	6278 Harbour Heights Pkwy
Eric Wu	10523 62nd Pl W
Lorna & Brian Wuellner	5600 Harbour Pointe Blvd Unit 1-407
Brian Wyrick	10907 59th Ave W
Danya & Chris Youngblood	847 Goat Trail Loop Rd
Yanlin Yu	12577 Hummingbird St
Nick Zandi	4836 Ellis Way
Andres Zapata	4676 Camden Pl
Erica Zapata	12303 Harbour Pointe Blvd Apt C103
Boris Zaretsky	6016 122nd Pl SW
Ya Zhou	10720 58th Ave W
Peter & Maria Zieve	10517 62nd Pl W
Musaka & Salome Zimba	1035 17th Ct
Patricia & Fred Zimbelman	5008 Holyoke St
Alan Zugel	834 2nd St

#### *July 11, 2020 9:34 AM – Preserve Mukilteo<sup>4</sup>*

PM will need 15% of registered voters to sign or about 1900 to get this on the ballot. Ideally the Nov 3 ballot. Please review and if you have any legal friends get their eye on it as well. PM will mail to every household at least once, maybe more.

We are in much worse shape than Edmonds where the mayor could not get her destruction plan through the city council:

<https://myedmondsnews.com/2019/01/contentious-capacity-crowd-as-edmonds-housing-strategy-discussion-continues/>

Our squad guarantees that whatever plan the mayor proposes it will get a rubber stamp. JB told me that the Edmonds mayor seemed to be getting lubrication from Compass Construction. See Janet Pope from Compass Construction in the article.

Mailing alone will not be enough. We will need volunteers of all sorts.

---

<sup>4</sup> Forwarded to City on July 15, 2020 at 3:04 PM.

December 30, 2020 4:45 AM – Preserve Mukilteo<sup>5</sup>



Very ugly. I took this photo just before I crossed into Mukilteo. This is what our mayor and city council intend to bring to Mukilteo. Bad enough that we need to have it on the opposite side of Bev Park Rd.

Note it is 5 stories! We don't want more than 2 stories in Mukilteo. The height is about 70 feet off of the low side. We don't want more than 30 feet<sup>6</sup>. The density (residence per acre) is hard to calculate but I will when I can. There is almost no parking. Note that another similar monstrosity is going up on the Bev Park side to completely obliterate the parking lot. If you don't speak out now this is our future. All the other Vantage units are four stories so they just keep ratcheting up.

Everybody please go to this site and tell them you don't want this in Mukilteo! Make a second comment about this horrible development in the Vantage apartment complex on the Speedway.

<https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/planning-long-range/housing-action-plan/housing-action-plan-submit-comments-or-questions/>

The exact same thing is planned for the Boeing Harbour Pointe technical center. Lauren at the city told me that is a "done deal" and we have no input.<sup>7</sup> Simply hold up the zoning map to the existing parking lot and you can see what is coming. Were you consulted? No!

--

Preserve Mukilteo

[preservemukilteo@gmail.com](mailto:preservemukilteo@gmail.com)

Peter Zieve, temporary chairman

<sup>5</sup> Forwarded to City on December 31, 2020 at 2:49 PM.

<sup>6</sup> Current height limits in Mukilteo can be found online at:

<https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Mukilteo/#!/Mukilteo17/Mukilteo1720.html#17.20.020>

<sup>7</sup> See response to Peter Zieve, sent December 4, 2020 8:20 AM – Lauren Balisky.



10517 62nd Pl W, Mukilteo

4252934203



## 47. Rafter, Leanne

*July 6, 2020 11:35 AM – Leanne Rafter*

To Mayor Gregerson and the Mukilteo City Council,

This letter concerns the proposed adoption of the Housing Action Plan (HAP).

The plan is an extremely controversial proposal. The residents of Mukilteo need more information from both sides: those in favor and those opposed.

Therefore, we would strongly urge you to delay any action on this issue at this time and put it on the November ballot. The citizens of Mukilteo should make this decision, which is the democratic and correct way an issue of this importance should be handled.

Please listen to your constituents and give us the opportunity to make make an educated, well-informed decision at the November elections.



#### 48. Reilly, Mike

*December 30, 2020 8:56 PM – Mike Reilly – Via HAP Comment Form*

We do not need nor want changes in the existing zoning or regulations. Mukilteo has enough zoning that allows for affordable housing. In addition Mukilteo is surrounded with more than enough affordable housing. Our current zoning works.



## 49. Riley, Shirley

### *December 31, 2020 12:24 PM – Shirley Riley – Via HAP Comment Form*

We live in Sundance, and it recently came to our attention that a five story (?) residential building is slated to be built on the old Boeing office property land at the end of Harbour Heights Parkway, news that we find somewhat upsetting. We had understood the current building and property had been sold to a Kirkland company....Is the residential planning something in addition to that? My husband and myself and many of our neighbors and interested parties attended a meeting at city hall last year where we were able to provide feedback with regard to concerns about future plans for the property. We felt that good points were made and that we were heard in terms of concerns about construction noise, ability of our schools to support a large residential project, additional traffic, and so on. If it is true that a five story residential property is to be build in that area, then as a citizen and resident of Mukilteo--I feel that we were not heard. I need confirmation about these plans so that I know how to best proceed in letting our concerns be heard. Thank you.

### *December 31, 2020 12:31 PM – Lauren Balisky*

There are currently no proposals to develop the Boeing Technical Center into multi-family development. As you note, in early 2019 there was a request on the preliminary docket to change the future land use designation and zoning to allow for housing at the Boeing site.

The preliminary docket is a process where anyone from the public, staff and City Council can make suggestions for changes to land use designations, zoning, or development regulations. City Council holds a public hearing, and determine which items warrant further study. These items are then placed on the "final docket" for formal application and review. For this particular request, City Council voted to **not** place the request on the final docket, and it did not move any further (see minutes for the [April 1, 2019 City Council Meeting](#)). The property has since sold to [Systema Technologies](#), and we do not anticipate that they would request a rezone for a use incompatible with their business.

We have been receiving a lot of inquiries about this over the past two days – would you be willing to share where the information is coming from?

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance.

### *December 31, 2020 2:49 PM – Shirley Riley*

At the bottom of this email is the email I received from [redacted], my Sundance neighbor with regard to what we've spoken about today. After her message to me is the actual email from the Zeive group. She is apparently on a mailing list for this 'preserve mukilteo' group, got this email from them with the subject line 'Stopped the Car yesterday just before I crossed Bev Park Road'--and she connected with me and our HOA president (the Mills') to



find out what we thought. As I said, I figure the best way to find out the truth of something is to go someone who knows---and that was most certainly you! Thank you for your quick response---and thank you for clarifying both the process and the reality. I will pass on your email to my neighbors so they can rest easy and not worry about this misleading 'scam' from Zeive's group. Again--thank you for your work on behalf of our community. Happy New Year!



## 50. Ripley, Donald

*October 15, 2020 5:06 PM – Donald Ripley*

Comments re: Housing Action Plan

It seems there has been a lot of time and money spent on a project that not many people want. A lot of time and money spent attempting to convince citizens that we need this. Affordable Housing is not something we need and is not a priority at this time. Please move on.



## 51. Ripley, Renee

*July 6, 2020 4:02 PM – Renee Ripley*

Council,

We understand the council is considering hiring another consultant, Berk Consulting. Our concern is they are not familiar with Mukilteo

and the citizens who live here. We've hired consultants in the past, wasted a lot of tax dollars and were not happy with the results.

Many have written recent letters stating absolutely no affordable housing, no more construction. We would like to know more about Section 4.3.

which seems to be in favor of increasing the supply of housing. Please be aware if you are representing the citizens - most do not want any affordable housing as we are completely surrounded by affordable housing with even more being built right now.

Please take this seriously. We are asked to pay more and more taxes with less and less service and a quality of life that is not as nice as it once was. Please stop the downhill slide.

*September 1, 2020 11:27 PM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form*

Comments are Density should NOT exceed 22 units per acre.

Parking spots need to be addressed .

No more than 30 feet in height.

*November 5, 2020 11:33 AM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form*

It seems the Berk consulting reports projected figures are not figures specifically for Mukilteo.

This issue has been discussed in the past. Citizens at that time made it clear this type of housing NOT be allowed. How long have the stakeholders lived here? Mayor and council were elected to represent the citizens who live here. Our city has grown WAY to fast and we've seen our quality of life decline. Put this project on hold. There is no reason to try and rush this through during a pandemic when you know people won't have proper input or even know what's happening. This is not a priority. No more changes, absolutely no more population added.



*December 4, 2020 12:36 AM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form*

As a long time resident of Mukilteo we have seen many changes. Some of which have caused our quality of life to decrease substantially. The HAP project is another one of those. If you love Mukilteo it will not be hard to see that this project will do nothing for the good of the citizens here. Look around the area bordering Mukilteo - we are surrounded by "affordable housing". It is everywhere with more being built. We are adamantly opposed to this housing action plan. Citizens have put up with a lot and deserve better. NO AFFORDABLE HOUSING



## 52. Rocca, Paolo

*July 6, 2020 11:07 AM – Paolo Rocca*

Dear Mayor Gregerson and members of the Mukilteo City Council,

By now you have seen the letter below urging you not to study or adopt a Housing Action Plan (HAP). I personally find offensive, to all mukilteo residents, that this very important matter is being decided by the city council without informing the mukilteo residents; I myself found it out by chance, when I saw Mr Zieve's flyer in my mailbox. The only reason That Mr Zieve pledge got only 450 signatures is due to the Covid-19 pandemic; I talked to many people who are willing to open various stands to collect signature against this housing project, but I hope we do not have to move in that direction.

I echo Mr. Boris Zaretsky in his proposal to put the Housing Action Plan as a referendum on the November 2020 ballot. I would appreciate that this very important decision is taken through a fair and democratic process.

Therefore I ask you to please delay the HAP study and put the subject up for a vote through a referendum on the November 2020 ballot.



### 53. Rogers, William

*December 30, 2020 8:46 AM – Rogers, Bill – Via HAP Comment Form*

Mukilteo needs to maintain a 2 story building height restrictions and Require adequate parking lot spaces for all new construction.



## 54. Sanchez, Daniel

*November 16, 2020 2:19 PM – Daniel Sanchez – Via HAP Comment Form*

Could I make housing immediate for people?

Especially in this cold weather single or in a relationship or married.

*November 16, 2020 2:50 PM – Lauren Balisky*

I am not sure I understand your question – are you asking about temporary housing for the homeless during inclement weather?

If so, the City does have regulations that allow for this – please see [Chapter 17.78 of the Mukilteo Municipal Code \(MMC\)](#) for requirements, and let me know if you have any additional questions.

*November 17, 2020 6:00 PM – Daniel Sanchez*

Comment of guaranteed housing plan ?

*November 18, 2020 11:48 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Is there a good time to give you a call?

*November 18, 2020 7:16 PM – Daniel Sanchez*

8-4pm I'm staying at Carnegie Hall

*November 19, 2020 4:03 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Your question about guaranteed housing makes more sense now. The short answer is that no, the Mukilteo Housing Action Plan will not provide any guaranteed housing. It is a plan of future actions to take to improve housing options in City, but it does not actually construct any housing or make housing available.

I wish I had better news for you, or a magic wand, or that the solution to solving housing and housing needs was simpler. And I do want to sincerely thank you for reaching out with your question. [Carnegie Hall](#) is a great option in Snohomish County for connecting to housing options that are right for you.





## 55. Sarno, Anthony

*September 5, 2020 6:52 PM – Anthony Sarno – Via HAP Comment Form*

I want a 7 year moratorium on all residential development in Mukilteo. I have been living here and paying real estate taxes since 1997. I can't even recognize this place anymore. This used to be a really nice place to live, not anymore.

*November 6, 2020 1:57 PM – Anthony Sarno*

Sarah, the HAP is a complete farce, we are being scammed by Berk. I don't believe that any of the presented statistics were accurate. Am I supposed to feel bad that three decades of hard work put me into a nice neighborhood? Is that the message?

*November 9, 2020 8:54 AM – Sarah Kress*

I've cc'd Lauren Balisky, our Planning Manager and the lead on the Housing Action Plan, on this email. She will make note of your comments. She can also provide information on how BERK obtained their statistics.

*November 9, 2020 10:36 AM – Anthony Sarno*

Thanks for allowing me to vent.

*November 9, 2020 11:27 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for sending in your questions to the City of Mukilteo. As with all comments we receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and again to City Council as the Housing Action Plan (HAP) process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like, and we would encourage you to use the [comment form on the HAP website](#).

I will do my best to respond to what I understand your questions to be, below:

### **J) Where did all the data about residents of Mukilteo come from?**

A complete list of data sources is available in Appendix A of the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#) (HNA). None of the information is available to us at an individual person or household level – only by Census tract, zip code, or places (like Mukilteo as a whole, Snohomish County as a whole, the King-Snohomish-Pierce area as a whole, etc.).

Census data is publicly available on their website, here: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>. Other data, such as

from Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Snohomish County Point In Time homeless counts, etc. are all also publicly available. I believe the only one that may not be publicly available as a big block of data is the Zillow data (BERK – please correct me if I am wrong).<sup>2</sup>

**K) What responsibility does Mukilteo have to provide low-income housing?**

I realize I am extrapolating a bit here, since you are welcome to feel however you want about housing in your community, nor should you feel bad about being in a home and community you enjoy.

There is a nuanced distinction here that seems to have gotten a bit muddled in the HAP process – one is the difference between affordable housing and low-income housing:

- Affordable housing is housing affordable to the person or household in it. Obviously this varies greatly based on everyone's unique situation, but the metric used industry wide is whether you are spending 30% or more of your income on rent / mortgage and utilities.
- Low-income housing is a form of housing that is subsidized (and therefore affordable) for people generally earning 80% or below Area Median Income. These are programs (like Section 8) or places (such as some of the units at Vantage, just outside the City, and Carvel, inside the City).

The City is required to understand its housing needs as part of its long-range planning process. Under state law, the goal is to plan for Mukilteo's proportionate share (relative to Snohomish County) of projected population, housing units, and employment in a way that meets the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act. For housing, we are required to adopt a "housing element" in our long-range planning document for the City, also known as [Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan](#).

Specifically [the law states that](#):

*... Each comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design for each of the following:*

*...*

*(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that:*

*(a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth;*

*(b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences;*

*(c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and*

*(d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.*



*In counties and cities subject to the review and evaluation requirements of RCW [36.70A.215](#), any revision to the housing element shall include consideration of prior review and evaluation reports and any reasonable measures identified.*

The HNA helps us start meeting the above requirements, particularly in Items (2)(a) and (d). The current Comprehensive Plan, linked above, walks through each of the above items in turn for the growth projected through 2035.

The most recent numbers we have for Mukilteo's fair (proportionate) share of low-income housing is from [Snohomish County's 2025 Fair Share Housing Allocation](#) (see page 2), which states that Mukilteo's fair share of low- to moderate-income housing units is 1,537 in 2025.

For rental households, the HNA estimates that as of 2016, there are 1,480 units affordable to low-income households making less than 80% of Area Median Income, or a gap of 57 units that needs to be made up by 2025 under our growth allocation (see document page 46). Unfortunately, we do not have access to similar data for homeowner households, however I would guess that the number of units affordable to low- to moderate-income households has shrunk since 2016.

Snohomish County is in the process of updating their allocations, including fair share of housing, and we expect to receive new targets by the end of 2021. The City, through a public process, then gets to decide *how* it wants to accommodate the growth. An important nuance here is that the City is required to demonstrate that it can accommodate the growth, not to force the growth to happen. In other words, we decide how we want to set the stage, and the market decides when it wants to join in.

Please let me know if I can be of any additional assistance, and I hope you have a great week.

*December 5, 2020 1:28 PM – Anthony Sarno – Via HAP Comment Form <sup>8</sup>*

I am totally opposed to the HAP. This can do nothing positive for me, my family and my employees. It can cause a lot of problems. I moved my family to Mukilteo because I enjoy the "single family home" way of living. I don't know why the city is pursuing a program that will harm the residents of the city. In addition to my family of five and the one hundred and fifty employees of Electroimpact that live in Mukilteo, I also maintain an email group and membership of five hundred residents that is opposed to the HAP. I call my group Preservemukilteo. I am sure there are other groups as well. My membership is opposed to MR zoning, even more opposed to denser and higher than MR. I notice that half the upper parking lot at the Boeing tech center on Harbour Heights Parkway has recently been reclassified as MR with a PRD overlay. I have asked friends that live in that area. The Mukilteo residents I spoke to are not aware of this change. The change was made in the dead of night. I predict the residents will be enraged when they see this built up with a density of 26.4 dwellings per acre. The city staff is supposed to be working for the residents but it doesn't happen in Mukilteo. For some reason they are working against us.

---

<sup>8</sup> This appears to be a copy of the language submitted by Peter Zieve on December 4, 2020 at 4:12 AM. For this reason, this comment is not indexed.



## 56. Schumacher, Jeff

*May 20, 2020 12:01 PM – Steve Powers*

Thanks for the phone call yesterday and inquiry about whether or not 260 units of multifamily housing are proposed for construction in Mukilteo. In short, no such project is proposed at this time.

In researching the answer to your question I found only two projects that come close to the 260 figure. First, there was a preliminary proposal for a mixed-use commercial and parking garage project presented to the City late last year. This proposal included 261 parking spaces. Second, there is also a project located southeast of Mukilteo (not within our city limits) that proposes 176 multifamily units.

Again, the City is not currently processing an application for a 260-unit multifamily project. Please let me know if you have additional questions.

*May 20, 2020 3:02 PM – Jeff Schumacher*

I found the flyer

Can you share with me more in detail about what is going on ?

See attachment



## Attachment

# PRESERVE MUKILTEO

**Mukilteo will soon become a city with significant low-income housing.**

**Preserve Mukilteo** is a community group of Mukilteo voters trying to stop this. **Preserve Mukilteo** is opposed to the city adopting an Affordable Housing Plan (AHP). The AHP will recommend zoning changes that will encourage the construction of low-income housing in Mukilteo. This could bring in crime and drugs. If you own a home the AHP could crush the value of your home.

The mayor submitted a grant application to Olympia for the AHP on September 30, 2019. The grant was funded for \$100K and the city council voted 4:3 on January 21, 2020 to accept the grant without seeking approval of the voters. A "Project Scope of Services" for the consultant was written March 30, 2020. The consulting firm BERK Consulting has been engaged and is moving forward.

Read the documents at the below address, or if you request we can email the documents.

[bit.ly/preservemukilteo](https://bit.ly/preservemukilteo)

On page 8 of the grant proposal the mayor states that Mukilteo needs **2,660 units of low-income housing**. On the back of this card are 106 neighbors that have signed onto **Preserve Mukilteo** and oppose an AHP. We need you to join in order to preserve Mukilteo.

Preserve Mukilteo is registered by the PDC as a Political Committee. Peter Zieve is the sponsor.

**Registered Mukilteo voters that want to help stop the AHP, as many as possible, please sign below:**

Signature	Name	Address (Mukilteo)	Email

*Sign, take a picture with your cell and text the picture to 425.293.4203  
or email to [preservemukilteo@gmail.com](mailto:preservemukilteo@gmail.com)*



*May 21, 2020 3:06 PM – Steve Powers*

Thank you for your email and providing a copy of the mailer. I appreciate you taking the time to ask questions.

By way of background, the City received a State grant to prepare what is called a Housing Action Plan (“HAP”). The State made these funds available to cities throughout Washington in response to many households in our state being impacted by rising housing costs the past several years.

The City is in the process of hiring a consultant to work with the community in preparing the HAP.

I think it’s important for Mukilteo residents to know what the HAP is and is not. The HAP will allow the City to update our current housing data, review our current housing policies and create a public process to see how the City might implement code changes or develop strategies to encourage construction of affordable and market rate housing. Per the law that authorized the grants, this includes developing strategies for the “for-profit single-family home market.” So the plan is to look at the broad spectrum of housing needs and supply, and not for just any specific segment.

As the HAP is intended to address housing affordability, unfortunately, some people have interpreted that to mean that the City is making an effort to build low income housing. That is not the case. The HAP is not:

- a) A low-income housing program
- b) A financial assistance program for low-income households (or any household for that matter), or
- c) Approval of low-income housing construction permits

I hope you find this information helpful. I am cc’ing Lauren Balisky, Planning Manager, on this email. Please feel free to contact her if you have additional questions.

Thanks again for taking the time to learn about this community topic.

*May 22, 2020 9:26 AM – Jeff Schumacher*

Hi Steve and Lauren,

CC: Mukilteo City Council

Thanks for the information.

At times there is always community misinformation.

This flyer as attached is being circulated around the Mukilteo Community and is causing social disturbance.

Consider a public response on the Mukilteo Website and Mukilteo Beacon Newspaper to the attached document.

The public wants answers of what exactly is the intent of the Mukilteo City.



In short, there is lack of communication between the city of Mukilteo and the public.

Continuously, many citizens feel that the city of Mukilteo is moving forward with decisions without the public knowledge.

In addition to the Mukilteo City Council Meetings:

During Covid-19, Congressman Rick Larsen has regular public town home meetings by PHONE.

A phone call is made to the citizens to announce a one-two days in advance of a date/time for a phone town home meeting.

At that time, another phone call is made to start the meeting and there is instruction for citizens to push \*3 if they want to ask a question.

It is limited on how many citizens can ask a question and their talk time is limited to about 2-3 min.

- \* All Citizens that answer the phone call Townhome meeting are on mute and can simply listen to the meeting.
- \* Citizens are also able to opt out of any future Phone call announcements of Phone Town home meetings.
- \* Likewise, The City of Mukilteo should continuously have RECORDED monthly public PHONE town hall meetings to discuss City of Mukilteo activity and intent for one hour by PHONE.

The Phone Townhome recordings should be on the Mukilteo website for the public to review and to listen in the future.

This is my kind suggestion to help improve communication between The City of Mukilteo and the Public.



## 57. Sellentin, Jeff

*September 9, 2020 5:00 PM – Jeff Sellentin – Via HAP Comment Form*

These are my Feelings and Opinions related to the Housing Action Plan.

As an Architect and General Contractor I think this effort to control the market with unwarranted regulation is an overstep of government authority. Also note, I beleive this Federal Mandate was canceled this year and is yet another attempt to over reach into our lives and communities. Communities thrive without the interjection of ill-qualified politicians attempting an ill conceived attempt at creating affordable housing. Please focus on assisting businesses by leaving them alone or allowing them to thrive. Then wages for the local residences will thrive. Local , State and Federal Policies have been trying the same ill-advised thought processes and ideas with a miserable outcome. The number one thing we can do in Mukilteo is widen the small bridge that leads down to the ferry. It's a choke point and unsafe. The Housing Action Plan is the same garbage we were peddled in Grad School...how this was somehow going to solve a social issue. Get the Drugs, gangs, prowlers, Dealers and Pimps taken care of and people will thrive. The band-aid suggestions are unwanted and a waste although they make someone who doesn't know what they are doing feel good about themselves or feel powerful.

Any politician worth their salt has worked in the private sector and understands how difficult it is to make a buck. Handing things out merely diminishes the innate human need to work and be rewarded for the work. The churches are very good at helping the real needs. "GOVERNMENT is the Problem" ....as one of our great Presidents once said. Thanks Ron Reagan





## 58. Silver, Brent

*June 24, 2020 2:56 PM – Brent Silver*

Thought you should be aware that an error 404 occurs when hitting the 'more information, get involved' link on the Housing Action Plan. Also could you place me on an email notification list for Housing Action Plan updates? Thank you and have a nice afternoon.

*June 24, 2020 2:58 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for reminding me – I have not had a chance to finish building the page yet! I will be sure to let you know when it is live. Is there any information I can provide you in the meantime?

*June 24, 2020 3:18 PM – Brent Silver*

Glad to hear it is under construction and in safe hands. Adding me to the email list is great, thank you! Have looked over the schedule by Berk a bit and cannot think of any information right now that you could share but thanks for asking. Should I think of something I will reach out and ask. Take care and stay safe.

*July 1, 2020 2:43 PM – Lauren Balisky*

While I still have not had a chance to work on the website, I thought you might want to look at the agenda items for the July 6, 2020 Council Meeting. It is available on the City's website here: [https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view\\_id=4&event\\_id=736](https://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736)

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

*July 7, 2020 2:07 PM – Brent Silver*

Well that went long into the night! Listened in and wanted to express some thoughts while still fresh in my head.

It seems that fear/misinformation has taken root and was certainly expressed by 3 Council members. From what I understand from the packet you provided, this is a study with the final say of any action resting completely with the Council. It is not a Trojan Horse that will magically allow large apartment buildings to be built everywhere. Was quite surprised to hear that an income in the 50k range for an individual makes them housing burdened. How high for a family!

Looking through the various tactics that the State encourages, one stuck out that would allow for additional housing but not through rezones. It would also work well with the increase from 4 to 9 units for the simpler permitting process. The 6 lot per acre minimum that the State recommends seems to make sense and hopefully it

will be studied. It would provide more supply but also maintain the existing zoning throughout the city. This would make half acre and full acre parcels viable and the simpler permitting would help as well to keep costs down.

The ADU idea is great in theory but they are expensive to build as an add on to an existing home. If built with new housing it works better but the rent needed to break even is not affordable. It is a great idea for aging in place, snowbirds, etc. but is not the silver bullet on its own.

Anyway, thank you for keeping me aware of the goings on and listening to my thoughts.

### *July 7, 2020 4:16 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for listening in, and for sharing your thoughts. I do hope that you continue to participate and provide feedback as the opportunities present themselves, and I did ask the consultant to help me get a website up sooner than later to help get accurate information out there.

Believe it or not, Mukilteo currently does have a zone that is at the 6 lots per acre density. It is the RD-7.2 zone show in a few places on the [City's online Zoning Map](#). RD-7.6 is also close to that threshold, but results in a net density of 5 lots per acre (mostly in Old Town).

If I remember correctly the State required that jurisdictions allow ADUs a number of years ago. Mukilteo adopted a code in 2009, but it really has not gotten much use. Things we could look at are form (what they look like), bulk restrictions (size, where they are placed), how much parking is required and where it can be located. There are also things on the permitting side, such as standard plans (meaning they do not need to be designed from scratch), or ways to expedite permitting.

### *July 10, 2020 11:09 AM – Brent Silver*

Thank you for the zoning map and the info about existing 6 units per acre. Sounds like the city is close to build out and an updated buildable land study will be quite helpful. From what I could tell it looks like the 7.2 and 7.6 zones seem concentrated in Old Town.

My thoughts on ADUs are that they are a better and less expensive build with new housing compared to as additions to existing homes. Perhaps you could require these types of housing units built in new construction in return for more density. For example, a parcel would become 7.2 or 7.6 zoned if they built these units onsite.

Down in Seattle they have some added height/density and better floor area ratio granted in return for affordable housing apartments built onsite or paid into a fund. While that might work there, perhaps allowing denser housing in single family zones only if they construct granny flats/backyard cottages might work better for Mukilteo.

Also onsite ownership requirements would alleviate many of the concerns expressed by a few Councilmembers.



Again thank you for the timely information and listening to my thoughts. Have a great weekend!

*July 15, 2020 9:28 AM – Brent Silver*

Was notified about your Planning meeting this Thursday and thought you might find this of interest. Particularly the section about eliminating local and state housing regulations (about 10% down from the top of page). <https://joe Biden.com/housing>

*July 15, 2020 12:24 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for sharing. Is this the specific item you are referencing?

**Eliminate local and state housing regulations that perpetuate discrimination.**

Exclusionary zoning has for decades been strategically used to keep people of color and low-income families out of certain communities. As President, Biden will enact legislation requiring any state receiving federal dollars through the Community Development Block Grants or Surface Transportation Block Grants to develop a strategy for inclusionary zoning, as proposed in the [HOME Act of 2019](#) by Majority Whip Clyburn and Senator Cory Booker. Biden will also invest \$300 million in [Local Housing Policy Grants](#) to give states and localities the technical assistance and planning support they need to eliminate exclusionary zoning policies and other local regulations that contribute to sprawl.

We have observed a move in this direction by the Minnesota and Oregon legislatures, as well as California and to a lesser extent, Washington. Some have opined that the HB 1923 legislation may be a test of the willingness of local jurisdictions to address exclusionary zoning on their own.

*July 15, 2020 3:05 PM – Brent Silver*

Yes it is. I'm sure you are up on these things but thought that it dovetailed into the concerns raised by Councilmembers Marine and Khan. Obviously nothing is set in stone but the momentum is there for changes and your Housing Action Plan is a step in the right direction. Best of luck and stay well.

*July 22, 2020 4:27 PM – Brent Silver*

Was unable to watch the Planning meeting from last week due to unforeseen circumstances. Have looked for it on the archive page but it is not there. I see the Council meeting from Monday is up and the Planning one was last week. Am I looking in the right place? Or perhaps the upload is taking longer? Either way it would be great to know if I'm looking in the wrong place or if it has not yet been added. Please let me know when convenient and stay safe and healthy.



*July 22, 2020 4:34 PM – Lauren Balisky*

We have been having an issue getting the Zoom meetings uploaded into our meeting server. We are looking into it and hope to have a solution soon. It's probably something easy that is right in front of us!!!

*July 23, 2020 12:14 PM – Brent Silver*

Thanks for the update. Would have thought I was doing something wrong and wasted a heap of time trying to figure it out. Tech gives and certainly takes. Sure you all will figure it out. Thank you for keeping me informed and please stay well.

*July 31, 2020 1:38 PM – Brent Silver*

I see the July 16th Planning meeting is on the audio/video page but it shows up as 0 minutes and nothing happens when I try to watch. Was there anything of importance discussed? Heard that the Feds have reduced many of the affordable housing requirements on the books for suburbs and the Cory Booker bill further requiring such is not advancing.

Anyway, any information is greatly appreciated and as always thank you for your attention to my questions and your efforts addressing this important issue. Please be safe and try to have a fun weekend.

*July 31, 2020 2:31 PM – Lauren Balisky*

We are still trying to figure out a solution for getting our videos online, however we are happy to email / share a copy if you would like to watch. We gave a very brief overview of the scope and schedule without much in the way of substantive discussion. From talking to our Clerk yesterday, it sounds like we have a very time-intensive workaround in place and she has started getting the backlog of Council meetings uploaded.

At the August 20 meeting, the principal demographer at Snohomish County will be giving a presentation on the Buildable Lands Report and Growth Monitoring Report if that is of interest to you. These documents both inform long-range planning efforts in the county and its cities.

We should also have the HAP website up here in the next two weeks – thank you again for your patience!

*July 31, 2020 3:04 PM – Brent Silver*

Thank you for the update, sounds like I didn't miss much in the way of substance from the 16th. Looks like the August 20th will have meat on the bone and I will be sure to watch. Will also keep an eye out for updates, uploads, etc. on the City website. Again, thank you for your quick responses and good information. Look forward to learning more. Take care!



## 59. Smith, Armandina and Covie

*September 6, 2020 6:41 PM – Armandina and Covie Smith – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have less than two parking spots per residents. The parking spots must be bound to the residence by title and not legally separable from ownership of any residence. I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have less than 22 residents per acre of land. I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have a building height of greater than thirty-five feet.



## 60. Taber, Paul

*October 25, 2020 4:42:26 PM – Paul Taber*

Elected leaders of Mukilteo,

I have read the draft HAP plan, and I take several issues with it.

1. The report is comparing Mukilteo to the greater Snohomish county. This is an inaccurate comparison. Mukilteo is a city, while in the greater county there is farmland and much other uninhabited/sparsely inhabited land. To provide a more accurate comparison, Mukilteo should be related to Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace, or Mill Creek.

2. The report states that the average empty residence rate in America as a whole is 2% and that Mukilteo's is 0%. This just means people like living here. The report goes on to state that this means more houses need to be built. However, only a certain number of houses can be built before space runs out. The only alternative then would be to build denser housing buildings like condos or apartment buildings. But that would destroy why people like living here- having an individual house NOT connected to any other building.

I am fine with additional housing being built but not, I repeat NOT, at the expense of excessive densification. That will ruin Mukilteo instead of making it better.

3. The report estimates that more jobs in Mukilteo will be moving from manufacturing to retail, and because of that the average salary will fall. There is a way to counter that- introduce policies that make it attractive for companies to create and retain higher paying jobs in the Mukilteo. That will help counter any decrease in average salary that an increase in retail jobs may bring.

4. The whole focus of this report and it's study seems to be because housing prices here are higher than in other areas of Snohomish county. (Well of course they are because this is a city, not the middle of the countryside someplace). But again, this is because people like to live here. Having higher housing prices is better than having lower housing prices because the alternative means people do not want to live here; and that brings in more crime, drug use/abuse, a poor reputation, and generally negative connotations.

To alleviate any concerns over higher housing prices, the best and easiest course of action would be to build more housing; which I support, but again NOT at the expense of high densification. DON'T mess up our city. Keep Mukilteo primarily with single family dwellings. This will maintain the overall feel of the community, which is why people like living here.

Thank you for your consideration.

*October 27, 2020 9:28 AM – Lauren Balisky*

Your email was forwarded to me by the Mayor. First, thank you for sending in your comment to the City of



Mukilteo. As with all comments we receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and again to City Council as the Housing Action Plan (HAP) process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like, and we would encourage you to use the [comment form on the HAP website](#).

It sounds like you may have read the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#), which takes a look at who lives and works in Mukilteo now, and what housing gaps exist for the City's current residents. There are two opportunities coming up to learn more about that document:

1. **Listen to the next Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting:** The next meeting is scheduled for 4 PM on October 29, 2020. The agenda is online in the [HAP Project Library](#).
2. **Join us at the November Community Meeting:** We will be hosting a community meeting at 7 PM on November 5, 2020, where you can ask questions and give feedback on the draft Housing Needs Assessment.

There will, of course, be additional opportunities to participate throughout the project. I believe we have you on our mailing list already, but please also keep an eye on the City's website and Facebook page for updates.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance and I hope you have a good week.



## 61. Tapert, Alan

*December 4, 2020 12:27 PM – Alan Tapert – Via HAP Comment Form*

I live in Mukilteo for Quality of life, Not Quantity of life. A high density population will destroy that quality and lower the values of our homes.





## 62. Townsend, Rob

*September 7, 2020 8:35 PM – Rob Townsend – Via HAP Comment Form*

I do not want the added traffic and crime that comes with high density housing. I live in Mukilteo because of its small town feel. I do not agree that creating high density housing areas within the city is a good thing.



## 63. Vago, Donna

*July 6, 2020 3:40 PM – Donna Vago*

To: Mayor Gregerson, et al.

This project will change the community of Mukilteo in perpetuity. Therefore, being an issue of such import it should only pass after the strictest of scrutiny from the community and council. Since it appears that the community is not well apprised of the issue, and many are not in support of it, it would be unjust for the council to make such a move without further community involvement.

Prima facia, this proposal is not a resolution to the economic factors it proposes to address, i.e, the increasing cost of housing verses the value of the dollar. Not to mention the actual real issue being the overall ratio of income to cost of all goods, services, energy, housing, ect.

It would be prudent for council to explore other options to increase housing, if indeed that is the issue here, before diving into such drastic measures that will forever impact those of us living here, possibly in a very negative way.

Mukilteo resident since 1998: Registered voter

*August 7, 2020 7:50 AM – Donna Vago*

RE: State legislation 1923/AFFH

This is a complicated and legal subject. And that is why we depend on elected officials to be informed and make decisions for the community. Therefore I wish to ask the council a few questions to gain some understanding on what effects a federal decision has on what is happening in our little town here. And also try to understand some of the decisions that have been made already.

Recently the POTUS rescinded HUD legislation AFFH: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.

1. How does this effect State Legislation 1923 and the subsequent plans for Affordable Housing in Mukilteo?
2. When the mayor applied for HAP there were 4 criteria, and 2 of the 4 items were required to be selected to qualify for the grant. Which 2 criteria did the mayor agree to?
3. What type of housing and rezoning did the mayor have in mind when she agreed to these items?
4. What is the timeline for these actions? When is the HAP study complete, when are the recommendations of the HAP put into action, when does construction or actions begin?
5. Who are "stakeholders"?
6. If the community objects to the HAP recommendations are taxpayers required to pay back the grant?



7. If the community objects to HAP recommendations will the city nix plans to carry out Affordable Housing?
8. What infrastructure, such as sewage, roads, transportation, water, fire, police and schools will require upgrading to support the housing and what will the tax increases be?

In addition I am asking and encouraging you to look at your "Affordable Housing Plan" idea from all sides. I lived in a community where lower income groups were integrated into the demographic. We were a small bedroom community outside of Los Angeles. Most people commuted out of town to work. My neighborhood was small starter homes with young families, just like me.

On my left was a couple from Nicaragua. They commuted into LA every day and had a nanny for their young boy and daughter. They left LA due to crime and violence and made the sacrifice to commute 80 miles each way to work so they could live in a better community. On my right was a young father that worked three jobs to build a tuxedo business. After several years he opened a shop in town. Across the street a beautiful and wonderful woman had a mobile gymnastics business. I worked for her once in a while when she needed extra help. I baby sat for some of the moms when they worked or had errands or returned to college - two women on our street became Preschool teachers. It was nice.

Then, not by chance, but by design, through legislation, came gangs from LA. One young gang mother said to me she was so glad to get away from LA and all the drugs and violence. But in reality she didn't get away from it. It followed her into our community.

The short version of the story - we started a neighborhood watch program that educated us on how to live with the increased crime and gangs. It was of little use. Every morning the streets were littered with people's personal belongings from their cars that were burgled during the night. Grocery carts were discarded onto people's lawns. Drugs were sold on corners by bad looking men. We enrolled our kids into Catholic school after the first knife stabbing at public middle school.

The man that owned the tuxedo business took a stray bullet when the jewelry shop a few doors down was robbed.

The Nicaraguan couple's commuter van, parked in their front yard, was damaged by someone driving a stolen vehicle. They were constantly menaced by their "new neighbor." Don't you know, they knock on the door to see if you are home before they break in. The nanny didn't speak english, so she didn't answer the door. It scared the poor woman half to death when they tried to get in the window. Knowing this they came into the back yard frequently just to scare her.

That wonderful woman with the mobile gymnastics business went out of business when her van was stolen. Later found abandoned in a field, all her equipment ruined.

We got the opportunity to move to the PNW and so we left CA and started over. Our house had a negative \$30k of equity and the state of CA was kind enough to charge us with income tax on the loss.

And now you say you want the same thing here? I implore you to do more research into the negative effects of

these decisions. I do not disagree there are some very big problems with the economy that need to be addressed. However, this solution has the potential for very negative outcomes. It does not address the problem within the context of reality.

Me and my husband worked and sacrificed long and hard to be here. You should consider the negative effects of this “solution.” From my experience these relocated people do not come with hearts full of hope with dreams of new opportunity. They arrive with envy and entitlement and destruction follows. This is my personal story Mayor and council. Consider your decisions with thought and reflection. Research how this has affected other towns where it has been implemented. Your actions will impact this city forever. What are you prepared to sacrifice if you are wrong? If this grand idea goes sideways you will have created more poverty. You will have taken from everyone in this community their years of hard work and leave them with less.

### *August 7, 2020 12:27 PM – Jennifer Gregerson*

Here is some feedback for you from my perspective:

1. How does this effect State Legislation 1923 and the subsequent plans for Affordable Housing in Mukilteo?

I don't believe the federal law impacts this legislation, or at least how Mukilteo is responding to it. We do not have any federally funded housing developments envisioned as part of the plan.

2. When the mayor applied for HAP there were 4 criteria, and 2 of the 4 items were required to be selected to qualify for the grant. Which 2 criteria did the mayor agree to?

We agree to conduct public outreach and create a housing action plan reflecting our community's input. We did not have to agree to other elements of the legislation because of this. We do already have ADU regulations, though.

3. What type of housing and rezoning did the mayor have in mind when she agreed to these items?

I didn't have anything in particular in mind, I expect that the community process and Council approval will drive the results.

I would say, if I was voting on the plan, I would expect some improvements to internal permit processes, some recommendations to make it easier for homeowners to add ADUs (mother in law type accessory dwelling units), and maybe some feedback about the commercial zoning we have that does not allow a second story of residential for mixed use.

4. What is the timeline for these actions? When is the HAP study complete, when are the recommendations of the HAP put into action, when does construction or actions begin?

Our consultant is working with staff on public outreach for the Housing Action Plan last month and some of this month. The scope of work includes these key dates for your opportunities to participate in the



process. Our City website should be live soon, and I'll include it in one of my semi-weekly emails once we have it up (we are editing and prepping it now).

**Public and specific stakeholder outreach begins in September and runs through November. This will include web-based open houses, possible community meetings (in person if allowed under stay home orders).** There also will be a stakeholder advisory group providing feedback. All of that input gets summarized by November 30, 2020 and submitted to the City.

Then, the consultant takes that input and develops the housing policy recommendations and land use code amendment recommendations based on that input. They will also make permit process improvements for our city planning and engineering departments to provide better service to property owners. Those recommendations will be delivered to the City by December 31, 2020.

There will be a **Public Hearing before the Planning Commission in March-April; and a City Council Public Hearing and meetings in the April-June time-frame.** Council is anticipated to adopt a Final Housing Action Plan by June 15, 2021.

5. Who are "stakeholders"?

Residents of Mukilteo, business owners, the development community (for instance, the Master Builders Association), housing nonprofits, and others

6. If the community objects to the HAP recommendations are taxpayers required to pay back the grant?

The Council will adopt the Housing Action Plan, and they can make changes. The adopted plan will have to be one that is acceptable to a majority of the Council. I suppose if the Council refused to adopt any recommendations we might be at risk of this. However, I believe that at least some of the recommendations, if not all, will be acceptable to the Council as good ideas.

7. If the community objects to HAP recommendations will the city nix plans to carry out Affordable Housing?

It depends on what you mean. We do not plan to build affordable housing. If the Council approves the plan, we will move forward to implement the recommendations. The plan might include the items I talked about above in your question 3.

8. What infrastructure, such as sewage, roads, transportation, water, fire, police and schools will require upgrading to support the housing and what will the tax increases be?

This one I can't answer, other than to say most of the community supported water/sewer/stormwater/transportation and public safety infrastructure is already built. When a private property owner decides to build, they generally have to build out any needed infrastructure- if more than a driveway is needed, they have to build the road or sidewalk, for instance. There are no quantifiable tax increases envisioned.

In closing, I cannot imagine a scenario that would bring the terrible impacts that you experienced in Los Angeles. If



I could do it all on my own, I would just want to make sure there are different types of housing so that someone who raised a family in a 2000-4000 square foot house in Harbour Pointe could move into a smaller one, or one without a yard, or a condo, when that house doesn't meet their needs as they age. I would want to make sure that our regulations allow that type of housing to be built, where it makes sense for our community values. I'm not saying it has to be "cheap" or (under federal definitions) "affordable." I just think we can have a future that makes it possible for people who have lived in Mukilteo to stay in Mukilteo. Of course, it's not all up to me—it will really be up to the members of the community that speak up and contribute as we develop the plan. I hope that you plan to do so.

I hope that helps!

*October 30, 2020 10:14 AM – Donna Vago*

Dear Lauren, Mayor and City Council,

Post SAG#2 meeting, Oct 29, I would like to address the following concerns and questions.

Low population growth projection: We are a small land area with limited buildable land and additional barrier to entry due to the high cost of housing. Given these factors what is the goal? How will the city accommodate the projected growth? Rezone usable land and allow affordable or low income multifamily dwellings? Is it known what economic class the projected residents will be? Note: If we allow low income dwellings, those are the residents we attract.

Single Family v Multifamily of 5 or more units: Mukilteo has a higher percentage of multifamily units than Snohomish country overall, 60% v. 65%. Carvel was acquired by HASCO in 2018 with one half of the 231 units being low income. I mention this because it is a significant number of units for low income families. What proportion of the population does the city plan to be low or lower income? There is a cost to the city in taxes and services and it should be presented as such in the discussion.

What are the housing goals for existing and future residents? There are people living here right now considered to be cost burdened in addition to the "gaps" in available housing. How will this be addressed for current and future residents? One of the stated goals was to build a city where residents worked and lived and this brings up several queries. 1. Higher paying jobs are in decline (according to the report) if that is true can it be expected market forces will adjust the cost of housing. a) if service jobs will increase what plans does the city have to accommodate this growth? b) is the goal to build smaller houses and more multifamily income restricted apartments? 2. Transportation corridor-needs to be clarified. This sounds like people commuting through the city, not in the city- and if the city's goal is for residents to work and live here the two are opposing ideas. Does the city foresee us being a "hub" and a community of commuters?

Rezoning: The stated recommendation to rezone under utilized land for other uses: This is quite the large statement with potential negative consequences. It is a pandora's box that once opened cannot be closed. It must be approached with the respect it deserves.

In closing are some personal statements in general. Using the AMI formula as a financial marker can be part of a much larger argument involving economics. Here are a few: 1. Banks do not apply this as a hard fast rule. Though it is sound financial planning banks use this rule at their discretion and have not applied it equally. Especially true during the housing financial crisis. 2. There are a plethora of ways to get a mortgage. Such as government programs for first time buyers, VA options, financing the down payment, ect. Using the example of 12% down, as in the report, becomes a disingenuous tactic to make the data read in the reports favor. There is a slippery slope between data that supports a plan of action and data that may be used as a deception. Finally, there is no free lunch. Every plan of action requires a price to be paid. The price for future planning will be paid by the current residents. I hope this is on the forefront of everyone's mind when discussing planning.

*November 2, 2020 6:42 PM – Donna Vago*

Thank you for your patience, and thank you again for taking the time to send in your questions and concerns. I am by no means an expert in all of them, but will do my best to answer them (or at least point you in the right direction).

**1. Given limited remaining available land and high housing costs, what is the goal of planning? How will the City accommodate the projected growth?**

The goal is to plan for Mukilteo's proportionate share (relative to Snohomish County) of projected population, housing units, and employment in a way that meets the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act. For housing, we are required to adopt a "housing element" in our long-range planning document for the City, also known as [Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan](#).

Specifically [the law states that](#):

... Each comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design for each of the following:

...

(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that:

(a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth;

(b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences;

(c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and

(d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the

community.

In counties and cities subject to the review and evaluation requirements of RCW [36.70A.215](#), any revision to the housing element shall include consideration of prior review and evaluation reports and any reasonable measures identified.

The draft Housing Needs Assessment helps us start meeting the above requirements, particularly in Items (2)(a) and (d). The current Comprehensive Plan, linked above, walks through each of the above items in turn for the growth projected through 2035.

We are currently waiting for updated growth allocations for 2044, though at this point I do not expect the trends for Mukilteo to be drastically different due to existing limitations of the natural environment here.

The City, through a public process, then gets to decide how it wants to accommodate the growth. An important nuance here is that the City is required to demonstrate that it can accommodate the growth, not to force the growth to happen. In other words, we decide how we want to set the stage, and the market decides when it wants to join in.

## 2. What proportion of the population does the City plan to be low or lower income?

The [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#) indicates the following for extremely low-income, very low-income, and low-income households out of a total of ~8,055 households:

Income Category	Est. Quantity	% of All Households
Extremely Low-Income (≤30% Area Median Income (AMI))	525	6.5%
Very Low-Income (30-50% AMI)	465	5.8%
Low-Income (50-80% AMI)	424	5.3%

This is our estimate of actual low or lower-income households, and may not be the same as the City's proportional share of these income groups. We will not have that information until the County completes its process to assign growth targets in 2021.

Generally, smaller cities such as Mukilteo are unable to provide for housing below 50% AMI, since it needs significant public investment. The Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations attempt to address the 50%-120% housing market, since there is more ability to influence that through market production rather than government production of housing (I hope that makes sense). The state, PSRC, and the County recognize that, and recognize regional efforts to provide affordable housing through other means (such as supporting the work of HASCO).



One way the City does this is by passing on a portion of our sales tax to affordable housing agencies to help subsidize housing costs. It is a small but important piece of the puzzle.

### **3. What are the housing goals for existing and future residents?**

This is part of what the HAP is starting to help the City address as part of the 2024 major comprehensive plan update, where we (the City, staff, and our residents) will need to take a long, hard look at what makes sense for Mukilteo moving forward. I do not get any sense from Council that there is a predetermined outcome to any of this – they are genuinely interested in where the data in the HNA and the public input leads us. It could mean more housing types, it could mean more density, it could mean annexation, or it could not.

The recommendations in the HAP will be very helpful for updating or reworking (as appropriate) the existing goals in Mukilteo's current housing element. The growth targets for employment will also be very helpful for moving this work forward in 2021-2024.

### **4. Please explain the high-capacity transit community designation from PSRC (I interpreted this one a bit – please correct me if I misunderstood).**

Mukilteo is designated as a high-capacity transit community due to the ferry terminal and the Sounder train station, not due to SR 525 or SR 526. It means that the planning guidelines intend to focus more growth towards those locations.

Obviously, Mukilteo has significant constraints to these locations, including topography, lack of pedestrian access, the railway cutting off access between Old Town and the waterfront, as well as critical areas in the waterfront area (shoreline, ocean floodplain).

Part of the conversation currently being had at the County level is what kind of planning is required with this designation, as well as what is required when it really isn't even feasible. So far, the County is very receptive to the fact that not all locations that were historically favorable for the movement of goods (such as Mukilteo) are still great for transit-oriented development.

We also do not have adequate bus service or density anywhere else in the City to meet the requirements for transit-oriented development, so this designation is very limited to the waterfront area.

### **5. How will existing cost-burdened residents and the gaps in the available units be addressed?**

This is where the HAP comes in! Recognizing there is a gap, what kinds of housing does the community recommend allowing or allowing more of? What steps is the community willing to take to make that easier? The recommendations that come out of the HAP process will be evaluated in more detail with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update.

### **6. Recommendation to rezone.**

I could not find a reference in the draft HNA recommending a rezone, nor do I currently expect the HAP to land there based on current community input. I agree that this is a topic that always merits significant community conversation, and also comes with significant study about whether the existing infrastructure



could support it (schools, police, fire, roads, etc.).

**7. Using AMI as the basis for ability to obtain a mortgage is disingenuous / deceptive.**

Recognizing that everyone's financial situation is unique, and that we do not (nor should we) have access to wealth data or individual purchase contracts, at a certain point to understand affordability in Mukilteo we need to pick a data point in order to do an analysis. No analysis is perfect, since no data set is perfect; however I would not characterize it as purposefully deceptive or disingenuous.

Is 12% the best down payment number? Maybe, maybe not – as you note, it may be worth asking Adam's input on whether that number is reasonable based on his experience in Mukilteo. That is certainly something we can do.

Please let me know if any of the above brings up additional questions, or if I can be of any further assistance. I hope you have a great week, and feel free to join us at the community meeting on November 5!

*November 3, 2020 4:30 PM – Donna Vago*

In reference to Question #6. I take this as rezoning land. Please correct me if I am misunderstanding. Thank you.

Section 4. Housing Needs

Emerging Housing Needs:

Housing Needed for Future Growth

"Mukilteo's existing housing constraints contribute to the recent limited population growth. High housing costs, current zoning, comprehensive plan designations, and little vacant land limit the market feasibility of additional housing supply. Further development opportunity likely lies in redeveloping land that is currently under utilizing the existing development potential or redeveloping older housing. Development potential under the existing regulatory schema is being studied as part of Snohomish County's 2021 Buildable Lands Report.

With continued low vacancy rates and high housing costs, even meeting the growth targets may not adequately address existing affordability challenges and limited housing options for Mukilteo's residents and workers."

*November 3, 2020 4:48 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for pointing out the section – I will add this to the list for reworking to make it clearer. The short answer is no, it is not, but I will do my best to explain why:

The Snohomish County Buildable Lands process takes a look at the existing land in a community and constraints. Constraints could be easements, critical areas (such as wetlands, streams or steep slopes), or some other special agreement that may be in place. Examples of these types of agreements could be conservation agreements for agricultural or timber land, or a transfer of development rights that takes density from one area and moves it to another. To be clear, we do not have any density transfer areas in Mukilteo.

The Buildable Lands process also takes a look at the actual existing use of properties, the existing zoning of a property, and (this is a gross oversimplification) the market values of land and improvements on a property. This information tells us whether the land on each parcel, under existing zoning, is:

- Vacant (empty, and has complete capacity available under the current zoning)
- Underdeveloped (not developed to the full extent under current zoning, and may have capacity for additional housing units or jobs)
- Redevelopable (based on data, may be likely to redevelop in the upcoming planning period. The price seems right!)

The County also meets with local jurisdictions to get information on actual applications that are in the door, and notes those are part of their analysis. All of this information together gives us an indication of how much capacity is available in the City at this given point in time.

The County then uses this information to help with the growth target allocation process, where they assign proportional shares of population, housing units, and employment to local jurisdictions. These growth targets may be adjusted up or down some based on an individual community's actual ability to accommodate the growth and what was learned during the Buildable Lands process.

It is possible that the City will be allocated more growth than we can accommodate under our current zoning. We will not know this until sometime in late 2021. At this point, based on the meetings at the County I am attending and the size of and location of Mukilteo in relation to mass transit options, I consider it highly unlikely that any growth allocation amount would be so extreme that Mukilteo would be in a position of discussing major, city-wide rezoning.

I hope that makes sense, but of course if it doesn't, please feel free to ask more questions!



## 64. Zaretsky, Boris

*October 29, 2020 11:29 AM – Boris Zaretsky*

I have reviewed the subject HAP report draft and, while I appreciate the work done by Berk Consulting, I found the draft report unsatisfactory and disappointing. It uses dubious metrics and mostly irrelevant statistics to recommend social re-engineering of Mukilteo, which our city does not need.

Below please find comments on specific portions of the report:

- **Definition of Cost Burden.** Defining Cost Burden based on the housing cost percentage of the overall household income is inaccurate and misleading. Consider, for example, a family with an annual household income of \$20K, which spends \$5K on housing and a second family with an annual household income of \$200K, which spends \$100K on housing. By the Cost Burden definition in the Report, the first family is not cost burdened, while the second one is. This is, of course, not true. A much better measure of Cost Burden would be household income after housing costs are subtracted; this would be \$15K for the first family and \$100K for the second in the example above. But even this measure is inaccurate. It does not apply to retired people whose income is relatively low, but whose net worth is quite high – they are certainly not burdened by housing costs. Since I found the definition of Cost Burden inaccurate, I had a difficult time accepting any statistics that use this measure.
- **Population Growth.** According to the report, Mukilteo is expected to add approximately 450 people between 2020 and 2035. So why are we spending considerable resources to accommodate the needs of 450 people over a period of 15 years? Seems like an overkill to me. Furthermore, I see no reason to be concerned about Mukilteo growing slower and having slightly older population than Snohomish County as a whole.
- **Household Income.** No surprises here. Mukilteo household income is higher than in Snohomish County as a whole. Mukilteo is an affluent city and this is a very good thing.
- **Cost-Burdened Households.** As I mentioned above, I do not consider the Report's way of measuring cost burden accurate. But even if I accept this measure, I do not see the relevance of the cost burden statistics presented in this portion of the Report. One does not have the right to live where one wants, one has the right to live where one can afford. However much I like Mukilteo, I may prefer to live in Beverly Hills or just south of Central Park in New York. But I don't, because I can't afford to live there. I don't view this as an infringement on my rights, but rather as a simple economic reality. Similarly, there is absolutely nothing wrong with people choosing not to live in Mukilteo due to its high housing costs. Mukilteo is neither an island nor an oasis in the middle of uninhabitable desert. Those who find Mukilteo's housing costs too much to bear, can easily find accommodations in nearby communities with lower housing costs.
- **Travel to Work.** This one genuinely surprised me. I always thought of Mukilteo as a "bedroom" community. So learning that more people commute into Mukilteo than commute out of Mukilteo was a

surprise. I can truly emphasize with people making a long drive to their place of employment, as I commuted 35 miles one way for nearly 20 years until my retirement. It was tough, but it was also a personal choice. I wanted to stay in Mukilteo for my family and for all the wonderful things our community provides and I wanted to work for my employer, because I loved my job and appreciated its compensation (I could not ask my employer to relocate in order to reduce my commute, could I?). So while I truly feel for people making a long commute, I don't see this as a problem for the City of Mukilteo. People are making personal choices and no one is obligated to make these choices easier.

- **Alleged Misalignment between the Size of Housing Units and the Size of Existing Local Households.** The report shows that there are many 2 person households who live in a house that is “too big” for them. First of all, who has the right to tell another person that their house is “too big”? Secondly, these are probably empty-nesters with husband and wife who bought a large house and raised their family in Mukilteo. Now that the children grew up and moved out, the parents are living in a large house. How is this a problem? They can choose to stay in their house or sell it and move to a smaller place either in Mukilteo or somewhere else. And given high real estate prices in Mukilteo, they will obtain a good price for their home and will have no problem finding excellent smaller accommodations.
- **Home Owner Costs and Vacancy Rates.** Low vacancy rates are very good for our community. They mean that people find Mukilteo a highly desirable place to live. This, in turn, drives up housing prices, which is also good for Mukilteo, because it increases the property tax base and provides funds for excellent schools and public amenities we all enjoy. So I don't see this as a problem. On the contrary, I see it as an indication of the overall health of our city.
- **Homeownership Affordability.** This portion of the draft Report makes absolutely no sense to me. If you condense all the figures, it basically says that many people who live in Mukilteo now cannot afford to live in Mukilteo. This is nonsense! If people could not afford to live in Mukilteo, they would not be living here. A much better interpretation of the numbers is that people who currently own homes in Mukilteo would find it more difficult to buy the same house in which they live now if they did not buy it when they did. But this is very positive. It means that Mukilteo homeowners made a good investment, when they purchased their house. They are now rejoicing in the equity in their houses, as it constitutes a major portion of their nest egg. What about new homeowners, people who want to move into Mukilteo, but have a financial difficulty to purchase a home here? Again, they have a choice to live in a community with lower housing costs, a choice with which we need not interfere. Furthermore, we are talking about 450 people in the next 15 years, so is it worth spending all these resources to accommodate them?
- **Rental Housing.** In my experience, people rent instead of own their housing for three reasons or a combination thereof:
  1. They cannot afford the down payment (monthly mortgage payment is not an issue, since at today's low interest rates it is often lower than rental payment)
  2. They are not sure they want to permanently settle in the community (leaving at the end of a lease is much easier than selling a property you own)

3. They think that the housing prices are too high and, therefore, not a good investment and are waiting for the prices to drop

I don't see how any of the reasons above constitute a concern for the City of Mukilteo. As I said before, people have a choice and it is not the responsibility of our city to influence this choice one way or another

- **Housing Needs.** In its essence, this section of the report states that many people cannot afford to buy or rent homes in Mukilteo, because the housing costs are high. How is this a problem? To paraphrase what I stated earlier in my comments, high financial barrier to entry into our community is a good thing. It means that people who move here have sufficiently high income/assets to live here and positively contribute to the property tax base. So while I appreciate the data showing high desirability of living in Mukilteo, I completely disagree with the conclusion that we must do something about it, that we must provide lower cost housing options in Mukilteo. Besides, we are talking about only approximately 450 people in the next 15 years, so why make a big fuss about it?

To conclude, my recommendation based on reading of the draft Report is that we thank Berk Consulting for their work, but do not implement the recommendations of their Report.

Please kindly share this e-mail with other members of the SAG for their consideration. I look forward to our discussion later today.

*October 29, 2020 2:06 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Thank you for taking the time to thoroughly read the draft Housing Needs Assessment and for sending in your comments. In order to ensure everyone has a chance to form their own thoughts for the SAG, I will wait to share your email with the rest of the group until after the meeting today. I hope that you understand.

I would encourage you, however, to share these thoughts verbally during the meeting (there will be lots of opportunity to ask questions and give feedback) and I will be sure the BERK team is also provided with a copy for both the meeting summary and to address as part of their updates to the HNA.

As an aside, BERK is waiting to get feedback from multiple groups (Planning Commission, SAG, the community meeting and staff) before issuing another public draft in order to avoid any confusion about what version we are looking at.

*October 30, 2020 12:19 PM – Boris Zaretsky*

One thing that became abundantly clear during last night's meeting is that all SAG member with a possible exception of Greg and Adam need a crash course on Urban Planning. The last time I had anything resembling such a class was in my sophomore year in high school and, as you could probably tell from my Zoom video, this was more than a couple of years ago. You and Berk Consulting, on the other hand, are experts on the subject. So my one big recommendation for the Public meeting on November 5 is to spend less time on population and income



statistics, most of which are irrelevant, and more time on educating the audience on urban planning. Specifically,

- Start with Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan 2035. Explain what it is and what it says with respect to housing. This is extremely relevant to the audience as it provides a baseline for any potential changes. I am willing to bet that most people have never read or even heard of this plan. I for one was not even aware it existed until last night
- Thoroughly explain the role of the State of Washington and the Snohomish County in providing urban planning guidelines to the City of Mukilteo
  - What are these guidelines based on?
  - Who within the State of Washington and the Snohomish County provides these guidelines?
    - Are these elected or appointed officials?
    - If appointed, who appoints them?
    - Is public input solicited in providing these guidelines? If so, how?
  - How do these guidelines translate from state and county-wide guidelines to the City of Mukilteo
  - What leeway does the City have in implementing these guidelines?
  - What happens if the City refuses to implement these guidelines?
    - Does someone go to jail?
    - Does the City lose some sort of funding? If so, what is the nature and the amount of this funding?
    - Can the County or the State force implementation either by unilaterally changing the City's land use codes or even through Eminent Domain
  - Who in the City of Mukilteo makes the final decision on whether and how to implement the state and county guidelines?
    - The Mayor?
    - The City Council?
    - Someone else
- If all or a portion of the HAP gets adopted, what will this mean?
  - Change to the Mukilteo Comprehensive plan 2035?
  - Immediate change to land use codes, allowing for development and construction of new housing units right away?

- Something else
- What is the relationship between the City of Mukilteo government and the private sector (real estate developers) in implementing the HAP?
- How will adoption of all or a portion of the HAP affect the tax base and the quality of life in Mukilteo

Thanks for listening. And let me once again volunteer myself to be the guinea pig for the HAP presentation. If the arguments and explanations make sense to me, regardless of whether I agree with them or not, I am willing to bet most people in the audience will better understand what is being proposed, which should lead to a more civil discourse.

*November 2, 2020 5:22 PM – Lauren Balisky*

As usual, thank you for your thoughtful feedback. I've attempted to address each one individually, below:

- **Crash course on urban planning:**

The Department of Commerce provides just this class, called the "Short Course on Local Planning." They have a series of videos (and an online class, if you would prefer to Q&A) on their website (scroll halfway down):

<https://www.commerce.wa.gov/serving-communities/growth-management/short-course/>

- **Community meeting content:**

We spent some time discussing your suggestion, and while we wholeheartedly agree that providing the overall planning context is important, we felt it was more important to get community feedback at the meeting. We also have an obligation under the grant contract to get community input on the needs assessment and (later on) on the proposed strategy recommendations, and so need to focus on that.

*Dawn will be reaching out to you and Skip directly to offer some time where she can provide you her portion of the presentation and get your feedback, if you are both still interested.*

- **About Comprehensive Planning:**

I'm going to give you more self-serve links here, and feel free to ask me any questions. MRSC does a great job of summarizing [Comprehensive Planning](#), the [Comprehensive Plan Update Process](#), and I've also linked to [Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan](#).

- **About the Comprehensive Plan Update Process:**

- The Washington State legislature provides the guidelines for planning in the Growth Management Act. PSRC and the County further refine the language, however local jurisdictions have a lot of leeway for *how* they choose to meet those guidelines (some are mandatory, some are "please do this pretty please"). PSRC and the County's decision-making bodies are almost entirely elected officials, with a limited number of citizen-at-large seats.





- No one goes to jail if the City does not implement the guidelines, however if we do not have a certified (aka “compliant”) Comprehensive Plan, we are no longer eligible to apply for many forms of grant funding. This includes funding to design and build parks, sidewalks, etc. or for grants like this, which really increase our ability to have a community conversation that we otherwise would not have the resources for.
- The Courts can force the City to rewrite portions of the plan that are not compliant. A recent example of this is the [Stickney v. City of Sammamish](#), where the courts ordered Sammamish to rewrite their housing element to ensure they could provide for their proportionate share of housing for all income levels.
- The City Council makes the final decision on whether and how to implement the state and county guidelines, after public hearing and a pretty lengthy public process.
- About the HAP Adoption
  - If the HAP gets adopted, it sets up a program of future actions. Those actions are not immediately in effect with adoption of the HAP, and most (if not all) will need to go through their own public process.
  - There is no more of a relationship between the City of Mukilteo and developers / realtors than there is with the general public. They have the right to comment and provide input along with everyone else, and their comments are given appropriate weight.
  - Adoption of the HAP will not impact tax rates in Mukilteo. Some big ifs:
    - If the plan recommends changes to land use designations and/or zoning designations; and
    - Those changes make it through the public process to adoption; then
    - Individual property owners may request a revaluation from the Assessor’s office (this is not a City process).

Please keep an eye out for an email from Dawn and hopefully you are able to join us on Thursday evening.



## 65. Zieve, Peter

### *March 15, 2020 10:20 AM – Peter Zieve*

In 3/11 Beacon there was one letter in favor of Jennifer's AHP and none against. The liberals think that we will get tired of the issue, go back to our jobs homes and families. Then they are free to wreak havoc on our city.

That often happens. But we aren't done yet.

We have 75 signatures. When we get to 100 we will look at a mailing or a door to door campaign.

To sign on all you need to do is print out this form, sign, and take a picture with your cell phone. Text the picture to 425-293-4203 or email to [peterzieve@gmail.com](mailto:peterzieve@gmail.com)

When we do the city mailing patriots won't even need to print. They can sign the post card and their cell phone will do the rest.

### *May 21, 2020 1:50 PM – Peter Zieve*

Dave, I am opposed to an affordable housing plan in Mukilteo. You saw me stand up in several council meetings to speak against this study.

You are welcome to call me and discuss, or I can call you.

Dave I moved my business here in 1993 and my home here in 2008. I believe I know the community well. I have reviewed documents. Two documents for the grant proposal and one for the work statement of the contractor. As these documents are disseminated in my view the Mukilteo voters will be unhappy.

Can we talk about this?

### *May 22, 2020 at 10:16 AM – Dave Osaki*

Thanks for the email. Pleasure to hear from you again.

It would be great having a chance to chat. Normally I would say let's meet for coffee or lunch but that's not an option, for now at least.

Let's aim for something for next week if that works for you.

Anytime Wednesday afternoon (May 27, 2020) or anytime all day Thursday (May 28, 2020) works for me (we're closed Monday for Memorial Day).

Let me know if a time during either of those days/times work for you. I can just give you a call. If those days/times are inconvenient, just let me know and I can offer up some additional days/times. I can even talk in



the evening if that works better for you..

I do want to send you some info in advance so you have a chance to look at it. I promise not to inundate you with paper when I do that. I'll send it to you over this weekend.

So just let me know what works best for you Peter.

As an aside, I had read the article about how Electroimpact had repurposed business operations to produce face shields. Thanks for doing that.

Take care and be safe.

*May 22, 2020 12:54 PM – Peter Zieve*

I look forward to meeting with you. Next week Friday May 29 would be great. We could meet at an Electroimpact conference room such as the G conference room. 4708 Chennault Beach Rd. The conference room is at the left front end of the building.

*May 22, 2020 3:01 PM – Dave Osaki*

Friday works too. Does 11:00 am work for you?

Just let me know.

Enjoy the weekend.

*May 22, 2020 3:16 PM – Peter Zieve*

Got it! Meet you at G Conf room 11AM.

*June 1, 2020 12:54 PM – Dave Osaki*

It was a pleasure seeing you today to discuss the Housing Action Plan, including the overall process and the community engagement process.

Our phones at City Hall are down, so the best way to reach me is through my work cell at 425-275-7677.

Would be glad to answer any questions or clarify any items.

Thanks for the tour as well. I enjoyed it.

Take care.



*June 1, 2020 1:44 PM – Peter Zieve*

I learned allot. In fact, I am still working on it in my head.

*July 15, 2020 8:57 AM – Peter Zieve*

After the vote 7/6 the HAP should be in process. Can you help me to speculate on potential outcomes?

The mayor has brought up the idea of 300 ADU. What zoning and regulatory changes would be required to allow this to happen? Some of the things I had heard about were street access and parking. Can you speculate what changes to the code might be required? Could these 300 ADU be separately deeded and sold off as separate properties? Or would they all be rentals?

As far as a high density housing project what might happen there? Would this be MR zoning (22 dwelling units per acre) or would it be even more?

I met with Councilman Khan and he mentioned two areas that he thought might be of interest.

1. The 5 acre lot across from the Staybridge. That is currently zoned PCB(s).
2. The Boeing Tech Center which is currently BP.

Could one of these two properties be rezoned at MR or would it be even denser to make it low cost?

*July 15, 2020 3:22 PM – Peter Zieve*

You are right. She specifies 300 but they aren;t all ADUs.

## **Attachment**



FYI, here is a response email from Jennifer Gregerson.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jennifer Gregerson** <[jgregerson@mukilteowa.gov](mailto:jgregerson@mukilteowa.gov)>

Date: Tue, May 26, 2020, 2:35 PM

Subject: RE: City of Mukilteo Plan for "Affordable Housing", Preserve Mukilteo and Request for Your Honesty

To: Chet and Lisa McBroom <[chetandlisamcbroom@gmail.com](mailto:chetandlisamcbroom@gmail.com)>

Cc: Elected <[elected@mukilteowa.gov](mailto:elected@mukilteowa.gov)>

Lisa,

I did not mean to leave you with the impression that this is about free housing. The study will address all income segments, including up to market rate housing.

I also thought I would address what led me to say that there were misunderstandings on the facts.

Mr. Zieve's flyer said that low income housing was soon to come to Mukilteo, and that's inaccurate. The study will propose strategies that the Council will adopt next year. The flyer also said that I stated that Mukilteo needs 2660 units of low-income housing. That is inaccurate. The grant proposal said that 2,300 households in Mukilteo today are cost burdened (they pay more than 30% of their income on housing costs). Based on regional growth studies, it's possible that 300 more households will join our community in the future. The flyer also said that Berk Consulting has been engaged and is moving forward. That is inaccurate, the consultant contract is coming to Council on July 6 for approval. They will be able to move ahead after that point with the public outreach program.

I am also happy to share that Mr. Zieve is meeting with our staff this week, which will help us understand his opinion and also share some more facts of the proposal and what is proposed.

Thanks so much, and I know I don't need to remind you to participate in that public outreach process this summer and into the fall.

Jennifer

**Mayor Jennifer Gregerson**

425.263.8018

*July 19, 2020 9:46 AM – Dave Osaki*

It was nice talking to you earlier last week. Also thank you for the follow up emails.

Looks like the 300 ADU number has been addressed, as it pertains more to units in general rather than ADU's specifically.

As we discussed last Wednesday, the City's ADU requirements may be found in Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) Chapter 17.30. There is a "No subdivision" section in that Chapter (see MMC section 17.30.050). Property owners are to reside in either the principal dwelling unit or in the ADU for at least six months of the calendar year.

Recommended amendments, if any, to ADU regulations will depend in part on comments we receive during the



HAP process. As an example, Lisa McBroom provided comments several months ago that addressed ADU's (see the part from her message I highlighted in yellow below). Lisa indicated that the City's ADU requirements are too tight and identified that a committee process could take a careful look at these requirements.

"On Tue, Feb 4, 2020 at 12:27 PM Chet and Lisa McBroom <[chetandlisamcbroom@gmail.com](mailto:chetandlisamcbroom@gmail.com)> wrote:

Mayor Gregerson:

Thank you so much for responding to my emails about plans you have as Mayor and plans or recommendations from you and the Mukilteo City Council, as well as whomever you will have working with you to discuss and formulate any Housing Action Plan regarding "Affordable Housing" in Mukilteo. I really appreciate your response and good information that you share in your email. I have a few questions and ideas for your consideration below. Thank you for your time to read this and work on these issues.

If you continue, going forward, to communicate openly and be sure to include all your City Council in good discussions, as well as listen to the business owners and residents of our City regarding these related issues, you will achieve, with that kind of careful and good leadership, a more comprehensive and better thought out approach to these affordable housing issues.

Who is on your committee for this Housing Action Plan?

Are you open to a Re-Vote by the Council about accepting this grant? Does the acceptance of this grant mandate legal consequences or specific use for it or not? Can it all be used for research, such as the research you mention?

If the grant can be used, without exception, for research regarding these matters, that is a good thing. However, if acceptance of the grant requires Mukilteo to provide more "affordable housing" with certain limitations, then it is not good, and you should do a Re-Vote and vote against it. You and the Council, in that case, would be better to Re-Vote against the grant while also voting to specifically discuss these issues and set up a committee(s) with many qualified persons of differing backgrounds and diverse views so that you can still do the reasonable studies and research, while engaging members of the public and business who are part of Mukilteo to bring in good information regarding these issues.

To speak to one way to provide more affordable housing:

RENTAL UNIT PRICE CONTROL OR MANDATES: Not an answer as it limits business.

Firstly, requiring owners of rentals to lower rates is unfair and not a good business practice for economic reasons. It is not a solution to penalize the business capability of others to accommodate other financial levels that do not fit with their business plan. This limits free enterprise and puts business owners out of business. Keeping business owners in business is a good practice. It is unfair business to require that prices be controlled completely. Price



gauging of extreme nature such as with recent medical prescription pricing new helps - some new helps of differing kinds are now helping to lower the prescription range for one item which could range from \$10 up to \$2000 for the same item - this is one extreme example of price gauging where it IS something that should be dealt with: but regarding rental units, requiring businesses to loose money because people want free rides or want to take advantage of others is not good for Mukilteo. That rental pricing control is a type of government control on profitability and sustainability and limits and restricts business success and improvement capabilty.

<sup>9</sup>ADU's: Accessory Dwelling Units CAN be the solution or can be a large solution help in residential areas to population increases accomodation in Mukilteo, IF regulations not too tight, IF parking issues solved, IF comprehensive plan recreated.

If ADU's were to be more available to those with financial limitations who already live in Mukilteo, this could fix a large portion of the entire desire to provide some methods of greater affordability to persons who do not have enough money to live here independently at the present time. Let me explain - to broadly generalize, regarding ADU's:

Currently, the ADU regulations are so tight that very few homeowners could create an ADU on their property, whether it be an add-on, exisiting building interior modification, or stand-alone addition to the property. Many of us have overarching PARKING CONCERNS that, regardless of the growth our City experiences in the future, we would want that there would continue to be adequate parking for residents and reasonable amounts of resident guests, wide enough residential streets that are not overrun by stacked parking of many cars, adequate parking but not too crowded - on the street, residential parking and safe and clean parking conditions, and also so that loiterers or transient types of vehicles or abandoned vehicles or derelict vehicles cannot be parked or remain or camp at or near our residences. But these are issues specifically regarding parking and parking issues could be readdressed and these parking concerns and desires accomodated by building and planning committees well versed in these planning matters who work with a new, larger committee to study this out.

*We want our City to remain a lovely and quiet City and we want to intelligently and comprehensively provide for appropriate future growth. We want any growth that makes good sense. However, if it doesn't improve our City, but downgrades it or detracts from anything in our present good City look and culture, we don't want it.*

Current City of Mukilteo ADU requirements ask for far too restrictive sizing requirements, for huge setbacks, or walkway and parking particulars and for occupancy and rental requirements that are impossible to meet for most properties. If you would wisely set up a large and diverse committee to look into, as you have already suggested, how to best modify or overhaul the

---

<sup>9</sup> Highlight formatting retained from email.



existing ADU laws and permitting process, without allowing on the street parking problems (see above), then you could, to broadly generalize, enable 10 percent or more of the residential homes to be able to modify their home, or/and add on to their home or/and add 1 or more smaller, very nice and attractive tiny homes or dwellings on their properties, and if so, new regulations that allowed more freedom within a good framework of requirements would accomodate quite a bit of City growth. That would increase homeowner income as they could rent out one or more of these for lower amounts - for any amount they wished, not for regulated rental amounts - or allow persons to live in them free of charge. And this would help the students and the elderly, as well as others.

Right now Mukilteo ADU's restrictive code does not allow me to add, modify or build something on my property to house an elderly person or friend in need, but I would like to be able to do that.

*If there could be far more ADU's in Mukilteo (in residential areas) which looked very good in appearance, and did not adversely affect street parking optimal needs and desires (see above regarding parking), then the persons living here who owned the ADU's would make additional money with some of the rentals, which would would give the City more money in taxes because of increased dwelling unit property value, while also providing a substantial amount of "affordable housing" for elderly, students, guests and other housing needs and desires. This type of "affordable housing" would not come with government requirements or restrictions to be monitored or paid for (or dealt with on higher levels) on the City and so it would be an overall business and income boost for residents and the City.*

*Along with the ADU issues the new diverse and comprehensive committee to study this out could look into cottage business laws loosening, particularly regarding bed and breakfasts being allowed in residential areas - simply examine the issue thoroughly, whether it may be something good for parts or all of the residential areas.*

There are nice communities elsewhere who have allowed ADU's in a variety of ways, which have created attractive and cottage housing industries for many persons, and which allow for school and student housing and paid rental housing and affordable elderly housing and personal elder care and vacation and guest housing that is upscale and profitable for both the property owners and the occupants/ renters.

Mayor Gregerson, I am so encouraged by your email response this morning, in which I read a sincere desire to dialogue wisely about these things and seek the best solutions carefully. Just as I am writing to you, right now, rather than speaking face to face yet, in my experience I can communicate more effectively and thoroughly in writing in just one email than if there would simply be one or two town meetings about this subject. One or more community meetings about these issues would not be the tip of the iceberg whatsoever to begin for a committee to dialogue, research and discuss to formulate wise planning about these things. A meeting of a few hours in which multiple persons speak only a few sentences each or for a few minutes





cannot possibly make any adequate plan for these matters. I know you realize that. I hope that you have or will be talking openly about setting up a committee to discuss and bring recommendations about these matters. Please do not take specific action at all about these matters, before you have facilitated a goodsized and diverse committee group who has had the time to talk and research and come up with a well-thought out recommendation(s), prior to any plan implementation.

Thank you again for responding to my email. I am thankful for your response and I greatly appreciate your help to make our City of Mukilteo wisely better, without losing any of its wonderful aspects.

Sincerely,

Lisa McBroom

Mukilteo, WA

Comments like Lisa's will be looked at during the HAP process. As it also relates to ADU's, I want to try and contact past ADU applicants to see what their perception of the City's ADU regulations and City permit process is/was.

As for the two parcels you reference, the property owner for the parcel across from Staybridge has expressed interest in developing a hotel there.

As we discussed, part (approx. 7.5 acres) of the Harbour Pointe Technical Center property was rezoned in 2004 from "Business Park" to "Multi-Family Residential- 22 units per acre". The 2004 rezone decision referenced townhomes for the proposed development. Although the property was rezoned to MF-22 units per acre, the City's approval capped the total number of allowable housing units on the rezoned property to a lesser density of 80 (units).

As part of the City's annual 2019 Comprehensive Plan/Zoning "docket" process, the Harbour Pointe Technical Center property owner submitted a preliminary docket application to amend the Comprehensive Plan map for the rest of the site from "Industrial" to "Multi-Family High Density" and to change the zoning map from "Business Park" to "Multifamily Residential - 22 dwelling units per acre". At that time, the property owner expressed uncertainty over whether Boeing would extend its lease and sought increased flexibility for use of the site by allowing for residential uses, even though the property might stay in its current business park type use for an undetermined time.

The preliminary docket is a process for the City Council to decide whether or not a request to amend the comprehensive plan/zoning map/zoning code merits further detailed consideration by staff, planning commission and city council to determine if it should or should not be approved. The City Council did not approve the Harbour Pointe Technical Center property owner's 2019 preliminary docket application to move on to that detailed phase.

As a preliminary docket application, conceptual plans were not required for the Harbour Pointe Technical Center proposal. I'm going by memory, but what I recall was that the property owner was looking at some type of



housing like townhouses or housing types consistent with the style of attached housing development in that immediate area like the Villas.

Given Boeing's COVID-19 situation right now, I can't say with certainty that the Harbour Pointe Technical Center property owner will never come back in the future for a similar request. But that's going to be a market decision on the property owner's part. It won't be the HAP that makes that decision. And any rezone request the property owner makes would need to go through the preliminary docket process and, if the application is allowed to continue past that stage, through public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

You asked about Airbnb's. They City allows them under the zoning code definition of rooming and boarding. Where permitted in single-family residential zones, rooming and boarding of not more two persons is allowed. In the multifamily zones where it is allowed, rooming and boarding shall be limited to not more than four persons. The municipal code definition of a "Rooming house" speaks to the dwelling being "owner occupied." So the rooming and boarding house would also need to be owner occupied.

Finally, I looked at the Edmonds News article you sent. While there was some discussion of their housing strategy report, the public meeting included discussion of two development projects that generated plenty of interest – one under construction at that time (Westgate Village, 91 units ) and another (the Compass Housing Alliance Blokable Village project of up to 80 units) which did not have permit submitted yet. Both projects had some type of income restricted housing component.

Lots of information in this email. Feel free to let me know if you have any questions. I can see the HAP process looking into other issues too. Mukilteo's current Comprehensive Plan talks about how the City should investigate ways to assist residents to stay in their dwelling units, even after retirement. The HAP is an opportunity to look into this issue as well.

Thanks and enjoy the rest of the weekend.

*July 19, 2020 2:26 PM – Peter Zieve*

Dave, I'm lost. The Mayor has put out an expectation of 300 units.

Suppose we can stimulate the development of 50 ADU. That would be a lot! And then we need 250 others.

The two Edmonds projects which inflamed protest in Jan 2019, they total 171 units.

We are still short 79 units from meeting the Mayor's goal.

What are your ideas to get those?

*July 21, 2020 2:14 PM – Dave Osaki*

Thanks for your message.



Give me a few days to get back to you.

I'm going to see if I can find some background information that was prepared for the City's 2015 Comprehensive Plan update.

Under the Growth Management Act, there is a process where the City (and other Cities and the County) is/are assigned a certain growth target that is done in coordination with a requirement called "buildable lands."

If I can find some of that information, I think it will help explain your question.

More to follow.

Thanks Peter.

*July 31, 2020 8:11 AM – Peter Zieve*

It was great to run into you at the QFC this week.

I see in the Municipal Code there is a special section 17.25C for PCB District.

There is nothing about PCB(S). What can you tell me about PCB(S)? Where can I read the special conditions of PCB(S) versus PCB?

*August 1, 2020 3:04 PM – Dave Osaki*

Nice to see you as well. Hope the milk tasted great.

As a start to compare the PCB and PCB-S zones, you'll want to go to the Use Table in Mukilteo Municipal Code (MMC) Section 17.16.040 ("Permitted use matrix"). There you can compare the uses allowed in the two zoning districts.

One item to keep in mind is that Table 17.16.040 relies heavily on Footnotes – in rows, columns and individual cells. So just looking to see if a use is or is not allowed in a particular zoning district needs to be done in conjunction with reading those footnotes extremely carefully, since many uses have qualifiers or additional requirements tied to those footnotes.

Certain zoning districts, because of their geography or other unique factors, have additional standards. The Downtown Business District, Waterfront Mixed Use District, Community Business District and Planned Community Business District are examples. The Community Business and Planned Community Business zones have additional standards because those zones are located at the intersection of SR 525 and 84th Street. That intersection/area is seen as having an opportunity to redevelop in a mixed use manner given its location. But not all zones in the City get special additional standards in the code.

Part of the area shown on the zoning map as PCB(S) (generally the northern part) is subject to what is commonly



called the Sector 3 development agreement (attached)<sup>10</sup>. That development agreement has been in effect for a while, and does have certain standards and requirements you won't necessarily find in the zoning code for those properties covered by the development agreement. This agreement may be helpful to you depending on what you are specifically looking at.

Following up on your other email regarding housing units/growth, I'm still putting together information. But the following is some information for now.

Mukilteo's 2035 Growth Management Act (GMA) population growth target is 21,812. Mukilteo's 2020 State estimated population (which is subject to update/verification when the US Census count is eventually completed/released) is about 21,360. What I still need to do some research on is that back in 2014/2015 the population (people) got converted to housing units for the purposes of growth projections. I need to get certain information about that conversion and then we can get back to you.

A couple of more items though. First, population and housing unit projections do not distinguish income. A housing unit is a housing unit for the purposes of tracking growth, regardless of the household's income. Also, each city (and the unincorporated County) planning under the GMA has a growth target. So population growth/housing units built in the city of Edmonds would not count towards Mukilteo's population/ housing unit growth and vice versa.

Also, the GMA growth targets are updated with each new mandated GMA Comprehensive Plan update. Mukilteo (and other jurisdictions) must adopt updated GMA Comprehensive Plans by mid-2024, which will include new 20 year growth targets to 2045. So over the next couple of years the process of allocating year 2045 growth targets for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update will be taking place.

Anyway, I'll be following up with you some more about growth numbers in the next week or two.

Thanks Peter. Enjoy the rest of the weekend.

*August 8, 2020 12:45 PM – Peter Zieve*

Thank you for sending Sector 3 development agreement. This brings up so many questions.

The dense Bella Terra apartments are troubling. They are in the PCB(S) zoning.

The Exhibit 2.1 Permitted Land Use does not allow apartments yet they are there. The height is 45 feet although I see that is allowed in Table 2.2.1a. But apartments are not allowed.

And the minimum land per residential unit is not specified. That is why they are so dense.

Is there another document for the Bella Terra apartment area?

---

<sup>10</sup> The Sector 3 Development Agreement is available upon request.



*August 15, 2020 12:20 PM – Dave Osaki*

Sorry for not getting back to you sooner but once the week gets started it gets pretty busy with not a lot of time to do research.

But with regards to Bella Terra, we've tracked down a document (attached)<sup>11</sup> that should be helpful.

A few notes for your information. Both of the areas (Sector 3 and then the area where Bella Terra is located) are subject to separate development agreements. So one really needs to focus on the individual development agreements and the uses allowed/requirements in those specific agreements more so than how the zoning for those properties is shown on the zoning map.

For the Sector 3 development agreement, residential uses are not allowed. There is a proposal submitted last year to amend that Sector 3 development agreement to allow for a 32-townhome style condo residential development for a parcel just south of the Montessori School, but that amendment request has not advanced to the City Council for review yet.

Bella Terra is located within an area subject to a separate/different development agreement (attached) than the Sector 3 development agreement. The development agreement for the Bella Terra area does allow residential uses. So yes, there is a document for the Bella Terra area.

Exhibit B to that development agreement identifies the geographic area to which it applies. That development agreement area is much larger than just Bella Terra, and totals over 70 acres.

So Bella Terra is part of an overall development consisting of a mix of attached and detached residential uses, commercial development and open space. As described in the agreement, the intent was to develop an integrated mixed use development including combined residential and retail space, innovative design and sensitive areas preservation.

That development agreement divides the 70+acres into two subareas: "A" and "B" (see the chart on Page 1 for information about those two subareas and also the map in Exhibit B for where they are located). Over that entire area, the maximum number of residential units cannot exceed 700 (each subarea also has a maximum number of dwelling units). That would make the potential overall residential development density at less than 10 units per acre.

Bella Terra may seem dense if one just looks at that development exclusively by itself, but it is part of a larger overall development/acreage with other areas developed at lesser densities as well as some areas which cannot be developed at all due to wetlands.

Hope this one answers more questions than creates new ones, but let us know if you have questions.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Sector 15 Development Agreement is available upon request.



*September 6, 2020 3:26 AM – Peter Zieve – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have less than two parking spots per residence. The parking spots must be bound to the residence by title and not legally separable from the ownership of the residence. I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that has more than 22 residences per acre of land. I am opposed to any residential projects being planned or permitted that have a building height of greater than thirty-five feet.

*October 14, 2020 5:02 PM – Dave Osaki*

Hope you have been doing well.

I wanted to get back to you on a housing item we have previously discussed regarding future housing unit needs.

As you may know, Berk Consulting has prepared a preliminary draft Housing Needs Assessment. The preliminary draft Housing Needs Assessment is on the City's website, but I went ahead and attached<sup>12</sup> it in case you haven't had the opportunity to see it.

Pages 54-55 of the preliminary draft Housing Needs Assessment is a discussion about housing needs for future growth.

There was a countywide process to assign population and employment targets to local jurisdictions that was done prior the City's adoption of the Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan in 2015. Through that process, the City of Mukilteo was assigned a 20-year (2015-2035) population growth target of 21,812 to the year 2035 to include in the Comprehensive Plan.

Berk's analysis, from the present year of 2020 to 2035, estimates the City would need about 190 new housing units to the year 2035 to meet the 21,812 population target (assuming a 5% vacancy rate and assuming that an average household size of 2.56 persons per household stays what it is today).

From about 2015 to 2019, Berk indicates the City averaged about 10 net housing units per year, or about 50 units over those five years.

A few items to note. The 21,812 is an assigned target. It represents the minimum population the City needed to plan for in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update, but actual population/housing unit growth might be higher or lower.

Also, vacancy rates and average household size assumptions affect housing unit estimates when the calculation of converting population to housing units is done.

Finally, the other and perhaps a more important issue, is that State law requires that local governments update

---

<sup>12</sup> The draft Housing Needs Assessment is available online at: <https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/planning-long-range/housing-action-plan/housing-action-plan-project-library/#project>



their GMA Comprehensive Plan before the end of the year 2035 20 year period. As of now, the City (and other local governments in Snohomish County) will have to adopt an updated GMA Comprehensive Plan by June 30, 2024. The City will be assigned new 20-year population and employment targets to use for the 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan update, and those new targets will be for the year 2044.

So the City is going to have new population and employment targets (to 2044). The new population targets will get translated into housing units and those numbers will then be the basis for planning discussion in the future. This process is also discussed briefly on page 54 of Berk's needs assessment.

I hope this helps.

*December 3, 2020 3:05 PM – Peter Zieve*

I see on the agenda that you sent for December 10 they will review community feedback. What is the best way for the community to give feedback.

*December 3, 2020 3:56 PM – Lauren Balisky*

Anyone can submit a comment or question at any time on the City's [HAP Comment webpage](#) – these comments come directly to me as well as to the consultant team.

A complete copy of public comments received by this department to date is available here:  
<https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/planning-long-range/housing-action-plan/housing-action-plan-project-library/#comments>

Please note that Planning Commission is only reviewing a summary of the November 5, 2020 Community Meeting and a summary of comments to date, since they will be receiving a complete copy of the comments as part of the public hearing process in Spring 2021.


Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

*December 4, 2020 4:12 AM – Peter Zieve – Via HAP Comment Form*

I am totally opposed to the HAP. This can do nothing positive for me, my family and my employees. It can cause a lot of problems. I moved my family to Mukilteo because I enjoy the "single family home" way of living. I don't know why the city is pursuing a program that will harm the residents of the city. In addition to my family of five and the one hundred and fifty employees of Electroimpact that live in Mukilteo, I also maintain an email group and membership of five hundred residents that is opposed to the HAP. I call my group Preservemukilteo. I am sure there are other groups as well. My membership is opposed to MR zoning, even more opposed to denser and higher than MR. I notice that half the upper parking lot at the Boeing tech center on Harbour Heights Parkway has recently been reclassified as MR with a PRD overlay. I have asked friends that live in that area. The Mukilteo residents I spoke to are not aware of this change. The change was made in the dead of night. I predict the residents

December 4, 2020 8:20 AM – Lauren Balisky

### Wired Zone Rezone:



Approved Findings of Fact and Conclusions Ord-1098-Exhibit A.doc

Page 14 of 23

<sup>13</sup> Ordinance No. 1098 is available upon request.



## Public Comments by Date

Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
<b><u>January 21, 2020 – City Council Meeting – Grant Acceptance</u></b>		
A-01	January 29, 2020 5:01 PM – Elaine Knapp	Grant information request.
A-02	January 30, 2020 2:16 PM – Elaine Knapp	Asked how grant acceptance works.
A-03	January 30, 2020 5:17 PM – Elaine Knapp	Thank you for explanation of grant acceptance process (included).
	February 3, 2020 4:55 PM – Lisa McBroom	Request Council reconsider vote to accept grant.
	February 3, 2020 10:26 PM – Lisa McBroom	Concern that HAP is proposal to construct Section 8 housing.
	February 4, 2020 12:28 PM – Lisa McBroom	Request Mayor reconsider vote to accept grant.
A-04	February 4, 2020 1:01 PM – Elaine Knapp	Whether grants are accepted via a public input process.
	February 4, 2020 1:09 PM – Lisa McBroom	Support for senior-only housing; does not support student-only housing.
A-05	February 4, 2020 1:20 PM – Lisa McBroom	Request for revote on grant acceptance by Council; against grant and subsidized housing.
A-06	February 4, 2020 1:34 PM – Lisa McBroom	Ms. McBroom forwarded an email chain with the Mayor.
A-07	February 4, 2020 3:17 PM – Elaine Knapp	Thank you for explanation of public input process.
A-08	February 16, 2020 2:48 PM – David Grimes	Request to connect with consultant to provide input.
B-01	March 15, 2020 10:20 AM – Peter Zieve	Initiation of Preserve Mukilteo petition.
B-02	May 20, 2020 3:02 PM – Jeff Schumacher	Concern about Preserve Mukilteo flyer.
A-09	May 21, 2020 11:21 AM – Kris Nicoll-Henry	Support for grant.
B-03	May 21, 2020 1:50 PM – Peter Zieve	Opposed to affordable housing.
B-04	May 22, 2020 9:26 AM – Jeff Schumacher	Provided copy of Preserve Mukilteo flyer, suggestions for virtual meetings.
B-05	May 22, 2020 12:54 PM – Peter Zieve	Coordinating one-on-one meeting with Director Osaki.
	May 22, 2020 3:16 PM – Peter Zieve	Confirmation of meeting with Director Osaki.
B-06	May 30, 2020 4:19 PM – Casey Burt	Concern about Preserve Mukilteo flyer; request for grant information.

<sup>14</sup> Comment number assigned for public comment summary, provided to Planning Commission for the December 10, 2020 meeting.



Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
B-07	June 1, 2020 1:44 PM – Peter Zieve	Brief summary and response to one-on-one meeting with Director Osaki.
<b><u>June 2, 2020 – City Council Land Use and Economic Development Committee – Consultant Review</u></b>		
A-10	June 5, 2020 2:18 PM – Lauren Balisky (Eric Albright)	Request for grant proposal; concern about Preserve Mukilteo flyer.
B-08	June 23, 2020 1:59 PM – Preserve Mukilteo	List of Preserve Mukilteo members; request for Council to reject consultant contract.
C-01	February 4, 2020 1:34 PM – Lisa McBroom	HAP is flawed, does not support moving forward.
	Mr. Osaki - fyi. June 24, 2020 12:15 PM – Lisa McBroom	
C-02	June 24, 2020 12:43 PM – Lisa McBroom	Remainder of Preserve Mukilteo member list.
	June 24, 2020 2:56 PM – Brent Silver	Informed City of website error.
	June 24, 2020 3:18 PM – Brent Silver	Confirmed interest in email list.
	July 2, 2020 9:04 AM – Lisa McBroom	Thank you for being informed of upcoming Council meeting.
C-03	July 5, 2020 1:16 PM – Chris Collier	Letter in support of grant and consultant acceptance.
<b><u>July 6, 2020 – City Council Meeting – Consultant Selection</u></b>		
C-04	July 6, 2020 10:24 AM – Daniel Lynn	Does not support consultant contract; schools overcrowded.
C-05	July 6, 2020 11:07 AM – Paolo Rocca	Request to place HAP on the November 2020 ballot.
C-06	July 6, 2020 11:17 AM – Shaina Kirsch	Does not support consultant contract; schools overcrowded; request to place HAP on the November 2020 ballot.
C-07	July 6, 2020 11:35 AM – Leanne Rafter	Request to place HAP on the November 2020 ballot.
C-08	July 6, 2020 1:16 PM – Kyle Johnson	Hiring a consultant is wasteful.
C-09	July 6, 2020 2:07 PM – Ray Boyer	Concern about density; request to place HAP on the November 2020 ballot.
C-10	July 6, 2020 2:39 PM – Matthew Morgan	Concern about quality of life (e.g. Paine Field) with increased density.
C-11	July 6, 2020 3:40 PM – Donna Vago	Concern about housing density.
C-12	July 6, 2020 4:02 PM – Renee Ripley	BERK is unfamiliar with Mukilteo; opposed to density and subsidized housing.



Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
C-13	July 6, 2020 6:24 PM – Lisa McBroom	Request to table vote on consultant contract.
C-14	July 6, 2020 6:42 PM – Lisa McBroom	Concern that HAP is agenda-driven and will be made up of pre-determined outcomes.
C-15	July 6, 2020 6:56 PM – Lisa McBroom	Concern that decision on consultant contract is presupposed.
C-16	July 6, 2020 9:50 PM – Chris Collier	City unable to regulation Section 8 program.
D-01	July 7, 2020 2:07 PM – Brent Silver	Comments on July 6, 2020 Council meeting, suggestions for code amendments.
D-02	July 10, 2020 11:09 AM – Brent Silver	Comments on zoning, ADUs, floor area ratio.
B-09	July 11, 2020 9:34 AM – Preserve Mukilteo	Ballot process.
D-03	<p>June 1, 2020 12:54 PM – Dave Osaki</p> <p>It was a pleasure seeing you today to discuss the Housing Action Plan, including the overall process and the community engagement process.</p> <p>Our phones at City Hall are down, so the best way to reach me is through my work cell at 425-275-7677.</p> <p>Would be glad to answer any questions or clarify any items.</p> <p>Thanks for the tour as well. I enjoyed it.</p> <p>Take care.</p> <p><i>June 1, 2020 1:44 PM – Peter Zieve</i></p> <p>I learned allot. In fact, I am still working on it in my head.</p> <p>July 15, 2020 8:57 AM – Peter Zieve</p>	Request for Director Osaki to speculate on potential outcomes of the HAP.
D-04	July 15, 2020 9:28 AM – Brent Silver	Shared Joe Biden's housing agenda.
D-05	July 15, 2020 3:05 PM – Brent Silver	Confirmed portion of Joe Biden's agenda he intended to share.

Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
D-06	July 15, 2020 3:22 PM – Peter Zieve	Follow-up to prior conversation [context unclear] regarding housing units.
<b><u>July 16, 2020 – Planning Commission – Update on July 6, 2020 Council Action</u></b>		
D-07	July 19, 2020 2:26 PM – Peter Zieve	Clarification of housing units [in 2035 growth target].
	July 22, 2020 4:27 PM – Brent Silver	Notification of Granicus / Zoom recording issue.
	July 23, 2020 12:14 PM – Brent Silver	Thank you for clarification of Granicus / Zoom issue.
	July 31, 2020 8:11 AM – Peter Zieve	Questions about Planned Community Business (PCB) and Planned Community Business – South (PCB(S)) zones.
	July 31, 2020 1:38 PM – Brent Silver	Second notification of Granicus / Zoom recording issue.
	July 31, 2020 3:04 PM – Brent Silver	Thank you for clarification of Granicus / Zoom issue.
D-08	August 7, 2020 7:50 AM – Donna Vago	Request for clarification on what was agreed to with the HAP Grant.
	August 8, 2020 12:45 PM – Peter Zieve	Concern about Bella Terra apartments.
<b><u>August 22, 2020 – Coffee with Council</u></b>		
E-01	September 1, 2020 4:16 PM – Adrian B – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density, height, parking, and criminal backgrounds.
E-02	September 1, 2020 11:27 PM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density, height, and parking.
E-03	September 2, 2020 6:08 AM – Richard Foltz – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density, height, and parking.
E-04	September 2, 2020 9:05 AM – Joan Johnson – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about design standards, density and parking.
E-05	September 2, 2020 2:38 PM – Fabienne Palu-Benson – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about low-income housing, school capacity.
E-06	September 4, 2020 12:00 PM – Ken Benoit – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density, height, and parking.
E-07	September 5, 2020 6:42 AM – Matt Morgan	Concern about density.
E-08	September 5, 2020 6:52 PM – Anthony Sarno – Via HAP Comment Form	Request for development moratorium.
E-09	September 6, 2020 3:26 AM – Peter Zieve – Via HAP Comment Form	Parking should be legally bound to unit. Concerns about density and height.
E-10	September 6, 2020 6:19 AM – Ly Lin – Via HAP Comment Form	Parking should be legally bound to unit. Concerns about density and height.



Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
E-11	September 6, 2020 6:41 PM – Armandina and Covie Smith – Via HAP Comment Form	Parking should be legally bound to unit. Concerns about density and height.
E-12	September 7, 2020 4:56 PM – Matthew Goodrich – Via HAP Comment Form	Parking should be legally bound to unit. Concerns about density and height.
E-13	September 7, 2020 8:35 PM – Rob Townsend – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about density, crime and traffic.
E-14	September 9, 2020 10:48 AM – Daniel Lynn – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about overcrowded schools, parking, traffic. HAP should be voted on.
E-15	September 9, 2020 5:00 PM – Jeff Sellentin – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about government intervention in housing market, traffic and crime.
E-16	September 12, 2020 4:31 PM – Amy Laroche – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about loss of character, parking.

#### **September 17, 2020 – Planning Commission – FYI on Planning Commission Schedule**

#### **September 22, 2020 – Coffee with Council**

E-17	September 28, 2020 12:50 PM – Justin Nielson – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about density, parking, neighborhood character.
D-09	October 13, 2020 9:35 PM – Charlie Pancerzewski – Via HAP Comment Form	Request for clarification on how the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) was selected.

#### **October 15, 2020 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #1**

#### **October 15, 2020 – Planning Commission – Discussion on Draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA)**

F-01	October 15, 2020 5:06 PM – Donald Ripley	HAP is not a priority.
G-01	October 21, 2020 9:50 AM – Ross Everett	Concern about low-income housing, crime, safety.
G-02	October 25, 2020 4:42:26 PM – Paul Taber	Detailed responses to findings of draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA).

#### **October 29, 2020 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #2**

G-03	October 29, 2020 11:29 AM – Boris Zaretsky	Detailed responses to findings of draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA).
G-04	October 30, 2020 10:14 AM – Donna Vago	Concern about growth targets, single-family to multi-family unit ratio, goals for housing, rezoning.
G-05	October 30, 2020 12:19 PM – Boris Zaretsky	Recommendations for Community Meeting on preliminary HNA findings. Questions about what happens if City does not comply with Growth Management Act requirements.

Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
D-10	November 2, 2020 1:26 PM – Dilep Nayak – Via HAP Comment Form	Against HAP; need public park in Harbour Pointe.
E-18	November 3, 2020 2:38 PM – Scott Kirkwall – Via HAP Comment Form	Zoning density should be increased in a way that retains single-family character.
G-06	November 3, 2020 4:30 PM – Donna Vago	Request for clarification on Buildable Lands Report terminology.
E-19	November 4, 2020 10:14 AM – Gerald Bauer – Via HAP Comment Form	ADU code is inflexible; provided information on Seattle's ADU codes.
<b><u>November 5, 2020 – Community Meeting #1</u></b>		
G-07	November 5, 2020 11:33 AM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about HNA data quality, tenure of SAG members, opposed to additional population growth.
	November 5, 2020 1:08 PM – Gerald Bauer	Comments on lack of flexibility in ADU codes.
G-08	November 5, 2020 3:04 PM – Marianne Conger – Via HAP Comment Form	Questions about affordable housing gap in Mukilteo, potential solutions.
D-11	November 5, 2020 5:14 PM – Cheryl Labarre	Supports workforce housing, elderly housing. Wants to be a model city.
H-01	November 6, 2020 12:18 PM – Ray Boyer – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about data and privacy; questions regarding penalties for not complying with Growth Management Act requirements.
H-02	November 6, 2020 1:57 PM – Anthony Sarno	HAP is a scam.
	November 7, 2020 11:04 PM – Melanie Field	Specific copyediting and clarification suggestions for draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA).
	November 9, 2020 10:36 AM – Anthony Sarno	Thank you to staff.
H-03	November 9, 2020 12:47 PM – Ray Boyer	Thank you for response, email to Mayor Gregerson.
H-04	November 10, 2020 10:18 PM – Ray Boyer – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about HAP failing to address potential adverse effects of housing types, specifically schools, traffic, and public safety.
	November 11, 2020 3:12 PM – Ray Boyer	Concern comment not received.
	November 11, 2020 7:03 PM – Ray Boyer	Updated staff on test of website form fix.
H-05	November 13, 2020 12:52 AM – Ray Boyer	Ongoing concern about school quality, inequity within school district.
H-06	November 13, 2020 5:00 AM – Ray Boyer – Via HAP Comment Form	Ongoing concern about school quality; shared Seattle P-I article.

Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
H-07	November 15, 2020 9:09 AM – Ray Boyer	Email to Council regarding adverse effects of rezoning, school quality, impact on generational wealth.
D-12	November 16, 2020 2:19 PM – Daniel Sanchez – Via HAP Comment Form	Request for affordable housing assistance.
D-13	November 17, 2020 6:00 PM – Daniel Sanchez	Request for guaranteed affordable housing.
D-14	November 18, 2020 7:16 PM – Daniel Sanchez	Response by staff to Mr. Sanchez.
E-20	December 1, 2020 12:29 PM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form	Consider rezoning Midtown Mukilteo, allow detached ADUs in R12.5 Zone.
	December 1, 2020 11:42 PM – Derek Flores	Suggestion to require HOAs to complete FHA loan paperwork and to work with the legislature to eliminate rental caps in HOAs.
	December 3, 2020 3:05 PM – Peter Zieve	Request for best method to provide feedback.
	December 3, 2020 10:57 PM – Christopher Beamis – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about subsidized housing, crime, and litter.
	December 4, 2020 12:36 AM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about subsidized housing.
	December 4, 2020 4:12 AM – Peter Zieve – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about loss of single-family zoning, and rezone of former Boeing Technical Center.
	December 4, 2020 9:56 AM – Gene Goosman – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about rezone of former Boeing Technical Center.
	December 4, 2020 12:27 PM – Alan Tapert – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density and home values.
	December 4, 2020 1:45 PM – Cathy Carter – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density, loss of small-town feel and green space, and impacts to infrastructure.
	December 5, 2020 12:27 PM – Dilep Nayak – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about subsidized housing and parks.
	December 5, 2020 1:28 PM – Anthony Sarno – Via HAP Comment Form	Form comment.
	December 6, 2020 12:59 PM – Joseph Kunthara – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about subsidized housing.
	December 7, 2020 1:54 PM – Leslie Gregg – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about home values, data quality, clarity of draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA), federal housing requirements, availability of subsidized housing outside of Mukilteo, and draft HNA findings.



Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
	December 7, 2020 3:49 PM – Derek Flores	Thank you.
	December 8, 2020 12:40 PM – Leslie Gregg	Concerns about rezoning, personal investments, impacts of COVID-19, and draft HNA findings.
	December 9, 2020 9:36 AM – Leslie Gregg	Concerns about uncertainty of final result of HAP process, suggestion for how to clarify draft HNA, concern about ability to make decisions with requirements changing over time.
<b><u>December 10, 2020 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #3</u></b>		
<b><u>December 10, 2020 – Planning Commission – Review of Public Comments to Date</u></b>		
	December 10, 2020 5:26 PM – Dana Patrick – Via HAP Comment Form	Existing housing options are adequate; concerns about schools, taxes, and safety.
	December 10, 2020 5:37 PM – Allen Arp – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about subsidized housing and apartments.
	December 15, 2020 10:28 AM – Melinda MacFarland – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about subsidized housing and crime.
	December 22, 2020 11:22 AM – Ray Boyer	Concern that HAP does not address adverse impacts of the strategy recommendations, particularly impacts to schools.
	December 30, 2020 4:45 AM – Preserve Mukilteo	Vantage Apartments
	December 30, 2020 6:33 AM – Ly Lin – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density, subsidized housing.
	December 30, 2020 8:46 AM – Rogers, Bill – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about height and parking.
	December 30, 2020 9:15 AM – Patrick Keller – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about density and parking.
	December 30, 2020 9:23 AM – Rich Davis – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about impacts from additional growth.
	December 30, 2020 11:22 AM – Tina Chun	Concern about rezone of former Boeing Technical Center.
	December 30, 2020 11:27 AM – Christopher Beamis – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about subsidized housing, crime, traffic, height and parking.
	December 30, 2020 2:12 PM – Ken Benoit – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about rezone of former Boeing Technical Center.
	December 30, 2020 4:34 PM – Melinda MacFarland – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about height, traffic and parking.





Comment No. <sup>14</sup>	Date Time – Name	Summary
	December 30, 2020 4:41 PM – Georgia Fisher – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about subsidized housing, traffic, pollution, and crime.
	December 30, 2020 8:56 PM – Mike Reilly – Via HAP Comment Form	Concerns about rezoning.
	December 31, 2020 8:26 AM – Tina Chun	Thank you.
	December 31, 2020 12:16 PM – Charlene Blankenship – Via HAP Comment Form	Informed the City of a conversation regarding the HAP occurring on the NextDoor app.
	December 31, 2020 12:24 PM – Shirley Riley – Via HAP Comment Form	Concern about rezone of former Boeing Technical Center.
	December 31, 2020 2:49 PM – Shirley Riley	Thank you, concern about Preserve Mukilteo.



## Index

### **A**

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) .....	9, 46, 79, 81, 97, 106, 138, 148, 164
Annexation .....	13, 153

### **B**

Boeing Technical Center .....	11, 28, 48, 116, 120, 176
-------------------------------	---------------------------

### **C**

Character .....	11, 18, 24, 27, 42, 46, 63, 64, 96, 100, 105, 123, 128, 144, 145
Climate Change .....	See Environment
Community Character .....	See Character
Comprehensive Plan .....	15, 21, 31, 34, 159
Docket Process .....	48, 75, 120, 169
Growth Targets .....	15, 150, 156, 170, 172
Consultant .....	6, 13, 31, 61, 64, 66, 106, 123, 128
COVID-19 .....	27, 39, 49, 54, 56, 97, 105, 125, 135, 170
Crime .....	8, 10, 18, 22, 38, 42, 64, 73, 76, 142, 145, 147

### **D**

Density .....	8, 10, 11, 13, 27, 42, 45, 47, 49, 61, 62, 63, 71, 96, 100, 106, 116, 123, 137, 141, 142, 144, 145, 174, 176
---------------	--

### **E**

Employment Targets .....	See Comprehensive Plan, Growth Targets
Environment .....	10, 16, 27, 42, 152
Equity .....	7, 12, 20, 31, 139

### **G**

Grant .....	5, 26, 65, 80, 97, 99, 106, 123, 146, 162
Growth Management Act .....	15, 20, 24, 31, 34, 74
Penalties for Noncompliance .....	14, 17, 34, 159

### **H**

Height .....	8, 11, 42, 45, 47, 71, 116, 123, 126, 141, 174
Homelessness .....	64, 76, 127
Homeownership .....	7, 49, 96, 157
Housing	
Affordable .....	19, 43, 46, 65, 105, 142, 157
Choice .....	7, 38, 49, 105



Cottage.....	59, 82, 138
Deficit.....	34, 35
Design Standards .....	45, 60
Federal Requirements.....	14, 50, 54, 136, 139, 146
Mandate .....	17, 20, 76, 80, 84
Senior .....	50, 53, 57, 69, 80, 83
Subsidized.....	7, 10, 11, 17, 19, 43, 64, 68, 69, 71, 73, 96, 98, 101, 123, 127, 132, 136, 137, 145, 162
Vacancy .....	50, 142, 157
Housing Action Plan (HAP)	
Public Process .....	13, 67, 115, 122, 163, 175
Purpose .....	27, 85
Housing Needs Assessment (HNA).....	14, 35, 39, 49
Data Quality.....	49, 123, 128, 142, 156
Data Sources .....	14, 49
Housing Targets .....	See Comprehensive Plan, Growth Targets
<b>I</b>	
Impact Fees .....	20, 80
Infrastructure.....	18, 21, 22, 24, 106, 147
<b>L</b>	
Landscaping.....	See Housing, Design Standards
Litter.....	See Environment
Low-Income Housing.....	See Housing, Subsidized
<b>M</b>	
Midtown Mukilteo.....	41, 46
Mother-in-Law Apartment.....	See Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)
Mukilteo School District .....	See Schools
<b>P</b>	
Paine Field .....	49, 96
Parking .....	8, 11, 37, 45, 60, 62, 70, 71, 72, 73, 100, 116, 123, 126, 141, 174
Parks and Open Space .....	31, 48, 61, 97
Population Targets .....	See Comprehensive Plan, Growth Targets
Preserve Mukilteo .....	5, 26, 49, 74, 99, 106, 120, 125, 132, 162, 175
<b>Q</b>	
Quality of Life .....	See Character
<b>R</b>	
Racism .....	See Equity



Rezone.....48, 49, 106, 119, 146, 159

## **S**

Schools .....18, 20, 21, 31, 37, 61, 64, 69, 72, 101, 105, 106

Section 8 ..... See Housing, Subsidized

Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)..... 102, 123, 146, 166

## **T**

Taxes ..... 20, 37, 72, 105, 128, 147, 160

Tiny Homes ..... See Housing, Cottage

Traffic.....18, 31, 37, 42, 48, 72, 105, 136, 145, 147

## **V**

Vantage Apartments ..... 7, 11, 12, 20, 42, 55, 64, 68, 71, 73, 80, 106, 116, 129