

Mukilteo Housing Action Plan

Public Comments

This document is intended to help the reader review public comments received on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan project. It includes comments received by Community Development Department staff between January 2020 and 4:30 PM on June 10, 2021, 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. Summary of Public Comments

This section includes a summary of public outreach methods, the composition of commenters, and the top ten most common topics.

2. Summary of Public Comments by Date

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

3. Comment Threads

Substantive comments, questions and staff responses are grouped alphabetically by last name. Each set of comments is presented 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 and appropriate.

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 |
| | Summary of Public Comments |
| ▼ | Comment Threads |



Table of Contents

| Table of Contents | 2 |
|--|----------|
| Summary of Public Comments | 7 |
| Summary of Public Comments by Date | 8 |
| Comment Threads | 26 |
| 1. Albright, Eric | 26 |
| 2. Almgren, Karl | 28 |
| 3. Armstrong, Russell (R.J.) | 29 |
| 4. Arp, Carol | 30 |
| 5. Arp, Drew | 31 |
| 6. B, Adrian | 33 |
| 7. Barhoum, Marla | 34 |
| 8. Bauer, Gerald | 35 |
| 9. Beamis, Christopher | 36 |
| 10. Becher, Katherine | 37 |
| 11. Belfry, Margaret | 38 |
| 12. Benoit, Ken | 40 |
| 13. Blankenship, Charlene | 41 |
| 14. Bogner, Jo | 42 |
| 15. Boyer, Ray | 43 |
| 16. Brinkley, Kim | 58 |
| 17. Burt, Casey | 60 |
| 18. Carter, Cathy | 61 |
| 19. Chun, Tina | 62 |
| 20. Collier, Chris (Program Manager, Alliance for Housing Affordability) | 64 |
| 21. Conger, Marianne | 68 |
| 22. Dang, Tam | 71 |
| 23. Davis, Richard | 72 |
| 24. Ding, Yonglian | 73 |
| 25. Domnin, Andrey | 76 |
| 26. Duskin, Rebecca | 77 |
| 27. Engel, Tom | 78 |



| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 28. | Erickson, Sandy | 79 |
| 29. | Everett, Ross | 81 |
| 30. | Field, Melanie | 82 |
| 31. | Fisher, Georgia | 85 |
| 32. | Flores, Derek | 86 |
| 33. | Foltz, Richard | 88 |
| 34. | Foster-Busch, Amy | 89 |
| 35. | Fung, Anthony (Tony Funk, Tony Fung) | 90 |
| 36. | Gheoca Ciochina, Doina | 91 |
| 37. | Gheoca, Radu | 92 |
| 38. | Gold, Morgan | 93 |
| 39. | Gompf, Loren Lee | 95 |
| 40. | Goodrich, Matthew | 96 |
| 41. | Goosman, Gene | 97 |
| 42. | Grace, Wendy | 98 |
| 43. | Gregg, Leslie | 99 |
| 44. | Grimes, David | 109 |
| 45. | Hansen-Baker, Evelyn | 110 |
| 46. | Hayes, Dawn | 111 |
| 47. | Hicks, Candace | 113 |
| 48. | Holcomb, Malin | 114 |
| 49. | Hoppe, Sue | 115 |
| 50. | Hovland, Eric | 116 |
| 51. | Hui, Maria (Assistant Project Director, Basel Capital Group) | 121 |
| 52. | Ioana, Bogdan | 134 |
| 53. | Iseman, Jon and Wendy | 135 |
| 54. | Johnson, Joan | 137 |
| 55. | Johnson, Kyle | 139 |
| 56. | Keller, Patrick | 140 |
| 57. | Kinahan, Peter | 141 |
| 58. | Kirkwall, Scott | 142 |
| 59. | Kirsch, Shaina | 143 |
| 60. | Kiser, Kathy | 144 |
| 61. | Kissler, Ron | 146 |



| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 62. | Knapp, Elaine | 147 |
| 63. | Kunard, Audra | 152 |
| 64. | Kunthara, Joseph | 153 |
| 65. | Labarre, Cheryl | 154 |
| 66. | Labarre, Michel | 155 |
| 67. | LaCasse, Anita | 156 |
| 68. | Langdon, Marilyn | 158 |
| 69. | Laroche, Amy | 159 |
| 70. | LaSorella, Jeff | 161 |
| 71. | Leonard, Duane (Executive Director, Housing Authority of Snohomish County) | 162 |
| 72. | Lin, Ly | 164 |
| 73. | Lynn, Daniel | 165 |
| 74. | MacFarland, Melinda | 166 |
| 75. | Mahar, Michael | 168 |
| 76. | Malaska, Barbara | 169 |
| 77. | Marine, Joe | 171 |
| 78. | Markey, Tony | 172 |
| 79. | McBroom, Lisa | 173 |
| 80. | Mendenhall, Jim | 210 |
| 81. | Moore, Dana | 212 |
| 82. | Morgan, Matthew (Matt) | 213 |
| 83. | Morrill, Cami (Snohomish County – Camano Association of REALTORS) | 214 |
| 84. | Morrison, Patricia | 218 |
| 85. | Nayak, Dilep | 219 |
| 86. | Nicoll-Henry, Kris | 221 |
| 87. | Nielson, Justin | 222 |
| 88. | Nielson, Kael | 223 |
| 89. | Norman, Mary | 224 |
| 90. | Nov, Anna | 226 |
| 91. | Nowak, Doug | 227 |
| 92. | Nurani, Alif (360 Hotel Group) | 228 |
| 93. | O'Connor, Lani | 231 |
| 94. | Ohlfs, Carol | 235 |
| 95. | Palu-Benson, Fabienne | 236 |



| | | |
|------|----------------------------|-----|
| 96. | Pao, Phillip | 237 |
| 97. | Pancerzewski, Charlie | 238 |
| 98. | Patrick, Dana | 244 |
| 99. | Preserve Mukilteo | 245 |
| 100. | Rafter, Leanne | 257 |
| 101. | Rees, Stephanie | 258 |
| 102. | Reilly, Mike | 259 |
| 103. | Riley, Shirley | 260 |
| 104. | Rilov, Anna | 262 |
| 105. | Ripley, Donald | 263 |
| 106. | Ripley, Renee | 265 |
| 107. | Robinson, Kathy | 267 |
| 108. | Rocca, Paolo | 270 |
| 109. | Rogers, William | 271 |
| 110. | Rudd, Brandon | 272 |
| 111. | Sackner, Denise | 273 |
| 112. | Sanchez, Daniel | 274 |
| 113. | Sapp, Wanda | 275 |
| 114. | Sarno, Anthony | 276 |
| 115. | Schmalz, Steve | 279 |
| 116. | Schumacher, Jeff | 280 |
| 117. | Schumann, Leslie | 284 |
| 118. | Sellentin, Jeff | 285 |
| 119. | Silver, Brent | 286 |
| 120. | Smith, Armandina and Covie | 290 |
| 121. | Stevens, Anne-Marie | 291 |
| 122. | Stewart, Sherry | 292 |
| 123. | Stollwerck, Christina | 293 |
| 124. | Storr, Melissa | 294 |
| 125. | Sullivan, Paula | 295 |
| 126. | Swann, Sharon | 296 |
| 127. | Taber, Paul | 298 |
| 128. | Tapert, Alan | 300 |
| 129. | Temmer, Beverly | 301 |



| | | |
|-------|---------------------------|-----|
| 130. | Townsend, Rob | 302 |
| 131. | Vago, Donna | 303 |
| 132. | Vallins, Elizabeth (Lisa) | 316 |
| 133. | Wade, Scott | 318 |
| 134. | Walker, Bridget | 321 |
| 135. | Wallin, Eric Todd | 322 |
| 136. | White, Zhanna | 323 |
| 137. | Whitney, Jennifer | 324 |
| 138. | Wright, Maggie | 325 |
| 139. | Wuellner, Brian | 326 |
| 140. | Wuellner, Lorna | 327 |
| 141. | Zaretsky, Boris | 328 |
| 142. | Zieve, Peter | 342 |
| Index | | 369 |



Summary of Public Comments

As part of the Housing Action Plan project, the City solicited feedback from the community in a variety of ways, including at public meetings with City Council and the Planning Commission, community meetings, stakeholder interviews, the use of a focus group (the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)), meeting with the Mukilteo Youth Advisory Committee, as well as accepting written comments. Notifications of meetings were provided by email, postcard, on the City's website and Facebook page, and banners were posted at key locations for the community meetings.

This document includes, in full, written comments submitted to the Planning and Community Development Department (Department) by email, by use of the comment form available on the HAP website, and comments on meeting recordings submitted on the City's Facebook page.

Overall, the Department received:

- Approximately 268 substantive comments from 141 individual commenters¹;
- Of those 268 comments, 140 comments (or 52%) were made by those who signed the Preserve Mukilteo petition in June 2020²;
- 93 commenters, or approximately 66% of all commenters, submitted one (1) comment; and
- 16 commenters, or approximately 11% of all commenters, submitted approximately 38% of all comments (102 comments).

Comments primarily address the HAP grant acceptance process, consultant selection, results of the Housing Needs Assessment, suggestions regarding changes to development regulations, as well as general comments. Common topics are listed in the index. The top ten most common topics referenced in order of frequency are:

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Density | 6. Traffic |
| 2. Public Process | 7. Schools |
| 3. Subsidized (Low-Income) Housing ³ | 8. Vantage Apartments |
| 4. Crime | 9. Parking |
| 5. Character / Quality of Life | 10. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) |

¹ There are 142 individual comment threads in this document. Barbara Malaska spoke with staff and requested information, however did not submit any written comment. The information is provided here to fully document the public outreach for this project.

² Early in the process, a group called "Preserve Mukilteo" submitted a petition to the City, requesting that City Council not move forward with the HAP project. This petition included approximately 440 individuals, or approximately 2% of the City's population.

³ Comments were indexed based on the definitions in the Housing Needs Assessment for "Affordable Housing" and "Subsidized Housing." When a comment used the term "Affordable Housing" and the context indicated the writer was describing "Subsidized Housing," the comment was indexed as "Subsidized Housing."



Summary of Public Comments by Date

| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--|---|--|
| <u>January 21, 2020 – City Council Meeting – Grant Acceptance</u> | | |
| 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. |

⁴ Comment number assigned for public comment summary, provided to Planning Commission for the December 10, 2020 meeting.



| Comment No. ⁴ | 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. |
| <u>June 2, 2020 – City Council Land Use and Economic Development Committee – Consultant Review</u> | | |
| 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 | June 24, 2020 12:15 PM – Lisa McBroom | HAP is flawed, does not support moving forward. Request for Council to reject consultant contract; concerns about grant acceptance process. |
| 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. |
| <u>July 6, 2020 – City Council Meeting – Consultant Selection</u> | | |
| 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. |
| 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. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|---|--|---|
| C-15 | July 6, 2020 6:56 PM – Lisa McBroom | Concern that decision on consultant contract is presupposed. |
| | July 6, 2020 7:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook | Support for consultant contract. |
| C-16 | July 6, 2020 9:50 PM – Chris Collier | City unable to regulate 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 | June 1, 2020 1:44 PM – Peter Zieve | 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. |
| D-06 | July 15, 2020 3:22 PM – Peter Zieve | Follow-up to prior conversation [context unclear] regarding housing units. |
| <u>July 16, 2020 – Planning Commission – Update on July 6, 2020 Council Action</u> | | |
| 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. |
| <u>August 22, 2020 – Coffee with Council</u> | | |
| 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. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--|--|---|
| 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. |
| 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. |
| <u>September 17, 2020 – Planning Commission – FYI on Planning Commission Schedule</u> | | |
| <u>September 22, 2020 – Coffee with Council</u> | | |
| 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. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|---|---|--|
| <u>October 15, 2020 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #1</u> | | |
| | October 15, 2021 4:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook | Concern that online meetings excludes seniors. |
| <u>October 15, 2020 – Planning Commission – Discussion of Draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA)</u> | | |
| 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). |
| <u>October 29, 2020 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #2</u> | | |
| G-03 | October 29, 2020 11:29 AM – Boris Zaretsky | Detailed responses to findings of draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA). |
| | October 29, 2021 4:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook | Concerns about Boeing, COVID, density, and subsidized housing. |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| <u>November 5, 2020 – Community Meeting #1</u> | | |
| 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. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| D-11 | November 5, 2020 5:14 PM – Cheryl Labarre | Supports workforce housing, elderly housing. Wants to be a model city. |
| | November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – R.J. Armstrong – Via Facebook | Concern with HNA data, subsidized housing, density, and the HAP process. |
| | November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook | Participated in Community Meeting #1 polling Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook | Concern about subsidized housing. |
| | November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Jim Mendenhall – Via Facebook | Participated in Community Meeting #1 polling Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Dana Moore – Via Facebook | Kudos for comments made during Community Meeting #1 Via Facebook Live feed. |
| 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. |
| 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. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| 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 Harbour Pointe Technical Center. |
| | December 4, 2020 9:56 AM – Gene Goosman – Via HAP Comment Form | Concern about rezone of former Harbour Pointe 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. |
| | 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. |



| Comment Date Time – Name No. ⁴ | Summary |
|---|---|
| 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. |
| <u>December 10, 2020 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #3</u> | |
| <u>December 10, 2020 – Planning Commission – Review of Public Comments to Date</u> | |
| 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 – <i>Via HAP Comment Form</i> | 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 Harbour Pointe 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 Harbour Pointe Technical Center. |
| December 30, 2020 4:34 PM – Melinda MacFarland – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about height, traffic and parking. |
| December 30, 2020 4:41 PM – Georgia Fisher – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about subsidized housing, traffic, pollution, and crime. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--|--|---|
| | 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 Harbour Pointe Technical Center. |
| | December 31, 2020 2:49 PM – Shirley Riley | Thank you, concern about Preserve Mukilteo. |
| | January 1, 2021 9:46 PM – Michel Labarre – Via HAP Comment Form | Support for affordable housing and higher density. |
| | January 1, 2021 11:52 PM – CE Hicks – Via HAP Comment Form | Concern about rezoning occurring without public process. |
| | January 2, 2021 1:10 PM – Tina Chun | Request for confirmation of no proposed development near Harbour Pointe Technical Center. |
| | January 4, 2021 1:18 PM – Rebecca Duskin – Via HAP Comment Form | Prefers senior housing to additional multi-family units. |
| | January 5, 2021 6:29 PM – Brian Wuellner – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about quality of life and density. |
| | January 5, 2021 7:02 PM – Lorna Wuellner – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerned (subject not specified). |
| | January 7, 2021 10:07 PM - Charlie Pancerzewski – To Electeds | Comments on cost-burden and the draft Housing Needs Assessment; responsibility of Mukilteo to plan. |
| | January 8, 2021 10:49 PM – Donald Ripley | Concerns about quality of life and density. |
| | January 9, 2021 9:20 AM – Paula Sullivan | Concerns about renters, pets, traffic and short-term rentals. |
| <u>January 11, 2021 – City Council – Discussion of Draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) and Review of Public Comments to Date</u> | | |
| | January 11, 2021 12:54 AM – Charlie Pancerzewski | Additional comments about housing cost burden. |
| | January 11, 2021 12:37 PM – Eric Wallin | Concerns about density, crime, traffic and quality of life. |
| | January 13, 2021 7:27 PM – Matt Morgan – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about density and loss of community character. |
| <u>January 14, 2021 – Community Meeting #2</u> | | |
| | January 14, 2021 9:19 AM – Elaine Knapp | Concern about mischaracterization of HAP as rezoning. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|---|--|--|
| | January 14, 2021 2:44 PM – Elaine Knapp | Thank you. |
| | January 14, 2021 6:16 PM – Dr. Bridget Walker – Via HAP Comment Form | Supports equitable, affordable housing options. |
| | January 14, 2021 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook | Participated in Community Meeting #2 polling Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | January 14, 2021 7:00 PM – Tam Dang – Via Facebook | Participated in Community Meeting #2 polling Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | January 15, 2021 9:00 AM – Karl Almgren | Recommends adding a strategy to streamline permit processes in draft HAP. |
| | January 26, 2021 3:52 PM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form | Support for strategy to allow cottages where townhouses are allowed, and vice versa. |
| <u>January 28, 2021 – Planning Commission – Review of Potential Strategy Recommendations</u> | | |
| | January 28, 2021 4:39 PM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about rapid growth and subsidized housing. |
| <u>February 11, 2021 – Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting #4</u> | | |
| | February 9, 2021 7:43 PM – Boris Zaretsky | Disagrees with use of the word “needs” in “housing needs assessment.” |
| | February 10, 2021 10:50 AM – Boris Zaretsky | Suggests clarification between “needs” and “gaps” for Housing Needs Assessment. |
| | February 16, 2021 2:56 PM – Donna Vago | Concern that data does not adequately support strategies or increases in density, and concern about requirements of HB 1923. |
| | February 16, 2021 5:11 PM – Donna Vago | Thank you for staff clarification of HB 1923 requirements. |
| | February 17, 2021 8:48 AM – Donna Vago | Updated comments expressing concern about rezoning and changes to permitting requirements. |
| <u>February 19, 2021 – Notice of Environmental Decision</u> | | |
| | February 21, 2021 10:14 AM – Peter Zieve | Question about comment process. |
| | February 22, 2021 1:29 PM – Boris Zaretsky | Disagreement with the Housing Needs Assessment findings and comment on specific strategies by category in the draft Housing Action Plan. |
| | February 27, 2021 12:46 PM – Donna Vago | Does not support adoption of the Housing Action Plan. |
| | February 28, 2021 12:02 PM – Peter Zieve | Request for information on how to appeal the SEPA determination. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|---|---|---|
| | February 28, 2021 1:30 PM – Lisa McBroom | Does not support adoption of the Housing Action Plan. |
| | February 28, 2021 3:49 PM – Brian Wuellner | States HAP process has been one-sided and unilateral. |
| | February 28, 2021 4:26 PM – Michael Mahar | Request for HAP process to be delayed until in-person meeting possible. |
| | February 28, 2021 4:51 PM – Joan Johnson | Does not support apartments, concerns about crime. |
| | March 1, 2021 12:26 PM – Joan Johnson – Via HAP Comment Form | Repeat of February 28, 2021 comments. |
| | March 1, 2021 1:24 PM – Peter Zieve | Requests response ASAP. |
| | March 1, 2021 3:43 PM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form | Does not support adoption of the Housing Action Plan. |
| | March 2, 2021 9:21 PM – Scott Wade | Concerns about multi-family development, traffic and crime. |
| | March 3, 2021 2:12 PM – Sharon Swann | Does not support adoption of the Housing Action Plan. |
| | March 3, 2021 2:37 PM – Scott Wade | Thank you. |
| | March 3, 2021 3:55 PM – Kathy Robinson | Does not support adoption of the Housing Action Plan; concerns about crime, infrastructure, and schools. |
| | March 3, 2021 5:39 PM – Tony Funk – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about crime, reputation of Mukilteo, traffic. |
| | March 3, 2021 6:08 PM – Boris Zaretsky – Via HAP Comment Form | Repeat of February 22, 2021 comments. |
| | March 4, 2021 9:05 AM – Sharon Swann – Via HAP Comment Form | Repeat of March 3, 2021 comments. |
| | March 4, 2021 8:37 PM – Eric Hovland | Disagrees with SEPA determination. Concerns about Paine Field expansion, density, noise, crime, and environmental, traffic and service impacts. |
| | March 4, 2021 10:29 PM – Lisa McBroom | Discussion of potential impacts of HAP, if adopted; concern about State pre-emption of local authority. |
| March 5, 2021 – SEPA Comment Period Ends | | |
| | March 5, 2021 4:45 AM – Peter Zieve | Disagrees with SEPA determination. Concerns about ADUs, cottage housing, building height, recreation, preservation of existing neighborhoods, transportation and public services. |
| | March 5, 2021 7:20 AM – Lisa McBroom | Concerns about pressures from external government agencies on local housing decisions. |



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | March 5, 2021 7:38 AM – Elizabeth Vallins – Via HAP Comment Form | Disagrees with SEPA determination. Concerns about government overreach, density, crime, and subsidized housing. |
| | March 5, 2021 8:22 AM – Dawn Hayes – Via HAP Comment Form | Request for city not to accept grant funds. Concerns about |
| | March 5, 2021 8:51 AM – Dawn Hayes | Disagrees with SEPA determination. Concerns about ADUs, density, building height, transportation and public services. |
| | March 5, 2021 11:20 AM – Kathy Kiser | Disagrees with SEPA determination. Concerns about transportation, recreation, schools and public services. |
| | March 5, 2021 12:18 PM – Christina Stollwerck – Via HAP Comment Form | Concern about lack of senior housing. Supports ADUs and cottage housing, with adequate parking. |
| | March 5, 2021 12:46 PM – Amy Laroche | Concerns about traffic and parking. |
| | March 5, 2021 12:53 PM – Wanda Sapp – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about traffic and density. |
| | March 5, 2021 1:24 PM – Melinda MacFarland | Concerns about crime, crowding, and home values. |
| | March 5, 2021 1:26 PM – Leslie Schumann – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about traffic, crime, and home values. |
| | March 5, 2021 4:00 PM – Mary Norman | Disagrees with SEPA determination. Requests HAP be put to a vote. Concerns about grant timing. |
| | March 5, 2021 4:10 PM – Mike Reilly – Via HAP Comment Form | Concerns about parking and trash. |
| | March 5, 2021 4:27 PM – Anita LaCasse | Form comment. |
| | March 5, 2021 4:43 PM – Yonglian Ding | Role of Mukilteo regionally; concerns about timing, density, environmental impacts, traffic, crime, type of workforce, schools, and housing form. |
| | March 7, 2021 4:41 PM – McBroom, Lisa | Short story imagining conversation with future generations about the HAP. |

March 8, 2021 – City Council – Review of Draft Housing Action Plan

| | |
|--|--|
| March 8, 2021 6:00 PM – Lani O’Connor – Via Facebook | Commented on March 8, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| March 8, 2021 6:00 PM – Lisa Vallins – Via Facebook | Commented on March 8, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |

March 9, 2021 – Mukilteo Youth Advisory Committee



| Comment No. ⁴ | Date Time – Name | Summary |
|--|---|---|
| | March 9, 2021 10:43 AM – Ray Boyer | Thank you to staff for clarifying what affordable housing is. |
| | March 10, 2021 3:25 PM – Ray Boyer – To Electeds | Request Council forfeit the remaining grant funding. |
| | March 12, 2021 12:59 PM – Wendy Grace | Request to be added to contact list for low-income housing. |
| | March 14, 2021 11:41 AM – Lisa McBroom | Provided suggestions for access to green spaces and building character. |
| | March 14, 2021 11:41 AM – Lisa McBroom | Correction to email. |
| | March 16, 2021 9:14 PM – Lisa McBroom | Thank you to staff for response to SEPA comments. |
| <u>March 18, 2021 – Planning Commission – Review of Draft Housing Action Plan</u> | | |
| | March 18, 2021 2:09 AM – Peter Zieve | Complaint about a suspected ADU and requested to review HAP meeting recordings with Director Osaki. |
| | March 18, 2021 8:09 PM – Peter Zieve | Provided additional information about the complaint. |
| <u>March 19, 2021 – SEPA Appeal Period Ends</u> | | |
| | April 13, 2021 1:20 PM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment For ⁵ | Support for Public Hearing Draft of the HAP as written. |
| | April 14, 2021 9:08 PM – Donald Ripley – To Electeds ⁵ | Opposes affordable housing and requests that Council forfeit the remaining grant funding. |
| | April 14, 2021 10:36 PM – Carol Arp – Via HAP Comment Form ⁵ | Opposes subsidized housing and the HAP. |
| <u>April 15, 2021 – Planning Commission – Public Hearing</u> | | |
| | April 15, 2021 11:49 AM – Dean (Dilep) Nayak ⁵ | Opposes subsidized housing and the HAP. |
| | April 15, 2021 12:41 PM – Brian Wuellner – Via HAP Comment Form | Asks whether HAP will be approved by popular vote; concerns about data. |
| | April 15, 2021 4:25 PM – Maria Hui | Support for townhouse development and housing choice. |
| | April 15, 2021 9:25 PM – Sharon Swann – To Electeds | Provides definition of the character of Mukilteo. |
| | April 28, 2021 12:05 AM – Melinda MacFarland – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |

⁵ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



| Comment Date Time – Name No. ⁴ | Summary |
|---|--|
| May 4, 2021 1:48 PM – Cami Morrill | Support for diverse housing choice, affordable housing, and improved permit processes. |
| May 14, 2021 6:35 PM – Maria Hui | Support for townhouse development and housing choice. |
| May 17, 2021 – City Council – Public Hearing | |
| May 17, 2021 1:00 PM – Karl Almgren – To Electeds | Supports adoption of the HAP. |
| May 17, 2021 1:37 PM – Patricia Morrison | Does not support approval of the HAP or subsidized housing. |
| May 17, 2021 3:30 PM – Alif Nurani | Supports adoption of the HAP. |
| May 17, 2021 7:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook | Supports adoption of the HAP. |
| May 17, 2021 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook | Asks Council to listen to the concerns of the community. |
| May 17, 2021 – City Council – Public Hearing Closed for Additional Testimony | |
| May 18, 2021 11:29 AM – Kathy Robinson | Question regarding how comments are tracked. |
| May 18, 2021 1:33 PM – Kathy Robinson | Thank you to staff. |
| May 21, 2021 10:05 AM – Jim Mendenhall – To Electeds | Does not support the HAP. |
| May 21, 2021 4:05 PM – Jon and Wendy Iseman – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| May 29, 2021 1:00 PM – Kathy Robinson – Via Facebook | Concern about HAP and potential use or sale of golf course for redevelopment. |
| June 4, 2021 7:52 AM – Peter Kinahan – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 4, 2021 4:26 PM – Doug Nowak – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 4, 2021 8:40 PM – Carol Ohlfs – Via HAP Comment Form | Supports adoption of the HAP. |
| June 5, 2021 3:05 PM – Phillip Pao – Via HAP Comment Form | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 5, 2021 6:00 PM – Ron Kissler – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 5, 2021 7:00 PM – Tom Engel – Via HAP Comment Form | Opposes the HAP. |



| Comment Date Time – Name No. ⁴ | Summary |
|---|---|
| June 6, 2021 7:38 AM – Denise Sackner – Via HAP Comment Form | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 7:42 AM – Denise Sackner – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 8:51 AM – Sue Hoppe – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 2:43 PM – Lisa McBroom | Opposes the HAP and subsidized housing. |
| June 6, 2021 4:04 PM – Charlie Pancerzewski – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 4:25 PM – Sherry Stewart – To Mayor Gregerson | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 5:31 PM – Brandon Rudd – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 5:37 PM – Jennifer Whitney – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 5:57 PM – Jo Bogner – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 7:59 PM – Melinda MacFarland – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 8:28 PM – Radu Gheoca – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP and subsidized housing. |
| June 6, 2021 9:36 PM – Anna Rilov – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 6, 2021 10:19 PM – Rich Davis – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| <u>June 7, 2021 – City Council – Discussion and Decision on Resolution 2021-01</u> | |
| June 7, 2021 12:17 AM – Lani O'Connor – To Electeds | Supports adoption of the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 12:55 AM – Zhanna White – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 6:01 AM – Amy Foster-Busch – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 7:38 AM – Jeff LaSorella – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |



| Comment Date Time – Name No. ⁴ | Summary |
|---|--|
| June 7, 2021 10:11 AM – Sharon Swann – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 11:27 AM – Kael Neilson – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 11:30 AM – Paula Sullivan – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 11:47 AM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form | Supports adoption of the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 12:21 PM – Andrey Domnin – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 12:17 PM – Bogdan Ioana – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 1:02 PM – Fabienne Palu-Benson – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 1:17 PM – Morgan Gold | Supports adoption of the HAP; duplicate of earlier message. |
| June 7, 2021 1:39 PM – Drew Arp – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 1:51 PM – Eric Hovland – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 1:51 PM – Gene Goosman – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 2:00 PM – Anne-Marie Stevens – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 2:32 PM – Boris Zaretsky – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 3:28 PM – Georgia Fisher – Via HAP Comment Form | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 4:58 PM – Jon and Wendy Iseman – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 5:14 PM – Marla Barhoum – To Electeds | Opposes the HAP. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Marla Barhoum – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |



| Comment Date Time – Name No. ⁴ | Summary |
|---|---|
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Katherine Becher – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Margaret Belfry – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Jo Bogner – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Doina Gheoca Ciochina – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Evelyn Hansen-Baker – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Malin Holcomb – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Audra Kunard – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Marilyn Langdon – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Joe Marine – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Jim Mendenhall – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Dana Moore – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Anna Nov – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Denise Sackner – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Steve Schmalz – Via Facebook | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |



| Comment | Date | Time – Name | No. ⁴ | Summary |
|---------|--------------|---|------------------|---|
| | June 7, 2021 | 7:00 PM – Melissa Storr – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | June 7, 2021 | 7:00 PM – Beverly Temmer – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | June 7, 2021 | 7:00 PM – Lisa Vallins – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | June 7, 2021 | 7:00 PM – Maggie Wright – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Meeting Via Facebook Live feed. |
| | June 7, 2021 | 9:32 PM – Brandon Rudd – To Electeds | | Opposes the HAP. |
| | June 7, 2021 | 11:50 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Via Facebook. |
| | June 8, 2021 | 1:08 AM – Steve Schmalz – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Via Facebook. |
| | June 8, 2021 | 6:43 PM – Tony Markey – Via Facebook | | Commented on June 7, 2021 Council Via Facebook. |



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

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://mukilteo-wa.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://mukilteo-wa.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?view_id=4&event_id=736.



2. Almgren, Karl

January 15, 2021 9:00 AM – Karl Almgren

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Last night was the second open house on the Housing Action Plan. The City Staff is clearly working tirelessly to address the concerns of the community and their efforts were evident last night. Kudos to Lauren, Garrett, and Berk Consulting.

One theme from members of the public that has continued between the two open houses is an exclusionary viewpoint that this plan must only be based on those from Mukilteo. The Housing Action Plan is a strategic document to better the lives of current, and future residents. It is imperative that the Council remain open to ideas and opinions from all people when considering methodology to better Mukilteo's housing options.

I also encourage the Council to consider how the Housing Action Plan can strategically streamline permitting and simplify the regulations of the City. Much of the zoning code exists today based on decisions from the annexation of Harbour Pointe, literally a generation ago. It can be simplified. It can be done without threatening the way of life in Mukilteo. It can be done to ensure development regulations are equally applied throughout the city.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

May 17, 2021 1:00 PM – Karl Almgren – To Electeds

I wanted to inform you of my support for the Housing Action Plan. As a fourth generation Mukilteo Property Owner, Mukilteo should be a community for all residents and not held as an exclusive community by government policy. Please support the Housing Action Plan and be a Council who leads for all.



3. Armstrong, Russell (R.J.)

November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – R.J. Armstrong – Via Facebook⁶

Recording Minute 0:00 – With such a low rate of growth projected why are we spending time on this? There are many bigger fish to fry. I have a laundry list if you like.

Recording Minute 0:00 – Salaries are being paid. How can you assert that the cost is minimal or non-existent as per your words?

Recording Minute 0:00 – Agree with Leslie. All one needs to do is look across the speedway across from Safeway. This is not Mukilteo city limits, but is a huge development

Recording Minute 0:00 – Leave Mukilteo alone. If you are consultants, it is your duty to inform city management that there is significant pushback.

Recording Minute 0:00 – Why was the HAP voted on behind closed doors?

Recording Minute 0:00 – If built out and it is known, is it not your responsibility to advise the city that we are wasting taxpayers' money to continue down this path?

Recording Minute 0:00 – Income vs home prices is irrelevant. The housing prices are what the market will bear.

Recording Minute 0:00 – Housing ratio is also irrelevant. Many many people commute to work, myself included.

Recording Minute 0:00 – Why is this study concerned with single family housing? Isn't home ownership the American dream?

⁶ Facebook comments were provided in response to November 5, 2020 Community Meeting #1. Meeting minutes were listed as 0:00 by Facebook.



4. Arp, Carol

April 14, 2021 10:36 PM – Carol Arp – Via HAP Comment Form⁷

Mukilteo is a unique smaller community and it seems we have a good balance of home ownership and rental property - however more rental, specifically subsidized housing will adversely effect the quality and character of Mukilteo. Low income/affordable housing exists all around us in Lynnwood and Everett as well as Mukilteo. Unfortunately with increased density comes crime - just look at Highway 99 and Casino road.

After a life of working hard and being fiscally responsible we are being penalized with more taxes for these programs. People need to make proper choices, get a job, be responsible to provide for themselves and their families.

When did we come up with the concept that everyone should be able to live in Mukilteo - we would love to live in Woodway but our family's net worth does not support that move!!

What is the return to the community? it appears these programs just attract more needy citizens and non citizens.

There are no filters as to who can be housed in these programs which is ridiculous. Our taxes should be used only for US citizens. Washington state is spending a ridiculous amount of money on social programs with no tangible positive results. Our society is in a spiral of stupidity.

We are not in favor of increased housing density, low income apartments or a change in the zoning to encourage MIL, tiny homes or increased density.

The State of Washington has many programs for low income families and housing but we are not seeing any improvement just more need. There has to be a program for families to work toward home ownership ie: pride in ownership, increased self esteem, building net worth.

Subsidized housing will continue to be a drain on resources .

⁷ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



5. 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.



June 7, 2021 1:39 PM – Drew Arp – To Electeds

I worked as a consultant in the construction trades before retiring. I witnessed first hand the special interests that worm their way into the pockets of the taxpayer. The taxpayer has little to no representation once these programs like HAP get launched. We do not need to waste taxpayers monies to promote higher density in our city and enrich outside outside conglomerates. Lynnwood, MLT, and Everett have taken upon themselves to become hight density ghettos of the future. Leave Mukilteo as-is, a nice place to live.



6. 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.



7. Barhoum, Marla

June 7, 2021 5:14 PM – Marla Barhoum – To Electeds

Until more residents know more about the city's plans, you need to pull the breaks.

We need more information to make an educated decision as to what's best for our community, together...not just the members of the city council.

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Marla Barhoum – Via Facebook⁸

Meeting Minute 00:37:23 - Thank you, Council Member Marine.

Meeting Minute 00:51:15 - Great questions, Council Member Harris. Thank you for digging deeper.

Meeting Minute 01:09:52 - Where did the \$ go?

⁸ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



8. 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.



9. 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.



10. Becher, Katherine

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Katherine Becher – Via Facebook⁹

Meeting Minute 00:38:39 - Thank you Council Member Marine

Meeting Minute 00:57:59 - Thank you Council Member Marine

Meeting Minute 02:12:12 - Thank you Paul!

Meeting Minute 02:47:27 - Question; Is this live chat stream viewable by all council members or just the Mayor? I know all of us here can see it, just wondering if all Council members can see it too

Meeting Minute 02:47:30 - Everywhere and anywhere 😰

Meeting Minute 03:39:25 - GREAT IDEA!!!

Meeting Minute 03:40:23 - Let's put it on a ballot!

⁹ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



11. Belfry, Margaret

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Margaret Belfry – Via Facebook¹⁰

Meeting Minute 02:31:12 - We have cottage housing in Spokane Valley, WA and it is ridiculous! It is a burden on the Fire Dept and other emergency vehicles. We have people building houses behind houses and alleyways or private drives that go across people's property lines to get to these house. We have duplexes going up on 7,000 sq ft property and sold as split townhouses. DON'T DO IT!!! You will ruin your great city of Mukilteo, that we once loved living in. Good luck everyone, we will be praying for you to make the right decisions.

Meeting Minute 02:32:43 - While ruining peoples way of life and invading their peace and privacy!

Meeting Minute 02:39:32 - Don't bring your political views into this situation. Quit talking about how your realtor was white and you are an immigrant. If you don't like it in this Great United States, don't complain!

Meeting Minute 02:40:08 - Pulled the race card right there! UGH!

Meeting Minute 02:41:30 - Look at things like your infrastructure. If you are willing to add more streets and make traffic flow properly first, then you can take a vote on whether to add cottage housing and more apartments. Traffic is bad enough there!

Meeting Minute 02:44:29 - Housing affordability is the same all across the United States and you need to realize this is not just happening in Mukilteo. Our own kids can't afford to live in the area that they graduated from high school in. Housing is skyrocketing and the real problem is that it is cheaper and easier to buy a NEW BUILD than it is to bid on an older house. YOU ARE NOT ALONE!

Meeting Minute 02:56:54 - The only people supporting this are the house flippers, real estate agents and landlords!

Meeting Minute 03:44:50 - Everybody wants FREE MONEY and they will go for it at any cost to the citizens of any city.

Meeting Minute 03:45:53 - Why do you allow people with children, meetings, etc make you rush to do things. Don't run for a job if you can't do it correctly!

Meeting Minute 03:48:00 - Let the people vote!

Meeting Minute 03:53:50 - Aha! Land use was hidden within and now we are back peddling!

Meeting Minute 03:55:29 - You have no idea what the heck you just voted on? WOW! Let the people vote if you have no idea what you are doing. UGH!

Meeting Minute 03:56:34 - For a whopping \$30,000? Are you all crazy?

Meeting Minute 03:58:33 - Over a lousy \$30,000? You're voting to change land use, etc? Are you kidding me?

¹⁰ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



Meeting Minute 04:02:36 - I agree 100%. I'm just feeling like this is a rushed decision and should be voted on by the people.



12. 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.



13. Blankenship, Charlene

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

So many concerned if these are within city of Mukilteo¹¹. Not sure why. When I moved there in '87 non of Harbour Point was Mukilteo. Lots of racism evident in Nextdoor site.

¹¹ 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.



14. Bogner, Jo

June 6, 2021 5:57 PM – Jo Bogner – To Electeds

I wish to reiterate my opposition to the HAP. Please vote No. We have a representative form of government and you have been elected to represent your constituents, not developers or special interests. In overwhelming numbers your constituents are opposed to the HAP. We know full well what this plan is and its intent. We do not want the character of our beautiful town changed. We will be watching very closely to see how each council member votes and then we will vote in November.

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Jo Bogner – Via Facebook¹²

Meeting Minute 02:13:17 - Well said, Mr. Ellis!!

Meeting Minute 02:38:50 - Thanks Peter! Looking forward to voting for you.

Meeting Minute 02:41:24 - Mukilteo is extremely diverse. Walking Harbour Point Blvd alone would clearly demonstrate this.

¹² Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



15. 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).¹³

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.

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

¹³ The Zillow data is publicly available at: <https://www.zillow.com/research/data/>. Commenters were provided with this information.



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 24th in our state while Mariner High School ranked 123rd 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.

March 9, 2021 9:36 AM – Lauren Balisky

Here is the link to the Office of Financial Management's (OFMs) population estimates:

<https://ofm.wa.gov/washington-data-research/population-demographics/population-estimates/april-1-official-population-estimates>

March 9, 2021 10:43 AM – Ray Boyer

Thanks Lauren for helping me better understand the housing plan!

I went from upset to confused.

I am especially glad you provided clarification as to what affordable housing means. Based upon what you said (affordable to Families making 80% to 120% of median wealth of existing Mukilteo Families) I now take it that the relative wealth of Mukilteo may not be reduced at all due to Growth Management Act requirements. It still seems that increasing population density may adversely impact housing value though which could in turn affect Family wealth adversely although that would be hard to predict.

City planning is complicated and very hard!

Again, thank you very much for everything you do.

March 9, 2021 5:16 PM – Lauren Balisky

I wanted to make some additional clarifications, to ensure we are communicating from the same place moving forward. All of this information is also available in the [final draft of the Housing Needs Assessment](#), available on the [HAP Project Library](#).

- **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).. Income groups are typically defined as follows:
 - Extremely Low-Income: 30% AMI or less
 - Very Low-Income: above 30% and not exceeding 50% AMI
 - Low-Income: above 50% and not exceeding 80% AMI
 - Moderate-Income: above 80% and not exceeding 100% AMI
 - Above Median Income: greater than 100% AMI
- The HAP strategies are focused around **market-rate housing**, not low-income housing, since that is what the City has the most control over via its permitting and development regulations. Various forms of low-income housing are typically provided at the regional level. Market-rate housing is housing affordable to those making 80-120% of **area median income**.
- **Area median income (AMI)** refers to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Area Median Family Income (MFI or HAMFI) for the Seattle-Bellevue, WA HUD Metro Fair Market Rent (FMR) Area, which includes both King and Snohomish counties. Median income is the middle income amount out of all family household incomes in a county or metropolitan region. Income limits to qualify for income-restricted housing are often set relative to AMI or MFI, with consideration of household size.
 - The 2020 HUD AMI for King and Snohomish counties was \$113,300.
 - In 2018, Mukilteo's median income for all households was approximately \$105,200, median family income was approximately \$127,000, and non-family median income was approximately \$68,400.

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

March 10, 2021 3:25 PM – Ray Boyer – To Electeds

I listened to most of the March 8th City Council work session concerning the housing action plan study. I have also have talked to Lauren Balisky on March 9th, and 10th, in order to better understand the study recommendations.

First, I wish to thank Council Member Kahn for his questions during the work session concerning how the people of Mukilteo feel about the HAP recommendations so that those feelings could be taken into account.

I'd also like to thank Council Member Marine for pointing out that we are essentially a fully developed city.

Although I have written the City Council previously concerning my feelings that Mukilteo's population density is already too high, I have decided to reiterate my feelings and comment on the HAP recommended options for the future.



I urge the City Council to forfeit the 30,000 dollar reimbursement by rejecting the recommended HAP options that facilitate increasing population density. .

I urge the City Council to oppose any changes to Mukilteo ordinances so as to facilitate increasing population density in Mukilteo.

We can not endlessly increase the population in Mukilteo.



16. Brinkley, Kim

November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook¹⁴

Recording Minute 40:03 – 50+¹⁵

Recording Minute 1:42:52 – Thank You!

January 14, 2021 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook¹⁶

Recording Minute 1:05:58 – Can we vote Via Facebook Live?

Recording Minute 2:08:18 – Thank You 😊

Recording Minute 1:48:20 – I would not support further study of adding more restrictions for setbacks to existing homes, if anything, I would support grandfathering in existing homes and the only parking available for them. However, I would support standardized and consistent se...

Recording Minute 1:32:38 – And apologies I can't attend Via Zoom as I am multi-tasking with care duties.

Recording Minute 1:31:38 – I would support further study of Cottages so long as 3 parking spot minimum per unit/house.

Recording Minute 1:28:16 – I like the cottages so long as there is adequate parking included (at least 3 parking spots per house/unit which includes owner and guest).

Recording Minute 1:21:25 – If I can vote (I live in Old Town Mukilteo), I would vote for further study of duplex (lumped in with ADUs).

Recording Minute 1:10:26 – For ADUs, I would recommend further study.

Recording Minute 1:06:18 – If yes, I would vote to continue

May 17, 2021 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook¹⁷

Recording Minute 1:57:40 – I would just encourage the Council to listen to the citizens of Mukilteo and represent them.

¹⁴ Facebook comments were provided in response to November 5, 2020 Community Meeting #1.

¹⁵ Response to poll question about how much median home values in Mukilteo have increased since 2010.

¹⁶ Facebook comments were provided in response to January 14, 2021 Community Meeting #2.

¹⁷ Facebook comments were provided in response to May 17, 2021 City Council Public Hearing.



June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Kim Brinkley – Via Facebook¹⁸

Meeting Minute 01:59:50 - Lani O'Connor Oh thank you, I joined late.

Meeting Minute 02:39:20 - Lani O'Connor Is there specific language and stipulations that prevent the City from applying for and receiving money/grants if the City rejects the HAP, that is what you are referring to? If yes, I can go research/look for this language/stipulations.

Meeting Minute 02:52:20 - I would like to see more options available for our aging population (Independent Living, Assisted Living, Memory Care, etc.) for when Mukilteo residents may no longer be able stay in their homes for whatever reasons it may be. However, I am not supportive of high density as I purposely left Seattle (selling my home) to get away from this.

Meeting Minute 03:09:52 - Richard Emery - what is driving your concerns with regards to the City of Mukilteo not being able to apply for and receive future grants if the HAP is not approved?

Meeting Minute 3:34:14 – 

Meeting Minute 03:36:53 - Crawford brings up good points with regards as to why are these priorities of the citizens not being addressed via the City's Comprehensive Planning Plan.

¹⁸ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



17. 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!



18. 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?



19. 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.

December 31, 2020 12:01 PM – Lauren Balisky

We have been receiving a lot of similar inquiries in relation to the [Housing Action Plan](#) project – would you like to be added to our Parties of Interest list so you can receive updates?

January 2, 2021 1:10 PM – Tina Chun

Thanks Lauren, yes I would like to receive regular emails regarding the Housing Action Plan. Are you able to confirm what Dave Osaki said in his email to me? That there are no known plans for housing development in the lots located near or around the Waterton residential community and Sundance townhomes?

January 3, 2021 9:47 AM – Lauren Balisky

I am also unaware of any plans or applications for housing development in that area.



20. 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 supports 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 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 outpatient 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.



21. 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,



22. Dang, Tam

January 14, 2021 7:00 PM – Tam Dang – Via Facebook¹⁹

Recording Minute 2:13:12 – ability to add ADU and DADU²⁰

¹⁹ Facebook comments were provided in response to January 14, 2021 Community Meeting #2.

²⁰ Response to discussion questions at community meeting: 1) What information surprised you? 2) In what ways do the findings reflect your experience? And 3) What housing needs would you prioritize in Mukilteo and why?



23. 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.

June 6, 2021 10:19 PM – Rich Davis – To Electeds

I want to my voice to the almost unanimous voices AGAINST HAP. IF you have statistical data that shows most citizens are for it, then go forward, if not, you must support the citizens voices you've heard and not make up things about how the citizens feel.

I do not want to turn Mukilteo into an urban or high density area. Please do not allow the HAP study to move forward. Please listen to your voters. That's what we elected you to do.

When you drive by the Vantage Apartments, do you think, my, how wonderful to have so many more people living nearby and in such close proximity? Have you seen the shadow the buildings cast on the street? It's daunting. Let's keep Mukilteo a very liveable and authentic place, NOT like Seattle.



24. Ding, Yonglian

March 5, 2021 4:43 PM – Yonglian Ding

I am a resident in the City of Mukilteo. I learned that the City has engaged a consultant in developing a House Action Plan and SEPA. I do have several comments here for your consideration:

- Did the study consider the recent completed, in-progress, and incoming housing development projects in the neighboring cities (e.g., Lynnwood, Everett, and others) and their impacts to overall house supply? Mukilteo, as a small town, should not be considered as a stand-alone city while other cities and communities are so close to Mukilteo and we share the similar employment patterns and are served by the same service providers. There are multiple recent completed, in-progress, and incoming housing development projects around us, such as the one apartment community facing Alberson on the other side of Speedway Blvd; the mix-use complex in the Costco shopping area in Lynnwood, the Lynnwood City Center apartment facing Lynnwood Convention Center, and more
- The main driver for people to choose where to live is job. In this region, including Mukilteo, Lynnwood, Everett and more, Boeing, Microsoft, Medical professional, (and more) are among the biggest employers. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, employment at Boeing and others have been impacted and maybe continue to be down for several years to come. So during this period of time with many uncertainties, it makes more sense that the City should consider to hold off closing the HAP and SEPA at this time since the basic house need assessment and house prices, more of those basic data may need another look.
- Should the vision of the City of Mukilteo be a friendly and safe community with amenities and services serving the needs of their current and future residents? As a current resident, my wishes are to have a less crowded community, safe to everyone, walkable sidewalk for kids and all, green environment (meaning no more tree cutting)... Building more dense community is going to ruin all of those. Building more dense community means there are more trees need to be removed, more earth will be covered by buildings, streets and parkings, which lead to more (untreated) surface runoff to rivers/ponds, more traffic, more pollution, and maybe more incidents/crime as well. I am very curious why those impacts were not mentioned in the SEPA checklist.
- Should the City of Mukilteo, one of most livable small towns in 2010, be thinking about how to retain and attract professionals while serving all type of residents (of course), instead of thinking about the work force here going to go to more service-oriented? Who will be customers for those service-oriented providers without professionals living or working in the City or surrounding neighbors? With more and more employers planning to adapt more flexible (remote) working style, should the City of Mukilteo maintain the mindset to be one of hometowns for more professionals, e.g., software engineers in Microsoft, Amazon, and more...?
- Our good schools are another attractive factor for young and medium-age families. There is a natural cycle which young and medium-age families move into a good school neighbor while older families move to places more accessible to medical care, and singles move to places with more and active fun activities. Market itself will determine the prices of housing, modules of houses (i.e, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, and more), and



more...The house need assessment may miss an understanding of this natural cycle, thus inappropriately project the population distribution and subsequent house needs.

- The City of Mukilteo, after a more thorough study, may need to think about how to steer unsuitable development (such as houses with more-than-marketable bedrooms, under the assumption that finding in the HAP study, which is we have too many multiple-bedroom houses is true.) to more suitable development for the unique Mukilteo...

Above are just some of my thoughts, which may not be all correct. Please consider.

We love the green, safe, and educated Mukilteo. Please help us stay this way.

Thank you very much for your attention.

March 8, 2021 8:00 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP)! As with all comments we receive, your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the HAP process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like throughout the HAP process.

Your input is critical for ensuring the strategies and recommendations in the HAP reflect the current and future needs of Mukilteo. We would like to hear from everyone. In addition to submitting a comment, you can stay involved by joining us at either of the two upcoming virtual meetings on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) project:

- **City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)**
 - Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.
- **Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021**
 - Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

A recording of the meetings will be available on the City's website. If you are unable to make it to the meetings, you are always welcome to:



- [Submit a comment on the City's Housing Action Plan website;](#)
- Mail a comment to City Hall at 11930 Cyrus Way, Mukilteo, WA 98275; or
- Join us at any of our virtual meetings this Spring!

Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to City Council in April 2021. No decisions will be made until after a public hearing is held by City Council in late Spring 2021.

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



25. Domnin, Andrey

June 7, 2021 12:21 PM – Andrey Domnin – To Electeds

I am against HAP.

I mentioned my opinion on zoom meeting previously.



26. Duskin, Rebecca

January 4, 2021 1:18 PM – Rebecca Duskin – Via HAP Comment Form

I do not want multifamily affordable housing in Mukilteo. We need senior affordable housing first.

I will be in attendance of all future Zoom meetings with the council.



27. Engel, Tom

June 5, 2021 7:00 PM – Tom Engel – Via HAP Comment Form

No on HAP. The era of development is over in Mukilteo. Where do we stop, 30 to 40 story condos and apts? Follow Edmonds. I have lived here 40 yrs, seen all the development. We can be an Edmonds or we can be Lynnwood.



28. Erickson, Sandy

January 11, 2021 1:22 PM – Sandy Erickson – Via HAP Comment Form

My friends/neighbors in Mukilteo have recently told me that the upper parking lot of the Boeing Tech Center located on my street, Harbour Heights Parkway, has been rezoned as MR with a PRD overlay. As a resident and homewoner I am completely against this! High density, low-income, multi-family housing will only bring crime, noise, and added policing to our beautiful area, bringing down home values. Instead, we should be adding low density, high-income housing that could only benefit our area. People who can afford to pay more will pay more to live in this beautiful community especially when it offers such breathtaking views.

Having the Ring Doorbell app, I am constantly being notified of theft, vandeling, disturbing noise, and unknown intruders on private property in Mukilteo neighborhoods of high-density populations. I choose to live in Harbour Pointe for a reason: safety, piece of mind, and tranquility.

Please help Mukilteo remain the best place to live.


January 11, 2021 1:38 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for sending in your concerns to the City. There are currently no proposals to develop the Harbour Pointe Technical Center into multi-family development. The portion of the parking lot you are referring to was rezoned to MR with a PRD overlay in 2004 – please see document pages 14-18 (pages 9-14 of the Findings and Conclusions) of the attached Ordinance No. 1098²¹.

²¹ Ordinance No. 1098 is available upon request.



Wired Zone Rezone:



Legal Description:

Portion of Tracts 3 and 4 of Snohomish County Binding Site Plan recorded under Recording No. 8311075005. – Lot 2 of Binding Site Plan 2003-01.

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 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 us know if we can be of any further assistance.



29. 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.



30. 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 its own character.



Thanks for passing these thoughts/notes along.



31. 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.

June 7, 2021 3:28 PM – Georgia Fisher – Via HAP Comment Form

The HAP says, there will be an "increase of 371 residents within eleven years" which is an interesting statement: 371/11 yrs equals less than 34 people a year. I don't see the need for high rise apartments and other density increasing housing projects. The number 34 equates to 8 families which could easily be absorbed into our community by the departure of a few retirees. I noticed the HAP report does not address impact of schools and traffic. The HAP report does indicate retirees take up too much housing space, this is a biased false statement. The HAP also mentions our home selling prices are too high for many people, yet our homes are now and have been selling quickly so this another bias of the HAP and not true in fact. I disapprove of the HAP. It should not be adopted in any way. The HAP report simply directs the city to go for large apartment complexes which are not needed and not in keeping with the beautiful community of Mukilteo.



32. 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

<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 !



33. 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.



34. Foster-Busch, Amy

June 7, 2021 6:01 AM – Amy Foster-Busch – To Electeds

I a Mukilteo homeowner, request that you reject HAP. I'll be joining the council meeting via zoom to witness your vote on behalf the residence of Mukilteo.



35. Fung, Anthony (Tony Funk, Tony Fung)

March 3, 2021 5:39 PM – Tony Funk – Via HAP Comment Form

Why the crime rate increasing every year in the City?

Why the City of Mukilteo voted as the most livable city in the past and now the reputation and rating has been declining?

Why the traffic on the speedway deteriorate worsen yearly?

Additional housing plan will lead us to be a city like San Francisco where is known of homeless, senior citizens have been out of their home etc.

If the trend remains, there will be numerous negative impacts on the nice City of Mukilteo. \$ base decision is unconscionable and immoral.



36. Gheoca Ciochina, Doina

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Doina Gheoca Ciochina – Via Facebook²²

Meeting Minute 01:32:47 - Margaret Zyla Belfry I don't think anything about the HAP should be approved. Any piece of it opens Pandora's box. Let the people vote on it.

Meeting Minute 02:15:23 - No HAP!

²² Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



37. Gheoca, Radu

June 6, 2021 8:28 PM – Radu Gheoca – To Electeds

NO ON HAP/No to initiative to allow low cost high density housing in Mukilteo !



38. 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.

January 26, 2021 3:52 PM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form

Strongly support the recommendation to allow cottages where townhouses are permitted and vice versa. Would really help fill that middle gap of housing affordability while keeping neighborhood character intact.

April 13, 2021 1:20 PM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form²³

Firstly, we would like to commend all the parties involved (Lauren, Berk, the stakeholders group and all those that listened and/or commented). A lot of time and evenings were spent planning for a better future. The end product is measured, well thought out and strikes a good balance between growth and NIMBYism. Job well done and this member of the quiet majority urges the Planning commission to adopt these recommendations. Please remember that this only sets the menu, the City Council places the order.

June 7, 2021 11:47 AM – Morgan Gold – Via HAP Comment Form

Please adopt the HAP report as prepared by Berk.

- It took a lot of time and resources to arrive at these recommendations. Beyond the grant money, many hours of city staff time as well as volunteers' time was invested.
- Rejecting it and paying back the grant will not change the requirements of the Growth Management Act. In fact, it will make you less prepared and poorer for it. The HAP simply identifies potential solutions, you make the final call. Tearing up the report and returning the grant money does not stop your obligations under the GMA.
- I remember in the late 1980s when the GMA was adopted and similar gloom and doom opinions were articulated by anti-growth zealots. Ironic that Harbour Pointe was/is a great example of GMA planning, yet much of the anti-HAP hysteria originates from there.

²³ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



Please think of the future and a future you planned for with resources you asked for.

June 7, 2021 1:17 PM – Morgan Gold

Please adopt the HAP report as prepared by Berk.

- It took a lot of time and resources to arrive at these recommendations. Beyond the grant money, many hours of city staff time as well as volunteers' time was invested.
- Rejecting it and paying back the grant will not change the requirements of the Growth Management Act. In fact, it will make you less prepared and poorer for it. The HAP simply identifies potential solutions, you make the final call. Ripping up the report and paying back the grant does nothing to stop your obligations under the GMA.
- I remember in the late 1980s when the GMA was adopted and similar gloom and doom opinions were articulated by anti-growth zealots. Ironic that Harbour Pointe was/is a great example of GMA planning, yet much of the anti-HAP hysteria originates from there.

Please think of the future and a future you planned for with resources you asked for.



39. Gompf, Loren Lee

October 15, 2021 4:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook²⁴

Recording Minute 1:17:03 – I agree we need a public forum once we are covid safe. Older peoples are stakeholders and their opinion matter and I feel this forum excludes them.

October 29, 2021 4:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook²⁵

Recording Minute 26:48 – I wonder how the numbers will look with the jobs leaving Boeing, COVID having white collar jobs be done remotely? When I moved here a city planner told he Mukilteo was already built and they could build more. This was one of the reason I relocated my factory here. Are we talking about rezoning are to accommodate Low income housing?

Recording Minute 28:19 – Does the Study look into the massive low income housing that was built at the Edge of city limits across the street from Safeway?

November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook²⁶

Recording Minute 30:56 – If you only look into city limits for housing look across the street at the Vantage apartments which appears to doubled in size.

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Lee Gompf – Via Facebook²⁷

Meeting Minute 01:08:59 - The future of Mukilteo is worth more than 30,000. To it's residences

Meeting Minute 02:28:57 - Just say no to HAP!

Meeting Minute 03:50:01 - Great idea Joe

Meeting Minute 03:55:13 - I don't believe most people in Mukilteo know what's going on.

Meeting Minute 03:56:16 - Remember who started this when you vote for next mayor.

²⁴ Facebook comments were provided in response to October 15, 2021 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting #1.

²⁵ Facebook comments were provided in response to October 29, 2021 Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting #2.

²⁶ Facebook comments were provided in response to November 5, 2020 Community Meeting #1.

²⁷ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



40. 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.



41. 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.

June 7, 2021 1:51 PM – Gene Goosman – To Electeds

I certainly agree with Drew Arp!²⁸

²⁸ Reference to June 7, 2021 1:39 PM email from Drew Arp to City Council.



42. Grace, Wendy

March 12, 2021 12:59 PM – Wendy Grace

Please put me on your e-mail communications regarding low-income and high-density housing.

March 12, 2021 1:33 PM – Cathy Rizzo

You have been added to our Housing Action Plan (HAP) Parties of Interest list.

March 16, 2021 8:07 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you signing up for alerts, though I do want to clarify that the Housing Action Plan (HAP) is not specifically about (nor is it proposing) anything to do with low-income or high-density housing. It does propose some strategies for housing types and densities already permitted in Mukilteo. More information about the HAP can be found on our [HAP website](#).

Did you intend to sign up for the HAP list, or would you like us to add you to the list for any future discussions about these topics specifically?

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



43. 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 or 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.



44. 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.



45. Hansen-Baker, Evelyn

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Evelyn Hansen-Baker – Via Facebook²⁹

Meeting Minute 02:17:24 - No hap

Meeting Minute 03:39:31 - Agreed CM Marine

Meeting Minute 03:49:36 - Put it on the ballot

Meeting Minute 03:57:33 - Bob nailed it - you're opening Pandora's box

Meeting Minute 4:17:22 –   

²⁹ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



46. Hayes, Dawn

March 5, 2021 8:22 AM – Dawn Hayes – Via HAP Comment Form

Turn this money down. It has too many strings attached to it. We are a small residential community. That is most of us live here. This will change this significantly. This will strain our police, fire, recreational services, schools and roads. Our tax base is not set to handle this. DO NOT TAKE THESE FUNDS!

March 5, 2021 8:51 AM – Dawn Hayes

I disagree with your determination of non-significance (DNS) for the HAP.

The HAP is a big threat to Mukilteo. That is why four city councilpersons have voted to not take the HAP money. They are:

Anna Rohrbough Joe Marine Bob Champion Riaz Khan.

This money needs to be turned down as it has too many strings attached to it.

I wonder why you were so condescending to the HAP critics on the calls discussing this.

The most concerning is ADUs. Why are you, a city employee, promoting ADUs?

Here are some of my concerns: - ADUs - I suggest you visit and stay in those in south Everett for a few days. Is that what this city needs?

- Raising the maximum structure height. Again is that what our community needs?

That is not why I moved here.

- Our parks are already over crowded and now you want to add more high density housing?

- traffic is already strained due to volume and the ferry traffic. Perhaps you should be concentrating on that instead of this HAP.

- 15a Public Services is the most concerning as high density projects draw heavily on public services. We will all suffer from the increased demand on our Police, Fire and Ambulance services. Unfortunately I had to call for police services and having them there in minutes meant the world to me. My tax dollars working to keep me safe. That is what I want and why I live here. Other places such as friends in Everett indicate it can take up to an hour. That is not what I want!!!!

I've lived here since 1985. Please DO NOT TAKE THESE FUNDS!!!

March 8, 2021 8:10 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP)! As with all comments



we receive, your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the HAP process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like throughout the HAP process.

Your input is critical for ensuring the strategies and recommendations in the HAP reflect the current and future needs of Mukilteo. We would like to hear from everyone. In addition to submitting a comment, you can stay involved by joining us at either of the two upcoming virtual meetings on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) project:

- **City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)**
 - o Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.
- **Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021**
 - o Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

A recording of the meetings will be available on the City's website. If you are unable to make it to the meetings, you are always welcome to:

- [Submit a comment on the City's Housing Action Plan website;](#)
- Mail a comment to City Hall at 11930 Cyrus Way, Mukilteo, WA 98275; or
- Join us at any of our virtual meetings this Spring!

Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to City Council in April 2021. No decisions will be made until after a public hearing is held by City Council in late Spring 2021.

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



47. Hicks, Candace

January 1, 2021 11:52 PM – CE Hicks – Via HAP Comment Form

I am really upset as a resident of Mukilteo that we have little to no input as to the zoning/density rules for our city. We are the tax payers and we should have some verbal rights. The density rulings are getting out of hand!

January 4, 2021 11:42 AM – Lauren Balisky

Any proposed change to zoning maps, development regulations, or long-range plans of the City are required to go through a public process, and are required to provide an opportunity for public comment.

Thank you for doing just that for the Housing Action Plan (HAP). We have added your comment to the record and it will be provided to both the Planning Commission and City Council when they hold public hearings on the HAP later this spring. You are always welcome to make a public comment at any of those meetings, or submit additional written comments in advance of those meetings.

Other Ways to Learn More:

- All active projects are posted to the City's website here: [Land Use Action Notices](#). Any active proposal for a rezone, code amendment, or change to the comprehensive plan will be posted here, as well as advertised in local papers and posted at the City's official posting sites (City Hall, post office, QFC/Rite Aid, and Rosehill).
- If you would like to be notified of any land use action in general, or a particular type of action, let us know and we will add you to our notification list.
- For site-specific rezones, where a single property is being rezoned, adjacent property owners will also get a notice mailed directly to them.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance, or if there is a specific project you would like more information on.



48. Holcomb, Malin

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Malin Holcomb – Via Facebook³⁰

Meeting Minute 00:27:53 - Yes! Full Transparency!

Meeting Minute 03:40:30 - Thank you Council Members Bob Champion, Joe Marine and Riaz Kahn for speaking up.

Meeting Minute 03:52:32 - The majority of Mukilteo residents are still unaware of HAP. It needs to be brought out into the open and not kept just within a handful of people, the Mayor and the Council.

Meeting Minute 03:53:35 - Yes Richard, the citizens of this town want more say.

Meeting Minute 03:57:40 - Thank You Joe. Elizabeth just doesn't understand, her words.

Meeting Minute 03:59:24 - Crawford “Just doesn't understand”, as she stated. We got what Joe Marine was trying to point out.

³⁰ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



49. Hoppe, Sue

June 6, 2021 8:51 AM – Sue Hoppe – To Electeds

This will be a decision point for me in the next election. I'm opposed to the plan implementation and think Gregerson was sneaky. Anytime a politician tries to do something under the radar is highly suspicious!



50. Hovland, Eric

March 4, 2021 8:37 PM – Eric Hovland

I moved to Mukilteo because it HAD a small town feel like the one I grew up in (Burien) and was close to my employer.

In the 30 plus years I have lived here, I have watched it change, and in my opinion, not for the better.

I've tried working with the city in the past on traffic calming, 92nd st sidewalks, and "rain gardens".

It just doesn't matter what we say or do, those with the most money and power will control our government and prevail.

I predict Mukilteo will soon be buried by the 3rd runway just as my childhood friends house/neighborhood was!

Now on to the HAP and SEPA environmental checklist; Either I don't understand what this is about, or the answers given by Lauren Balisky are extremely short sighted.

I see a whole lot of "Not applicable"'s!

and...

"The HAP would NOT DIRECTLY cause any of these impact"

"The proposed changes are UNLIKELY to deplete energy or natural resources."

"The HAP will NOT IMMEDIATELY impact land use"

"The proposal is UNLIKELY to increase demands on transportation, public services and utilities."

"Not directly; though"!

Wouldn't ANY gain in population density add strain/demand to our infrastructure/environment?

I could list a few; clean water, clean air, noise, traffic, energy (fossil fuels, hydro), storm water, sewage, litter, garbage, parking, crime, fire, police, schools, sidewalks, bike lanes, de-forestation, hospitals, etc, etc

And in the final paragraph of your SEPA checklist; "The HAP meets the intent of the Growth Management Act to ensure adequate housing for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community, and by concentrating population growth in urban areas that have access to transportation, public services and utilities."

So, will we allow tent cities for the homeless drug addicts to meet this requirement - "all economic segments of the community" ???

I had always dreamed someday the value of my home would increase because I lived in a desirable area NOT just increase from inflation!



One final thought, How about building high density apartments in the parking lot of the Mukilteo Beach Park. There is no need to reserve that space for automobiles as the area is serviced by bus, rail , and ferry!

March 8, 2021 12:32 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the Housing Action Plan (HAP), as well as on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Determination of Nonsignificance.

We are working on responding to your specific comments on the environmental checklist, however in the meantime you can stay involved by joining us at either of the **two** upcoming virtual meetings on the HAP project:

- **City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)**
 - Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.
- **Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021**
 - Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance, and we plan on getting back to you soon.

March 16, 2021 6:07 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for your patience as we worked on responses to your specific comments on the environmental checklist. We would also like to use this opportunity to better explain the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and what the City is obligated to do for the Housing Action Plan (HAP).

About SEPA and the HAP

The purpose of SEPA is to ensure that government agencies consider various environmental impacts for proposed actions. State law includes two broad types of proposed actions – “project,” meaning that it is specific to one or more physical locations, and “non-project,” meaning that the proposal is not specific to a physical location. Non-project actions are usually are for actions related to plans, policies or programs, such as updates to



the City's Comprehensive Plan or changes to development regulations.

Since the HAP is not specific to a location, it is a "non-project" action under SEPA. The HAP is a work plan made up of strategies related to housing. City Council has full discretion over which strategies in the draft Housing Action Plan to adopt. Council can adopt the HAP as-is, modify and/or remove suggested strategies, add strategies, or adopt nothing. Adoption of a strategy simply means Council wishes to study that item in more detail.

Council has full authority over which strategies to adopt. Council also has full authority over which strategies to implement. Below is the typical code amendment process to provide an example of what future implementation may look like:

1. A HAP strategy to review ADU development regulations is added to the City's preliminary docket as part of the annual docket process (see the [City's Comprehensive Plan webpage](#) for more information about this process).
2. After a public hearing, City Council decides to move the item to the final docket. This authorizes staff to begin work on the code amendment.
3. Staff develops a draft for public input and review. Depending on the amendment, this may be with interested parties, stakeholders, and/or Planning Commission involvement.
4. Once the draft is ready for public comment (i.e. makes sense, considers the feedback staff are aware of to that point, etc.), it is reviewed under SEPA. The draft and the SEPA determination are typically released together, and there is a period for public input.
5. The draft is updated based on any public comment received, and then a public hearing is held with the Planning Commission. Planning Commission also accepts and reviews written and verbal public comment. The Commission then makes a formal recommendation to City Council to adopt, adopt with modifications, or to deny the proposal.
6. City Council holds a public hearing, and also accepts and reviews written and verbal public comment. City Council may adopt, adopt with modifications, or to deny the proposal.

Since the HAP itself does not change the City's adopted plans, policies or development regulations, there are no environmental impacts to consider with this proposal. Any future changes to the City's adopted plans, policies or development regulations (whether or not it is suggested in the HAP) would require its own review under SEPA and its own public input process. This is where specific environmental impacts of a proposed change would be evaluated, including impacts to water, air, noise, traffic, energy, infrastructure and services.

If you would like to learn more about SEPA, we recommend the [Municipal Research Services Center \(MRSC\) SEPA webpage](#) and the [Department of Ecology's SEPA FAQ webpage](#).

About the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the HAP

The Growth Management Act (GMA) was adopted by the State Legislature in 1990 to help the state, counties,



and local jurisdictions plan proactively for how to accommodate growth. It includes a series of goals in RCW 36.70A.020, including goals for growth, sprawl, transportation and housing:

RCW 36.70A.020 Planning goals.

The following goals are adopted to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations of those counties and cities that are required or choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040. The following goals are not listed in order of priority and shall be used exclusively for the purpose of guiding the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations:

- (1) Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
- (2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.
- (3) Transportation. Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.
- (4) Housing. Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

The GMA was amended in 2019 to add the option for cities to complete a HAP (see RCW 36.70A.600(2)) and to make grant funding available to those cities. The focus of the HAP is more specific to market-rate housing than the overall GMA goal (emphasis added):

RCW 36.70A.600 Cities planning under RCW 36.70A.040—Increasing residential building capacity—Housing action plan authorized—Grant assistance.

- (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...

The City is able to control how its plans, policies and development regulations impact or inadvertently slow the permitting process. By evaluating the City's existing regulations (and eventually updating them), the City can encourage the construction of more housing and permit housing more quickly so it can be brought to the market faster. Expanding housing supply and bringing housing on to the market faster is one way to address rising housing costs.

Since extremely low-income housing is typically a regional issue, the City works to address this housing needs in other ways, including partnerships with the Housing Authority of Snohomish County (HASCO) and participation on the Alliance for Housing Affordability (AHA).



If you would like to learn more about the GMA, we recommend [MRSC's GMA webpage](#) and the [Department of Commerce's Short Course on Local Planning](#).

About the HAP and Population Growth

Some of your comments reference population growth, and attributes that growth to the HAP. As described above, a strategic plan like the HAP does not create growth. No codes are changed, no properties are rezoned, and no site-specific projects are approved.

What might be of interest to you is the upcoming population and employment growth targets allocated to various cities, towns and the county to be used in the State-mandated 2024 GMA update. Those numbers will determine what Mukilteo needs to plan for (with the market ultimately driving whether those targets are achieved or not). This is completed through a process led by Snohomish County. Mukilteo's current 2035 population planning target of 21,812 (an increase of 1,502 over a 2011 population estimate of 20,310) was assigned through this countywide process.

Snohomish County is just starting their work on this allocation process for population and employment growth through 2024, and we expect this process to be complete sometime in 2021. This process does not have a direct relationship with the HAP, nor will the HAP stop the allocation of 2044 population and employment targets to Mukilteo for the upcoming State-mandated 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update.

About Homeless Encampments

The City adopted regulations for homeless temporary encampments in 2008 under [Mukilteo Municipal Code \(MMC\) Chapter 17.78](#). This chapter includes standards to ensure the safety of the occupants and to minimize any external impacts from the site.

About Use of Waterfront Parks for High-Density Apartments

Lighthouse Park was granted to the City with a deed restriction that limits the use of the property to public, recreational use. This park will be available to the public in perpetuity.

We hope that this clarifies the role of SEPA in the HAP as well as your specific environmental comments. Please let us know if you have questions, need clarification, or if we can be of any further assistance.

June 7, 2021 1:51 PM – Eric Hovland – To Electeds

Please vote NO on HAP.



51. Hui, Maria (Assistant Project Director, Basel Capital Group)

April 15, 2021 4:25 PM – Maria Hui³¹

Please see attached our comment letter for the Planning Commission Meeting on the HAP this evening. We would like to be a Party of Record. Thank you.

Attachment

³¹ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



Planning Commission
City of Mukilteo
11930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo, WA 98275

Re: Comments on Housing Action Plan Public Draft (CPA-2020-001)

Dear Chairperson Krivanek and Planning Commissioners,

Basel Capital is the developer of the proposed Harbour Pointe Townhomes project seeking to build 31 new housing units along Harbor Place off the Mukilteo Speedway near the Staybridge Suites Hotel. Please see the attached summary and fact sheets about our Harbour Pointe Townhomes project which has already been submitted for City staff review. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP) public draft before you at the Public Hearing this evening.

As a stakeholder in the community, we support the City's and Planning Commission's efforts to prepare and implement the HAP. The HAP's findings provide illustrative insights into housing needs the City faces and the HAP identifies numerous subjects for future study and action. One of those identified subjects is Townhouses. The HAP points out that townhouses are more affordable than traditional single family homes and can offer additional ownership options for the community. The HAP also notes that townhouses can provide a good transition between commercial development and low density neighborhoods. The Harbour Pointe Townhomes project has been positioned to provide owner-occupied housing in the gap between single family homes and the apartment rental market, and the location is in a mixed use district with residential uses (Harbour Pointe Senior Living) and commercial uses (Walgreens, restaurants, hotel). Thus, the Harbour Pointe Townhomes project can be an example of the type of projects that could be developed in the future under new regulations implementing the HAP.

Another comment we have is that are a number of trends pointing toward housing units with more than one to two bedrooms. First, many families cannot afford single family homes, but still want to own their home and raise a family. Second, because housing is so expensive, another trend is toward multigenerational sharing housing usually parent(s) living with an adult child and family. Third, the newest trend brought about by the pandemic is that extra bedrooms are needed for remote work spaces. For these reasons, the Harbour Pointe Townhomes project proposes three and four bedroom units in a wonderful community setting with access to the Big Gulch Trail.

We also want to point out that the City's Comprehensive Plan 2035 requires an additional 570 housing units to be built from 2015 to 2035 to meet the housing target of 9,211 units. This means adding an average of 28.5 units per year. However, from the HAP report, the City has only added 41 units since 2015 to date, thus by next year the City will be over 150 housing units behind schedule. The HAP is an important step to promote future development of townhomes and other affordable housing types, but the City should also look to immediate steps to alleviate the housing supply deficit. We think our Harbour Pointe Townhomes project will provide needed housing in the short term in a manner that is



beneficial to the City of Mukilteo as described in the attached summary and fact sheets. Thank you for your time and dedication to making Mukilteo a wonderful community.

Sincerely,
Basel Capital
April 15, 2021

By: Maria Lau Hui, Assistant Project Director



Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes

Project Description

Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes is a 31-townhome style condo proposal situated on a 3.26 site located at the western terminus of the Harbour Place's short access road off Mukilteo Speedway in Mukilteo, WA. It is a unique residential proposal that intends to bridge the gap between single family residences and apartment rental market.

There are 4 buildings, a community playground, a picnic area, and various pocket art parks. The project proposes 8 visitor parking spots strategically scattered throughout the site. The project is accessible primarily by a southern egress point on site.

Programming by Design

Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes' central focus is to provide a Northwestern family-oriented design that fits into the diverse and inclusive culture of the City of Mukilteo. It is essential to provide common open spaces for residents to interact and to foster a sense of community. The playground, picnic area, and pocket art parks all provide opportunities for "chance encounters" between neighbors to get to know one another.

The adjacent Harbour Pointe Montessori School, nearby Staybridge Suites hotel, and existing retail businesses are important, valuable assets to the greater Mukilteo community. At Basel, we believe the addition of our Harbour Pointe Townhomes shall add to the economic development and vibrancy of the community and provide proud homeownership opportunities to the neighborhood.



BBBasel®



BASEL HARBOUR POINTE TOWNHOMES: DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ADMENDMENT

Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes is a 31-townhome style condo proposal situated on a 3.26 acre site located at the western terminus of the Harbour Place's short access road off Mukilteo Speedway in Mukilteo, WA.



It is a unique residential proposal that intends to bridge the gap between single family residences and apartment rental market. There are 4 buildings, a community playground, and a picnic area. The project proposes various visitor parking strategically scattered throughout the site and is accessible by a southern egress point. Design attributes include:

- 31 total dwellings split between three-bedroom units and four-bedroom units.
- 14 units, about 45%, will be three-bedroom units varying from 1,355 to 1,504 SF.
- Four-bedroom dwellings will be sized from 2,282 to 2,347 SF.
- Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes will add 78+- new city residents or provide new housing opportunities for existing city residents.

The proposal is well-positioned to meet compatibility with the City of Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan goals and policies regarding housing, critical areas, and infrastructure. Harbour Pointe's Sector 3 contains a commercial center, which includes hotel, retail, eateries, and office space users. While the townhomes site is near the highly trafficked Mukilteo Speedway, it fronts on Harbour Place which has a boulevard appeal. With adjacent uses of a senior living complex and abutting a Montessori school, the townhomes blend into the community and its established uses. Townhomes are a compatible and complimentary development and will meet the requirements of the codes and regulations of the City.

The site is desirable for townhomes for a vast number of socio-economic reasons, including waterfront community appeal, proximity of employment centers, neighborhood walkability (including on-site trail system access), and quality of area schools. As a good neighbor, Basel's focused on transparency and responsiveness to the neighboring property owners (Sector 3) and the community. Early conversations with neighbors guided important on-site planning decisions – from access points to additional visitor parking area. Across Harbour Place is a commercial development (Valgreen's / Starbucks, in a complex with assorted eateries and businesses), which will benefit from the influx of residents within close walking distance. Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes is a \$16 million project and generates numerous community benefits including:

- Environmental Impact Avoidance. All structures and associated infrastructure are located outside of all critical areas and their buffers. The proposal completely avoids environmental impacts to the on-site streams and wetlands and associated habitat corridor at Big Gulch.



- Tree Planting. Approximately 266 trees will be planted in the buffer restoration area.
- Big Gulch (via Harbour Pointe) Trail Improvements. Signage, including trail map and interpretative information, and other means will be provided as an oncoming commitment in respecting the natural environment and in improving the trail.
- Job creation. The project will create construction jobs and a few permanent jobs.
- Sales Tax Revenues. The City will receive up to \$124,000 in sales tax from project construction. New residents will bring additional sales tax revenues into the City on a continuing basis.
- Real Estate Excise Tax Revenues (REET). The City is due to receive about \$107,000 in REET from initial home sales and additional \$153,000 in REET from ongoing home sales.
- Property Tax Revenues. The City is due to receive about \$280,000 over the next 10 years in property taxes.
- Mitigation Fees. The project will contribute project mitigation fees (about \$180,000 School Fee, \$50,000 Park Fee, and \$32,000 City Traffic Fee).



May 14, 2021 6:35 PM – Maria Hui

We would like to submit the attached written comment for the upcoming May 17th Council meeting on the Housing Action Plan. Thank you.

Attachment



May 17, 2021

City Council
City of Mukilteo
11930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo, WA 98275

Re: Comments on Housing Action Plan Public Draft (CPA-2020-001)

Dear Mayor Gregerson, Council President Kneller, Council Vice President Champion, and Councilmembers Crawford, Harris, Khan, and Marine,

Basel Capital is the developer of the proposed Harbour Pointe Townhomes project seeking to build 31 new housing units along Harbour Place off the Mukilteo Speedway near the Staybridge Suites Hotel. Please see the attached summary and fact sheets about our Harbour Pointe Townhomes project which has already been submitted for City staff review. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP) public draft before you at the Public Hearing this evening.

As a stakeholder in the community, we support the City's efforts to prepare and implement the HAP. The HAP's findings provide illustrative insights into housing needs the City faces and the HAP identifies numerous subjects for future study and action. One of those identified subjects is Townhouses. The HAP points out that townhouses are more affordable than traditional single family homes and can offer additional ownership options for the community. The HAP also notes that townhouses can provide a good transition between commercial development and low density neighborhoods. The Harbour Pointe Townhomes project has been positioned to provide owner-occupied housing in the gap between single family homes and the apartment rental market, and the location is in a mixed use district with residential uses (Harbour Pointe Senior Living) and commercial uses (Walgreens, restaurants, hotel). Thus, the Harbour Pointe Townhomes project can be an example of the type of projects that could be developed in the future under new regulations implementing the HAP.

Another comment we have is that there are a number of trends pointing toward housing units with more than one to two bedrooms. First, many families cannot afford single family homes, but still want to own their home and raise a family. Second, because housing is so expensive, another trend is toward multigenerational shared housing; usually parent(s) living with an adult child and family. Third, the newest trend brought about by the pandemic is that extra bedrooms are needed for remote work spaces. For these reasons, the Harbour Pointe Townhomes project proposes three and four bedroom units in a wonderful community setting with access to the Big Gulch Trail.

We also want to point out that the City's Comprehensive Plan 2035 requires an additional 570 housing units to be built from 2015 to 2035 to meet the housing target of 9,211 units. This means adding an average of 28.5 units per year. However, from the HAP report, the City has only added 41 units since 2015 to date; thus by next year the City will be over 150 housing units behind schedule. The HAP is an important step to promote future development of townhomes and other affordable housing types, but



the City should also look to immediate steps to alleviate the housing supply deficit. We think our Harbour Pointe Townhomes project will provide needed housing in the short term in a manner that is beneficial to the City of Mukilteo as described in the attached summary and fact sheets. Thank you for your time and dedication to making Mukilteo a wonderful community.

Sincerely,
Basel Capital

By: Maria Lau Hui, Assistant Project Director



Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes

Project Description

Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes is a 31-townhome style condo proposal situated on a 3.26 site located at the western terminus of the Harbour Place's short access road off Mukilteo Speedway in Mukilteo, WA. It is a unique residential proposal that intends to bridge the gap between single family residences and apartment rental market.

There are 4 buildings, a community playground, a picnic area, and various pocket art parks. The project proposes various visitor parking spots strategically scattered throughout the site. The project is accessible primarily by a southern egress point on site.

Programming by Design

Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes' central focus is to provide a Northwestern family-oriented design that fits into the diverse and inclusive culture of the City of Mukilteo. It is essential to provide common open spaces for residents to interact and to foster a sense of community. The playground, picnic area, and pocket art parks all provide opportunities for "chance encounters" between neighbors to get to know one another.

The adjacent Harbour Pointe Montessori School, nearby Staybridge Suites hotel, and existing retail businesses are important, valuable assets to the greater Mukilteo community. At Basel, we believe the addition of our Harbour Pointe Townhomes shall add to the economic development and vibrancy of the community and provide proud homeownership opportunities to the neighborhood.



BBBasel



BASEL HARBOUR POINTE TOWNHOMES: DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ADMENDMENT

Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes is a 31-townhome style condo proposal situated on a 3.26 acre site located at the western terminus of the Harbour Place's short access road off Mukilteo Speedway in Mukilteo, WA.



It is a unique residential proposal that intends to bridge the gap between single family residences and apartment rental market. There are 4 buildings, a community playground, and a picnic area. The project proposes various visitor parking strategically scattered throughout the site and is accessible by a southern egress point. Design attributes include:

- 31 total dwellings split between three-bedroom units and four-bedroom units.
- 14 units, about 45%, will be three-bedroom units varying from 1,355 to 1,504 SF.
- Four-bedroom dwellings will be sized from 2,282 to 2,347 SF.
- Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes will add 78+- new city residents or provide new housing opportunities for existing city residents.

The proposal is well-positioned to meet compatibility with the City of Mukilteo's Comprehensive Plan goals and policies regarding housing, critical areas, and infrastructure. Harbour Pointe's Sector 3 contains a commercial center, which includes hotel, retail, eateries, and office space users. While the townhomes site is near the highly trafficked Mukilteo Speedway, it fronts on Harbour Place which has a boulevard appeal. With adjacent uses of a senior living complex and abutting a Montessori school, the townhomes blend into the community and its established uses. Townhomes are a compatible and complimentary development and will meet the requirements of the codes and regulations of the City.

The site is desirable for townhomes for a vast number of socio-economic reasons, including waterfront community appeal, proximity of employment centers, neighborhood walkability (including on-site trail system access), and quality of area schools. As a good neighbor, Basel's focused on transparency and responsiveness to the neighboring property owners (Sector 3) and the community. Early conversations with neighbors guided important on-site planning decisions – from access points to additional visitor parking area. Across Harbour Place is a commercial development (Walgreen's / Starbucks, in a complex with assorted eateries and businesses), which will benefit from the influx of residents within close walking distance. Basel Harbour Pointe Townhomes is a \$16 million project and generates numerous community benefits including:

- Environmental Impact Avoidance. All structures and associated infrastructure are located outside of all critical areas and their buffers. The proposal completely avoids environmental impacts to the on-site streams and wetlands and associated habitat corridor at Big Gulch.



- Tree Planting. Approximately 266 trees will be planted in the buffer restoration area.
- Big Gulch (via Harbour Pointe) Trail Improvements. Signage, including trail map and interpretative information, and other means will be provided as an oncoming commitment in respecting the natural environment and in improving the trail.
- Job creation. The project will create construction jobs and a few permanent jobs.
- Sales Tax Revenues. The City will receive up to \$124,000 in sales tax from project construction. New residents will bring additional sales tax revenues into the City on a continuing basis.
- Real Estate Excise Tax Revenues (REET). The City is due to receive about \$107,000 in REET from initial home sales and additional \$153,000 in REET from ongoing home sales.
- Property Tax Revenues. The City is due to receive about \$280,000 over the next 10 years in property taxes.
- Mitigation Fees. The project will contribute project mitigation fees (about \$180,000 School Fee, \$50,000 Park Fee, and \$32,000 City Traffic Fee).





52. Ioana, Bogdan

June 7, 2021 12:17 PM – Bogdan Ioana – To Electeds

I and all my voting members of my family are against HAP in Mukilteo.

The Housing Action Plan is full of misguiding information, false data and blunt lies like the number of more than 10,000 workers coming to work in Mukilteo from out-of-town.

Where they found more than 10,000 jobs in our city of 20,000 residents? I want to see that list of companies offering 10,000 jobs in my city, to apply for one.

The Mukilteo HAP is a cooked-up plan that doesn't serve the Mukilteo citizens, but the greedy real estate developers lurking in the shadows.



53. Iseman, Jon and Wendy

May 21, 2021 4:05 PM – Jon and Wendy Iseman – To Electeds

Please, PLEASE vote NO on HAP! Mukilteo is a charming small town that will, over time, become a crowded (mini) mess similar to Seattle – IF you vote it in. There is a reason that my family lives here – and we have been here for nearly FORTY years. We have raised five children from birth through high school in Mukilteo, going through Columbia, Harbour Pointe Middle School and Kamiak (GO KNIGHTS!) – all productive adults out on their own now. We own three businesses based out of Mukilteo. We have seen a lot of mayors, changing city councils and agendas. This one has got to be the worst! We simply do not want Mukilteo to become a crowded mess! All we need to do to see firsthand what a nightmare it will be is to go two minutes up the Mukilteo Speedway to the Vantage Apartments across from Safeway. Do any of us want that in Mukilteo?! NO!!! And while I understand many say that this sort of housing does not bring crime with it, I respectfully disagree. Those apartments have been there for less than five years and I know of two murders that were committed by a person associated with the apartment complex – he and his girlfriend were sentenced recently. Seriously?! Why in the world would we want that in our community? I of course understand that a murder suspect can live anywhere – but the point is he either lived at the Vantage or was associated with someone who lived there – it is a fact. Too close for my comfort!

Rather than argue my position – of which many ahead of me have already done, in droves and very eloquently – I ask you to look at the City of Edmonds and how they handled their HAP vote. They voted NO. They are larger than us and they have more land to build on and they STILL voted no. I admire that city government for standing up for their citizens – who voted each of them into office, by the way – and saying no. This is exactly what we want you to do as our representatives. This decision is far reaching and its impact will remain long, long after you are no longer in office. This honestly may be the most important decision the council has had before them. I understand not all council members have lived here for many years, and maybe the overcrowded schools were already in place when they arrived. Maybe they think the school district can just add in another portable as needed. It only it were that simple – but honestly, it is not. Mukilteo is a small community by design – and the last thing you should do is allow and encourage more building and housing to fit in with what we already have – and especially and in particular not encourage builders who hide behind tax set-ups allowing them to not pay taxes for extended periods of time. There is tons of buildable land in Lynnwood, Everett, etc. – but not in Mukilteo. I am sorry – it is just how it is with the boundaries in place. Every town/city has boundaries. We have done several annexations accounting for a bit more space – but I think most citizens agree that it needs to stop with this. Our police and fire departments can't handle more – and someone, i.e., the homeowners, need to pay for it. Builders who get out of paying taxes for the first ten years don't care about our city – they will be long gone and likely have sold the property by the time their tax structure kicks in.

My family and my extended family – ALL RAISED IN MUKILTEO – strongly encourage you to say NO to HAP. It is the right thing to do to save our little slice of heaven by the water. PLEASE!



June 7, 2021 4:58 PM – Jon and Wendy Iseman – To Electeds

I am circling back once again, on the day of your vote on HAP, to encourage you, as strongly as I can, to PLEASE VOTE NO. PLEASE. Our city residents are up in arms and on Nextdoor, with so many just finding out about this vote this evening. I have a feeling it has a lot to do with the fact that the Mukilteo Beacon is subscription only now, and so many people in town were used to reading their news there – and they just didn't know. If it is possible to delay the vote for another couple of weeks in order to get your citizens more up to speed with the issue, I would also encourage that. However, if you MUST vote this evening – please vote no. I have lived here since 1987 and while my little town by the sea has gotten a bit bigger, we have not yet been worried about the issues that come, eventually, with approving the HAP. I have always felt like the City Council had the backs of the town's residents. Now – I am not so sure, due to how this grant was obtained to begin with. Once you open this Pandora's Box, it will be nearly impossible to shut. Finally, it bothers me – and should bother each of you – that Mayor Gregorson applied for this grant yet said nothing to any of you – her council members. Where is the transparency?

As I said before – I honestly think this may well be the most important decision placed in front of our City Council. Please use your vote well and as a representative of the very people who elected you. Your citizens are watching and taking note of who is listening to us. I can say that although not a scientific study, the vast majority of people I have talked to about this all think it is a terrible idea and would vote no if it were to be placed on a ballot to voters.

Thank you for your time – we all appreciate the hard job you do, and we look to you to do the right thing.



54. 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.

February 28, 2021 4:51 PM – Joan Johnson

I'm very confused. I don't want to see more apartments in Mukilteo with minimal parking spaces. Mukilteo residents are considerable distance from other cities and it's impossible to reach these places for work, medical or personal business. If you are expecting people to use street parking it is dangerous in more than one way. There is limited street parking and the danger is having too many cars parked in the street for drivers to safely get through, and it is not safe



for the pedestrians trying to reach their cars especially at night. Too many breakins have been happening in Mukilteo and this will greatly increase personal safety.

Mukilteo is getting quite crowded. There are not enough services for even more people and there are definitely not enough parks.

Please don't consider overbuilding without taking the information to the people.

How did this all start?

March 1, 2021 12:26 PM – Joan Johnson – Via HAP Comment Form³²

I'm very confused. I don't want to see more apartments in Mukilteo with minimal parking spaces. Mukilteo residents are considerable distance from other cities and it's impossible to reach these places for work, medical or personal business. If you are expecting people to use street parking it is dangerous in more than one way. There is limited street parking and the danger is having too many cars parked in the street for drivers to safely get through, and it is not safe for the pedestrians trying to reach their cars especially at night. Too many breakins have been happening in Mukilteo and this will greatly increase personal safety.

Mukilteo is getting quite crowded. There are not enough services for even more people and there are definitely not enough parks.

Please don't consider overbuilding without taking the information to the people.

How did this all start?

³² This appears to be a copy of Joan Johnson's comments from February 28, 2021 at 4:51 PM. For this reason, this comment is not indexed.



55. 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.



56. 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.



57. Kinahan, Peter

June 4, 2021 7:52 AM – Peter Kinahan – To Electeds

As a 20-year resident of old town Mukilteo, I want to render my opinion on the HAP plan.

I am upset but not surprised by the tactic taken by our Mayor - She has proceeded with her own intentions and done so surreptitiously so the general public and council have been denied

input.

I am generally not involved politically, and I understand the complexity of the issue of affordable housing.

I have many friends in Mukilteo who agree that we don't want to convert Mukilteo into a cookie cutter copy of every other city in America.

This is an important issue that needs to be carefully and publicly discussed in an open and transparent process.

I don't expect a response to this letter, but I will send it to a few friends as an invitation for their input.

Please note that this is my opinion, and I am not implying that my friends above have the same opinion.

Please consider this at the upcoming vote on this matter on June 7th.



58. 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.



59. 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.



60. Kiser, Kathy

March 5, 2021 11:20 AM – Kathy Kiser

I disagree with your determination of non-significance (DNS) for the HAP. The HAP is the biggest threat ever posed to the environment of Mukilteo. This will destroy the quality of life that many of us in Mukilteo have enjoyed for so many years! Transportation, recreation, education, and public services will all be severely and negatively impacted! It is naive and irresponsible to think otherwise. This is not what our City Managers should be promoting for the well being of our city. Please do not approve this program.

March 8, 2021 11:23 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP)! As with all comments we receive, your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the HAP process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like throughout the HAP process.

Your input is critical for ensuring the strategies and recommendations in the HAP reflect the current and future needs of Mukilteo. We would like to hear from everyone. In addition to submitting a comment, you can stay involved by joining us at either of the two upcoming virtual meetings on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) project:

- ***City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)***
 - o Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.
- ***Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021***
 - o Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

A recording of the meetings will be available on the City's website. If you are unable to make it to the meetings, you are always welcome to:

- [Submit a comment on the City's Housing Action Plan website](#);



- Mail a comment to City Hall at 11930 Cyrus Way, Mukilteo, WA 98275; or
- Join us at any of our virtual meetings this Spring!

Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to City Council in April 2021. No decisions will be made until after a public hearing is held by City Council in late Spring 2021.

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



61. Kissler, Ron

June 5, 2021 6:00 PM – Ron Kissler – To Electeds

Dear Mayor and Council, I urge you to please reject the HAP . It is not needed or wanted in Mukilteo. Notice that it was rejected by our next door neighbor Edmonds. Could it be they know something you don't?



62. 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.

January 14, 2021 9:19 AM – Elaine Knapp

I listened to the HAP meeting on Facebook. Good job by both you and Dawn. Pretty complicated issue. I recall hearing that HAP will NOT cause rezoning, yet Joe Marine said it will (in an article in the Herald). Since he is now running for Mayor, I suspect we will hear more of this as a way of putting our Mayor in a bad light. Is there a way to let the public know (again)that rezoning is not in play? I recall Sarah Kneller posted a good article on HAP. I think most Mukilteo citizens are not even aware of HAP (sadly, not engaged). But for those who are aware and are trying at every turn to make HAP a negative issue, I think it is important to counterpunch their false claims about HAP.



You mentioned public input recently and said that you were "shocked", or you used another word, about the comments that related to diversity.

Is there a transcript of that meeting or can I access it online?

Can the public sign into the meeting with the Tribes today?

Thank you again for your work on this very complex issue,

January 14, 2021 2:08 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for reaching out with your questions. You are correct that the HAP itself will not cause or approve any rezoning:

1. None of the strategies currently being proposed are for rezones, but really ways to make it easier for housing types that are already allowed to be constructed.
2. The HAP itself cannot approve a rezone. It is a strategic plan, so in the event rezoning was a strategy approved in the HAP, it would still need to go through its own study and public approval process.
3. The City does not currently have a need to do a rezone based on our current growth targets. This may change once we get our allocation later in 2021, however at this time I have no reason to believe that the amount of growth allocated to Mukilteo will necessitate mass or drastic rezones.

Regarding to the diversity comment, I recall Councilmember Crawford making a comment however do not recall specifically what she said. The recording of Monday night's meeting (and all prior HAP meetings) are available on the [HAP Project Library](#) webpage, as well as all [public comments](#) through December 31, 2020. We do not generally create meeting transcripts, however at some point over the next month there should be meeting minutes available.

As for the tribe meeting, I was not involved and unfortunately do not know more. My understanding is it was a staff meeting without a council quorum and it is therefore unlikely that it was open to the public.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance, and hopefully you can join us for the [HAP Community Meeting tonight!](#)

January 14, 2021 2:44 PM – Elaine Knapp

Thank you, I plan to be at tonight's meeting.

January 15, 2021 9:22 AM – Elaine Knapp

I listened to the presentation. You, staff, and Dawn did an excellent job of presenting some very complex issues having to do with HAP.



I couldn't vote because I was reluctant to start hitting buttons. I'll figure that out for next time.

Charlie P. asked one question that was puzzling. It concerned how many people are projected to be added to Mukilteo by 2035. Did he say some 400? Is that people? Homes?

I will have to re-listen because math is not my high suite. I researched cottage homes after the meeting last night. I like the concept. I ran across this 15-year-old article from the Herald. It is short, but I note that Joe Marine was our Mayor then and he comments at the end of the story:

<https://www.heraldnet.com/news/mukilteo-puts-cottages-on-hold/>

Thanks Again for your work on HAP,

January 15, 2021 3:16 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for the kind words and for the article!

If I understood correctly, Mr. Pancerzewski was referencing the [draft Housing Needs Assessment](#) and the update given to Council on Monday night ([January 11, 2021](#)). Our current Comprehensive Plan, for 2015-2035, sets a population growth target of 21,812, or approximately 450 more people than the 2020 estimate of 21,360. Assuming an equal number of people per year between now and 2035, that is about 32 new people per year.

If you would like to send me your preferences on the proposed strategies presented last night Via email, you are more than welcome to do so. Please feel free to submit any other ideas as well!



63. Kunard, Audra

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Audra Kunard – Via Facebook³³

Meeting Minute 03:49:05 - Agree. It should be on a ballot.

³³ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



64. 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.



65. 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.



66. Labarre, Michel

January 1, 2021 9:46 PM – Michel Labarre – Via HAP Comment Form

Affordable housing must be based on affordable cost. While many in Mukilteo have the good fortune of living in low density housing, we must come to terms with the fact that affordable housing will unavoidably rely on higher densities. That means apartments in multi-story buildings. The zoning must be adapted to make this possible.

Contrary to what doomsayers are pretending, that will not result in a decaying city. Do we want to impose on our grandchildren the long term economic and societal costs of divided communities where most folks cannot afford to live in reasonable proximity of their work?



67. LaCasse, Anita

March 5, 2021 4:27 PM – Anita LaCasse³⁴

I disagree with your determination of non-significance (DNS) for the HAP. The HAP is the biggest threat ever posed to the environment of Mukilteo. That is why four city councilpersons

have voted to not take the HAP money. They are: Anna Rohrbough Joe Marine Bob Champion Riaz Khan It is not normal to turn down "free money" but this money is not free and should not have been accepted. I also find your lack of neutrality disturbing. On the calls you have been condescending to the HAP critics, the majority of Mukilteo residents I am sure. Every single proposal I have heard will deteriorate and denigrate the lifestyle of Mukilteo. The most disturbing is ADUs. These are disgusting eyesores. Nobody wants them in their neighborhood. Why are you, a city employee, promoting ADUs? I intend to appeal the DNS as far and as long as possible. Here are some areas:
9c Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts Answer: There will be severe impacts of additional housing. There will be massive impacts of every one of these suggestions. ADUs are the worst. Cottage housing, no thanks! Have you visited the cottage housing off of 88th St SW? Please do. They are a mess, in poor repair. 10a What is the tallest height of any structure Answer: We have reviewed the projects which result from a HAP in neighboring communities. In Lynnwood there are eight story apartment complexes being built. These will severely affect their surroundings. I find them disgusting warehouses for people. No residential structure should be allowed to be taller than 35 feet. 12c Recreation Answer: Our parks are already shoulder to shoulder on a nice day. Have you ever tried to get a picnic table at any of our parks on a nice summer day? Or use a fire pit? These things are impossible NOW. And you intend to add thousands of additional persons to the community without adding parks, beaches, roads? No thanks. 13c Historic and Cultural Preservation Answer: The history and culture of Mukilteo is single family neighborhoods. The HAP is an attempt to change that and I oppose that. 14. Transportation Answer: Adding more cars to our streets is not ok. With the burden from the ferry our streets are already way too crowded. And then you add projects with minimum off street parking such as Carvel Apartments and On the Green that only provide one off street parking spot per residence. The result is streets parked up such as across from the Police department. We the residents of Mukilteo do not want this. We insist on two off street parking spots per residence for future projects. 15a Public Services Answer: High density projects draw heavily on public services. We will all suffer from the increased demand on our Police, Fire and Ambulance services. Right now I can get a Mukilteo Police cruiser at my home or business in minutes. That is what I want. That is what I am paying for. In Everett my friends have told me it can take an hour. No thank you! Keep Mukilteo the way it is.

March 8, 2021 8:00 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP)! As with all comments we receive, your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the HAP process moves

³⁴ This appears to be a copy of the language submitted by Peter Zieve on March 5, 2021 at 4:45 AM. For this reason, this comment is not indexed.



forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like throughout the HAP process.

Your input is critical for ensuring the strategies and recommendations in the HAP reflect the current and future needs of Mukilteo. We would like to hear from everyone. In addition to submitting a comment, you can stay involved by joining us at either of the two upcoming virtual meetings on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) project:

- **City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)**

- o Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
- o This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
- o The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

- **Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021**

- o Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
- o This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
- o The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

A recording of the meetings will be available on the City's website. If you are unable to make it to the meetings, you are always welcome to:

- [Submit a comment on the City's Housing Action Plan website](#);
- Mail a comment to City Hall at 11930 Cyrus Way, Mukilteo, WA 98275; or
- Join us at any of our virtual meetings this Spring!

Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to City Council in April 2021. No decisions will be made until after a public hearing is held by City Council in late Spring 2021.

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



68. Langdon, Marilyn

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Marilyn Langdon – Via Facebook³⁵

Meeting Minute 02:39:51 - Thank you Carolyn!

Meeting Minute 02:47:33 - Thank you Karl!

³⁵ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



69. 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.

March 5, 2021 12:46 PM – Amy Laroche

I agree Mr. Zieve's email regarding the current Mukilteo HAP project. Mr. Zieve's research and observation of the current housing situation are true.

I hereby add my comments as well as sopport ing Mr.Zieve's comments.

My family have lived in Mukilteo for the 7th years now. We experienced the traffic congestion from Mukilte to and from Seattle , at Mukilteo Blov and the SR 525.

The Harbour Reach Corridor Project is an approval that the current and future traffic will be an issue. Why did the city agree the high traffic go through a quite, nice local street ??

Harbour Point blvd is one of the best , comfortable and nicest neighbor hood with 4 schools and a library that we love. It is the neighbor hood we love to live in and we can walk and relax on street walk daily on Harbor point blvd. Harbour Reach blvd will become the "second Mukilteo blvd "Very soon.

I also want to tell you how important that parking space for housing. We lived at On the Green apartments when we first moved to Mukilteo. At the beginning(the 1st year we moved in), residents at On the Green didn't require a parking tag. Then the parking spaces began an issue the next year.

My husband came back home from a business trip past midnight at a raining night as well. He turned around the whole neighborhood and couldn't find a empty parking spot. The only spot was a handicap parking space. He thought it was already midnight, if he moved his car at the early morning, it shouldn't affect anyone. However, when he went to move his car around 7 am , a parking ticket was waiting for us. The tickets was issued around 2am. And the ticket costed \$400. So do you think enough parking space isn't a big issue ?? If anyone have experience on tight parking space will understand what I say.



Below is Mr. Zieve's comments. I agreed and support.

March 8, 2021 8:07 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP)! As with all comments we receive, your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the HAP process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like throughout the HAP process.

Your input is critical for ensuring the strategies and recommendations in the HAP reflect the current and future needs of Mukilteo. We would like to hear from everyone. In addition to submitting a comment, you can stay involved by joining us at either of the two upcoming virtual meetings on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) project:

- **City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)**
 - o Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.
- **Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021**
 - o Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.

A recording of the meetings will be available on the City's website. If you are unable to make it to the meetings, you are always welcome to:

- [Submit a comment on the City's Housing Action Plan website](#);
- Mail a comment to City Hall at 11930 Cyrus Way, Mukilteo, WA 98275; or
- Join us at any of our virtual meetings this Spring!

Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to City Council in April 2021. No decisions will be made until after a public hearing is held by City Council in late Spring 2021.

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



70. LaSorella, Jeff

June 7, 2021 7:38 AM – Jeff LaSorella – To Electeds

The HAP will ruin Mukilteo as we know it today. 90 percent of the residents do not want the HAP to move forward. Serve your constituents as your duty calls for and vote NO.



71. Leonard, Duane (Executive Director, Housing Authority of Snohomish County)

January 11, 2021 – Duane Leonard

I am writing today to endorse the findings and methods of the Mukilteo Draft Housing Needs Assessment, dated October 7, 2020. This document is necessary to understand the City's current circumstances, no matter what the future holds. This Housing Needs Assessment will serve the City well for years to come. The Alliance for Housing Affordability made me aware of this process and the opportunity to comment. I hope these comments are received as they are intended, a simple endorsement of the foundation of this document, and a perspective on the likely future of the region's housing needs.

Data presented in Sections 1, 2, and 3 accurately represent Mukilteo's current circumstances to the best ability to do so. The sources and methods of analysis are well done and in keeping with national best practices. They are the same that HASCO uses for its work, as do other states, cities, and housing authorities. The conclusions drawn from this in Sections 4 and 5, are well grounded in fact.

Much of the data in this report begins with the US Census Bureau, which tabulates and does spot-samples surveys on a rolling basis in the interregnum between decennial censuses. Further analysis is done by state agencies (like OFM) and supplemented by local knowledge and research. To improve upon this data would require the City of Mukilteo to conduct its own population census (including income, home values, unit & room counts, household demographics, language spoken, and more), analyze the data, and only then could it be used for the HNA. This would not be easy, cheap, or un-invasive to residents of Mukilteo.

Therefore, again, I am writing to endorse the sources, methodology, and conclusions drawn from them in the Mukilteo Housing Needs Assessment before you.

I anticipate another area of concern, in addition to data, is the future of the region. The impacts of COVID-19 and telework, and Boeing's future, loom large. Will these two issues, or others, turn the housing market on its head and invalidate this work? No.

COVID-19 generating a telework diaspora is unlikely. That telework diaspora has had 9+ months to manifest itself in our housing market. Instead, in this time, home sales and prices in King County remain as high as they have ever been. In event of a long-term telework culture in the tech sector, few, if any, would seek to live outside of the Puget Sound, the region they have long called home. At best (for Seattle's market), pressure from there will distribute to Snohomish and Pierce counties, which we have begun to see, in an effort to get more space for the money. This has generated additional demand, now unfettered by a regular commute south on I-5 every morning.

Further, considering growing impacts of climate change, it is not unreasonable to expect national migration patterns to remain or accelerate despite COVID's impact. Compared to intensifying California wildfires, South-East hurricane seasons, North-East winters, and Midwest droughts, Washington is temperate and desirable.

With this said, Boeing's future, whether it remains in whole, part, or not at all in Washington, is irrelevant. Not only



will Boeing and related aerospace industry workers likely not pick up and move to other states, but any housing vacancies will be quickly occupied for reasons outlined above.

Further, those who do not leave will struggle financially as they seek other work or to re-train. A punishingly expensive housing market will exacerbate their woes. So, in fact, a Boeing drawdown in the Pacific Northwest would amplify the need for understanding our housing market, as this Assessment does.

In conclusion, the methods and sources that are the foundation of this Housing Needs Assessment are sound and consistent with past practices. The need for its continued study and discussion is clear, and Mukilteo has a role in the region's future. Action by the City will have direct impact on not only its current and future residents, but also its neighbors and the region. Mukilteo is an integral part of the regional fabric and must diligently consider and decide its role to play in the region's housing market. I ask that you give this important issue its due consideration, confident in the factuality of the information before you, and with an eye toward today, as well as the future.



72. 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!!



73. 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.



74. 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.

March 5, 2021 1:24 PM – Melinda MacFarland

Dear Mayor, City Council & City Leaders,

We are opposed to the Housing Action Plan (HAP), & we question the recent findings of the DNS. My husband & I believe that going along with both of these, will change our city dramatically & will be a detriment.

We moved to Mukilteo 3 yrs ago for several good reasons: the beautiful views of the Puget Sound, the natural beauty of the city, the gorgeous trees, the low crime w/excellent police visibility, the well maintained streets/sidewalks/grass areas, the highly rated schools, houses that appreciate considerably in value, the peacefulness & quiet. We passed on cities like Lynnwood, Everett & Seattle becuz they didn't have the assets that Mukilteo does. We don't want to become like those cities with their homelessness, dirty streets, enormous traffic, high crime, noise, crowded housing, school overcrowding, depressed home values & an over all hodge podge "anything goes" look to it.

We don't want the changes that we think the city of Mukilteo has in mind with HAP & DNS.

Many neighbors in our city feel the same way that we do, & we hope all of you are listening.

Please forward my email to any others I might have missed. Thank you.



April 28, 2021 12:05 AM – Melinda MacFarland – To Electeds

Please add our comments to the pile “against” HAP. We want Mukilteo to remain the same as we bought into 3 years ago.

We love the diversity of the residents here, the excellent policing, the high rating of our schools, the exquisite beauty of the forests & the gorgeous Puget Sound - it’s a lovely place to live.

We don’t want high density or low income housing squeezed into our city. We don’t want more traffic, more crime, drug addicts living in tents on our streets/ playgrounds, vagrants bothering our residents & business owners, we don’t want defunding of our police dept, AND we don’t want to become anything like Seattle. If we wanted Mukilteo to be like Seattle, we would have bought a condo in Seattle.

Pls keep our city as it is. Pls stop wasting money & valuable time (of yours & ours - the voters), conducting these meetings. Pls get back to work concentrating on what will keep Mukilteo the pristine & safe city it is today, & not to become “Seattle Weird”.

Don’t you representatives have enough to keep you busy without having these long winded HAP meetings?

We are watching & listening.

June 6, 2021 7:59 PM – Melinda MacFarland – To Electeds

All of you on the city council already knows the many reasons we don’t want HAP to go thru in our beloved city of Mukilteo, but I’ll repeat a few:

Higher crime, more traffic on already crowded roads, overcrowding in our schools, parks & beaches, ugly monstrosities built like the Vantage Apts for higher density housing. There are more negatives to passing HAP than positives.

Pls vote NO on HAP.



75. Mahar, Michael

February 28, 2021 4:26 PM – Michael Mahar

Please, delay any action on HAP until city hall is open and residents can participate.



76. 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. 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
- 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.



77. Marine, Joe

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Joe Marine – Via Facebook³⁶

Meeting Minute 02:48:09 - I am watching as well.

³⁶ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



78. Markey, Tony

June 8, 2021 6:43 PM – Tony Markey – Via Facebook³⁷

Lisa Vallins wait - this has been in the works for years as a matter of public record.

³⁷ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



79. 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 5th 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 accomodate 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 capability.

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 accomodations, 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.³⁸

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 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

³⁸ Forwarded email from Mayor Gregerson sent February 4, 2020 at 1:25 PM.



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 |
| 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 Debrelon 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 & Rosario 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.

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.

February 28, 2021 1:30 PM – Lisa McBroom

Dear Ms. Balisky and Mr. Osaki -

I disagree that changing the building codes to increase density in Mukilteo and add more housing projects does not do anything to Mukilteo. It will completely change many things and you know that. That is crazy to say the opposite, what is that for? Why is this agenda to completely change Mukilteo so important to you, when most of Mukilteo does not want Mukilteo changed? Why do you think that it is perfectly ethical to utterly change Mukilteo when the people who live here do not, largely want that?

You two are so talented and capable, but why force these personal wishes upon us, rather than work for the common good and common desires of the residents of Mukilteo? Why not enjoy meeting the desires of the people who live here, rather than try to cause us what we think, to us are future problems we do not want?

Please consider postponing your changes, as you kindly hear the voices of the people who are speaking out about this in opposition.

Many people disagree with the findings of the study group and consultancy completely and with your view points on these matters. Please be reasonable and do not force your personal preferences on Mukilteo, against the wishes of the people and against strong opposition.

Thank you for your good efforts to try to better Mukilteo. I understand and agree that you both do genuinely mean well and think you are doing great good, I get that. Along with your good intent, please consider and keep in mind the wish of the residents here over the wishes of other entities. Let the people here have a larger say and let the people here determine what happens in our City, not other entities dictate that to us in opposition to what we want. Thank you for working on this and I hope to see you slow this process down to make sure that you are not going against what the majority of Mukilteo wants.

Thanks so much for your renewed consideration.

March 1, 2021 9:31 AM – Jennifer Gregerson

Thank you for sharing your thoughts.

Just to clarify- the plan does not represent the personal thoughts of Community Development Director Osaki and Planning Manager Balisky. Their job is to facilitate the work of the consultant, to reflect the feedback of the community



and to present the best work that we can. They do not bring their personal views to bear as part of their professional work.

Regarding timing: we are bound to the commitment when the grant was accepted, which is to bring the Housing Action Plan to the Planning Commission on March 18 and April 15, to Council on May 17 and probably June 7 (there will be a date in June, it's just not on the calendar yet), for adoption by June 15. The Commissioners and Councilmembers will be ready to hear your thoughts about the plan and the concepts, in specific. Your feedback is an important part of the process.

March 3, 2021 at 8:22 PM – Elisabeth Crawford

Thank you for taking the time to express your concerns about the HAP. It will come to council next Monday in form of work session, where we will be able to ask questions and discuss the findings of the DNS. I appreciate your input.

March 4, 2021 10:29 PM – Lisa McBroom

Dear Mayor Gregerson and City Council:

And Cc: to Ms. Balisky for filing as comments as to the specific comments opposed to the SEPA form

Thank you for your response. I have appreciated the Mayor's good responsiveness in all written dialogue regarding the HAP and related Mukilteo future growth and land use planning matters. And thank you to Ms. Balisky and many on City Council for great responsiveness.

As Mayor Gregerson indicates here in her response in this new email chain, responding to my email copied to you all that I sent to Ms. Balisky and Mr. Osaki, our Mayor responds that the impetus for applying for the HAP grant and following through to the conclusion of that predetermined process by those who created the HAP process, does not come from Ms. Balisky and Mr. Osaki and the City of Mukilteo Planning Department, but it comes from those to whom they report. In other words, in large part it comes from Mayor Gregerson's admission in earlier dialogue she indicates that she is being asked or pushed by Washington State entities to comply with SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) recommendations to change land use growth in suburbs to be cookie cutter and low income, high density housing centric. This is the push of SEPA during the current and recent administration priorities within the State of Washington. So our Mayor has done a great job of trying diligently to accommodate pressures from outside the City of Mukilteo that want to usher in zoning and land use sweeping changes, guidelines to change the demographics, change the culture, and become favorable to the United Nations global reset for 2030 that is out there which is influencing SEPA - that reset specifically wants to change bedroom communities and quiet residential areas and turn them all into the same exact thing everywhere. But nevermind that, as it is not the main thing we are discussing, but just note that it is well documented that the UN plan for 2030 residential areas to usher in as much urban sprawl as possible is the blueprint guideline for the State of Washington's residential suggestions that are coming down in HAP form, wherever the various city and county areas will allow the HAP findings to be implemented.



SEPA information is on the Washington State Department of Ecology website. It is interesting that SEPA does make provision for local governing authorities, i.e. such as the City of Mukilteo, to make their own decisions which may not completely agree with or follow the advisory data provided by the HAP consultants or even SEPA. in our US and state system of laws, the City does have it's own authority. In the case of the City of Mukilteo, we have the ability to break from a SEPA or HAP finding adherence because we have complied with SEPA or tried to, with the initial adopting of this HAP; we, the City of Mukilteo, have been very cooperative with SEPA and we have adopted their policies by way of pursuing the implementation of this HAP. Because we have adopted their suggested (not required, but suggested) policy to do the HAP study and discuss and bring this to a vote of the City Council after reviews, and process, we have the authority as a City (as City Council) to say "no," if we wish. Again, Mukilteo City Council, you are not bound to accept the findings of this HAP and continue doing what the consultant group for HAP says you must adopt for Mukilteo. See this I have copied from the SEPA website:

Q: What is SEPA substantive authority?

A: SEPA substantive authority is the regulatory authority granted to all state and local agencies to condition or deny a proposal to ensure identified environmental impacts can be sufficiently offset. To use SEPA substantive authority, an agency must have adopted SEPA policies.

Q: Are the mitigation measures identified in the SEPA document (DNS or EIS) mandatory?

A: Not necessarily. Mitigation conditions required under SEPA substantive authority must be included as conditions on a permit, license, or approval, before they become mandatory or enforceable. Mandatory mitigation required under other local, state, or federal laws may also be included on the DNS by the lead agency for the information of reviewers.

We have several things going on here. On one hand, we have the HAP process running its course, with input at City Council meetings, from focus group members, and from public input, but all which does nothing to negate the already agreed upon acceptance of the HAP consultant advice (Berk Consulting). So we, as a City have already agreed to do whatever this consultant says we have to do. But, you can see that SEPA allows for the authority of the local jurisdiction to reject, table, modify or change the result of the HAP consultants, which as we know is Berk Consulting.

Another thing we have going on is the Mayor trying to accomodate what is being asked of her, and also to honestly try to do the best things for the future planning for growth in Mukilteo, as well as help persons in need in our City and reach out to others desiring to live here that have financial needs. These are great things for the Mayor to try to do. I will address this after I finish the other things going on at the same time.

We have a City Council who has been supportive of our Mayor, which is great, and the Council has had some heated discussions and some lengthy discussions about this whole HAP grant and process and the potential future ramifications. The Council has not been unanimously in favor of adopting the HAP grant findings by Berk Consulting. In fact, as you all know, this has been a major point of disagreement by many on City Council. The discussions have nearly overturned this from the beginning, it has been close. So there is considerable intent by all on City Council to really consider what is going on here and to do the right thing. It is a pretty major issue to most or all



on City Council. And the fact that you all have really spent a lot of time on this is good, and it is hopeful for making the best outcome.

Meanwhile, there have been individuals and groups, including Preserve Mukilteo, which have signed petitions and many of whom, like myself have written to the Mayor, to the Mukilteo Beacon, and so many have written to City Council, and also many have been able to attend City Council meetings. This whole issue has been a big subject of great community interest, and not a passive interest whatsoever, but a very opinionated matter for those voicing their views, and a very important issue.

There has been misunderstanding, not intentional of course, but great misunderstanding by some persons reading comments by myself and others that those of us who are not in favor of the HAP and the implementation of its findings, that we are opposed to low income people, to low income housing in general and to helping persons obtain affordable housing. These are not accurate understandings of my views, or the views of the majority of persons in Mukilteo who oppose the HAP adoption of the HAP findings. Low income housing, in today's world, especially for elderly persons and those with physical needs, is an important part of a compassionate and appropriate society, one that puts people first. We need to be more loving and wisely comprehensive to take care of our society. But when I or another person opposed to the HAP and its adoption speak using the catchphrase "against low income housing" we are talking a concept of large-scale change to accommodate large-scale housing that caters to a seemingly element and to a drug use friendly and nonworking friendly and crime element friendly concept in housing and urban planning placement. There are various strategies for helping people with differing needs situations regarding housing and a position "opposed to low income housing" must be properly defined so that it is adequately explained and does not show intent of discrimination, which, again, I am not inferring that being snobby or pushing out persons in need is okay. It is a separate topic, but I really want to convey a different image than what has been projected on me and others. I think this can be a very large area of misunderstanding when discussing the broad topic and specifics about it, as well. Also I do not write with the intent to offend or be dismissive.

Now I would like to go back to the HAP grant and the study by Berk Consulting and the process and the result. And to what I hope, and I do believe what the majority of Mukilteans would like you all to do about this.

The Mayor and City Council have gone down this path because it was requested. But let's look at what our City needs versus what an outside entity suggests or directs.

The Mayor - Mayor Gregerson has done a good job of trying to do this, to make this thing work, to make it be helpful for the future City of Mukilteo growth planning and the accommodation of those with lesser income. She has fulfilled her duty to do her best on this already. She really has.

City Council, you have been pretty divided on this whole topic, on everything about it. You are really not unified on this because it doesn't really work for you, or most all of you. You know that changing the zoning density and changing regulations for growth and being told now and in the future by SEPA or Berk Consulting or whomever that you now need to add 300 or 500 or 1000 high density, living complexes or mixed use per person centers, at this particular point in time or within some future timeframe, you know that this will dramatically change the feel, quiet, safety, and great feeling of our City of Mukilteo. The reason you chose to live in Mukilteo is because it is safe, pretty, quiet, picturesque, historic and it is a nice neighborhood feeling everywhere, while still being close to the best shopping and amenities



everywhere, as well as bordering the beautiful Puget Sound. You chose to live here because Mukilteo is a beautiful and quiet and nice place to live. It feels good here and you would like that to stay the same.

What does the draft study show that Berk Consulting came up with? Now, I know you all read the whole thing, right? It is very long. Well, it was all prewritten with this from Snohomish County in general, and that from this past year over in a different area, and this projected thing from elsewhere and these guidelines and projections for other places. Did you get that it was not based on literally anything at all going on in the City of Mukilteo? We paid Berk Consulting a \$100K grant to tell us their cookie cutter SEPA dribble that everything needs to be like this innercity demographic and we are sure that Mukilteo is exactly like this. Only it isn't that way at all. Do you like the Draft findings? You as City Council approved the Draft. You like that Mukilteo is compared to the strip parts of Highway 99 and other high crime, high density areas, in some of the data Berk presented?

Let's go back to the Mayor. What did the Mayor try to achieve by using the requested HAP process to begin a future growth plan for the City that would not get her into any pressure from others over future planning? She wanted to be able to accommodate those who may not be able to afford to live here in the future, possibly look at ADU requirements and see if the consultant, Berk would come up with other helpful ideas and suggestions that would just be to our benefit as a City with now more information to make the best decisions on planning going forward. But have the Mayor's good wishes and desires for the City been accomplished with what is actually happening with the HAP? No, they have not!

Look at the discussions you have had with Berk Consulting personnel. These discusssion have been focused on why Mukilteo needs to be rezoned and to add a lot more of low density, low income housing (and when I say this, again, don't be offended, but Berk is talking adding a great deal of housing here, over time, more and more, and a lot of apartment complexes in a small area or multiple smaller areas can produce and can tend to add a seemly element, to add a drug culture, to add crime - they are the facts.) Now, to the City Council members who disagree with me, do any of you live in low density, highrise apartments right now? Or do you, did you and your family choose a quiet apartment that was not low density or a home to live in? Case in point if you are not very happy in a low income (i.e. Section 8, where a large percentage of persons do not work and there is a drug and crime element) apartment complex, then why is that? Why should we in Mukilteo want that next to our home, or more of that in our community, if you do not yourself love it and feel so at home with that yourself? Again, what Berk Consulting has been asked to do by SEPA is to get cities and counties to subjugate their planning processes to a HAP that will tend to bring down the culture of an area and make it more urban sprawl in an inner city manner. Are you really comfortable with supporting this agenda?

Take a look at some of the nice zoning maps we have on our awesome City of Mukilteo website. It is such a great website.

Here is the 2020 Zoning Map, the Urban Growth Area map, and the Land Use Designation Map. Tell me that you want to drop in a bunch of large apartment complexes near the Speedway and in the future growth areas, and that this will not affect safety, quiet, crime and not change the City quite a bit in feel.

<https://mukilteowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Zoning-Map-2.pdf>

<https://mukilteowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Urban-Growth-Area.pdf>



<https://mukilteowa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Land-Use-Designation.pdf>

You as the Mayor and City Council have an obligation firstly to our City. Your roles are elected roles, to represent us, the residents, and in particular the registered voting members who are US citizens residing in the City of Mukilteo. You have a greater responsibility to do good for our City than you have to do what any outside entity suggest to you. It's just like your family. Are you going to do what someone from the state suggests you do with your daughter rather than what you as a parent know is best? There is a pecking order. That pecking order is that we, the citizens of Mukilteo should be your first concern, your primary concern, your chief job to represent and honor and serve. Not the State of Washington, not SEPA, not some HAP you were suggested or requested to do, not some outside consulting group like Berk Consulting. Would you let Berk Consulting tell you how to parent your daughter? I hope not.

Mayor Gregerson, and City Council, the people of Mukilteo are not largely in favor of this HAP concept, the adoption of its findings and changing the feel and zoning and density of Mukilteo. We do not like that. This HAP process has provided for comment and for feedback and you have received a large quantity of it in opposition to adopting the HAP findings. You have the opportunity to stand up for the people of Mukilteo and just say "no". Just say that it is not accurate, it is not what you want, that they have done their study, but you do not entirely agree. That would be perfectly okay to change your direction and change your minds on this. Changing direction has been done many times before by good people considering more information. Surely you can see that adopting these findings as policy will dramatically change Mukilteo and that we will not be as quiet, as safe, as nice of a City in the future if you proceed with this.

As you know, hundreds of persons signed a petition opposed to this HAP or the adoption of its findings. That was significant and happened very quickly.

Now, let's look at some of the items listed on the SEPA DNS - and DNS means Determination of Non-Significance. Do you really think that adopting the final findings of the HAP process from Berk Consulting will have non-significance on Mukilteo? Of course you don't.

Yes, a document that says that land use and zoning and permits changes will be required and made does not itself impact land use, animals, quiet, money or safety. But are we talking about a document, or rather the implementation of required changes that will no longer be within the City of Mukilteo's control to manage? So, yes, changing zoning and changing density are going to change Mukilteo and yes, this will have effects on many of the line items in the SEPA document. Again, I am appealing to you: do you want all these negative affects on our City of Mukilteo? Do you think you simply have to go along with this? No, none of you do. It is not like the Mayor was told it would go, nor like her good wishes for the City, have gone, and so she and you, and that means all of you, should just say "no".

Let's talk about the Declaration of Independence. Well that was different and we cannot compare that whatsoever. But remember that the members of the Constitutional Congress debated supporting England and being submissive to England for a long time, before they changed their minds. It is good to consider and debate - it is good the considerations and conversations you all have had, but now it is time to change your minds and go in the other direction on the very important future of the City of Mukilteo. Don't subject us to the SEPA wished HAP consultant group findings. It is time. Just say "no."



We have this 19 page SEPA Environmental Checklist that has been filled out by City Planning per the guidelines wished by Berk Consulting, with regard to how the implementation of the HAP findings will or will not impact Mukilteo. Most of the answers are that there will be no effect, because they are issues of non-significance being "just a non-project action." By the way, do you think that the Declaration of Independence had no effect because it was just a "non-project action" document anyway and it wasn't really an active project. Well, it seems to have had continuing profound effects for freedoms and even process of law. So this HAP, if you say "yes" and adopt the Berk Consulting findings, it will actually change Mukilteo forever. Well, let's look at some of these line items and supposedly "no impact" effects on this environmental checklist:

Number

7.a. The Housing Action Plan (HAP) will result in a prioritized list of housing strategies that will be implemented over the next several years. Strategies may include future Comprehensive Plan amendments, changes to zoning or permit processing regulations, or programs. ----- so we can see that this become process and in place over and above the City's authority. Do you like that? I am not comfortable with that. Why do we want to willingly subjugate ourselves to be under this plan when we do not have to, this is merely suggested and requested? Suggested is not the same as required.

Do you realize some cities and places, like I believe the City of Edmonds, have just said "No", we are not doing this. I believe they rejected the HAP. We still have time to do that as well.

7.b. The City of Mukilteo is to use this as background research and analysis ----- that is good, nothing wrong with this.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. The proposed final HAP will be considered by the Mukilteo Planning Commission at a public hearing. The Planning Commission forwards a recommendation to City Council, which is the final decision authority for legislative actions. Any amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, development regulations, or project permits will be reviewed separately. ----- Interesting, the City Council, again, has authority to say "yes" and "no" on all this. And yet they don't. Kind of confusing and troubling.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.) In 2019, the Washington State Legislature authorized the Washington State Department of Commerce to offer grant funding for the development of Housing Action Plans (HAPs). The City of Mukilteo applied for and received a grant. The HAP is a strategic plan that identifies clear, actionable strategies to meet current and projected housing needs. Washington State law requires the HAP identify strategies to encourage construction of: • A greater variety of housing types; and • Housing at prices that are accessible to people with a wide range of incomes. Additional information on the Mukilteo HAP is available at:

<https://mukilteowa.gov/departments/planning-development/planning-longrange/housing-action-plan> ----- Notice that the City was authorized to receive a grant, was not mandated to receive it. Here, today, the City is still in control.

2. Air a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known. Not applicable; this is a non-project action. Promoting additional housing in areas served by transit (bus, ferry, and rail) can



help to reduce overall emissions. ---- Well, this is a potential issue for air quality, actually because if you increase density dramatically you are increasing the amount of air pollution with numbers of vehicles owned by the additional residents and increasing electrical, plumbing, natural gas and cooking and light and sound emissions that do change the air quality.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. Not applicable; this is a non-project action. ---- This is untrue, as increasing density will definitely increase waste water, and ground and surface water changes, depending on placement and permitting.

Noise -

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site. Not applicable; this is a non-project action. 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: Not applicable; this is a non-project action. ---- Of course, more people bring more noise.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? Not applicable; this is a non-project action. Structures may be demolished in the future as part of a project action. ---- So existing businesses, and homes may be required to vacate against their wishes.

1. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: Any strategy adopted under the HAP to allow for additional housing forms or allow currently permitted housing forms in additional locations would go through a public review process and consider standards to minimize impacts to existing neighborhoods. Adoption of any amendments would take place as a separate action. ---- This is good, but untrue because the HAP findings once adopted fully can trump any existing legal process!

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: This is a non-project action with the intent of implementing strategies that improve access to housing over time. The Planning Commission and City Council will be presented with strategy options for review and prioritization. --- Here we have it folks, the intent of the HAP is to tell the City of Mukilteo where to put people and when to do it and how. Are you feeling comfortable with this? I am not.

Just say "no".

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? None; this is a non-project action. Some review of parking standards are proposed as sub-recommendations of strategies in the HAP. If adopted by Council, these would be reviewed through a separate process. ---- This is good, we do need a parking reevaluation as we are not abiding by adequate numbers or exiting code numbers of parking spaces per unit now.

What is the bottom line? There are several things. Let's review:

1. The HAP and the findings by Berk Consulting encompass a flawed City growth concept suggested, but not actually required, only suggested, by the State of Washington (SEPA) that is too limiting to the future of the growth of the City of Mukilteo, and also will force negative change by mandating, and forcing continuing and ongoing urban sprawl,



particularly high density apartment complexes and multiuse complexes outside of the complete control of the wishes of the government and people residing in the City of Mukilteo.

2. The SEPA website itself provides for the local entity (i.e. the City of Mukilteo) which has complied with SEPA to disengage with all or part of something that does not work for it - see above. That is an "out" available to take.
3. The Mayor has done sufficient due diligence to go down this path that she could not be faulted for changing her mind and stopping this. She can always default for the better information, the more information, the further consideration and for the wishes of the people whom she represents, or for an overwhelming majority of her City Council.
4. City Council has recognized significant opposition to both this HAP concept and to adopting the final findings.
5. Most people who live in Mukilteo want it to stay the way it is now today. We do not want it changed by these methods and we do not think it has to be changed by these obligatory methods.
6. We are such a well organized, well working City, with great City planning people, great Mayor, great City Council, great City website, that we have the ability to project, and plan for future growth outside of and without putting the City of Mukilteo under the thumb of adopting the recommendations of the HAP consultant, Berk Consulting.
7. Mayor Gregerson and City Council, you know your primary obligation in your office is to represent us, the people, and not do what an outside entity suggests, particularly when you are getting a ton of feedback that is contrary to the outside entity direction.
8. I establish here, that there are several ways "out" of continuing on this path, and that you are really not obligated to continue going on this path of adopting the HAP findings. You can say "no", this is not exactly what I want for my City, it has some good elements but presents problems and so we are going to table it, stop, take action to say that it does not merit my/our approval.
9. You can say "no" because the people want you to say "no", or because the environmental impact statement does not sufficiently or adequately address what will happen with urban sprawl growth so it is flawed - and if you determine it is flawed, then you can reject it, and you can also reject it because Berk Consulting has presented data that is mish mash from other times and places and different future projections that do not exactly match your City of Mukilteo.
10. You have done a great job, as Mayor, City Council and the Planning Department, you have all done a great job spelling this all out professionally and thoroughly.

So my appeal, is that, for your constituents, for your voting public, for your neighbors, for your loved ones, for the future of the City of Mukilteo, please do not adopt any final recommendations of the HAP or of Berk Consulting on this matter. You do not have to and you should not. Please put a stop to this.

Thank you for your heartfelt and caring consideration and all your hard work on these matters.



March 5, 2021 7:20 AM – Lisa McBroom

Dear Mayor Gregerson and City Council -

The Department of Commerce is the chief governmental agency "behind" the HAP process, and the push to turn cities and areas into urban sprawl inner city areas. These are measures to prep areas that will comply to make them fully subject to future government resets that are requested by a UN 2030 global reset. These are not requirements but requests by the Dept. of Commerce and they are also influencing the Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies.

But do we, the people and the elected officials of this wonderful City of Mukilteo, do we think that it is perfectly ethical for us to submit ourselves, per their request and push, but not their requirement (because the Department of Commerce has no legal authority to force a City to do what it says) to do whatever now and down the road forever the Department of Commerce says we should do regarding adding this density within this timeframe and by adding this many units of apartments at what location and by what time, for instance?

What if, God forbid, in a few years, there was some new, despotic leaning USA government head or President that was making poor decisions and that government, with the Department of Commerce told Mukilteo they had to change this and that and demolish these nice housing areas and so on. That would be horrible. But if you do not say "no" to the final HAP recommendations by Berk Consulting, you are leaving open Mukilteo for unknown, unrestricted control by means you no longer influence.

You do not have to submit to a request or pressure from agencies, or government bodies who are pushing or have some part of them pushing in a direction that is not in the best wishes for the future of Mukilteo.

Let Mukilteo retain the characteristics that make it a wonderful city and keep us as free from influences and pressures that we are not actually obligated to accept, which may, and many of us believe, will definitely adversely and negatively affect the wellbeing and future of our wonderful City of Mukilteo.

I apologize for the length of my email last night. I hope that you will take the time to read the entire email of yesterday and that the concerns I tried to lay out will give you good ideas enough to exercise caution about these matters and stop the HAP results adoption.

Thank you for all your time and consideration to make the very best, most wise decisions for the future growth and planning for our City of Mukilteo. Let's leave the controls, as much as possible, in your hands and in the hands of the people who live here, and not in the hands of other entities who dictate to us what we can and cannot do.

Thank you so much for listening and trying to do the very best things for the future of Mukilteo.

March 7, 2021 4:41 PM – McBroom, Lisa

Dear Mayor Gregerson and City Council:

- For your kind review before your 3/08/2021 6 p.m. City Council Meeting - thank you. -



Here is a gently suggested overview solution summary for the whole HAP and housing and future planning scenario of what you all (gently suggested) should be thinking in 15 years/25 years:

[TIME: 15 (25 years from now)]

[WHOM IS SPEAKING: You (Mayor/ City Council Member) talking to your daughter (or friend, neighbor)]

[WHERE: Mukilteo, on a view hill, overlooking the water]

Look, (daughter name) - Isn't it beautiful? I wanted to tell you how I made history. Remember when I was (Mayor/ on City Council?)

We were facing a big situation that was controversial on City Council about a Housing Grant and how to grow Mukilteo. The Housing grant, HAP was really opposed by a lot of the citizens and groups in Mukilteo. Originally we thought they were all a bit crazy, but we listened politely and mostly ignored them at first. We even received a lot of signed petitions opposing the HAP or a housing grant. We hired the consulting group that had been suggested to us to use and they started sounding like they just wanted to push more housing units, basically, which is totally different than how the whole thing had been presented to us.

We had been pushed by different agencies to have this grant study to help us shape some of the future housing growth planning for the City, and many of us and the Mayor thought it would not hurt us and would be helpful. Our overall area was growing so fast, and it still is. The grant study was supposed to provide some guidelines and options to accommodate future growth predictions as the population grew. But as we got further into it, and there was so much flack and lack of smoothness in the process, while our great Planning Department did a great job to spell everything out as we went along the prescribed process ---- but we saw that the end goal of those behind the HAP process was to put the City of Mukilteo into a voluntary subjective position to different state and other entities that could have the ability to tell us, on an ongoing basis, how much additional high rise or mixed use or whatever type of high density apartment style dwellings they wanted us to put in or allow within certain timeframes. We could see that the purpose of the HAP was really to see if they could get us to be an area where they could gradually override more and more of the commercial land areas and existing residential areas, and that they would be requesting ongoing demolishing of percentages of existing really nice residential neighborhoods to request more and more high density housing built for anyone in need. That would just keep changing Mukilteo dramatically and the citizens would not like that. We got uncomfortable with this.

On the one hand, we wanted to be able to provide more housing for people in need of housing, but on the other hand we didn't think that somebody else telling us every year about more ways they wanted to change Mukilteo to be more high density inner city was the way to go.

The first problem was that adding density was not going to go over well with the citizens of Mukilteo. If we continued with the HAP, we would be putting our City Council in a neverending battle over continuing requests from outside entities and citizens fighting the requests to add more high density housing and multiuse housing issues and fighting about them. We really did not like the idea that demolishing existing residential neighborhoods was a big reality with this, either. We thought we didn't want to continue being in this unpleasant, ongoing conflict situation.



Secondly we decided we did actually prefer to keep the character of Mukilteo and not allow dramatic change. We took a look at some other tiny waterfront community cities in Oregon, California, New York, Connecticut and Rhode Island - small boutique cities on the water like Mukilteo who had refused to let urban sprawl inner city development take over. These areas were all really close to much larger, neighboring cities with a lot of high rises and low income housing and mixed use buildings. We decided it was okay for tiny waterfront cities to be different than neighboring, larger cities. So we endorsed a solution, with some of the citizens and groups in Mukilteo:

We fully endorsed the creation of the new Housing Helps of Mukilteo. It continues to be Mukilteo's largest, fully independent, non-profit employer. There are a lot of vetted and screened volunteers who work there as well. In fact it has dramatically increased employment in Mukilteo. The citizens and sponsoring groups here run it. We help them get grants to keep it going. It is so awesome. It was the solution we needed. At the time, Mayor Gregerson's vision and heart was to find ways to help anyone needing housing. But we didn't want to adversely affect the Mukilteo that we know and love. So the Housing Helps actually has a very high level of success in placing callers or those who inquire on the internet, with in person interviews elsewhere in neighboring Everett and Lynnwood. They do not talk to anyone in person, people looking for housing cannot go there. They call in or email and the Housing Helps is incredibly well connected to every agency and helps group in the state, but particularly to everything in and for Lynnwood or Everett. So we really are a big help to Lynnwood and Everett, for instance. And the creators of the Housing Helps of Mukilteo actually dedicated it in 2021 to Mayor Jennifer Gregerson and the City Council of 2021. That was awesome! We all came together for this and it was very unifying and strengthening for the community and the City.

Now Mukilteo has added several Senior Housing centers, but we decided we did not want to change the culture or feel of the city, but we felt that it should remain the way it is. And we are proud that, when we look at the huge skyscrapers in Everett and Lynnwood - just look behind you, they are bigger cities and they have grown so much and we have partnered with them to help people coming to us for housing help get into the housing they need. We are small here in Mukilteo, but we think it is a good thing that we are different than a big city, it's okay to be different. We are definitely doing our part, being a model city to help people get the housing help they need. If people call us and they want to live in Mukilteo, we can connect them to the realtors, brokers, and loan officers for purchasing a property here, or for those who are not purchasing but need assistance we can connect them to the best of every resource that will give them a heads up and probably help get them housing really close to Mukilteo, if that's what they are seeking, in Everett or Lynnwood, possibly even less than a mile from Mukilteo. The Housing Helps of Mukilteo is the first of its kind and they are a model for the rest of America. They help thousands of people every month. We are proud to endorse them.

Change is good to explore. And we did look at it for Mukilteo.

But change is not always the best option. So we didn't change Mukilteo. It's a little bit bigger, but it's still the same, still feels the same.

So once we found the solution, to provide a way to help almost anyone find housing - by endorsing the nonprofit Housing Helps, and that we could now have a clear conscience about keeping and preserving Mukilteo the way that it is, we did have to back out of the HAP process. And that was not so easy, but it was necessary. So we did it.



Isn't it nice here? And it has such a great feel. I love being here. Yes, I made history, with my colleagues, we kind of stepped out on a limb. But it was kind of a simple but logical solution and it works so well. And now I hear the City Council meetings are not so exciting as they used to be, but that's a good thing.

We decided to keep and preserve Mukilteo.

[END]

If you all think this may be a good overall solution, we can get some citizens and groups together to form the Housing Helps of Mukilteo, and we will be excited to receive the full endorsement from the City.

Thank you so much for your good efforts on these matters.

March 14, 2021 11:41 AM – Lisa McBroom

Dear Mayor Gregerson and City Council:

A far better improvement for the housing of the masses and growth of building up Mukilteo and than allowing and opening up Mukilteo for massive overcrowding with the problems the HAP opens up with the ever-increasing density, adding of collections of tiny dwellings and the crime, dirt and human crisis downgrading of Mukilteo that will result in the additional future reduction of nicer residential neighborhoods is this:

FRANCE, in the greater Paris area: What they are working on doing in the Paris, France area: making boroughs which have multiple ingredients - green spaces, mixes of historic and residential areas, shopping and manufacturing - but not pushing out or taking over existing character and history and feel and look, it is not focused on removing what exists or huge building ups or increasing the density but rather focused on quality of life by simply adding a little bit of something which may be missing is the overall concept.

WALES: What they are proposing for all of Wales - is adding access to parks and green areas, adding green areas as necessary so that existing residences of all kinds have an accessible park or green space within a 20 minute walk. We have this already, take a look at their reasoning and why this should be preserved and kept in Mukilteo, rather than overrun by redevelopment here, with the exception of adding some additional senior housing. See the reasoning here:

Call for all homes to be minutes from green space

By Rachel Flint

BBC News

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-wales-56320917>

There is a great deal of international consensus in favor of both of these approaches to satisfy change requested for both 2024 and 2030.



I hope you will reconsider your direction and decide to keep and preserve Mukilteo as it is today for the future.

Let's see you refocus on making Mukilteo more lovely and more special, not trashing it and making it innercity urban sprawl.

Again, we are tiny and special, and because we are so small and on the water, we do need to change. We can to assist population and assistance needs, as a City do multiple benevolent and endorsing things to support helps agencies to partner and help house increased populations and those in need of any type of partial to full housing assistance in neighboring Lynnwood and Everett which are vastly larger and poised for that accommodation and are just partial miles away, right here next to us.

March 14, 2021 11:41 AM – Lisa McBroom

typo - correction should read: We (Mukilteo) do NOT need to change.

March 16, 2021 6:07 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for your patience as we worked on responses to your specific comments on the environmental checklist. We would also like to use this opportunity to better explain the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and what the City is obligated to do for the Housing Action Plan (HAP).

About SEPA and the HAP

The purpose of SEPA is to ensure that government agencies consider various environmental impacts for proposed actions. State law includes two broad types of proposed actions – “project,” meaning that it is specific to one or more physical locations, and “non-project,” meaning that the proposal is not specific to a physical location. Non-project actions are usually are for actions related to plans, policies or programs, such as updates to the City’s Comprehensive Plan or changes to development regulations.

Since the HAP is not specific to a location, it is a “non-project” action under SEPA. The HAP is a work plan made up of strategies related to housing. City Council has full discretion over which strategies in the draft Housing Action Plan to adopt. Council can adopt the HAP as-is, modify and/or remove suggested strategies, add strategies, or adopt nothing. Adoption of a strategy simply means Council wishes to study that item in more detail.

If you would like to learn more about SEPA, we recommend the [Municipal Research Services Center \(MRSC\) SEPA webpage](#) and the [Department of Ecology’s SEPA FAQ webpage](#).

SEPA Checklist- Section A, Background – Items A-7 (Plans for Future Actions, Page 2), A-10 (Other Approvals, Page 3) and A-11 (Proposal Description, Page 3)

As noted above, Council has full authority over which strategies to adopt. Council also has full authority over



which strategies to implement. Below is the typical code amendment process to provide an example of what future implementation may look like:

7. A HAP strategy to review ADU development regulations is added to the City's preliminary docket as part of the annual docket process (see the [City's Comprehensive Plan webpage](#) for more information about this process).
8. After a public hearing, City Council decides to move the item to the final docket. This authorizes staff to begin work on the code amendment.
9. Staff develops a draft for public input and review. Depending on the amendment, this may be with interested parties, stakeholders, and/or Planning Commission involvement.
10. Once the draft is ready for public comment (i.e. makes sense, considers the feedback staff are aware of to that point, etc.), it is reviewed under SEPA. The draft and the SEPA determination are typically released together, and there is a period for public input.
11. The draft is updated based on any public comment received, and then a public hearing is held with the Planning Commission. Planning Commission also accepts and reviews written and verbal public comment. The Commission then makes a formal recommendation to City Council to adopt, adopt with modifications, or to deny the proposal.
12. City Council holds a public hearing, and also accepts and reviews written and verbal public comment. City Council may adopt, adopt with modifications, or to deny the proposal.

Edmonds is working on a housing strategy, outside of the HAP process. While the initial project was not approved, the City established a [Citizens' Housing Commission](#) which continues to work on housing policy. It appears that the recommended strategies were presented to the Edmonds Planning Commission in January 2021.

SEPA Checklist- Section B, Environmental Elements – Items Checklist Items B-2a (Air, Page 5), B-3b2 (Waste Materials in Waters, Page 6), B-7b (Noise, Page 10), B-8d (Demolition of Structures, Page 11), B-8l (Compatibility of Uses, Page 12), B-9c (Housing Impacts, Page 12), and B-14c (Parking Spaces, Page 14)

Since the HAP itself does not change the City's adopted plans, policies or development regulations, there are no environmental impacts to consider with this proposal. Any future changes to the City's adopted plans, policies or development regulations (whether or not it is suggested in the HAP) would require its own review under SEPA and its own public input process. This is where specific environmental impacts of a proposed change would be evaluated.

In response to your specific environmental concerns:

- Impacts to air quality would be review for any future, specific proposal. There are a number of local, state and federal air quality regulations that may apply depending on the proposal.



- Waste materials entering ground or surface waters are addressed through standards for sanitary sewer and stormwater facilities. The City does not allow for any uses that would allow for such release, and [MMC 13.12.080](#) includes a list of specific contaminants that are prohibited.
- Everyone in the City is subject to the same noise regulations, regardless of whether they are here now, are visiting, or join us in the future. The regulations for regular noise can be found in [Chapter 8.18 MMC](#), and the regulations for construction noise can be found in [MMC 9.46.080](#). The City is very proactive in addressing both noise and construction noise issues.
- Demolition of any structure 120 sq. ft. or larger requires a permit. Property owners have choice about demolishing structures on their property that tenants do not necessarily share, however any related vacancy or eviction would be a private matter. In the extremely unlikely circumstance that the City required a property for a public purpose, that property owner is offered fair market compensation as required by law.
- Your comments regarding compatibility of uses, housing impacts, and parking are noted.

We hope that this clarifies the role of SEPA in the HAP as well as your specific environmental comments. Please let us know if you have questions, need clarification, or if we can be of any further assistance.

March 16, 2021 9:14 PM – Lisa McBroom

Thank you so much for your detailed response to me.

And thank you for your ongoing efforts to help the City have the best information so that the Mayor and City Council are able to make the best decisions for future growth plans and land use and land and permitting management regarding to what the acceptance of the HAP or large portions of HAP recommendations by Berk Consulting will open the door - and as to whether that open door to encourage higher density and to deliberately increase assisted housing in Mukilteo, and favoring the increase of density rapidly will positively benefit the present and future Mukilteo or not.

I appreciate all your time to provide very good answers to the issues I emailed to the City - thank you so much.

June 6, 2021 2:43 PM – Lisa McBroom – To Electeds

Tomorrow you will make history. You decide to vote in favor or not in favor of the HAP, which is expertly designed to deliberately pave the easy way for pressures from various governmental and other affiliate agencies and developers to pressure Mukilteo into ongoing higher density building and development, and with a "yes" vote you open the door wide open for nonstop, neverending large developer and their attorney firm pressures on you, to give in to many, nonstop requests to turn raw land, commercial land, residential lots, and then suddenly even whole residential neighborhoods into higher density living, section 8 housing, mixed use complexes, multiuse complexes both large and small.

Do you really want to live in a City or visit here in 10 years, 20 years, when it has been transformed into a downtown, innercity, less quiet, less safe, more dirty, more dangerous, place? Do you really, really desire that Mukilteo become a



little built up inner city place? Do you really think that if you vote "yes" to the HAP that the people who live in Mukilteo will be thanking you now and later on for opening the door to pressures from outside our City to increase density as much as possible forever?

Why would you vote "yes" to wreck our City?

Why would you think that you have to say yes to developers who get tax benefits and help from agencies when they succeed in building higher density units? How does that benefit you in any way? - It does not benefit you in any way unless you are getting paid under the table to wreck our City by giving in to developers.

How do you think you will like it, and how do you think future City Council members will like it, when you have endless meetings to discuss and talk about and fight ongoing developer requests to take over sections of Mukilteo?

How does a loosely government sponsored (for the future world same, cookie cutter, mandated from other agencies if you let them, but not required, just requested) HAP fit into American and Mukilteo values, which are not built on pleasing other entities but are built on freedom and personal choice and voting and local wishes and laws to promote the wishes of local residents?

Why do you want to go over the heads and wishes of local residents to subjugate Mukilteo under new pressures to build out and build up asap?

Do you not like Mukilteo like it is? Is there something wrong with being safe, pretty, quiet, forested and NOT inner city?

Most Mukilteans like Mukilteo like it is. We are small, unique, nice and we are a tiny, long strip of little City bordering the water of Puget Sound. We are not sizewise anywhere near the larger sizes of Edmonds, Lynnwood and Everett. We are tiny. We can continue to be a boutique, nice City, if you will just stop trying to allow outside, dangerous and harmful wishes for our City to have their way!!! Come on, City Council, get a clue. DO NOT VOTE "YES" ON THE HAP. It does not benefit Mukilteo at all to vote "YES".

Please do what is best for the future of this City, and leave development control completely in your hands (City Council) and the hands of the people, the registered voters here, and do not complicate things by allowing various developer and agency influences to be able to pressure and battle you or force you to allow higher density. WE DO NOT, AS A TINY CITY, NEED TO TURN INTO BROOKLYN, NEW YORK. Let the larger nearby cities do their ongoing higher density in their designated areas. We are way too small to apportion out any areas - and this HAP just wants to gradually turn Mukilteo into all higher density. Let the higher density be in Lynnwood and Everett, which is so logical.

Please carefully consider your vote and err on the side of caution so that Mukilteo can remain a boutique, tiny, quiet, safe, waterfront City that retains its character and strength and independence.

As for helping people in need and providing housing, again, as I have written before, we can be a great City that helps others 1/3 of a mile to 1 mile away from here, and we can add senior housing inside of Mukilteo, but we do not have to become inner city or strapped with pressures from developers and agencies to have their way with high density here to meet all the needs of anyone in the whole entire world with housing needs inside our midst.



Please, please vote "NO" on the HAP. It is carefully designed to entrap you and us in trouble that we don't want and you would not want to deal with it when it starts coming in big and strong at your City Council meetings, so just say "NO". Do you want to have endless future City Council meetings talking with and fighting with developers and their attorneys?

Thank you for doing the right thing for your City and our City and standing up for our rights to be a beautiful and lovely little City that is not attacked by pressures to become higher density. WE ARE NOT REQUIRED to become higher density - we are being "asked" to allow higher density. Higher density for a tiny, little City means crime, lack of safety, problems, and you lose the look and feel and niceness pretty quickly. And people move out and the higher density quickly becomes the new character of the city pretty fast and it becomes worse and worse and worse. But we do not have to allow that.

Keep City Council and the people's control of Mukilteo. Don't give it up, don't give leeway to legal favor for developers to get their way very easily to do whatever they want here. Just say "NO".

This is really, really important. Please vote "NO" on the HAP tomorrow. I and about 28,000 people who live here and like it here and want it to stay like it is are all of us counting on you all to make the right decision. Think about your future and our future. Be safe and vote "NO".



80. Mendenhall, Jim

November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Jim Mendenhall – Via Facebook³⁹

Recording Minute 39:43 – 80⁴⁰

Recording Minute 40:42 – 60⁴¹

Recording Minute 42:32 – 1.5⁴²

Recording Minute 43:37 – 95%⁴³

May 21, 2021 10:05 AM – Jim Mendenhall – To Electeds

Please vote no to HAP and you will have my vote next election

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Jim Mendenhall – Via Facebook⁴⁴

Meeting Minute 00:31:20 - Yes I agree completely they will turn us against us down the road and make us do things we don't want to

Meeting Minute 00:32:08 - Once you open the door you cannot control what comes in as part of a group through Snohomish county someone else will probably pull the strings

Meeting Minute 00:37:22 - Thank you Joe

Meeting Minute 00:59:51 - Our hands will be tied in my opinion

Meeting Minute 01:02:53 - This sounds very scary it's giving control of our town to outside entities and if they don't like what we do they will make us do a different

Meeting Minute 01:05:52 - Thank you thank you thank you

Meeting Minute 01:07:29 - That would be the best thing we spent the money 30,000 is a cheap price to pay to get out of this

³⁹ Facebook comments were provided in response to November 5, 2020 Community Meeting #1

⁴⁰ Response to poll question about how much median home values in Mukilteo have increased since 2010.

⁴¹ Response to poll question about what percent of Mukilteo residents pay more than 30% of their household income on housing costs, including utilities.

⁴² Response to poll question about the 2019 jobs-to-housing ratio in Mukilteo.

⁴³ Response to poll question about what proportion of housing units are single-family in Mukilteo.

⁴⁴ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



Meeting Minute 01:07:52 – Thanks

Meeting Minute 01:19:07 - Thank you Bob

Meeting Minute 01:36:45 - Mukilteo has no room to grow except for up and nobody wants up

Meeting Minute 01:43:49 - With HAP and I think the citizens will continue to be blindsided and only know about things when it's too late to change them

Meeting Minute 01:47:15 - Thank you Joe couldn't agree more

Meeting Minute 01:51:37 - Public comment means nothing if it's not listened to

Meeting Minute 02:07:52 - Thank you

Meeting Minute 02:38:19 - No no no this is not represented to the majority of Mukilteo

Meeting Minute 02:52:35 - Seems that everybody that supports her plays the victim card it's not about that it's about what we want for our community

Meeting Minute 02:55:27 - The problem is I think it gives control to outside entities



81. Moore, Dana

November 5, 2020 7:00 PM – Dana Moore – Via Facebook⁴⁵

Recording Minute 1:38:22 – Very good point from 1969 Mukilteo resident Carl!

Recording Minute 1:58:47 – Yes, he's right! Harbour Pointe has very little wooded areas left in the last 2 decades

Recording Minute 1:58:53 – Enough!

Recording Minute 2:01:15 – Good points Boris!

Recording Minute 2:07:17 – Leslie is right!

Recording Minute 2:12:41 – So glad Leslie joined the feed tonight! Very articulate, thought out comments! Join the council Leslie!

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Dana Moore – Via Facebook⁴⁶

Meeting Minute 00:10:01 - Exactly Margaret Zyla Belfry! I agree 

Meeting Minute 02:16:54 - NO HAP!

Meeting Minute 02:25:58 - Vote NO!

Meeting Minute 03:15:33 - Absolutely! Someone FINALLY said it like it is! Thank YOU councilman Champion!

Meeting Minute 03:35:51 - Bob Champion... I am so grateful you're a part of the council!

Meeting Minute 03:36:56 - EXACTLY!

Meeting Minute 03:37:55 - Yes he is Joe Marine! Council member Champion is very wise...

Meeting Minute 03:57:43 - Then maybe you shouldn't be on the council! I understood him just fine

⁴⁵ Facebook comments were provided in response to November 5, 2020 Community Meeting #1

⁴⁶ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



82. 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 – Via HAP Comment Form

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.

January 13, 2021 7:27 PM – Matt Morgan – Via HAP Comment Form

I am very concerned about anything that could lead to the development of more high-density housing in Mukilteo. I live near the growing apartment complex by Safeway and that is already an eyesore and too much. We have already been hit with commercial air traffic from Paine. I do not want to lose that "great small town" claim we had just a few short years ago and I fear if not cautious we may be heading there on momentum alone. Apply brakes please. Thank you.

January 14, 2021 2:29 PM – Lauren Balisky

We have heard concern about loss of community character from a number of people, as well as concerns about density. I do hope you are able to join us tonight at the [Community Meeting](#), but if not, we will have the presentation and recording posted to the [HAP Project Library](#) webpage.

Please feel free to continue submitting comments, and let me know if you have any additional questions.



83. Morrill, Cami (Snohomish County – Camano Association of REALTORS)

May 4, 2021 1:48 PM – Cami Morrill

The Snohomish County-Camano Association of REALTORS® would like to submit the attached letter as a public comment for Mukilteo's Housing Action Plan.

Attachment



SNOHOMISH COUNTY-CAMANO ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS®

3201 Broadway, Suite E, Everett, WA 98201 • (425) 339-1388 • FAX (425) 339-2454
<http://www.sccar.org>

"The Voice for Real Estate in Snohomish County"

May 4th, 2021

Mukilteo City Council
11930 Cyrus Way
Mukilteo, WA 98275

RE: Housing Action Plan

Dear Mukilteo City Councilmembers,

Firstly, thank you for taking action to address the housing issues in Mukilteo. As you are aware, the lack of housing inventory has created an affordable housing crisis across Snohomish County. We believe every city in Snohomish County, including Mukilteo, will need to do its part in increasing their available housing stock.

The Snohomish County-Camano Association of REALTORS® (SCCAR), an organization which represents nearly two thousand REALTORS® who live and do business across Snohomish County, including Mukilteo, would like to express our support for the following items.

- REALTORS® would like to see an increase in a diverse housing inventory in Mukilteo.
- REALTORS® believe changes to the Growth Management Act (GMA) and local community comprehensive plans are necessary to ensure adequate housing choices for all income levels in local communities. To REALTORS®, these changes must include: ensuring buildable land supply for housing, increasing the densities of the urban growth areas, increasing the amount of land capacity available for development, considering expansion of the UGA boundary, ensuring county compliance with the GMA's housing goals and local community comprehensive plans' housing requirements, removing barriers by reducing construction costs and delays, expediting the permit process, and revising local zoning to encourage attached and detached dwelling units (ADUs & DADUs).
- REALTORS support the implementation of a local level multi-family property tax exemption program.

REALTORS® believe Mukilteo will benefit if it increases opportunities for all income levels to access homeownership. Homeowners have a stake in their communities, as their property value is an incentive to stay abreast of local activities and government actions. Affordable and stable housing increases individual and family well-being, including better physical and mental health, improving school performance for children, giving greater opportunities for economic self-sufficiency, creating equitable access to services, allowing all to prosper regardless of socioeconomic background, and improving racial and economic integration.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need anything, as we would be happy to partner with the city in any housing or real estate matter. We hope you and your families are staying safe and healthy in these times.



SNOHOMISH COUNTY-CAMANO ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS®

3201 Broadway, Suite E, Everett, WA 98201 • (425) 339-1388 • FAX (425) 339-2454
<http://www.secar.org>

"The Voice for Real Estate in Snohomish County"

Sincerely,

Cami Morrill
Director of Government & Public Affairs

MEMBER NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS® AND WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS®
REALTORS® is a federally registered membership mark which may only be used by real estate professionals who are members of the National Association of REALTORS® and subscribe to its strict Code of Ethics.





84. Morrison, Patricia

May 17, 2021 1:37 PM – Patricia Morrison

This message is for the Mayor and Mukilteo City Council.

We are residents and property owners here in Mukilteo for 28 years after fleeing Seattle's taxes and liberal politics in 1994. Now it seems we are in Seattle's clutches again as Mukilteo, Edmonds and Alderwood are becoming "Seattle North."

Regarding Housing Action Plan - Low Income Subsidized Housing:

Mukilteo does not need or deserve another monstrous, ugly low-income housing project like the one that rose so fast across from Albertson's grocery center—we knew nothing about it as it started in a single block—then it doubled overnight and now continues for several more blocks in all directions. It may technically be on the Everett side of the street, but it is on main street in Mukilteo— and it is a blight. WHO should live there? Is this housing the answer to the homeless and illegal immigrant problem? I'm guessing this is exactly what's happening.

This HAP has been pushed forward on Mukilteo during the 2020 shutdown of government services. During this year and a half, you did not mail PUBLICITY on the progress of the current HAP for the Public to know the dramatic impact another such a plan will have on our nine-square mile city.

PUBLICITY is proactive— it means YOU take extra time and money to inform residents by mail what is coming up BEFORE action decisions are to be made. Please do this NOW!

TONIGHT: DO NOT VOTE TO APPROVE ANY MORE LOW-COST HOUSING PLANS FOR MUKILTEO!



85. 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 a 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://mukilteoowa.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](#)).
 - o 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.

April 15, 2021 11:49 AM – Dean (Dilep) Nayak⁴⁷

I would like to express my concern on the HAP planning. There should be planning on current and future housing needs but what should be taken into consideration is the resources available by the city and the consequences of the plan regardless of how noble they may be. This is a very small city with very limited resources but the city does not exist on an isolated island. There are surrounding cities within very close proximity that have adequate housing needs for all income levels. To have local government intervention that will only negatively impact the current way of life for the current population is something that I do not support. Already the Mukilteo Farmer's Market is gone, schools are over crowded, Lighthouse festival is on life support not to mention lack of public parks for children in the Harbour Pointe area. Roads have gotten considerably over crowded. High density and low income housing will only add to the slow degradation of our known way of life in this city. There doesn't seem to be real solutions for the current residents of the city just discussions on adding to the current problems. Again, this city is not on an isolated island and we should be taking into consideration the surrounding communities and what they have to offer.

I will attest that I am a disabled minority and I do not support the current HAP planning as it exists. Please consider the true consequences of the planning beyond just studies being completed by outside agencies that do not have a vested interest in the quality of life of this city.

⁴⁷ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



86. 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.



87. 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.



88. Nielson, Kael

June 7, 2021 11:27 AM – Kael Neilson – To Electeds

I am writing to urge you to vote NO on the HAP.

My husband and I moved to Mukilteo 15 years ago and fell in love with its serenity, quaintness, and feeling of safety. These are the things that have kept us here all these years. These are the reasons we bought a house in Harbour Pointe and are raising our three children here. We pay a premium to live in a beautiful, quiet, safe community made up of single-family dwellings.

In fact, the primary reason we still live in the Seattle area is because of our love for the Mukilteo community. We do not wish it to become another Lynnwood or Everett or Mountlake Terrace. My family has no interest in living in a suburb with affordable housing and the accompanying parking issues, overcrowding, trash, petty crime, and transient population. If Mukilteo becomes this, we will leave.

Mukilteo is unlike any other suburb in the Seattle area; let's keep it that way.

I ask you all, as elected officials and public servants, to serve us well by preserving the uniqueness of our beautiful city.

Your duty is to us, the people of Mukilteo. Please honor us by voting NO on the HAP.



89. Norman, Mary

March 5, 2021 4:00 PM – Mary Norman

I disagree with your determination of non-significance for the HAP.

First and foremost, this should be presented to the citizens of Mukilteo and ultimately put to a vote. I do not appreciate this HAP process being shoved down our throats.

The HAP is the biggest threat ever posed to the citizens of Mukilteo.

I am horribly disappointed in the City of Mukilteo and its staff for attempting to put the HAP in place during this Covid Pandemic.

This needs to stop now.

March 8, 2021 8:05 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for submitting your comments on the City of Mukilteo Housing Action Plan (HAP)! As with all comments we receive, your comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council as the HAP process moves forward. You are welcome to submit a comment or question as often as you like throughout the HAP process.

Your input is critical for ensuring the strategies and recommendations in the HAP reflect the current and future needs of Mukilteo. We would like to hear from everyone. In addition to submitting a comment, you can stay involved by joining us at either of the two upcoming virtual meetings on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) project:

- ***City Council at 6 PM on Monday, March 8, 2021 (tonight)***
 - o Council will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This meeting is a work session, so Council will not be taking any written or verbal comments as part of this meeting. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link are available on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.
- ***Planning Commission at 7 PM on Thursday, March 18, 2021***
 - o Planning Commission will be discussing the draft Housing Action Plan.
 - o This is a discussion item. While Planning Commission will have time at the beginning of the meeting for general public comment, it will not be taking written or verbal comments as part of this agenda item. You are welcome to attend and listen to the meeting.
 - o The agenda and Zoom link will be available approximately five (5) days in advance of the meeting on the City's [Meetings, Agendas and Minutes](#) webpage.



A recording of the meetings will be available on the City's website. If you are unable to make it to the meetings, you are always welcome to:

- [Submit a comment on the City's Housing Action Plan website;](#)
- Mail a comment to City Hall at 11930 Cyrus Way, Mukilteo, WA 98275; or
- Join us at any of our virtual meetings this Spring!

Planning Commission will hold a public hearing and make a formal recommendation to City Council in April 2021. No decisions will be made until after a public hearing is held by City Council in late Spring 2021.

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



90. Nov, Anna

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Anna Nov – Via Facebook⁴⁸

Meeting Minute 02:48:09 - I am watching as well.

Meeting Minute 00:08:00 - And remember which of the council members are supporting this when we vote next time

Meeting Minute 00:08:00 - Marine for Mayor

Meeting Minute 00:16:00 - 100% Mr. Ellis! No to HAP

Meeting Minute 02:22:53 - 100% Jo Bogner! No to HAP!

Meeting Minute 02:26:13 - Thanks Sharon!

Meeting Minute 02:44:57 - I drove through Lynnwood today, i was pretty horrified with what they are doing in the Alderwood mall area.. can you imagine the gridlock during the holiday season??

Meeting Minute 02:51:53 - I have 2 school aged kids.. we are a young family, we OPPOSE the HAP

Meeting Minute 03:48:21 - Let the people vote

Meeting Minute 03:49:13 - Excellent!!

⁴⁸ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



91. Nowak, Doug

June 4, 2021 4:26 PM – Doug Nowak – To Electeds

I am a Mukilteo resident of 10 years with my wife and two young kids. We choose to live in Mukilteo because of the family friendly environment and schools. We love living in Mukilteo and plan to be here for decades.

I am strongly against the HAP due to the concern of increasing density when our schools are already over crowded and roads full of traffic. Increasing density with accessory dwelling units, condos, town homes and apartments will only increase the strain on our schools and infrastructure. Mukilteo should try to maintain the small town feel by promoting single family homes and not high density housing options.

Please vote against the proposed HAP.



92. Nurani, Alif (360 Hotel Group)

May 17, 2021 3:30 PM – Alif Nurani

Attached is my written testimony for the public hearing for the Housing Action Plan (HAP) this evening. I will also be reading the same during the public comment.

Attachment



Testimony to Mukilteo City Council

By Alif Nurani. 360 Hotel Group.

Monday, May 17, 2021

7 pm

Thank you for this opportunity to address the City Council on the topic of housing development and the HAP in Mukilteo. My name is Alif Nurani, and I represent 360 Hotel Group. Our affiliated companies own the Staybridge Suites hotel in Mukilteo as well as the 5-acre site across Harbour Place from the Staybridge Suites. We are a family-owned business with deep roots in the area, having owned and operated hotels in the Puget Sound area for over 45 years. We are long term owners and are committed to the communities where we operate.

I am here today to encourage the City Council to be flexible when adopting its decisions to enhance housing development in Mukilteo.

Our Staybridge Suites site, as well as the 5-acre site and other adjacent sites such as the Montessori School and industrial condos, is subject to a Development Agreement with design guidelines and land use designations. When we designed and built the Staybridge Suites in 2008, we worked closely with the City to enhance our development within the design guidelines of the Development Agreement and to create a hotel that would be befitting of our location.

At the time we built the Staybridge suites, we believed that the 5-acre parcel that was then owned by Harbour Properties and another entity would be developed into a retail town center. We romantically envisaged a smaller version of the Mill Creek Town Center, anchored by a local grocery store like a Met Market or a national chain like Trader Joes. We thought this would be a perfect complement to our Staybridge Suites hotel.

At the same time, the previous owners of the adjacent 5-acre site – which we now own – were unsuccessful in their continued quest to find anchor tenants for their town center concept. Since then, the online retail trends away from brick-and-mortar stores that had started 15 years ago – have only accelerated – which means that this 5-acre site will never be a retail or grocery store anchored development. When we approach grocery stores, they tell us that the way they calculate the local demand and market size is by drawing a circle with the proposed location as a center. When they do this, they get the Gulch and Puget Sound to the west and Paine Field to the east and to the south there are two large grocery stores — that easily meet the needs of the surrounding residents. This was the problem that the original owners faced 10-15 years ago and that we continue to face today, but now we also have online grocery shopping and Instacart. Covid 19 has accelerated the online retail trend even more.

About 6 years ago the original owners of the 5-acre vacant site realized they were not getting anywhere with the Town Center development and opted to sell. The proposed purchasers decided to develop a large-scale mixed-use development including over 400 units of studio and other apartment types. Note that at that time and still today, the underlying site zoning allows for housing, but the Development Agreement does not list housing as a specified use. We were able to purchase the site when the prospective buyers fell through.



Our plan has been to develop another upscale all-suites hotel on approximately 3 of the 5 acres and some other future development on the remaining 2 acres. However, several factors have come into play now, particularly with the pandemic. We are unsure what is happening with Boeing and their decisions may significantly impact the demand for room nights from the aerospace industry and the viability of a new hotel. The downward trends in grocery and retail have only been amplified during the pandemic. We therefore may need to develop the entire site in some other way if we believe that the demand for another hotel is no longer sufficient. I am constantly speaking to brokers. But the ONLY retail type of use that we have found is a 7-11 convenience store with a gas station. We do not want this, and we assume you do not either BUT it is permitted under the Development Agreement.

The only other feasible use is residential. I am receiving many requests to do a quality housing development. However, because the housing market has changed significantly in the past few years and because of high construction costs, some density enhancements beyond current zoning will be needed, of course with consultation with the City. Our site is ideal for higher end housing such as townhomes, apartments and similar.

At this point if density enhancements are not permitted on this site, we have the following options:

- (1) If hotel demand returns, we develop a hotel on part of the site and leave the rest empty.
- (2) Sell part of the site to a 7-11 store - gas station developer.
- (3) Leave the site empty and undeveloped for many more years.

I encourage the City Council to respect the **underlying zoning which is already in place** in order to incorporate housing in the Development Agreement and to allow density enhancements for housing use under the Development Agreement. We ask the City Council to enable the City to work with the site owners to develop housing that is both attractive and economically feasible.



93. O'Connor, Lani

July 6, 2020 7:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook⁴⁹

Recording Minute 1:45:53 – Please vote YES to sign the contract with Berk and proceed with the study. A needs assessment is required. We have a grant to fund the needs assessment. Part of the process includes public participating and feedback. No brainer...

Recording Minute 2:35:28 – I am hoping that our council is interested making data based decisions. This study will provide data as well as public feedback, which I assume our council would like to hear. Voting to have the study at no cost to citizens makes sense.

Recording Minute 2:58:05 – It's a study, not an action plan. No delay necessary. Vote tonight.

Recording Minute 3:07:25 – So disappointed in the motion councilmember Marine. Very short-sighted.

March 8, 2021 6:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook⁵⁰

Recording Minute 32:29 – Cottage housing. <https://lvpco.org/pdf/cottageHousingDev.pdf>

Recording Minute 1:02:32 – CM Marine, there is still opportunity to "not allow" cottages in certain zones. That might be a better way to maintain continuity in neighborhoods, than "over regulating" cottages by requiring public hearings?

Recording Minute 1:27:15 – CM Khan everyone has a right to participate and give comment - not just those that disagree with the discussion. As a CM, it seems that you should be listening to all comments also - not just those that are objecting.

Recording Minute 1:43:01 – CM Marine, it is important to list all of the details and options so that they can be part of a clear, specific decision making process. If high density is opposed by the citizens, then that will be reflected in the public comments. This is still under discussion and not at a detail level - keep listening to all comments, not just those you agree with.

May 17, 2021 7:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook⁵¹

Recording Minute 2:37:16 – Thank you CP Kneller for your knowledgeable comments on the need for some of the

⁴⁹ Facebook comments were provided in response to July 6, 2020 City Council meeting.

⁵⁰ Facebook comments were provided in response to March 8, 2021 City Council meeting.

⁵¹ Facebook comments were provided in response to May 17, 2021 City Council Public Hearing.



elements of the HAP plan. Not planning and addressing issues won't stop the growth. The HAP could be voted down and the city will still grow, traffic will still increase, more students will still be in our schools. Not planning for that will not make it stop growth.

Recording Minute 2:41:56 – Thank you CVP Champion for your comments clarifying that many of the HAP points are items that have needed to be addressed for a long time. Educating citizens regarding development, building rules and regulations before this meeting would have helped them understand some of the implications of the HAP and benefits of planning.

Recording Minute 2:49:12 – Thank you CM Emery to put some of the issues raised into perspective.

Recording Minute 2:52:11 – Thank you CM Crawford for pointing out that planning strategies are important to giving the citizens the environment they want to live in. Not sure why citizens think this is about low income housing? It is not.

Recording Minute 2:56:29 – CM Marine, politicizing the HAP and implying that voting the HAP down will solve the growth issues is in the area is misleading. Voting to change zoning is not apart of the HAP - that is always a possibility without the HAP and it is a change that has to be voted on either way.

June 7, 2021 12:17 AM – Lani O'Connor – To Electeds

The recommendations made in the Housing Action Plan Strategy Summary below should be approved by our council. The recommendations provide an opportunity to address some of our communities long-standing development/land use issues. More significantly, additional community input regarding the specifics of these recommendations can help shape the growth that our community will inevitably face, with or without the Housing Action Plan approval.

Based on comments, there has been much misinformation and misunderstanding regarding the possibilities of the HAP by the public and some council members. One of the primary misinterpretations is that the HAP will force changes to our community that will increase density and therefore growth in traffic and schools. The fact is that change and growth will happen within and surrounding our community regardless of the HAP.

Planning, land use and development regulations are complex issues not always easy to grasp. The items listed in the HAP Summary should be seen as potential tools that can be used to form a desirable community based on input by experts and community members.

Approving the HAP recommendations shown in the table below gives our citizens an opportunity to provide more specific feedback regarding the types of development they feel would be desirable in our community. For example, the public appears to feel strongly that high density apartments should not be allowed and that our Seniors should have additional housing options. “Not approving” the HAP strategy makes council unresponsive to those concerns and accomplishing those potential goals.

In deciding whether or not to vote for the HAP strategy recommendations, please take a proactive approach to affecting the future growth of our community by seeing the positive vision and opportunity provided by enacting these



recommendations.

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook⁵²

Meeting Minute 01:17:37 - The current proposed strategies for the HAP will benefit our community and provide additional opportunities for citizen input to shape our community. The strategies presented have taken into consideration the concern of citizens regarding density which is specifically related to zoning. The overall zoning of the city is not listed as something to be reviewed. If and when zoning was questioned, a public process would be required.

Another overall concern that was heard from citizens was senior housing options. Seniors that currently live in Mukilteo and are involved in our community are asking for housing options that more fit their needs. The recommendations of the HAP include reviewing and providing recommendations to meet these needs.

Meeting Minute 01:34:07 - Thank you CM Crawford for your informed questions.

Meeting Minute 01:38:11 - CM Crawford, I agree that approving the current HAP recommendations puts the control to shape our community in the hands of our city and citizens, not the other way around.

Meeting Minute 01:42:13 - The list of items in the HAP Strategy Summary are reflections of concerns and comments by citizens. This is work that should be done regardless of the HAP. Going through the review process will give citizens more opportunity to shape the growth in our community.

Meeting Minute 01:45:59 - Lee, the \$30,000 is irrelevant. Approving the recommendations that now reflect public concerns about density is a way to give citizens more opportunity to shape our community with the inevitable growth.

Meeting Minute 02:00:09 - In my opinion, the public has been listened to. The zoning review recommendation has been dropped in direct response to citizens concerns regarding density. Zoning generally determines the density of residential areas. Citizens gave lots of feedback on senior housing options specifically for those that live here and are involved in our community but no longer want a large home. Passing the current recommendations gives citizens even more input into how to regulate developments like cottage housing which are already allowed, but have lack of parking concerns. Cottage housing regulations could be revised to require adequate parking. Growth will happen, citizens should be able to shape our community with specific input on the regulations.

Meeting Minute 03:03:43 - The zoning component, which governs density was removed as a recommendation.

Meeting Minute 03:10:00 - I agree with your comments. There are many folks on this thread that clearly misunderstand this complicated process.

Meeting Minute 03:21:50 - CM Marine zoning is what drives density. So, taking the zoning review out of the HAP does indeed show that the staff have been responsive to the concerns of our citizens. In any case, all zoning changes are required to go through a public process and would allow further comment if a change was proposed that allowed more density.

⁵² Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



Meeting Minute 03:28:25 - CM Khan, really? If you think you don't like a vote, you try to postpone? What?

Meeting Minute 03:34:51 - CM Harris Improving Permit Processing is unrelated to the process the Old Town Project goes through for permit approval. So, opposing that addition will also have no effect on projects like the Old Town Project.

Meeting Minute 03:38:45 - CM Champion, the Old Town project is not governed by the HAP. It is governed by our current laws and regulations. Those that did not know they were living next to a commercially zoned site should have known, as it was in their best interest and clearly affected their property. Property owners have the right to develop their property - which is a direct quote from CM Marine.

Meeting Minute 03:42:05 - This takes us back to the question about grants and how we get money to support the items that need to be done.

Meeting Minute 03:55:58 - CM Marine, all the questions you are mentioning have already been asked of the citizens. Any vote would be an advisory vote.

Meeting Minute 03:58:17 - I'm not sure. It is definitely a question worth asking.

Meeting Minute 04:01:21 - The motion was already approved and the three items will go forward as the City of Mukilteo's response to the HAP, so it is now a non-issue.

Meeting Minute 04:04:20 - Most of the people commenting here don't know what is "going on".

Meeting Minute 04:05:45 - The motion was put before the council and they voted to proceed.

Meeting Minute 04:23:50 - Thank you to the councilmembers who chose to vote for three of the strategies mentioned in the HAP specifically related to the comprehensive plan (which has to be done anyway) and expanding senior housing options. Many citizens asked for this to be addressed and I am glad that at least some council members have the vision to see that and vote for it.

June 7, 2021 11:50 PM – Lani O'Connor – Via Facebook⁵³

Steve Schmalz All of what housing?

⁵³ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



94. Ohlfs, Carol

June 4, 2021 8:40 PM – Carol Ohlfs – Via HAP Comment Form

I fully support the housing action plan in Mukilteo. Thank you for taking on this important issue. I hope the city council votes to pass the plan because it will be a positive benefit to our community's economy, environment and social fabric.



95. 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.

June 7, 2021 1:02 PM – Fabienne Palu-Benson – To Electeds

I am writing ahead of the meeting on HAP to remind you that a huge majority of your constituents do not want high density housing in Mukilteo. It will seriously affect the school district with new schools being required to accommodate the students influx. As it stands, Kamiak is over capacity already with a lot of students having their classes in outside trailers. There are many reasons most of us chose to live in Mukilteo but one that everyone agrees on is that there are NOT a lot of high density housing. If we wanted this kind of environment we would have purchased in Everett or Bothell. You need to listen to your constituents and not follow the woke wave that is sweeping our nation.



96. Pao, Phillip

June 5, 2021 3:05 PM – Phillip Pao – Via HAP Comment Form

I am against HAP approval for Mukilteo. This issue has not been vetted sufficiently with residents. I just learned of this proposal today though informal social networks. Projects like these should have more visibility with residents before being approved.



97. 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.

January 7, 2021 10:07 PM - Charlie Pancerzewski – To Electeds

It is unfortunate you are not permitting public comment as the consultant's draft is very long and I do not have time to provide all my comments or to draft them in writing. So I will raise a few issues and hopefully you agree and will pursue them.

They say (p.19 among others) that HUD considers households spending too much on housing if spending is more than 30% of household income. They say spending for household includes utilities. Spending more than 30% is considered "cost-burdened" and more than 50% is "severely cost-burdened". They say 30% of households in Mukilteo are cost-burdened.

Page 43 shows how they calculate annual costs and how they calculate monthly and annual income needed to pay the costs of what they call Typical Home 2020 of \$632,600 and Lower Market Home 2020 of \$421,900. One problem is that they use an assumed current value and determine the mortgage payments, plus property tax and insurance. The utilities they say above are included are not included in the page 43 calculations. The biggest problem is they use today's home value to make the calculations. Yet we know that most home owners in Mukilteo did not buy their homes in 2020 and when they purchased their homes the values were much smaller and the mortgage payments were determined when they purchased the home.

Thus, most home owners of a current value home are paying much less than they would pay if they recently purchased the home. Their calculations appear to overstate the cost of housing by a large amount for most Mukilteo property owners. In order to say 30% of Mukilteo households are cost-burdened. Their way of calculating these costs show such cost calculations are very overstated and thus their statement that 30% of Mukilteo homeowners are cost-burdened is incorrect. In fact, most Mukilteo owners can afford to pay for their annual home costs. Most purchased their homes when the value was less and most have had increases in income since they purchased their homes.

For a non-Mukilteo person who wants to buy a home in Mukilteo the consultant's calculations may be closer to reality for that person, but not for 30% of home owners.

If Mukilteo home prices are what they say they are, why are homes sold so quickly with few on the market at what they consider affordable. When a person buys a house they typically have to have a significant down payment and the bank or other lending institution checks their financial ability to purchase and to pay the costs of ownership. Thus, most every person who purchases a home in Mukilteo has the resources to pay the costs to own that home, hardly a burden for most to have sufficient income to pay for their costs of ownership.

If buyers cannot afford a house they usually look for one that is lower priced. On the other hand, if more buyers can afford to pay more the price of homes will be bid up and that has been the case in Mukilteo for a few years.

I cannot accept that so many households are burdened or over burdened as foreclosures are few, if any.



Residents do not need affordable housing as they are already home owners if they own a home. They are not looking to sell their home and buy a much lower priced home in Mukilteo. Who are we/they trying to satisfy with developing lower cost housing? Lower cost for whom? Non residents that do not live here?

Why has there been such an increase in home values? More demand than supply. Why is demand so high? Because a lot of people have been encouraged to move here to work. Mukilteo has not had much unemployment so most new jobs that pay a better amount are attractive to move here and live here. Mukilteo has not had high unemployment so new jobs require people to move here or to our area to fill those jobs. Who has created all those new jobs? The state and developers have encouraged people to move here, not that the people who live here want more people to move here. When a lot more people move here, such as being due to the so called Boeing subsidy that actually applied to all aerospace companies until recently, attracted a lot of new people that needed housing. They also need more schools and infrastructure. They do not pay for much of that which falls on the shoulders of current residents who have to spend huge amounts to pay for this. One should turn to those who attracted so many people to move here to pay for it or to let them pay for the added costs their moving to our area create. Or if they cannot afford to live here without some sort of subsidy they can return to where they came from or move to some other area.

The consultants do not show how much of a house a family with annual income of \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 can afford and compare that to current home values to see if the affordable home price has to be so low that people with these income levels could in no way expect to see homes selling for that amount.

As to renters, rents are based on what rental rates are for similar units in the area, not just Mukilteo. Landlords will charge as much as they can and rents can go up or down depending on the competition. If a similar apartment in Everett rents for a lot less than a similar apartment in Mukilteo, most will select the apartment in Everett and commute to a job here if they have one here. Most who work in Mukilteo live elsewhere which is what the consultants say and most who live in Mukilteo work elsewhere. That has been the case for many years. Rents are not based on the market value of the apartment. Rents are based on how much the landlord can charge.

There are many questions not raised above due to the limits on my time to draft comments. If you get the above satisfactorily answered, then we can ask more. Why is the City and its current residents responsibilities for non residents who would just like to reside in Mukilteo but currently do not. Our residents and taxpayers should be doing what is best for them and not for non residents. We have no responsibility for non residents.

January 11, 2021 12:54 AM – Charlie Pancerzewski

You know that to determine if a homeowner is what they call cost burdened they have to know two things about each home in Mukilteo. They have to know the current cost of household spending for a home and the income of the homeowner. Only in that way can they determine if the homeowner is paying more than 30% or 50% of the homeowner's income. This is different for each home and I know they do not have the cost of household spending for each home in Mukilteo and also do not know the income of the specific homeowner of each house.

So how do they determine how many homes are "cost burdened" or "severely cost burdened"? They cannot.

For example, my income is very low. I do not have a mortgage but my property taxes and insurance are a significant



amount and for homes like mine, we are in the Port of Everett boundary--- about 50% of the real estate in Mukilteo, so the property taxes of those in the Port district are a higher percentage with taxes we pay to the Port. That means the above calculations would be much more complex as the consultants would have to take those added property taxes into account which are different depending where a home is located in Mukilteo.

Page 9 shows that 970 homes are severely cost burdened which means more than 50% of income of each owner of those homes is being paid for the mortgage, property tax, insurance etc. Please ask the consultants to show you how they determined the homeowner expenses and their income for each home to make that determination. It is highly unlikely this is factual so I want to see the calculations. You should want to know too. After all, you are paying the consultants \$100,000 to do this.

June 6, 2021 4:04 PM – Charlie Pancerzewski – To Electeds

For those who attended or listened to the Coffee With Council meeting last Saturday you know most of the hour was spent discussion HAP. I believe there were about 20 who spoke up against approval of HAP and no one who spoke in favor. That has ben the consistent feeling of residents in prior public meetings where they have the opportunity to speak. There are a few developers and realtors who have spoken in favor and most of them do not reside in Mukilteo. They just want you to approve HAP so they will have an opportunity to have more to build and sell, not because it is good for residents.

Several Councilmembers have said over the past year that paying a consultant to gather information about housing in Mukilteo would save the City a lot of time and money to gather information the City will need for the 2024 update of the Comprehensive Plan. You know City staff spent a large amount of time to assist the consultants in this process, much more than anyone anticipated. So the amount of time saved is questionable and staff time costs the City money.

In any case, the information you wanted for 2024 has been obtained and City staff is thoroughly familiar with it. No further consultant time is to be spent gathering more data. Thus, you do not have to approve the HAP to obtain the data. You do spend \$30,000 by not approving the HAP but that is a small amount to avoid the many problems the City would face for many years if HAP is approved. As the consultants and staff have said, approval is just the start and each recommendation will require separate additional work, public hearings and disputes, probably legal issues, that will cause continuous problems as a result of adopting HAP.

Hundreds of residents have told you they are not in favor of HAP. You are supposed to be representing Mukilteo residents, not those who do not live here or pay taxes here. You represent us and know that most everyone is against HAP. Why would you vote to approve something almost every resident you have heard from is against it. Residents like Mukilteo the way it is and purchased their homes at considerable cost to live in our great uncrowded environment. All the HAP suggestions require change to that environment with more increased intensity which residents do not want. Increased intensity reduces the great living conditions we now have and pay for.

You should not even hesitate to vote “no” on HAP to support the strong desire of those you say you represent. You live here too. Why would you want to live here if the environment is changed? The residents are against HAP and you should be too—because you represent the residents and because you live here too. It will impact you as one of the more



than 21,000 residents who live here.

The \$30,000 cost to vote “no” is small change compared to the future costs and problems HAP would bring to the people who live here. If for some reason residents want to consider changes to intensity of living or other changes that might have been considered under HAP you are able to pursue those matters without having HAP as HAP is not required in order to do that.

Voting “no” has the full support of the residents and you can show them you listen to their views and carry them out as their representatives.



98. 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



99. 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 Baldridge | 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 Debrelon 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 Fettters | 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 |
| 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 Huntings Ln |
| Saoirse Palu-Benson | 4801 Huntings 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 Debrelon 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 & Rosario 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 Mukilteo⁵⁴

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.

⁵⁴ Forwarded to City on July 15, 2020 at 3:04 PM.



December 30, 2020 4:45 AM – Preserve Mukilteo⁵⁵



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 feet⁵⁶. 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.⁵⁷ 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

Peter Zieve, temporary chairman

⁵⁵ Forwarded to City on December 31, 2020 at 2:49 PM.

⁵⁶ Current height limits in Mukilteo can be found online at:

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

⁵⁷ See response to Peter Zieve, sent December 4, 2020 8:20 AM – Lauren Balisky.



10517 62nd Pl W, Mukilteo

4252934203



100. 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 an educated, well-informed decision at the November elections.



101. Rees, Stephanie

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Stephanie Rees – Via Facebook⁵⁸

Meeting Minute 02:21:33 - NO HAP PLEASE!!!

⁵⁸ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



102. 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.

March 5, 2021 4:10 PM – Mike Reilly – Via HAP Comment Form

The current issue that we have with the HAP is lack of onsite parking. If current and future development is to occur there must be ample room to park off the street. Look around the area in denser areas and you'll find streets lined with cars and of course trash. Unacceptable.



103. 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 [Systima 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!



104. Rilov, Anna

June 6, 2021 9:36 PM – Anna Rilov – To Electeds

There are 3 voting members in our household and we will be keeping a close eye on how the council members will vote tomorrow on the HAP.

As residents of Mukilteo, we urge you to please OPPOSE the HAP. We do not want high density construction in Mukilteo. This is one of the reasons why we moved from Lynnwood.



105. 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.

January 8, 2021 10:49 PM – Donald Ripley

Elected,

We are adding our names to the letter below by Charlie Pancerzewski⁵⁹. Many of us in Old Town are extremely concerned about the push for “affordable housing”.

We have a huge development up the speedway that will affect all of us. We are also surrounded by “affordable housing” with more on the way (Lynnwood and

Everett). Any more would be extremely detrimental to our way of life and add to the already overcrowding we are experiencing. It is unnecessary and the reasons

given by the city do not make any sense. Please reconsider and remove this from further discussion.

April 14, 2021 9:08 PM – Donald Ripley – To Electeds⁶⁰

We are extremely opposed to any further push for “affordable housing”. There are many areas people cannot afford to live in. If you cannot afford to live in Mukilteo then wait until you can afford it like I am waiting to afford to live on Nantucket. This is ridiculous. There are many things people want but cannot afford - housing is one of them. Mukilteo and its residents should not have to figure out how to create lower priced homes any more than they need to figure out how to provide more affordable food, clothing, cars or any other item someone wants or needs. There is plenty of lower priced housing outside our city limits and there is no reason or responsibility of our council to take steps to try to provide less expensive housing to people who do not live in Mukilteo or just want to come here. Our council is elected to represent the residents of Mukilteo not people who live elsewhere.

There should be no reason to increase housing density that impacts existing residents who paid a price to live in our current environment and do not want to take steps to change that living environment that will reduce what we all paid

⁵⁹ See January 7, 2021, comment from Charlie Pancerzewski.

⁶⁰ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



a lot to obtain. Increasing density will reduce the environment we paid to live in and reduce the value of our homes. The council should want what the residents they represent want, not what some government politicians have decided we should do for non residents. We should not follow what other cities are doing for political reasons.

Mukilteo should cancel the HAP and pay whatever the amount is for cancelling. The question to the committee should have been asked is “should the city do nothing to change the living environment?” This process is designed to come up with options and recommendations the state and consultants want and to get the answers they want to recommend NOT what the citizens desire. Please cancel HAP now.



106. 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

January 28, 2021 4:39 PM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form

Thank you for taking out comments. I look at Mukilteo as a special place to live. If you look at the history you will know it didn't come about on its own. Many citizens worked together to slow growth, fight for safety, keeping population low and keeping a quality of life we all enjoy. It would be devastating and unfair to destroy this. As stated previously we are surrounded by multi family, affordable housing. For the good of the citizens and if you care about our city do not submit to this HAP agenda.

March 1, 2021 3:43 PM – Renee Ripley – Via HAP Comment Form

I am a 5th generation Mukilteo resident. We feel the HAP agenda is being pushed by the state and needs to be completely rejected. We have studied all this in the past, discussed it and were hoping all this would be behind us. Labeled by different names, it all comes down to more growth, more traffic and a lower quality of life for sure. There are multiple apartments, condos, etc. going up very quickly surrounding us - Lynnwood and Everett as we speak. Nothing we have read in the documents even comes close to making a case FOR more housing. Our neighbors are vehemently against this project. I think you all know this so we will help you out by writing once again and stating stop the HAP plan. It's bad for citizens and bad for Mukilteo. Our taxes continue to go up. Citizens deserve a better quality of life and to preserve the quality of life they moved here for. Thank you.



107. Robinson, Kathy

March 3, 2021 3:55 PM – Kathy Robinson

I oppose the Housing Action Plan (HAP) and dispute the recent findings of Determining Non Significance (DNS). For me, it will be very significant if Mukilteo becomes a city with denser housing as it was just what I was trying to avoid when I moved here 13 years ago.

I am a 3rd generation landlord, I know very well that denser housing and lower rent prices always brings in more suspicious behavior, crime, tenant turn-over and disputes between neighbors; in addition to wear and tear on our roads and crowding of schools.

Car prowls are up in Mukilteo and this will surely continue as city leaders advocate for situations that will place more cars parked on the streets. I also recall that under Joe Marine's leadership as mayor in 2011, Mukilteo was once voted as one of the top ten places to live by Money Magazine. Now it has slipped to number 42 in the rankings.

Please do not continue to push the HAP, and instead focus on safety and traffic issues.

March 3, 2021 4:52 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for sending your comments to the City of Mukilteo about the [draft Housing Action Plan \(HAP\)](#), available online in the [HAP Project Library](#). This email is to acknowledge receipt, and to confirm that we will be adding you to our Parties of Interest list for future project updates.

As with all comments we receive, your comment will be provided to the Planning Commission and again to City Council as part of the public hearing process for the HAP. 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 further assistance, and I hope you have a great week.

May 18, 2021 11:29 AM – Kathy Robinson

On May 17th I made my first attempt to join a zoom meeting. I'm not techno savvy so it was a learning experience for me, but I got the volume on about 20 minutes in to the meeting.....hopefully I will do better next time.

I did notice something on a document that was presented during the City Council May 17th meeting, it was discussing how many comments were "for" and "against" HAP and mentioned that 63% of the comments were from a group called "Preserve Mukilteo." I'm not sure why that detail was worth noting. I am wondering how it was determined that commentators were part of the Preserve Mukilteo group? Did the commentators identify themselves as members of Preserve Mukilteo? and if they did not, then who categorized them as current members and what determining factors were used?.....I ask because I am curious of the accuracy of this claim. I have been very vocal about being against HAP and I have never been part of Preserve Mukilteo and want to make sure I was not mistakenly counted as one of the



members.....but I also don't think members' voices should be discounted.....If Mukilteo City Planners used speculation to come up with the "63%" claim or if the claim is not accurate, then it should be removed from the report.

The tally count for how many people voiced being "for" or "against" HAP should be: (1 person = 1 tally) and I would love to see the numbers presented that way.

May 18, 2021 1:04 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for attending and I'm glad you were able to make the technology work! Zoom does have some good videos and tutorials on their [Help Center](#), if that would be useful.

The April 2021 version of the [HAP Attachment 3 – Community Input](#) (available in the [HAP Project Library](#)) includes all of the written comments received by this department, whether via email, the [HAP online comment form](#), or on the City's Facebook page. Normally, we provide Council a copy of the originals, however due to the volume of comments the formatting would have unnecessarily added many pages to the packet. As staff, it is our role to provide the comments as presented. Most comments included multiple topics, and tended to be a mix of likes, dislikes and concerns. We generally do not track "for" or "against" since comments are rarely that simple.

Attachment 3 includes:

- A high-level summary of commenters and themes, based on previous Council feedback requesting metrics on the quantity of comments;
- A time-based summary of comments by date, which provides a very high-level overview of each comment – again, we wanted to let the comments speak for themselves;
- A copy of each comment in full, by commenter, in date/time order; and
- An index of common topics.

The list of people who signed the Preserve Mukilteo petition is available on .pdf page 141 (document page 139) and .pdf page 181 (document page 179). We do not show you on the list sent to us then, and the City has not received an updated list since June 2020. In other words, signees to Preserve Mukilteo are self-identified, and we have not counted your projects as part of comments submitted by members of that group.

For all land use projects, we track written comments, both to keep those interested parties informed as the project moves through review and to address concerns as we are able. We also attempt to understand whether the comments we are receiving are representative, and whether we are doing adequate outreach to hear a variety of perspectives. As a point of information, the individuals who signed the Preserve Mukilteo petition make up about 2% of the City's population, and so we would expect the proportion of comments to be similar. What the 63% tells us is that the City is hearing disproportionately from one group. This is neither good nor bad, just something for Council to consider as part of all public testimony and participation.

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



May 18, 2021 1:33 PM – Kathy Robinson

Thank you for your very informative reply, it explains everything. Also thank you for the ZOOM help link. If anyone sees me on ZOOM in a future meetings please be patient as this tech is all new to me.

May 29, 2021 1:00 PM – Kathy Robinson – Via Facebook⁶¹

Approximate Recording Minute 0:30:00 – Another concern with HAP.....Golf courses across the USA are struggling financially and it's been in the news that many have been sold to developers. On social media a Mukilteo resident who lives on the golf course is reporting that Harbour Pointe golf course is owned by the same entity that owns Newcastle Golf Course in Bellevue and owner has recently applied to put a hotel on Newcastle Golf Course. Both Newcastle and Harbour Pointe golf courses were recently sold to Chinese Conglomerate HNA Holdings which is a real estate developing company.....If true, how worried should Mukilteo residents who live in Harbour Pointe be, especially if city moves forward with HAP? One would hope city council and mayor would have their back!

⁶¹ In reference to a Coffee with Council discussion. A video is available at https://fb.watch/5_tcyAgjb2/.



108. 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.



109. 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.



110.Rudd, Brandon

June 6, 2021 5:31 PM – Brandon Rudd – To Electeds

I'll be on the meeting Monday night however wanted to chime in regarding rejecting HAP. I moved here years ago and don't want to see our fair town burdened with the plight of so many other cities.

Please reject HAP!

June 7, 2021 9:32 PM – Brandon Rudd – To Electeds

After discussing HAP with Coulcilperson Crawford this afternoon, and sitting through the meeting since 7 PM, I'm really hoping you listen to the feedback tonight and reject HAP. Council member Marine stated it so clearly...why are we making a problem when we don't have one.

My laptop battery is about to expire, however I'm hoping to hear this was rejected in full.



111. Sackner, Denise

June 6, 2021 7:38 AM – Denise Sackner – Via HAP Comment Form

There is quite a bit of information on the city page about HAP, however, it is unclear what's in it for the residents and property owners. Does this add value to the city in some way? What is the impact on our schools and traffic if we are expediting new housing? In general, i am against high density housing in mukilteo. This isn't the reason we moved here. Traffic and parking are already a major issue. It is difficult see the benefits.

June 6, 2021 7:42 AM – Denise Sackner – To Electeds

I'm struggling to see how the HAP helps the city and it's current residents. There has been very little to no information about how it would help a homeowner when most of us are stuck in traffic, have one very crowded store to shop at and parking in many businesses and parks is an issue.

Vote no.

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Denise Sackner – Via Facebook⁶²

Meeting Minute 00:44:37 - How can we accomodate the increased density of the city without compromising the quality of life in Mukilteo?

Meeting Minute 01:12:18 - feels a bit like we are very focused on some kind of busy work to tick a box vs thinking holistically about and planning for what the residents of the city want for the future

⁶² Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



112. 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 garenteed 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.



113. Sapp, Wanda

March 5, 2021 12:53 PM – Wanda Sapp – Via HAP Comment Form

I am opposed to the City of Mukilteo accepting the HAP grant. Our family moved to Mukilteo over 20 years ago, during which time I commuted to Seattle 5 days a week. Did this because I wanted my family to grow up in a single family neighborhood, and not live in a dense area nearer to Seattle. Our traffic here is already challenging in the afternoon with Ferry Traffic, Boeing Traffic, and High School Traffic (before Covid.) We also don't have the social services to provide like those offered in bigger cities. Pls don't do this to our beautiful City of Mukilteo.



114. 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).¹³

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 Form⁶³

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.

⁶³ 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.



115. Schmalz, Steve

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Steve Schmalz – Via Facebook⁶⁴

Meeting Minute 01:38:13 - If the City has to wait for the growth figures from the County and then may only need to “tweak” the Comprehensive Plan” according to the Berk rep, then why the need of the HAP? This makes little sense.

Meeting Minute 01:47:13 - How much population growth are we discussing.? If the city is 98-99% built out.

Meeting Minute 03:19:02 - Where is all this housing going to be built?

June 8, 2021 1:08 AM – Steve Schmalz – Via Facebook⁶⁵

Senior housing. Do you know of any parcels of land that are available to build another senior living center or smaller homes with all the services needed? The city now is 98-99% built out.

⁶⁴ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.

⁶⁵ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



116. 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 withing 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

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*



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.



117. Schumann, Leslie

March 5, 2021 1:26 PM – Leslie Schumann – Via HAP Comment Form

I am also a school bus driver. Since the apartments have gone up on Mukilteo speedway, during the school year (normal year, that is) When School lets out it becomes almost a parking lot. Further as I drive side-streets even now they are more crowded with parked cars than ever before. Further with the current culture of Jay-walking wherever, bicycles that move from sidewalk to street at a moments thought, it's even more dangerous on our streets for both the pedestrian, bicyclist and motorist. Surely you can understand that unless you have made plans to improve egress from and through our neighborhoods, traffic in and around Mukilteo will become not only more congested, but stressful for humans trying to make their way through.

Further, I have noticed an up-tick in graffiti in our area that the Roads department is not able to keep up with. Bringing in more affordable housing has shown to decrease the cleanliness and beauty of a location. All you have to do is go to places that have the same housing plan and view the aftermath. This will lower our housing prices and affect us directly. Aren't you in place to protect and improve our lives?

Changing our living circumstances in our town should come with a well thought-out plan on how you will assure it doesn't affect our neighborhoods in a negative way. I haven't seen that plan yet. Please re-think and take your time to assure a truly zero impact change on our neighborhoods.



118. 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 believe 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



119.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

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 shown 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://joebiden.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 an



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!



120. 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.



121. Stevens, Anne-Marie

June 7, 2021 2:00 PM – Anne-Marie Stevens – To Electeds

I am writing ahead of the meeting on HAP to remind you that a huge majority of your constituents do not want high density housing in Mukilteo.

It will seriously affect the school district with new schools being required to accommodate the students influx. The reason we chose to live in Mukilteo is that there is not a lot of high density housing. If we wanted this kind of environment we would have purchased it in Everett or Bothell.

It will also require new schools and therefore higher taxes. You need to listen to your constituents.



122. Stewart, Sherry

June 6, 2021 4:25 PM – Sherry Stewart – To Mayor Gregerson

You do not have backing of constituents. Turn back. Let's plan something that will be an example for many communities. Show some integrity. Rethink this please. It's almost too late.

Sherry Stewart.

Few are backing this housing situation.



123.Stollwerck, Christina

March 5, 2021 12:18 PM – Christina Stollwerck – Via HAP Comment Form

Hi, Demographics are changing. That is a fact. We have a large portion of Mukilteans aging / will be aging out of their homes, but still desire to live in our great city close to their families. Problem is - there is a distinct lack of senior housing available. One solution is ADU / Cottage Homes type construction. We have a relatively high price for any kind of "starter home" - average cost of a home in Mukilteo is: \$683,700. I know when I graduated college (paid for myself), and was working my first real job with benefits (\$12.00/hr. to start in 1999, which would be about \$18/hr today), and had one child in daycare, I certainly could not afford a mortgage payment of \$5K per month, and all utilities. Where are all our young families going to be able to "buy into" our great neighborhood? Its sad our own kids graduating college can't afford to buy a home in our same neighborhoods? ADU's may not be a perfect answer, as I understand Mr. Zieve's trepidation and fear of ADU's becoming rentals in disrepair. But I am an optimist - I see ADU's as a way of increasing the opportunity for folks to be a part of the community. I also own two rental home properties. Proper management of rental properties does not create "bad tenant" situations, but "great neighbor" opportunities! The only request I have is that parking be addressed. Understanding our neighbors enjoy life, have friends who like to visit, and we are a car and boating culture. Large apartment complexes like Caravel and newer developments which only have one spot, or a two car garage, and no additional parking for things like boats, RV's and toys - not be used as examples of sufficient parking. We use public transportation for work commutes, but we all have vehicles for everything else. Any cottage style housing should have a dedicated "lot" that is for guests, overflow parking, and the owners toys. This would prevent the issue of nuisance vehicles.



124. Storr, Melissa

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Melissa Storr – Via Facebook⁶⁶

Meeting Minute 03:59:54 - An advisory vote seems like a waste of taxpayer money...

Meeting Minute 04:05:52 - Lani O'Connor agreed.

⁶⁶ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



125.Sullivan, Paula

January 9, 2021 9:20 AM – Paula Sullivan

Elected/Muk Clerk-

Please admit these comments as part of the HAP meeting as public record.

As someone who was an apartment property manager for 10 + years. I agree with everything the 2 letters express from my neighbors below⁶⁷.

Workers need higher wages, that is where the problem lies. Also- Dogs were factored into the equation-that is ridiculous !! Apartment dwellers should not have pets anyway. They are a dirty /noisy nuisance and were never allowed in the apartments I managed. Don't blame the dogs, blame the renters. And CARS, CARS, CARS.....traffic, etc.

Another factor effecting the lack of affordable housing problem is all the GREEDY property owners' who rent out their (extra) dwellings on short term rent/vacation rental platforms- AIR BnB and Venmo, etc, etc . RATHER than renting their extra dwellings (houses or rooms) on multiple year leases to people who actually need housing that work and want to live in the area and/or are looking for a shared home or roommates. These people are part of the problem.

June 7, 2021 11:30 AM – Paula Sullivan – To Electeds

Please make this email an official entry for tonight's meeting.

For reasons already submitted by me and numerous Mukilteo residents and neighbors VIA EMAIL AND bEACON ARTICLES

and as a 2NO HAP-NO HAP - NO HAP-NO HAP-NO- HAP-NO- HAP NO HAP-NO HAP -NO HAP-NO HAP NO HAP-NO HAP5 year RESIDENTS & VOTERS.....

DO NOT VOTE YES on HAP.

NO HAP-NO HAP - NO HAP-NO HAP-NO- HAP-NO- HAP NO HAP-NO HAP -NO HAP-NO HAP NO HAP-NO HAP

NO HAP-NO HAP - NO HAP-NO HAP-NO- HAP-NO- HAP NO HAP-NO HAP -NO HAP-NO HAP NO HAP-NO HAP

NO HAP-NO HAP - NO HAP-NO HAP-NO- HAP-NO- HAP NO HAP-NO HAP -NO HAP-NO HAP NO HAP-NO HAP

⁶⁷ See January 7, 2021 comments from Charlie Pancerzewski and January 8, 2021 comments from Donald Ripley.



126. Swann, Sharon

March 3, 2021 2:12 PM – Sharon Swann

Dear Mukilteo City Leaders/Council members. The purpose of my email is to respond to the Housing Action Plan (HAP) and question the recent findings of Determining Non Significance (DNS).

Mukilteo citizens like myself and many more believe very strongly that going forward with the HAP will drastically change Mukilteo in the future and not in a good way.

I have lived in Mukilteo now for over 29 years. I chose this community for the small town feeling, good schools, safety and many other reasons. Now leaders (SOME OF WHO DON'T EVEN LIVE IN MUKILTEO) have determined to undermine the wishes of the majority of residents. We are very concerned with real estated values, school overcrowding, crime, traffic and turning Mukilteo into a larger town that it has not been for many years.

Please forward this to other council members.

March 3, 2021 2:19 PM – Jennifer Gregerson

Thanks for your message- I have forward it on to the full Council (at elected@mukilteowa.gov).

March 4, 2021 9:05 AM – Sharon Swann – Via HAP Comment Form⁶⁸

Dear Mukilteo City Leaders/Council members. The purpose of my email is to respond to the Housing Action Plan (HAP) and question the recent findings of Determining Non Significance (DNS).

Mukilteo citizens like myself and many more believe very strongly that going forward with the HAP will drastically change Mukilteo in the future and not in a good way.

I have lived in Mukilteo now for over 29 years. I chose this community for the small town feeling, good schools, safety and many other reasons. Now leaders have determined to undermine the wishes of the majority of residents. We are very concerned with real estated values, school overcrowding, crime, traffic and turning Mukilteo into a larger town that it has not been for many years.

April 15, 2021 9:25 PM – Sharon Swann – To Electeds

I was quite surprised by the comments of Nicole Thomsen and Skip Ferderber this evening regarding the public comments spoken this everning were based on FEAR. Also, as well as Nicole Thomsen comments around she did not

⁶⁸ This appears to be a copy of Sharon Swann's comments from March 3, 2021 at 2:12 PM. For this reason, this comment is not indexed.



know "how our community is defined". Is Nicole not listening, did she not hear the general sentiment of the people making comments during the public comment section of the meeting this evening? She is demonstrating a total lack of understanding what the community is trying to relay to our council members. I can assure you that the general sentiment of Mukilteo residents is not based on fear at all. The residents of Mukilteo are proactively and collectively trying to preserve the character and definition of Mukilteo, which can be easily be defined as follows:

1. Small town atmosphere
2. Beautiful surroundings of natural beauty - including the Sound, natural forests, etc
3. A cohesive, safe, prosperous and happy place which is free of poverty and crime, providing a high quality of life for everyone that lives here.
4. Excellent schools
5. Historical society and lighthouse that we are all proud of
6. Low crime rates (as of now) or at least remain petty crimes
7. We will always have the poor and rich - and life's outcome is based on too many factors to mention here (individual responsibility, education, motivation, just to name a few)

June 7, 2021 10:11 AM – Sharon Swann – To Electeds

I know our council folks have heard the concerns around HAP and the majority of residents really don't like the idea of HAP at all.

Please consider voting NO on HAP.

Thank you for your consideration!



127.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.



128. 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.



129. Temmer, Beverly

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Beverly Temmer – Via Facebook⁶⁹

Meeting Minute 02:34:13 - Zeive! No!

⁶⁹ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



130. 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.



131. 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 were 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 pandoras 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, etc. 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 – Lauren Balisky

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:

- 1) Vacant (empty, and has complete capacity available under the current zoning)
- 2) Underdeveloped (not developed to the full extent under current zoning, and may have capacity for additional housing units or jobs)
- 3) 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!

February 16, 2021 2:56 PM – Donna Vago

Due to personal reasons it was impossible for me to attend the final SAG meeting. I would however like to send my final thoughts in summary Via email to share with the group.

The data collected and presented by Berk Consulting does not support action be taken by the City. The projected growth in population is relatively low, and coupled with the projected decline of industry in this area any action taken would be a zero and possibly a negative sum endeavor. Additionally, an increase in public transportation would be needed to justify such a housing plan. Also considering that the City is lacking buildable land the actions taken would be to increase housing density by rezoning and repurposing lands for any future building projects.

The negative effects of allowing the City to apply HB1923 to bring additional Affordable Housing are broad in scope. Among the greatest of my concerns are Rezoning, overriding Environmental laws, and changing Permitting laws and processes.

HB1923 encourages rezoning of single family neighborhoods to allow Duplexes and Tripleplexes to be built on corner lots. While also allowing for fewer parking spaces in higher density housing units. In my view this would have a large impact on single family home owners and increase street parking. As a personal testament one of my neighbors rents rooms in his house and a total of nine cars, of which 3-4 are parked in the driveway, often block use of the street.

The law also states current Environmental laws may be ignored in favor of construction of buildings and can NOT be challenged in court.

Also changing Permitting laws and processes that are potentially there to protect safety of occupants and make it difficult for any disputes to be challenged and reviewed has potential negative impacts on existing residents.



February 16, 2021 4:37 PM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for sending in your comments and I do hope you (and/or your family) are ok.

I would like to clarify that there were two distinct options under HB 1923 (codified as [RCW 36.70.600](#)):

- 1) Cities could adopt changes to their comprehensive plan, development regulations, and/or subarea plans from the menu of items; or
- 2) Cities could develop a Housing Action Plan.

Under Option 1 (which the City did not pursue), the law specifically exempts associated environmental determinations from appeal (RCW 36.70A.600(3)) and specifically exempts the actions taken from legal challenge (RCW 36.70A.600(4)). These exemptions only apply to changes to the comprehensive plan, development regulations, and/or subarea plans adopted under HB 1923. It does not exempt these proposals from completing the environmental review process, nor does it automatically extend to any subsequent proposed development.

These exemptions are specific to Option 1 and do not apply to HAPs developed under Option 2.

For the parking issue: if cars in the street are parked illegally and/or creating a barrier to emergency access, please call the Police Department non-emergency line at **425-407-3999** and an officer will be dispatched.

February 16, 2021 5:11 PM – Donna Vago

Thank you for clarifying this Lauren. I will revise the letter.

February 17, 2021 8:48 AM – Donna Vago

The data collected and presented by Berk Consulting does not support action be taken by the City. The projected growth in population being relatively low and coupled with the projected decline of industry in this area any action taken may be a negative sum endeavor.

Additionally, an increase in public transportation would be needed to justify parts of the housing plan. Also considering that the City is lacking buildable land the actions taken would be to increase housing density by rezoning and repurposing lands for any future building projects.

The negative effects of allowing the City to apply HB1923 to bring additional Affordable Housing must be taken into consideration in the overall arguments.

Among the greatest of my concerns are Rezoning and changing Permitting laws and processes.

HB1923 encourages rezoning of single family neighborhoods to allow Duplexes and Triples to be built on corner lots. While also allowing for fewer parking spaces in higher density housing units. In my view this would have a large impact on single family home owners and increase street parking.



Finally changing Permitting laws and processes has the potential to encourage unchecked growth, override building standards and may not allow for disputes to be settled in a timely manner.

February 27, 2021 12:46 PM – Donna Vago

Subject: HAP: Feb 27: Address to City Council

RE: Applying logic to the facts and data of the HAP document and subsequent course of action.

The HAP report supports HB1923 and not the needs of the City. These two documents share most of the same language in definitions and data points. Take the language in the statue, insert name of the City, add the data, and voila, HAP report completed.

The purpose of the law is to create Affordable Housing in areas where some people cannot afford to live. The reason being people should be able to live close to work and have affordable shelter. This law reminds me of one of my favorite children's story by Arnold Lobel, "Mouse Tales." In this compilation a short tale titled, "The Bath" a mouse was dirty and took a bath. He filled the tub with water but he was still dirty. So he let the water run onto the floor and it filled the bathroom, and so on, the mouse was still dirty so he let the water run out the window and it filled the street, his neighbors' house until eventually it filled the town. Finally the people in the town cried "Turn off the water! You are very clean now!"

Where does this law begin to help people and where does it end? After Affordable Housing must we fill the need for affordable transportation, affordable food, clothing, public services? Should businesses be required to provide affordable housing for its employees? We all can use "affordable" things. But how do we produce affordable things? And we must further ask, do we provide affordable things for some but not for all? Did the mouse need to fill the city with water before he was clean? Who is to say. Perhaps he felt everyone needed a bath because he was dirty and therefore everyone was dirty and he was doing everyone a service. Until the town cried out for him to stop.

According to the data projections recently collected Mukilteo has a low rate of population growth over the next decade and declining industry. Therefore let us ask and answer the following questions. How much housing do we really need to plan for? How much of that should be Affordable Housing and for whom? Those that already live here? Those who would like to live and work here but cannot afford it? Why would we plan for housing that exceeds the projected growth? Are we trying to increase the population beyond the projected growth? Is it possible we are filling our bathtub and the town?

Let us also consider the geography of Mukilteo in this equation as well. We are small in land size bordered by the Salish Sea on one side and larger cities on the other sides in addition to an airport. We also are limited by the terrain itself with large gulches and steep slopes. Certainly it imparts beauty and interest in our little burg, but also creates natural impediments for building and travel. In fact, the Speedway is the only road that connects us from top to bottom. All other roads wind around the gulches and airport. How much traffic is too much traffic for this road to bear? Until the day we have flying cars we are restricted to using this road to connect the city. And that's an awful lot to ask from one road. Do we keep building until the town looks like the shanty sea side town from the movie "Popeye" and we all are taxed for every activity to pay for all the services the mayor provides?



This law is an insidious worm, though perhaps created with good intentions, will infringe upon the rights of some to give to others. Like the mouse that wanted to take a bath but filled the town with water to satiate his needs before the town said, ENOUGH! The law serves an ideology and not the needs of our City.

April 15, 2021 5:26 PM – Donna Vago

The types of housing in the HNA already exists in the city. For example, we already have townhomes and condos (surprisingly the majority of housing) zero lot homes, low income housing, and senior housing. Why are we pursuing more of these type of housing under the Affordable Housing Act? Especially considering the city has such small supply of buildable lots.

Also, it is disheartening to hear from the mayor and council they are not pursuing “low income” or “affordable” housing or “revising zoning and permitting” when it’s all there in black and white in the HAP report. If they are not pursing these things outlined on the Affordable Housing Act, then what are they doing? Why all this hoopla?



132. Vallins, Elizabeth (Lisa)

March 5, 2021 7:38 AM – Elizabeth Vallins – Via HAP Comment Form

To the Mukilteo Planning Dept. I do not agree with the Sepa DNS for the Mukilteo HAP. The HAP states it can AMEND Mukilteo's 2015 Comprehensive Plan which said Mukilteo was basically "built-out." The HAP can CHANGE the zoning AND the Permit Processing regulations. (A. #7) Future projects may be impacted by implementing HAP schemes.(A.#9) These changes could have a detrimental effect on our environment and do not put the needs of the Citizens of Mukilteo first. It's Government over-reach. I can't imagine anyone would want to have a 6 story Apt. built next to their home due to a re-zoning. That Apt. will block out natural light and bring in noise, density, transitory tenants and excessive traffic AND lower property values. I think most people move to Mukilteo for the quality of life; the peacefulness, the schools, the views, and less density and crime. We scrimped and saved to move here after living with the hum of a major highway for decades. We lived across from Apts. where the Police visited at least twice a week. Our car was stolen from our driveway. Our yard flooded when a new sub-division was built up the street. (Watershed issues from rampant and unchecked development) Mukilteo is a multi-ethnic town with Condos, Apts. Homes, rentals, Affordable Section 8 housing, Industrial and Retail Businesses, Churches, Soon-to-be a Mosque, and an excellent School District. With the property taxes Citizens pay (going up 9.9% this yr.-2nd Highest in Snohomish County) they deserve to have a city that reflects their dedication and commitment to a strong quality of life. As a provider of affordable housing, I want my tenants to stay and thrive as equitable members of the community, and not have an Apt. building sprout up that peers into their backyard due to zoning changes. While some additional and controlled housing units may be necessary, like the current interior ADU approved yesterday on Marine View Dr. in Chennault Beach, I think the HAP gives Mukilteo Planners and the City much more control over what is built in the city than is necessary. Citizens, not developers and government officials, should steer the course of their cities. In addition, this \$100,000 HAP Grant was sought out by the Mayor without the approval of the Mukilteo City Council which is unusual in itself. I would hope our elected leaders would have their constituent's best interests in mind when making important decisions.

Thank you for your time and for taking my comments into consideration,

March 8, 2021 6:00 PM – Lisa Vallins – Via Facebook⁷⁰

Recording Minute 1:45:07 – Good question -How many Mukilteo Constituents wrote letters for or against the HAP? The City passed the HAP. The citizens who do not agree with many issues in the HAP and want to fight this plan have to file an appeal which costs money. They then have to hire an Attorney for the hearing, yet the city uses tax-payer dollars to defend their Position. WHY did the City of Edmonds refuse their HAP after their study? Because they listened to their constituents. You have letters for and against the Harbour Pl. 31 Townhouse project which is public record. And I understand you will be changing the zoning on that project. Will you put the public letters into the HAP library? (Public record)with all the up-zoning going on in Everett and Lynnwood, I see a very crowded, and polluted Snohomish County and schools.

⁷⁰ Facebook comments were provided in response to March 8, 2021 City Council meeting.



June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Lisa Vallins – Via Facebook⁷¹

Meeting Minute 02:02:21 - The HAP contains many ambiguities as pointed out by CM Marine. It also allows zoning changes, permit changes and also changes the building notifications. What we currently have is working. And what if our population decreases? So what if we have to do another GMA study in 2024. The only reason we had to do the comprehensive plan was because we went over 20,000 population. What if we go down in population?

Meeting Minute 02:10:05 - Thank you Paul Ellis!

Meeting Minute 02:11:43 - This HAP was pursued by the Mayor without the knowledge of the council. Wow

Meeting Minute 02:13:51 - Ask yourself - WHY did Edmonds reject their HAP?

Meeting Minute 02:17:39 - Can we preserve ANY little quant town in king or Snohomish county? When I lived in Lynnwood, Edmonds and Mukilteo were our go-to places to see the sunset and have a meal. I was not envious or jealous of those people who worked hard to live in those towns. Do we now have to declare them

Meeting Minute 02:18:17 - As “historic towns”

Meeting Minute 02:20:54 - To save them? Snohomish as well. England doesn’t destroy its villages, it preserves them. Residents pay big taxes to live in those beautiful historic villages, such as oxford upon Thames.

Meeting Minute 02:21:42 - They KNOW how to preserve their heritage and towns

Meeting Minute 02:22:37 - You are so right, Jo

Meeting Minute 02:24:57 - Government is supposed to be for the people and By the people. Remember that

Meeting Minute 02:26:33 - It’s time to vote NO.

Meeting Minute 02:27:25 - Kneller is often gone from meetings. Why?

Meeting Minute 02:28:07 - This is an important vote and we should know where our council members stand on this issue

Meeting Minute 02:31:38 - More building parcels equals lots more tax for government to spend - more positions, more pensions and more job security.

Meeting Minute 02:36:33 - There is no talk about the foreign buyers who outbid regular Mukilteo folks who want to purchase a home. Wa states GMA should include a 15% surcharge like Vancouver, Wa. Charges. Foreign buyers pushed up regular homes to over a million dollars. These homes were often used for college students to attend Canadian colleges. The homes were then neglected, with unkempt yards and peeling paint.

⁷¹ Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.




133.Wade, Scott

March 2, 2021 9:21 PM – Scott Wade

I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to any large multi-unit housing projects getting built in Mukilteo. A friend of mine lives in a house just north of 164th by Ash Way in Lynnwood and the big housing complexes that were built near his home in the last 10 years or so (Just West of I5 and north of 164th). My friend says that since these complexes have been built **it as lead to a marked increase in crime and traffic problems in his neighborhood**... As a concerned resident of Mukilteo I don't want to see this same kind of thing happening here.

Thanks very much for listening to my concerns.





March 3, 2021 8:39 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for sending your comments to the City of Mukilteo about the [draft Housing Action Plan \(HAP\)](#), available online in the [HAP Project Library](#). This email is to acknowledge receipt, and to confirm that we will be adding you to our Parties of Interest list for future project updates.

I would also like to clarify what the HAP is and is not. The HAP is a work plan that recommends strategies for future action around housing in Mukilteo. The HAP does not adopt any policies or zoning changes, nor does it 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.

Any strategy adopted as part of the HAP that proposes changes the Comprehensive Plan (the long-range vision of the City), zoning, or development regulations would be required to go through its own public process with opportunities for community input.

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



March 3, 2021 2:37 PM – Scott Wade

Thanks for the information and including me to the Parties of Interest list. I'm glad to hear that no large housing projects are planned for Mukilteo at this time.

I was also happy to learn recently that the Systima company from Kirkland had purchased the old Boeing Tech Center building and is in the process of moving in. I had heard that it might be torn down in favor of a giant residential complex, so I was glad to hear that it was going to be used for its original purpose after all.

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

Much appreciate the info! Thanks again.



134. Walker, Bridget

January 14, 2021 6:16 PM – Dr. Bridget Walker – Via HAP Comment Form

Given the unprecedented economic challenges in our country at this time, it is essential that our community thoughtfully plan and support accessible, affordable housing. I believe that we can do so in a way that also supports the aspects of our community that we love. I am very concerned that some community members use a variety of concerns to cover for their personal biases and prejudices, with a goal of stopping affordable housing because they fear diversity and inclusion. Now more than ever decisions need to be made weighing equity, opportunity for all and the overall benefits of a diverse, inclusive community. Thanks!



135. Wallin, Eric Todd

January 11, 2021 12:37 PM – Eric Wallin

I just completed reading the housing action plan. Very thorough. It strikes me that **people move to Mukilteo in spite of the high cost of housing** because of the lifestyle that is accorded here. The HAP plan to increase the number of low income housing units available actually undermines that lifestyle. Crime rates increase in low income compared to high income neighborhoods. Mukilteo traffic congestion will only worsen with high-density low income housing. Have you driven the speedway lately? It should be renamed the Mukilteo Parkway. Thank you for all the work done on the study but I will vote against it.



136. White, Zhanna

June 7, 2021 12:55 AM – Zhanna White – To Electeds

Many , many , many residents of Mukilteo including my self have very clearly expressed that the housing action plan is NOT in the best interest of Mukilteo , it will absolutely ruin a very beautiful and nice city (our home) and we want it canceled, rejected and stopped. Please honor the many many residents wishes that elected you and vote NO on the Housing Action Plan , thank you.



137. Whitney, Jennifer

June 6, 2021 5:37 PM – Jennifer Whitney – To Electeds

I am writing to ask that you vote “NO” on HAP.

We citizens of Mukilteo do not want our beautiful communities to be destroyed.

I will be looking forward to seeing you protect and represent all of us by voting against this and preserving our diverse and wonderful community.



138. Wright, Maggie

June 7, 2021 7:00 PM – Maggie Wright – Via Facebook⁷²

Meeting Minute 02:12:55 - Mr. Ellis' comments are spot on!

Meeting Minute 02:28:10 - She seems to miss meetings on a regular basis...

⁷² Facebook comments were provided in response to June 7, 2021, City Council meeting.



139. Wuellner, Brian

January 5, 2021 6:29 PM – Brian Wuellner – Via HAP Comment Form

Please do not destroy the neighborhood of Mukilteo. Do not allow these high density structures to spoil what we have.

February 28, 2021 3:49 PM – Brian Wuellner

Absolute hypocrisy on the part of City Hall.

You are making arbitrary one sided decisions that do not reflect all of your constituents.

I am disappointed that you feel empowered to act unilaterally.

April 15, 2021 12:41 PM – Brian Wuellner – Via HAP Comment Form⁷³

Will this plan be approved by popular vote?

There has not been sufficient evidence to support the need for this plan; nor is the EIS broad enough in scope

⁷³ Comment was read into the record at the Planning Commission public hearing on April 15, 2021.



140. Wuellner, Lorna

January 5, 2021 7:02 PM – Lorna Wuellner – Via HAP Comment Form

I do not want this!



141.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.

February 9, 2021 7:43 PM – Boris Zaretsky

I have briefly reviewed the draft and, to put it bluntly, I don't like it. I think many statements there ignore what you have heard during the SAG meetings and the larger community meetings. More precisely, the draft selects comments favorable to the initial input.

I particularly object to using the words "needs assessment". Most people in Mukilteo don't have any such needs. What you call "needs assessment" is more correctly characterized as "potential gaps with respect to state housing requirements". Words matter and by using inaccurate description of what is in the report you are encouraging misunderstanding and negative reaction from the residents. I have made this point several times before, but regrettably my suggestion to change the wording was not heeded.

I look forward to a lively discussion on Thursday.



February 10, 2021 10:07 AM – Lauren Balisky

Your concerns regarding the word “needs” have been heard and discussed internally at great length, however none of us are in a position to change the words used by the legislature for this project. The Housing Needs Assessment and other documents reflect the balance of all of the input we have received, including the community interviews, community meetings, all public comments, Council and Planning Commission meetings, as well as the SAG. The HNA has also been updated based on feedback since the October 8, 2020 draft and will be released with the draft HAP.

I agree that words matter. In the context of the HAP, the “need” is the overall issue that must be addressed (the what). This is consistent with the high-level, strategic nature of the HAP. The “gap” is the how much, and will be addressed as part of the future 2024 Comprehensive Plan update. The state law that authorizes this grant uses the term “housing needs” very specifically:

- Growth Management Act, [RCW 36.70A.070\(2\)](#) states that the mandatory elements of the Comprehensive Plan: “... (a) includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected **housing needs** that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth....”
- Growth Management Act, [RCW 36.70A.600\(2\)\(a\)](#) establishes the requirement for a HAP, specifically: “ ... (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....”
- Our contractual obligations with the State also uses “housing needs”, consistent with State law.

I also respectfully disagree that the document ignores what was heard in the SAG and in community meetings. A significant amount of effort has been put into making this document and its purpose as a strategic work plan clear. The strategies generated from the Housing Needs Assessment, policy analysis, and staff propose only small adjustments to the existing development framework, not broad aspirational changes that some communities are pursuing. The feedback of the SAG and the community are clearly provided on each page. Consistent with your desire to be heard, specific suggestions received in writing or at meetings were included for Council’s deliberation and decision.

We look forward to hearing any additional comments you may have during tomorrow’s final SAG meeting.

February 10, 2021 10:50 AM – Boris Zaretsky

Since the word “need” as used in the HAP is a legal term which often contradicts the common definition of the word, at the very least you should define what you mean by “need” at the beginning of the report. Otherwise you will confuse people unfamiliar with the Growth Management Act and generate an extremely negative reaction to the report.

As to the specific areas where I think the report inaccurately or incompletely portrays community’s input, we’ll discuss it on Thursday.



February 10, 2021 10:58 AM – Lauren Balisky

That is an edit we can certainly incorporate.

Enjoy the rest of your day!

February 22, 2021 1:29 PM – Boris Zaretsky

Dear members of the Mukilteo City Council and Mayor Gregerson,

As a 22-year resident of Mukilteo, I am grateful for the opportunity to serve on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAG) reviewing the HAP. While I appreciate the professionalism with which Lauren, Garrett and Berk Consulting prepared the subject draft and their willingness to listen to members of the Mukilteo community, there are a number of things in this draft with which I take issue. Below please find my detailed comments.

Housing Needs Assessment

The way this portion of the draft HAP is presented implies that the current and future residents of Mukilteo are suffering from lack of certain housing types and, thus, advocate for their construction. While this may be true for some people, it is not for many if not most residents who participated in the SAG and larger community meetings. In fact, of the seven Housing Needs identified on page 2 of the draft, I have heard support for only one - a growing need for housing options for older adults (this came from one member of the SAG). What is really driving the so-called Housing Needs Assessment are not the wishes of the current and future residents of Mukilteo, but rather potential shortfall of Mukilteo's current housing availability vs. state and county requirements (Lauren can cite all the applicable regulations). In other words, if Mukilteo does not make some changes to its current housing policies, they may be shoved down our throats. During the meetings I encouraged Berk and City Planners to state this issue explicitly, but I do not think the current draft does so. As a result, there is significant community dissatisfaction, even outrage, alleging that outsiders who do not represent the wishes of Mukilteo residents are telling us what we need. Therefore, I urge a change in the final HAP report that explicitly states that the Housing Needs Assessment does not necessarily represent the wishes of Mukilteo residents, but rather potential shortfall of Mukilteo's current housing policies vs. state and county regulations. Now to the specific Issues raised in the Housing Needs Assessment

1. Entry-Level Homeownership Options

Since Mukilteo is not and does not profess to be a place where people can afford to buy their first home, this is not a real need.

2. Greater Variety of Options for Moderate-Income Households

Since Mukilteo is not and does not profess to be a place where people can afford to buy an inexpensive home, this is not a real need.

3. Greater Variety of Rental Housing

Since there are many rental options in communities near Mukilteo (e.g. large apartment complex across Mukilteo



freeway from Safeway), this is not a real need.

4. Housing Attainable to Mukilteo's Workforce

We had a couple of different employers participate in SAG and large community meetings and none of them brought up this issue (no non-resident employees were invited to participate). Furthermore, I see no comments on this subject from the Mukilteo Chamber of Commerce. Since we had no input from stakeholders and since many less expensive housing options are available in nearby communities, this is not a real need.

5. Greater Variety of Housing Sizes

I resent the implication that some people live in a house that is “too big for them”. Since house size is not relevant to the HAP, this is not a real need.

6. Housing Options for Older Adults

One member of the SAG did bring up this issue. However, I do not think that the statistics cited in the draft report accurately represent reality in this case. While many older adults have lower incomes than they did when they were working, most have significantly lower expenses with no mortgage or college tuition to worry about. None of this is reflected in the statistics. So while housing options for older adults may be an issue for some Mukilteo residents, this is not a real need for most.

7. Housing to Accommodate Future Growth

If I remember correctly, an earlier version of the report estimated projected population growth to be slightly over 400 people over a period of 20 years. Since there is no reason why Mukilteo would not be able to accommodate such small growth with its current housing plan, this is not a real need.

Strategies to Address Housing Needs in Mukilteo

The Community Feedback section of this portion of the draft report is too vague and may be misconstrued. For example, under Townhomes, the stated Community Feedback was “mixed reaction for allowing townhomes in more zones”. In reality, there was mixed reaction for townhomes being allowed in the areas where cottages are currently allowed and nowhere else. The report should state community feedback explicitly and not in vague and sometimes misleading terms, so I urge the Community Feedback section to be re-written for the sections, where it does not accurately represent community input. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that for this portion of the draft HAP report, the support for various HAP strategies by members of the SAG was, in general, higher than by those who participated in the large community meetings. While there may be a number of reasons for this discrepancy, it may indicate that the SAG was not truly representative of the community at large. I expressed this concern during the last SAG meeting.

While in my comments on the Housing Needs Assessment I expressed general dissatisfaction with the draft HAP report shortcomings, below are my personal views on the presented strategies:

1. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)



I support some changes related to internal ADUs, not so much for the exterior structures. For these, I want to maintain lot size and dwelling size vs. main building requirements and parking requirements, but am willing to relax the “number of bedrooms” requirement.

2. Duplexes

I do not support any changes to the current duplex regulations.

3. Cottages

I support allowing cottages in the areas where townhouses are currently allowed. I support relaxing architectural requirements, as long as the overall lot size and exterior building dimensions remain unchanged. I do not support any other changes.

4. Townhomes

I support allowing townhouses in the areas where cottages are currently allowed. I do not support any other changes.

5. Mixed-Use Development

I do not object to a review of these regulations, as long as the zone area where mixed-use development is allowed is not increased.

6. Process Improvements

I do not support any so-called process improvements suggested in this section.

7. Zoning Regulations

I support reviewing setback consistency. I do not support new short-term rental requirements.

8. Housing Programs

I do not support any actions listed in this portion, as I do not think it is the responsibility of the City of Mukilteo to provide these programs.

9. Additional Community-Driven Strategies

I support additional study of housing for seniors and of consolidating some zoning districts. I do not support any other strategies in this part.

Implementation Plan

I have no comments on this portion of the draft HAP report.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to consider my comments in your review of the draft HAP report. Should you wish to discuss the matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.



March 3, 2021 6:08 PM – Boris Zaretsky – Via HAP Comment Form⁷⁴

Dear members of the Mukilteo City Council and Mayor Gregerson,

As a 22-year resident of Mukilteo, I am grateful for the opportunity to serve on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAG) reviewing the HAP. While I appreciate the professionalism with which Lauren, Garrett and Berk Consulting prepared the subject draft and their willingness to listen to members of the Mukilteo community, there are a number of things in this draft with which I take issue. Below please find my detailed comments.

Housing Needs Assessment

The way this portion of the draft HAP is presented implies that the current and future residents of Mukilteo are suffering from lack of certain housing types and, thus, advocate for their construction. While this may be true for some people, it is not for many if not most residents who participated in the SAG and larger community meetings. In fact, of the seven Housing Needs identified on page 2 of the draft, I have heard support for only one - a growing need for housing options for older adults (this came from one member of the SAG). What is really driving the so-called Housing Needs Assessment are not the wishes of the current and future residents of Mukilteo, but rather potential shortfall of Mukilteo's current housing availability vs. state and county requirements (Lauren can cite all the applicable regulations). In other words, if Mukilteo does not make some changes to its current housing policies, they may be shoved down our throats. During the meetings I encouraged Berk and City Planners to state this issue explicitly, but I do not think the current draft does so. As a result, there is significant community dissatisfaction, even outrage, alleging that outsiders who do not represent the wishes of Mukilteo residents are telling us what we need. Therefore, I urge a change in the final HAP report that explicitly states that the Housing Needs Assessment does not necessarily represent the wishes of Mukilteo residents, but rather potential shortfall of Mukilteo's current housing policies vs. state and county regulations. Now to the specific Issues raised in the Housing Needs Assessment

1. Entry-Level Homeownership Options

Since Mukilteo is not and does not profess to be a place where people can afford to buy their first home, this is not a real need.

2. Greater Variety of Options for Moderate-Income Households

Since Mukilteo is not and does not profess to be a place where people can afford to buy an inexpensive home, this is not a real need.

3. Greater Variety of Rental Housing

Since there many rental options in communities near Mukilteo (e.g. large apartment complex across Mukilteo freeway from Safeway), this is not a real need.

4. Housing Attainable to Mukilteo's Workforce

⁷⁴ This appears to be a copy of Boris Zaretsky's comments from February 22, 2021 at 1:29 PM. For this reason, this comment is not indexed.



We had a couple of different employers participate in SAG and large community meetings and none of them brought up this issue (no non-resident employees were invited to participate). Furthermore, I see no comments on this subject from the Mukilteo Chamber of Commerce. Since we had no input from stakeholders and since many less expensive housing options are available in nearby communities, this is not a real need.

5. Greater Variety of Housing Sizes

I resent the implication that some people live in a house that is “too big for them”. Since house size is not relevant to the HAP, this is not a real need.

6. Housing Options for Older Adults

One member of the SAG did bring up this issue. However, I do not think that the statistics cited in the draft report accurately represent reality in this case. While many older adults have lower incomes than they did when they were working, most have significantly lower expenses with no mortgage or college tuition to worry about. None of this is reflected in the statistics. So while housing options for older adults may be an issue for some Mukilteo residents, this is not a real need for most.

7. Housing to Accommodate Future Growth

If I remember correctly, an earlier version of the report estimated projected population growth to be slightly over 400 people over a period of 20 years. Since there is no reason why Mukilteo would not be able to accommodate such small growth with its current housing plan, this is not a real need.

Strategies to Address Housing Needs in Mukilteo

The Community Feedback section of this portion of the draft report is too vague and may be misconstrued. For example, under Townhomes, the stated Community Feedback was “mixed reaction for allowing townhomes in more zones”. In reality, there was mixed reaction for townhomes being allowed in the areas where cottages are currently allowed and nowhere else. The report should state community feedback explicitly and not in vague and sometimes misleading terms, so I urge the Community Feedback section to be re-written for the sections, where it does not accurately represent community input. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that for this portion of the draft HAP report, the support for various HAP strategies by members of the SAG was, in general, higher than by those who participated in the large community meetings. While there may be a number of reasons for this discrepancy, it may indicate that the SAG was not truly representative of the community at large. I expressed this concern during the last SAG meeting.

While in my comments on the Housing Needs Assessment I expressed general dissatisfaction with the draft HAP report shortcomings, below are my personal views on the presented strategies:

1. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

I support some changes related to internal ADUs, not so much for the exterior structures. For these, I want to maintain lot size and dwelling size vs. main building requirements and parking requirements, but am willing to relax the “number of bedrooms” requirement.



2. Duplexes

I do not support any changes to the current duplex regulations.

3. Cottages

I support allowing cottages in the areas where townhouses are currently allowed. I support relaxing architectural requirements, as long as the overall lot size and exterior building dimensions remain unchanged. I do not support any other changes.

4. Townhomes

I support allowing townhouses in the areas where cottages are currently allowed. I do not support any other changes.

5. Mixed-Use Development

I do not object to a review of these regulations, as long as the zone area where mixed-use development is allowed is not increased.

6. Process Improvements

I do not support any so-called process improvements suggested in this section.

7. Zoning Regulations

I support reviewing setback consistency. I do not support new short-term rental requirements.

8. Housing Programs

I do not support any actions listed in this portion, as I do not think it is the responsibility of the City of Mukilteo to provide these programs.

9. Additional Community-Driven Strategies

I support additional study of housing for seniors and of consolidating some zoning districts. I do not support any other strategies in this part.

Implementation Plan

I have no comments on this portion of the draft HAP report.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to consider my comments in your review of the draft HAP report. Should you wish to discuss the matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2021 2:32 PM – Boris Zaretsky – To Electeds

Please vote NO on the HAP tonight





142. 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

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>

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>

Cc: Elected <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> 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.

⁷⁵ADU'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 readressed 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),

⁷⁵ Highlight formatting retained from email.



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 accommodate 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.

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 than 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)⁷⁶. 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

⁷⁶ The Sector 3 Development Agreement is available upon request.



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?

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)⁷⁷ that should be helpful.

⁷⁷ The Sector 15 Development Agreement is available upon request.



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.

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 attached⁷⁸ 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 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.

⁷⁸ 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>



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 allot 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.


December 4, 2020 8:20 AM – Lauren Balisky

The northwest portion of the Boeing Technical Center (what is now the Systima Technologies site) was rezoned to MR with a PRD overlay in 2004 – please see document pages 14-18 (pages 9-14 of the Findings and Conclusions) of the



attached Ordinance No. 1098⁷⁹.

Wired Zone Rezone:



Legal Description:

Portion of Tracts 3 and 4 of Snohomish County Binding Site Plan recorded under Recording No. 8311075005. – Lot 2 of Binding Site Plan 2003-01.

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

February 21, 2021 10:14 AM – Peter Zieve

The Mukilteo Beacon on 2/17 indicates that a comment period is beginning for the HAP.

<https://www.mukilteobeacon.com/story/2021/02/17/news/public-input-sought-on-draft-housing-action-plan/21008.html>

⁷⁹ Ordinance No. 1098 is available upon request.



Please explain. Along with my friends we have been participating in the zoom meetings and leaving comments on the HAP webpage for months.

Is this something new?

February 22, 2021 9:21 AM – Lauren Balisky

Thank you for your question. This public comment period is only “new” in the sense that it is the next step in the process. All of the work completed between August 2020 and last week was part of the informal process to create the draft Housing Action Plan (HAP), including comments submitted by yourself and other members of the public. Those comments were considered while we developed the draft HAP, and will all be provided to Planning Commission and City Council to consider during their public hearings later this spring.

The draft HAP itself is now going through the formal review process, which includes a period for public comment. Comments received between now and March 30, 2021, will be reviewed for incorporation into the final draft that will be provided to Planning Commission and City Council during their public hearings. Comments submitted after that date will still be provided to Planning Commission and City Council, however we may not have adequate time to incorporate them into the final draft HAP.

Planning Commission and City Council will also both be holding informal review sessions on the draft HAP in March 2021. You will receive a notice from us closer to those dates so that you may join if you wish.

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

February 28, 2021 12:02 PM – Peter Zieve

Many people want to comment on the DNS for the HAP. We write up our comments and send where? By email to lbalisky@mukilteowa.gov? Where to?

Where can we find the appeal form that you ask for?

March 1, 2021 1:24 PM – Peter Zieve

We need a response to this asap!

March 1, 2021 4:10 PM – Lauren Balisky

Comments may be sent to me directly or to the [HAP online comment form](#). Director Osaki will be responding to you separately regarding the appeal information.



March 2, 2021 7:42 PM – Dave Osaki

It was nice talking to you.

I am following up on our conversation and on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) appeal portion of your question. An appeal form is attached.

I want to mention again that an appeal of the SEPA environmental determination for a strategic plan like the HAP (or any strategic plan on any topic) pertains to the environmental impacts of the proposal. In this case, the proposal involves strategies that may or may not be studied in more detail in the future. There is no code amendment that would be approved by the HAP nor would any changes in zoning be passed by the HAP.

Even if the City were to study a strategy like a zoning code amendment in the future (whether from the HAP or for any other reason), then that specific code amendment would require its own public outreach process, SEPA process with appeal period, and public hearing (Planning Commission and City Council) process. At that time, the public would have a detailed proposal before it (i.e. an ordinance with specific proposed language changes, as opposed to a general strategy in the HAP) to review and evaluate environmental impacts and decide on a SEPA appeal.

As for public comment, it (public comment) on the current February 2021 draft HAP (and any subsequent draft) will continue to be welcomed anytime throughout the rest of the HAP process, in general and during upcoming Planning Commission and City Council public hearings. The final HAP strategies are yet to be determined since those are still to be evaluated through this public outreach process and eventually decided by City Council action.

Let me know if you want to talk about this some more.

March 5, 2021 4:45 AM – Peter Zieve

I disagree with your determination of nonsignificance (DNS) for the HAP. The HAP is the biggest threat ever posed to the environment of Mukilteo. That is why four city councilpersons have voted to not take the HAP money. They are:

Anna Rohrbough

Joe Marine

Bob Champion

Riaz Khan

It is not normal to turn down "free money" but this money is not free and should not have been accepted. I also find your lack of neutrality disturbing. On the calls you have been condescending to the HAP critics, the majority of Mukilteo residents I am sure.

Every single proposal I have heard will deteriorate and degenerate the lifestyle of Mukilteo. The most disturbing is ADUs. These are disgusting eyesores. Nobody wants them in their neighborhood. Why are you, a city employee, promoting ADUs?



I intend to appeal the DNS as far and as long as possible. Here are some areas:

9c Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts

Answer: There will be severe impacts of additional housing. There will be massive impacts of every one of these suggestions. ADUs are the worst. Cottage housing, no thanks! Have you visited the cottage housing off of 88th St SW? Please do. They are a mess, in poor repair.

10a What is the tallest height of any structure

Answer: We have reviewed the projects which result from a HAP in neighboring communities. In Lynnwood there are eight story apartment complexes being built. These will severely affect their surroundings. I find them disgusting warehouses for people. No residential structure should be allowed to be taller than 35 feet.

12c Recreation

Answer: Our parks are already shoulder to shoulder on a nice day. Have you ever tried to get a picnic table at any of our parks on a nice summer day? Or use a fire pit? These things are impossible NOW. And you intend to add thousands of additional persons to the community without adding parks, beaches, roads? No thanks.

13c Historic and Cultural Preservation

Answer: The history and culture of Mukilteo is single family neighborhoods. The HAP is an attempt to change that and I oppose that.

14. Transportation

Answer: Adding more cars to our streets is not ok. With the burden from the ferry our streets are already way too crowded. And then you add projects with minimum off street parking such as Carvel Apartments and On the Green that only provide one off street parking spot per residence. The result is streets parked up such as across from the Police department. We the residents of Mukilteo do not want this. We insist on two off street parking spots per residence for future projects.

15a Public Services

Answer: High density projects draw heavily on public services. We will all suffer from the increased demand on our Police, Fire and Ambulance services. Right now I can get a Mukilteo Police cruiser at my home or business in minutes. That is what I want. That is what I am paying for. In Everett my friends have told me it can take an hour. No thank you! Keep Mukilteo the way it is.

March 16, 2021 11:01 AM – Dave Osaki

Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Housing Action Plan (HAP) SEPA DNS. As is the case with all comments, yours will be made available to the public, Planning Commission and City Council as this HAP process continues.



We have had the opportunity to review the comments and I am providing this response.

But before responding to your comments on the SEPA checklist, I want to address that portion of your comments about staff's lack of neutrality and being condescending to HAP critics.

I have looked at public comments submitted during the HAP process. The comments below are representative of those made about staff and/or the consultant. Certain comments below are from those that have disagreed about the HAP or particular issues.

- (From the Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting Notes): Boris shared that he appreciates the learning he has received from the city, BERK, and the other SAG members. Even when we disagreed, we did so civilly. He has learned much more about the work that Lauren and BERK does and appreciates that they record his comments as he states them, not what they wish he had stated.
- Peter Roberts. Thank you for the answer and for the links [staff provided link to the Land Use Action Notices webpage]
- Ray Boyer (November 9, 2020):

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,

- Gene Goosman (December 6, 2020):

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

- Leslie Gregg (December 8, 2020):

Thank you, Lauren, for your comments. I realize it takes time to respond, and I appreciate your efforts.

- Lisa McBroom:

- July 2, 2020 – thank you for letting her know about the July 6, 2020 meeting
- March 4, 2021 – “And thank you to Ms. Balisky and many on City Council for great responsiveness.”

These comments are far from expressing an opinion that staff/consultant responses are condescending. We have consistently received positive comments during the HAP process about listening and responsiveness.

Having said that, if you are hearing comments from the community about staff being condescending or dismissive, be



it on the HAP or any other issue for that matter, then you may have that individual contact me directly if he/she so chooses so that I can be aware of the particular circumstance. I can assure you that I will take comments seriously.

With regards to the SEPA environmental checklist, several of your comments reference (population) growth, and attributing that growth to the HAP.

A strategic plan like the HAP does not create growth. No codes are changed. No properties are rezoned. No site specific projects are approved.

What might be of interest to you is the upcoming population and employment growth targets allocated to various cities, towns and the county to be used in the State mandated 2024 GMA update. Those numbers will determine what Mukilteo needs to plan for (with the market ultimately driving whether those targets are achieved or not).

The population and employment growth targets allocated to the various cities, towns and the county is done through countywide process. Mukilteo's current 2035 population planning target of 21,812 (an increase of 1,502 over a 2011 population estimate of 20,310) was assigned through this countywide process. A HAP requirement did not exist back then. Not having a HAP back then did not stop the allocation of a 2035 population (and employment) growth target to Mukilteo, just as not having a HAP today would not stop the allocation of 2044 population and employment targets to Mukilteo for the upcoming State mandated 2024 Update.

With respect to your specific comments, the following provides a response. Your specific comment is identified, followed by a staff response (*in italics*)

“9c Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts

Answer: There will be severe impacts of additional housing. There will be massive impacts of every one of these suggestions. ADUs are the worst. Cottage housing, no thanks! Have you visited the cottage housing off of 88th St SW? Please do. They are a mess, in poor repair.”

RESPONSE: *I noted above that it has been mentioned throughout the HAP process that whatever strategies might be in approved in the HAP do not change codes or zoning. Whatever strategies are in the final HAP are a list for future study, subject to its own environmental review and public hearing process whenever that particular strategy might be considered in the future as time/workload allows.*

As noted above, your email mentions that ADU's are “the worst”. Elsewhere your email mentions that ADU's are disgusting eyesores.

State law requires that cities over 20,000 allow for ADU's in single family zones. We are not in a position to prohibit them. There is some flexibility for local governments on ADU standards (e.g. design, size etc. -- which Mukilteo's code currently addresses)

What I can say at this point is that we have received comment that ADU standards should be carefully revisited. I excerpted a comment about ADU standards from Lisa McBroom and put it at the very end of this email.

Regardless, ultimately it will be up to the City Council to decide whether further study on ADU's should



be included in the HAP.

“10a What is the tallest height of any structure

Answer: We have reviewed the projects which result from a HAP in neighboring communities. In Lynnwood there are eight story apartment complexes being built. These will severely affect their surroundings. I find them disgusting warehouses for people. No residential structure should be allowed to be taller than 35 feet.”

RESPONSE: *The projects in Lynnwood under construction you reference are not the result of a HAP. Lynnwood's website indicates its HAP is not yet even adopted.. Lynnwood's HAP is in the SEPA process right now.*

<https://www.lynnwoodwa.gov/Services/Development-Business-Services/Planning-Zoning/Ongoing-Planning-Projects/Housing-Action-Plan>

As for Mukilteo, the current maximum height limit in most residential zones is 30 or 35 ft. In the Multi-Family Residential (MRD) zone, development may be 45 ft. when certain criteria are met, including view preservation. No changes to height limits are proposed in the HAP, either as strategies or sub-recommendations

“12c Recreation

Answer: Our parks are already shoulder to shoulder on a nice day. Have you ever tried to get a picnic table at any of our parks on a nice summer day? Or use a fire pit? These things are impossible NOW. And you intend to add thousands of additional persons to the community without adding parks, beaches, roads? No thanks.”

RESPONSE: *The City does not “intend” to add thousands of additional persons to the community. As was done with the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update, the City planned for growth consistent with the allocated 2035 population/employment targets. What the City does intend to do in the future is plan for growth consistent with the City’s 2044 population/employment targets. Those numbers are yet to be determined.*

In 2017, the City adopted an updated Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Arts (PROSA) Plan. The PROSA Plan identifies existing facilities, public outreach results, conducts a present and future demand and needs analysis for parks (including indoor recreation), and identifies additional recreational opportunities and amenities needed for anticipated population growth.

The 2017 PROSA does identify a need for at least two additional picnic facilities, and indicates these could be added at existing park facilities and/or new waterfront parks as shown in the Downtown Waterfront Master Plan. The PROSA also concludes that “...the City is meeting the need for park acreage across the four types of parks: small neighborhood parks, large community parks, off-leash dog parks, and conservation areas.” (PROSA, pg. 50)

The City updates the PROSA every six-years to remain eligible for certain State recreation funding programs. Unless the State timing requirement changes, the next PROSA update will take place soon,



likely in the 2023 time frame. A similar evaluation of need and demand will take place then.

“13c Historic and Cultural Preservation

Answer: The history and culture of Mukilteo is single family neighborhoods. The HAP is an attempt to change that and I oppose that.”

RESPONSE: *The section of the SEPA checklist does not pertain to general land use patterns*

Instead, this SEPA checklist section is titled “Historic and cultural preservation” and addresses items such as buildings, structures, sites eligible for listing in national, state, or local registers. Landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation are also discussed in this section as is assessing the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near a project site, including human burials or old cemeteries. (The City’s Comprehensive Plan (pages 31-32) identifies properties on the city, state and national registers of historic places.)

(As an a side note related to your comment, the February 17, 2021 HAP Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) references that about 60% of the housing units in Mukilteo are single family homes and 29% are in multi-family buildings with five or more units. The HNA adds that compared to the housing mix in Snohomish County overall, Mukilteo has proportionately less single family housing (60% versus 65%) and more in multi-family buildings of five or more units (29% versus 20%). See February 17, 2021 Housing Needs Assessment, pgs. 37-38.

“14. Transportation

Answer: Adding more cars to our streets is not ok. With the burden from the ferry our streets are already way too crowded. And then you add projects with minimum off street parking such as Carvel Apartments and On the Green that only provide one off street parking spot per residence. The result is streets parked up such as across from the Police department. We the residents of Mukilteo do not want this. We insist on two off street parking spots per residence for future projects.”

RESPONSE: *The City of Mukilteo Comprehensive Plan has a Transportation Element (that begins on page 73). The Transportation Element analyzes existing and projected traffic volumes and adopts “Level of Service” standards for roadways.*

The Growth Management Act requires what is called a “concurrency” management system (See Mukilteo Municipal Code Chapter 17.15). Unless exempt from the concurrency management system requirements, the City evaluates specific development projects for their impact on the City’s adopted roadway level of service. In order to be approved, the development must meet the GMA concurrency requirements. Further, certain development is subject to the payment of traffic impact fees. These fees are then used to help finance projects that provide additional capacity to the road system.

I know the discussion above on level of service and concurrency may be technical, so feel free to contact me should you have questions.



Your parking comment for two off-street parking spaces is noted. As indicated earlier, your email will be provided to the Planning Commission and City Council so that they are aware of all of your comments, including your comment on two off street parking spots per residence, as they consider what strategies to include in the HAP.

“15a Public Services

Answer: High density projects draw heavily on public services. We will all suffer from the increased demand on our Police, Fire and Ambulance services. Right now I can get a Mukilteo Police cruiser at my home or business in minutes. That is what I want. That is what I am paying for. In Everett my friends have told me it can take an hour. No thank you! Keep Mukilteo the way it is.”

RESPONSE: *This statement presumes high-density projects will be an outcome of the HAP. The HAP does not propose high density projects as a strategy. I recall that Berk mentioned at a recent meeting how the community has expressed concern about high density projects. For that reason, there is no strategy in the current draft of the HAP to study high density projects.*

Thanks again Peter for taking the time to offer comments.

Let me know if you have questions or need clarification.

March 18, 2021 2:09 AM – Peter Zieve

Dave, thank you for your response.

I am confused, because the purpose of the HAP is to do the planning, the heavy lifting, for code changes. I consider your response technically correct but disingenuous.

I will be happy to go with you to Prospect Ave where an ADU is being built. How do I know? I got phone calls telling me "an ugly ADU is being built". I don't know if that ADU had a permit. I can assure you the neighbors are not happy. Then you take me to an ADU that you think is attractive and where the neighbors love it. It will be a fun outing.

I am happy to sit with you and review the recording. Several community members did not feel that their views were treated with respect. It could have been the two Berk consultants and not Lauren. Let's review it together.

As far as the situation in Lynnwood, it might not be due to the HAP, but it is horrible. I must take every opportunity to tell the decision makers in Mukilteo that we don't want that.

It is always a pleasure to hear from you and I always enjoy our times working together.

March 18, 2021 5:30 PM – Dave Osaki

Thanks for the email and your comments.



I'll get back to you on all your comments but I would be interested in knowing about the reference to an ADU being built on Prospect.

We may or may not be thinking is the same property, which is why I am asking. We do have a permit application, that will get issued soon, for interior work on a home in the 400 block of Prospect Avenue near Centennial Park. But that permit is to convert a bedroom into a bathroom. That is not an ADU. That same property has also raised concerns recently about a dumpster in the yard and the house being vacant with a tenant having moved out. No mention of an ADU existing or being built on that property though, so if you are thinking of another property let me know.

Also I have quickly looked at the last few ADU permits the City has processed (one in process now) over the past couple of years. We notify adjacent property owners of an ADU application.

I'm still going through the files but what I have seen so far is that we get very few comments on ADU's permit applications. The few comments I have seen so far with these applications ask questions or provide information rather than express opposition (e.g. one ADU was being built with a new house, so an adjacent property owner wanted to make sure the developer knew where a property line was. But that neighbor didn't oppose development of the house or the ADU. A comment on another ADU just wanted to know if the property owner was going to be able to build the ADU because he knew the property owner just retired and wanted to have an ADU to garner extra income. Again, there was no opposition to the ADU stated.)

I'll be glad to share these comments with you once I finish going through the files to make sure I have all the comments.

I'm also open to listening to the recording. There's not much left to this week, but I can find time next week if you want to get together.

So more to follow after I reconfirm comments on these past few ADU permit applications. I'll also address your comment on the purpose of the HAP and then see if you still want to meet and listen to the recording.

Thanks again Peter, and the pleasure is all mine.

Take care.

March 18, 2021 8:09 PM – Peter Zieve

I am standing on Prospect. Here is the beginning of the ADU. I forgot that there were just boards laid out on the ground.

Attachment



March 19, 2021 10:19 AM – Dave Osaki

Thanks for the information. This is helpful.

I recognize the property from the picture. Access to this property is from Prospect Avenue, but the property itself sits back off of Prospect. So thank you for the clarification.

Staff is familiar with this issue from last summer.

The picture is not the beginning of an ADU.

New homeowners purchased the property in 2020. Like many new homeowners, the new property owners wanted to make landscaping related improvements, including a patio as I recall.

As neighbors saw wood (like the boards in the picture) being brought to the property and also saw grading activity, the City received complaints that the new property owners were preparing to build a structure that might be an ADU or another use without permits.

The new property owners had contacted the City regarding landscaping work they wanted to do on the property and whether or not the landscaping work required a permit. But that inquiry was not within context of constructing an ADU. Staff worked with property owners to ensure the landscaping work met City code requirements related to



grading.

The parcel is not large enough to meet City standards for a detached ADU. The property owners could make an application for an attached or an interior ADU. But we have no ADU permit application now and just because someone could make an application for something in the future does not mean they will.

So this property would not be an example of a ugly ADU (or any ADU for that matter) because there is not an ADU on the property.

Putting aside the ADU issue, the current municipal code allows a property owner to have a rooming and boarding use of not more than two persons in single family residential zones (e.g. vacation room rental). The municipal code also requires that the property owner(s) has to reside in the house for this use to occur. The property owners at this property applied for and received a business license for a rooming and boarding use within the existing house.

Thanks again for the email. I'll be getting back to you on other items in your initial email first thing next week.

Have a great weekend.

April 4, 2021 12:48 PM – Dave Osaki

I'm following up on my earlier email.

A couple of items.

First, as noted in my earlier email, I'm still available to listen/watch a meeting video together if you would like regarding the concerns you had on how the public was treated. In the alternative, if there was a specific meeting you had concerns about, just let me know which one it was and I will watch it.

Second, I went through the files of recent ADU applications since 2017 (four ADU applications between 2017 and present) and pulled together comments that were received. These comments are attached.⁸⁰ This includes comments from agencies such as, for example, the Mukilteo School District and Mukilteo Water and Wastewater District. The agency comments just provide information and/or say they have no comment.

On ADU applications, the City provides public notice of a submitted application by mailing notice to adjacent property owners, posting public places, and then also posting the property with a public notice sign. This happens very early in the process, once the City knows all of the required application submittal items have been provided by the applicant.

For the most part, the City does not get many comments. Up until a recent ADU application, the comments have generally asked questions or wanted to provide information (e.g. location of property line.)

A recent ADU application on Marine View Drive had no public comments when notice of the ADU application was initially circulated. A couple of months later we received a comment from an individual who wanted to confirm that

⁸⁰ There are ten (10) attachments to this email, available upon request.



the property owner could build an ADU since he knew the property owner wanted to garner additional income given that he (the property owner) had recently retired. But no concerns were expressed in that letter. Later on in the process, when the ADU decision was issued, the City received two letters in opposition. One of those two letters indicated it wanted to appeal the decision. But the comment letter did not provide the necessary items required for an appeal such as, for example, the fee. So an appeal was not processed.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks.



Index

A

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 30, 35, 59, 94, 112, 178, 180, 198, 222, 231, 250, 293, 299, 311, 345, 352, 368, 373, 375
Annexation 28, 44, 137, 316

B

Boeing Technical Center *See* Harbour Pointe Technical Center

C

Character 40, 49, 55, 62, 86, 94, 137, 144, 145, 146, 198, 211, 216, 223, 226, 249, 268, 270, 271, 278, 281, 302, 303, 306, 308, 323, 329, 330, 334

Climate Change *See* Environment

Community Character *See* Character

Comprehensive Plan 46, 52, 66, 69, 323, 324, 339, 342

 Docket Process 98, 172, 265, 357

 Growth Targets 29, 46, 86, 153, 313, 319, 321, 336, 344, 358, 360

Consultant 27, 44, 66, 141, 145, 150, 250, 270, 281

COVID-19 62, 74, 83, 96, 100, 105, 107, 164, 222, 249, 275, 289, 329, 358

Crime 30, 33, 36, 49, 53, 80, 82, 86, 91, 117, 137, 140, 145, 168, 169, 175, 198, 207, 212, 227, 272, 290, 302, 303, 304, 308, 310, 323, 326, 330

D

Density 30, 32, 33, 36, 40, 44, 58, 60, 62, 73, 79, 80, 86, 89, 97, 99, 100, 114, 118, 137, 140, 141, 142, 144, 157, 166, 169, 194, 198, 210, 216, 223, 226, 231, 237, 241, 250, 260, 267, 268, 270, 272, 278, 292, 296, 297, 304, 306, 308, 319, 323, 326, 330, 334, 362, 364

E

Employment Targets *See* Comprehensive Plan, Growth Targets

Environment 36, 47, 62, 74, 86, 117, 164, 201, 303, 315, 321

Equity 28, 31, 42, 51, 66, 152, 157, 198, 294, 329

G

Grant 26, 58, 61, 138, 149, 179, 196, 222, 225, 250, 270, 280, 309, 319, 323, 324, 350

Growth Management Act 46, 51, 55, 57, 66, 69, 94, 171, 342, 343

 Penalties for Noncompliance 45, 48, 60, 69, 339

H

Harbour Pointe Technical Center 40, 63, 80, 98, 260, 265, 328, 352, 357, 364

Height 33, 40, 79, 86, 89, 97, 112, 166, 260, 270, 276, 296, 362, 368



| | |
|--|--|
| Home Values | 80, 164, 168, 216, 245, 246 |
| Homelessness | 91, 118, 145, 168, 169, 175, 227, 279 |
| Homeownership | 29, 31, 100, 216, 299, 337, 344 |
| House Bill 1923 | <i>See Grant</i> |
| Housing | |
| Affordable | 50, 57, 78, 87, 94, 149, 157, 197, 249, 268, 304, 320, 329, 337 |
| Choice | 31, 82, 100, 123, 246, 249, 344 |
| Cottage | 38, 59, 94, 110, 153, 181, 237, 293, 299, 345, 368 |
| Deficit | 69, 70 |
| Design Standards | 89, 139 |
| Duplex | 38, 59, 319, 345 |
| Federal Requirements | 45, 101, 105, 291, 294, 309 |
| Mandate | 48, 51, 175, 179, 183 |
| Senior | 60, 78, 101, 104, 108, 156, 179, 182, 197, 237, 321, 343 |
| Short-Term Rental | 301, 345 |
| Subsidized | 30, 31, 32, 36, 40, 48, 50, 80, 87, 96, 99, 145, 155, 156, 166, 168, 169, 197, 216, 223, 227, 241, 246, 268, 270, 271, 279, 286, 291, 292, 308, 321, 323, 330, 350, 368 |
| Townhouse | 38, 87, 94, 123, 129, 231, 232, 321, 324, 345 |
| Vacancy | 101, 304, 337 |
| Housing Action Plan (HAP) | 62, 94, 184, 341 |
| Data Quality | 136 |
| Public Process | 28, 29, 34, 37, 38, 43, 44, 58, 73, 77, 78, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 111, 114, 115, 116, 122, 136, 138, 143, 148, 151, 154, 163, 170, 174, 194, 196, 203, 213, 215, 216, 230, 237, 240, 242, 259, 263, 268, 277, 298, 300, 301, 303, 323, 331, 332, 334, 342, 349, 351, 363, 365, 366 |
| State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Environmental Review | 74, 117, 146, 168, 194, 195, 228, 272, 302, 323, 366, 367 |
| Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) | 45, 70, 83, 100, 164, 245, 247 |
| Cost Burden | 101, 103, 245, 246, 249, 292, 313, 336 |
| Data Quality | 29, 100, 164, 198, 270, 281, 304, 319, 336, 342 |
| Data Sources | 45, 100, 164 |
| Housing Targets | <i>See Comprehensive Plan, Growth Targets</i> |
| I | |
| Impact Fees | 51, 179 |
| Infrastructure | 49, 52, 53, 55, 231, 246, 250, 310 |
| L | |
| Landscaping | <i>See Housing, Design Standards</i> |
| Litter | <i>See Environment</i> |
| Low-Income Housing | <i>See Housing, Subsidized</i> |



M

Midtown Mukilteo 85, 94
Mother-in-Law Apartment *See Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)*
Mukilteo School District *See Schools*

N

Noise 117, 168, 202, 323

P

Paine Field 100, 117, 216, 321
Parking 33, 40, 59, 73, 89, 139, 142, 161, 166, 167, 168, 202, 226, 227, 260, 264, 270, 276, 296, 299, 319, 362
Parks and Open Space 66, 98, 112, 140, 141, 169, 207, 222, 303, 368
Permit Process 28, 345
Population Targets *See Comprehensive Plan, Growth Targets*
Preserve Mukilteo 26, 61, 100, 171, 197, 225, 250, 265, 275, 286, 350, 363
Public Services 112, 117, 140, 146, 158, 175, 310, 321, 368

Q

Quality of Life *See Character*

R

Racism *See Equity*
Rezone 30, 80, 96, 98, 100, 114, 151, 196, 238, 250, 264, 309, 319, 321, 323, 339

S

Schools 49, 51, 52, 66, 73, 75, 86, 137, 141, 145, 146, 156, 167, 168, 169, 231, 241, 246, 249, 250, 272, 297, 302, 303, 323
Section 8 *See Housing, Subsidized*
Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) 243, 270, 309, 318, 343, 354
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Environmental Review 334

T

Taxes 30, 51, 73, 137, 167, 246, 249, 271, 281, 297, 310, 340, 368
Tiny Homes *See Housing, Cottage*
Traffic 38, 49, 66, 73, 74, 86, 98, 117, 146, 161, 167, 168, 169, 223, 249, 271, 272, 280, 290, 291, 301, 302, 308, 310, 321, 323, 326, 330, 368

V

Vantage Apartments 29, 31, 40, 42, 51, 73, 74, 86, 96, 106, 137, 145, 155, 166, 168, 169, 179, 216, 250, 260, 282, 290, 344