

1. **Socially responsible development:** Seattle takes a strong stance in favor of environmentally sustainable development. Do you believe that Seattle also encourages socially responsible development? What does socially responsible development mean to you, and in the absence of any policy incentives, how does it come about? How can it be encouraged with policy?

Seattle can do a lot more to encourage socially responsible development. In order to create an equitable and affordable city, we have to ensure that new development results in quality, affordable housing that also provides significant public benefit. This is the core of socially responsible development – when developers are contributing to the surrounding community and providing affordable housing, neighborhood amenities like parks and open spaces, retail space and uses that support the local economy, and a development that is reflective of the local community, they are creating a socially responsible development.

It's up to decision makers to ensure that the incentives we have to encourage creation of these benefits truly act as an incentive. I believe we need to periodically evaluate and improve the city's affordable housing tools so that we can build more affordable units across the city. To that end, I have convened an advisory group led by Tom Tierney to look at affordable housing incentive programs across the city.

This group is exploring how the city can incentivize the inclusion of more affordable housing in developments, and making recommendations on how to improve the Multi Family Tax Exemption and Incentive Zoning programs. With the advice of this committee, I will amend the Incentive Zoning program in 2014. Next year the city will also begin a major update to our Comprehensive Plan, including updating the Housing Element. As a part of this effort, I plan to look at other tools the city uses or could use to increase production of affordable housing.

Beyond affordable housing tools, we can also encourage socially responsible development in other ways where the City has leverage. Alley vacations are a good example of a situation in which the City has more leverage to ensure that new development provides significant public good in exchange for the sale of public land to a private developer. In the case of Whole Foods, I have taken the position that the city is under no obligation to sell public property to a company that will depress wages and benefits for workers at existing grocery stores in the same neighborhood. This city is fortunate in that we are growing and prospering, but too many people are left out of that prosperity. This is true not only here but nationwide, where we have had decades of rising inequality. And this is not just a theoretical discussion — it has real impacts on people that work in our city. Will the person ringing up groceries have good health benefits? Will those who stock the shelves with the food we buy be able to live in this city?

When the alley vacation issue came before me I took a close look at what the law permitted me to do. Our City ordinances, as explained in my recommendation letter to Peter Hahn, allow me to look at economic development, and wages and benefits, as a factor in deciding whether a proposed street vacation provides a public benefit. I anticipate using this tool in the future to help influence the way our built environment impacts the social and economic fabric of our city.

In the absence of policy incentives (and aside from the current regulatory environment), we mostly have the goodwill of developers and the pressures of public input at play in shaping

development. Developers with the intention of creating quality projects that enhance and reflect the surrounding community are a boon to this city.

2. **Negative outcomes:** What trends accompanying growth and development in other cities, or in Seattle's history, do you hope Seattle will avoid in future development cycles? What brought you to live in Seattle? What aspects of growth do you believe bring about fear of loss? How can Seattle avoid negative outcomes?

I came to live in Seattle for work and family reasons, but I stayed because Seattle is a city that shares my values of sustainability – economic, environmental, and social sustainability.

Keeping Seattle affordable for a mix of incomes is a top priority. Seattle is a major North American city that is currently more affordable than many and I will work to keep it this way. Pricing people out of the city is not acceptable.

Conversely, other cities have also seen hard times from the recession and not been able to recover – which means that city investments concurrent with development have not been possible. This is clearly not the case in Seattle, which is experiencing a development boom at the same time that our City coffers are more stable than cities in Washington and throughout the nation, enabling us to invest in neighborhood transportation infrastructure, parks, and other community necessities as the city grows.

I believe that as a city we should take advantage of our economic strength in ways that are beneficial to all. People may have fears of loss of parking, an increase in people living near them, or of gentrification. These discussions need to be a part of the decision-making process. But creating a city where everyone can live, or even thrive, is our ultimate goal.

Preserving and enhancing our historical and cultural resources in neighborhoods has also been a focus of our work. On Capitol Hill, we used a cultural overlay district to help preserve arts and cultural resources, and the 12th Avenue Arts project will reflect those values. In the Central District we've supported a sustainable management model for the Langston Hughes Performing Arts Institute and assisted in the restoration of Washington Hall. We've offered training and support for immigrant entrepreneurs. In the Rainier Beach and Othello neighborhoods, we've used inclusive outreach models resulting in recommendations (like a multicultural center) that reflect the community's needs. Our Only in Seattle economic development granting program has assisted in making more of these community investments possible. I will continue to seek opportunities to increase this type of work upon re-election.

3. **Process:** How do you rate Seattle's speed in response to demand for housing? How can Seattle improve upon existing planning policy and process (Comprehensive Plan; Design Review; Planning Commission; etc.)? What are the benefits and shortcomings of the "Seattle process"? If you would modify the planning or permitting process in any way, please cite positive and/or negative examples from other cities. Are there any specific precedents from Seattle or other cities that you view as a model of civic and private partnership in the built environment?

Planning in Seattle has a long and storied history. I'm proud that as a city we engage with citizens in a meaningful way to shape the future of their neighborhoods and the city. In recent years, we have built on this legacy by developing new approaches like the Planning Outreach and Engagement Liaisons to effectively engage under-represented communities in the planning process. We've engaged deeply in neighborhoods from Othello to Capitol Hill to plan for equitable growth as significant investments are made in transportation infrastructure and huge opportunities for reshaping the urban fabric are emerging.

We have also laid the groundwork for important improvements to our permitting and development review process. In 2010, as development was beginning to pick back up in Seattle after the low point in 2009, I heard concerns from developers that long wait times for permits at the Department of Planning and Development were slowing the growth of badly needed commercial development, at a time when our city badly needed the jobs created by that development. Permit intake staffing at DPD is funded by permit fees. When the economy crashed in 2008, fewer permits were pulled and DPD had to lay off nearly 150 staff over two years, causing long wait times. I heard from some developers that it was taking up to 9 weeks to get an intake meeting. That was unacceptable.

I convened my staff and said we had to do better. And they responded. Within a few days, DPD reported back to me on their plan to add more appointment times by revising some intake processes, bringing back a former employee as a temporary hire, and shifting resources around to meet greatest demand. These revisions took a little time to implement, but a month later, we had gotten those appointments down to our target of two weeks. I believe this example shows that under the right leadership, we can be responsive to changing market forces while still operating within the bounds of the "Seattle Process."

I have also made needed modifications to the permitting process itself. I brought together stakeholders to develop a regulatory reform package, and accomplished the following:

- Streamlining environmental review with higher regulatory requirements in Urban Centers and certain Urban Villages
- Providing greater ability to mix residential uses in the ground floor of commercial zones
- Expanding opportunities for accessory dwelling units such as backyard cottages
- More parking flexibility and support for home-based businesses
- Easier permit renewals for temporary uses

Both the Affordable Housing Advisory Group (mentioned above) and the task force assembled for regulatory reform are good examples of private/public partnership. I believe it's very important to utilize the skills, knowledge, and expertise of private developers while we consider how to improve our current systems. If there are other changes to the planning or permitting systems that are recommended by those in the private industries, I am very open to discussing what might be changed.

4. **Built Form:** What do you believe is the right mix of parking and building typologies in Seattle in the next 10 years? If you anticipate reduced car ownership and/or increased density, please discuss potential changes in how Seattleites access nature and the outdoors. Examples of building typologies include:

- Single Family
- Small lot/ADUs
- Rowhouse or cottage housing
- Townhomes
- Midrise developments (45' to 85')
- High rise developments

As I previously mentioned, maintaining affordability in Seattle is a top priority. Maintaining and building on our economic strength is also a top priority. I anticipate that Seattle's economic engine will continue to grow, attracting new businesses and workers. To keep up with this growing demand while keeping housing costs in check, the city needs to grow and to increase in density. I believe we need a mix of new housing types, creating infill housing within existing neighborhoods. This means adding new homes and ADU's in existing single family areas, and adding a variety of higher densities in areas that are well served by transit. It's highly likely that current trends will continue, and in the future people will drive less and use transit, biking, and walking more. Thus, continuing to improve our transportation infrastructure to better serve all modes is very important as neighborhoods experience new development. Demand for parking and other car-centric uses will decrease in the future, and our regulations will need to keep pace. We have already significantly reduced parking requirements in parts of the city with good transit and walkable neighborhoods, and we will need to continue to adapt our regulations to changes in market demand as car ownership declines.

In terms of accessing nature and the outdoors as car ownership decreases in the future, I believe there are many opportunities. Transit currently serves most Seattle parks as well as a number of regional parks and recreation areas, including popular destinations like Cougar Mountain and Tiger Mountain. In addition, carsharing services like Zipcar and Car2Go provide additional options and flexibility. With more demand in the future, services like this are sure to expand.

5. **Affordability:** In which neighborhoods and what mix should affordability be found? Please also discuss strategies you believe are effective at reaching affordability targets, and those you believe are ineffective. Please cite specific examples from other cities. Example strategies include:

- Preservation of older housing and retail, and other means to prevent displacement;
- Increased housing supply and microhousing;
- Incentive zoning;
- Seattle Housing Levy—please also discuss any specific changes to the program or amount that you'd favor when the Housing Levy is brought up for renewal in 2016; and
- Multi-Family Tax Exemption.

Neighborhoods across Seattle should include a range of housing types and price points. Seattle needs policy tools to address housing needs across the spectrum of income and family sizes. There are substantial unmet needs for housing affordable to individuals and families earning incomes from 100% AMI all the way down to below 30% AMI. I believe we need tools to address that full spectrum of need. That said, families in the lower income brackets often struggle the most to find available housing that they can afford within the city. Tools like the City's Housing Levy play a critical role in continuing to build units that are affordable to people earning less than 60% AMI. I will work to renew the Housing Levy in 2016. In addition, the city plans to update its Comprehensive Plan in 2015, including the Housing Element, and through that process I will also look at ways to improve existing policy tools and add new policy tools to further incentivize production of units that are affordable across the full spectrum of need.

Increasing housing supply and reducing the costs of developing new housing are other tactics for creating more affordable housing outside of the Housing Levy. In the past four years we've been able to reduce costs of development through the previously mentioned regulatory reform package, as well as through the Multi-family rezone, which reduced parking requirements and included a number of new affordability incentives. In addition, we've made great strides in creating a regulatory framework that can help to encourage greater housing supply. I've supported the development of low cost market rate housing like micro apartments, which are a good way to provide low-rent living options for people want to live in the city. And I've supported development in neighborhoods like South Downtown and South Lake Union as well as areas around transit stations, which have been rezoned to accommodate more new housing.

Even now as the economy is recovering, Seattle has rents that are too high for many (especially those earning minimum wage) to afford. The recent South Lake Union rezone is a good example of how more affordable housing could have been realized but was not – as the package proposed to City Council included potential for more affordable housing than the legislation that passed. In fact, my proposal would have raised 2 million more for affordable housing in South Lake Union than the council-adopted proposal, because council reductions in new building capacity reduced the potential for new affordable housing fees.