

Beth Hintz

I live and work in Skyway, down the street from the contamination site and proposed development. Though I live within the 1/4 mile radius of the site, I did not receive any flyer or communication directly about this process--but I learned about it through the Skyway Coalition. I am concerned about the short time frame for community input and that not enough people are aware of the clean-up plan/process and the proposed development to be able to fully weigh in. I am concerned about the impacts of the contamination on my neighbors and my family.

I'm concerned about the proposed development plans, and I do not support the current proposed development. I am also confused b/c I have seen different numbers cited for affordability in various places. In one document, I saw that 20% would be designated to 60-80% AMI. In another I saw that 30-40% would be for affordable housing but no indication of what AMI these units would be for. This location is such a critical location for Skyway, and if it is not done correctly, with TRUE affordability and community-driven development without displacement as the central goal, this project will accelerate the displacement of families who have lived here for decades--many of whom are already struggling to make rent and already cannot afford homeownership. The model I have heard the developer discuss previously in meetings is a rent-to-own model, which has been researched by King County and the community through our anti-displacement strategies planning. It was shown to ultimately benefit the developer and not the community--it does not foster true affordability for residents. In addition, I'm concerned about affordable rent/ownership not being the primary goal of the project. If only 20% of units are slated for affordable housing, and those units would go to 60-80% of King County-wide AMI, that is insufficient and will accelerate gentrification. Especially b/c a large percentage of Skyway residents are at 50% or below of King County AMI. We need to do better for the families and residents who have lived here for many years. I would like to see at least 40% designated for affordable housing, and a clearly communicated and committed mix of affordability, including some for those living at 50% AMI or below. In short, I do not support the rent-to-own model. I do not support the current plan for development.

Lastly, and related to all of the above, I would request additional community meetings, community engagement, and opportunities for more residents to learn more about the entire project (clean up and proposed development) and to weigh in with their questions.