

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

In Re: Appeal by
Seattle Coalition for Affordability,
Livability, and Equity
of the City of Seattle Citywide
Implementation of Mandatory Housing
Affordability (MHA) Final Environmental
Impact Statement

Hearing Examiner File No. W-17-010

DECLARATION OF EUGENIA WOO

I, EUGENIA WOO, declare as follows:

1. I am the Director of Preservation Services for Historic Seattle. I have held that position since 2009. Historic Seattle is a public development authority, chartered by the City of Seattle in 1974, focused on preserving Seattle’s and King County’s architectural heritage. Historic Seattle provides education programs to its members and the public; advocates for preservation with the public and elected officials; and acquires historic properties for rehabilitation.

2. Prior to my employment with Historic Seattle, I was a historic preservation consultant with Artifacts Consulting, Inc. and before that, a community development specialist with the City of Seattle Department of Neighborhood’s Historic Preservation Program.

1 3. I received my B.A. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1989 in political
2 science and my Master's from the University of Washington in 1995 in Urban Planning, with a
3 certificate in Preservation Planning.

4 4. I am very familiar with historic resources in the City of Seattle, including inventories
5 of historic resources that have been compiled for various purposes, in various parts of the city, at
6 various times. The Department of Neighborhoods maintains a database which collects much of the
7 inventoried information, but not all inventories are included on the City's database and not all areas
8 of the city have been comprehensively studied in recent years (or decades) to catalogue all historic
9 properties. Still, the City's database represents the most complete inventory of historic resources in
10 one place.

11 5. The closest the EIS gets to providing information on the historic resources that would
12 be impacted by increased development are the two maps at 3-300 and 3-301 (exhibits 3.5-2 and 3.5-
13 3) which show the location of a small number of historic buildings. The properties mapped on these
14 exhibits are only those that have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of
15 Historic Places by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. These
16 determinations of eligibility barely scratch the surface of the known historic properties in the 27
17 neighborhoods. The City of Seattle has its own database of known historic structures which contains
18 hundreds, perhaps thousands, more historic structures. No information regarding the location or
19 significance of those historic resources is presented.

20 6. Recently, I queried the City's database for historic properties in the North Rainier
21 neighborhood. The query results showed 173 properties in the North Rainier neighborhood.

22 7. I also queried the City's database for historic properties in the Beacon Hill
23 neighborhood. The query results showed 340 historic resources in that neighborhood.

1 8. I also queried the City’s database for historic properties in the South Park
2 neighborhood. The query results showed 116 historic resources in that neighborhood.

3 9. The final EIS for the MHA proposal does not disclose the vast number of historic
4 resources in the North Rainier, Beacon Hill, and South Park neighborhoods. Instead, the EIS informs
5 the reader that there are only two historic buildings determined eligible for listing on the National
6 Register of Historic Places in North Rainier. EIS at 3-301 (Ex. 3.5-3). The EIS informs the reader
7 that there are no such historic buildings in the Beacon Hill neighborhood. *Id.* The EIS informs the
8 reader that there is only one such historic building in the South Park neighborhood. *Id.* These are
9 just three examples that I have provided. The same sort discrepancies may exist for other
10 neighborhoods that are within the study area. This information in the EIS would likely lead the
11 reader (*e.g.*, a City Council member or a member of the public) to believe that increased density in
12 that neighborhood would have little or no impact on historic resources. The information in the EIS
13 is grossly misleading.

14 10. It is particularly interesting to note that the EIS includes a discussion about the historic
15 resource surveys and the information that is in the City’s database for historic properties in different
16 neighborhoods (which I queried as described above) on page 3.297 and Ex. 3.5-4 on page 3.302
17 references those surveys, but then the details that I outline above about the results of those surveys are
18 not provided in the EIS. This is a glaring omission of readily available and important information
19 about the existing situation in the EIS.

20 11. SEPA is a not a fail-safe in the City of Seattle's review process. The thresholds for
21 categorical exemptions have increased significantly recently which has resulted in more potentially
22 historic properties falling through the large cracks of review. Code language in place that is meant to
23
24
25
26

1 provide a level of review for potentially historic properties is either being ignored or misinterpreted
2 by the City, resulting in the issuance of demolition permits for potential landmarks.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing
4 is true and correct.
5

6 Dated this 3rd day of May, 2018, at Seattle, Washington.
7

8
9
10 Eugenia Woo
EUGENIA WOO
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26