Overview

This report provides a record of the community engagement process that took place in 2021 for our University District ('U District') transit-oriented development (TOD) site, at 1000 NE 45th Street in Seattle. Under our Equitable Transit Oriented Development (TOD) policy, Sound Transit works to ensure the processes to plan, develop and implement TOD are inclusive and reflect the local community. Community feedback gathered through this engagement effort will inform our project goals for selecting a development partner for this site.
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Community engagement snapshot

- 1,832 survey participants over two surveys
- 70 businesses and over 900 people directly engaged
- 10,587 postcards mailed to U District residents in Phases 1 and 2
- Survey and outreach materials offered in 4 languages
Project background

Sound Transit owns a property at 1000 NE 45th Street in Seattle's U District, approximately two blocks from the U District Link station. At approximately 18,000 square feet, the property is about the size of six tennis courts, and was used during construction of the light rail extension to Northgate. Located near the core of the U District, Sound Transit plans to make this property available for transit-oriented development (TOD), which could include housing, retail, office, and/or community space.

Sound Transit met with stakeholders and reached out to the general public in the spring and fall of 2021 to understand community priorities and help us identify goals for the site. This report provides a record of the engagement effort and describes the next steps for the project.

Key findings

The following ‘headlines’ provide a high-level overview of the feedback we gathered over the course of the entire engagement process, organized by theme. The sections that follow provide more detail and specific insights into the feedback received.

Affordable housing is the top priority for this site
- Affordable housing should be the primary focus of the project
- Housing should be complemented by ground-floor uses, like retail or other community-oriented uses

Maximizing the number of housing units, while accommodating a range of household sizes, is also important
- Focus on strategies to achieve as much housing as is physically and financially feasible, such as realigning the alley and building a tall building
- Accommodate a range of household sizes, including families

The project should improve the street-level and pedestrian environment in this busy district
- Design safe and comfortable spaces for pedestrians
- Any alley changes should provide benefits including more affordable housing and improved pedestrian connections
Community Engagement Efforts

Overview

As part of the process to realize future development on this site, Sound Transit engaged community members in an effort to:

- Understand the community’s ideas for the future of this site
- Use this input to prioritize goals for the development outcomes

To accomplish this, Sound Transit developed a multi-phase community engagement plan:

- Early engagement: meetings with local stakeholders to discuss the project
- Phase 1: an online survey to gauge baseline preferences and interests of community members
- Phase 2: an online open house to review key takeaways from phase 1 and ask several additional survey questions to refine our understanding of community feedback

Early engagement

To inform the TOD planning process and our community engagement activities, Sound Transit held conversations with stakeholders representing the University District neighborhood in spring 2021. The purpose of these conversations was to shape the project’s engagement efforts by understanding the University District community and how the TOD project would affect the wider neighborhood. During this early engagement, Sound Transit spoke with Councilmember Alex Pedersen, U District Food Bank, U District Partnership, University Heights Center, University of Washington, and University Family YMCA.

Sound Transit TOD program overview

Transit-oriented development (TOD) is a term used to describe development strategies that integrate transit and land use while supporting community needs and development visions. These strategies focus on urban growth around facilities such as light rail stations to produce regional and local benefits, including increasing transit ridership, developing walkable communities and improving access to jobs.

Sound Transit’s TOD policy includes a priority to offer surplus property for the development of affordable housing. Washington state law requires Sound Transit to offer at least 80% of its surplus property that is suitable for housing to qualified entities to develop homes affordable to households with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income. In addition, Sound Transit has adopted an Equitable TOD Policy that commits the agency to “inclusive planning and decision-making processes, resulting in development outcomes that accommodate future residential and employment growth, increase opportunity and mobility for existing communities, and enhance public health for socially and economically diverse populations.”
**Phase 1 engagement**

The Phase 1 online survey, and notification materials, were developed in English, Spanish, simplified Chinese and traditional Chinese. The survey was shared with the public through a mailer to U District residents, flyers distributed to businesses, targeted Facebook ads, and street canvassing the area. In total, Sound Transit mailed 10,587 postcards, project staff spoke to approximately 900 people at the U District Farmers Market, and directly engaged over 90 people in businesses along NE 45th Street and University Way.

The Phase 1 survey was available from June 14 through July 12, 2021, and generated a total of 1,375 responses.

**Participant demographics**

Sound Transit asked demographic questions in the survey to gauge representation of potentially impacted and historically underrepresented communities. All demographic questions were optional.

Survey respondents were roughly evenly divided between those identifying as male (50 percent) and female (45 percent), with five percent choosing a gender not listed as an option. A majority of respondents (77 percent) recorded their race as White, 11 percent chose Asian or Asian American, eight percent identified as Other, and three percent as Hispanic/Latino. 97 percent of respondents reported speaking English at home. About five percent selected Spanish, four percent selected Mandarin, and about eight percent either selected another listed language or Other. Most survey respondents said they live nearby (62 percent), go to the businesses, restaurants, and services nearby (60 percent), work nearby (30 percent), or go to school nearby (11 percent).

**Phase 2 engagement**

In the fall of 2021, Sound Transit went back out to the U District community to report back on what we had heard in June and July, and to follow up on two topics: building height, and a possible reconfiguration of the alley on the site.

The Phase 1 survey, in question 4, asked respondents to choose whether they preferred a) a shorter building, which would include fewer overall housing units but could make affordable housing more feasible, or b) a taller building, which would fit more housing units but could only be feasible as market-rate housing. The question linked affordable housing feasibility with building height because, in practice, few tall affordable housing buildings have been built in Seattle, and the intent was to demonstrate that either priority might have trade-offs. However, by conflating these topics, the intent of responses was less clear. In fact, many respondents rejected that framing and replied that what they their true preference was a taller building with as many affordable housing units as possible. The questions in Phase 2 were intended to clarify participants’ preference on building height, as well as learn under which conditions participants would support changes to the alley, which would maximize the development capacity of the site.

The Phase 2 online survey, and notification materials, were developed in English, Spanish, simplified Chinese and traditional Chinese. The survey was shared with U District residents and businesses through email, targeted social media ads, a postcard mailer, and a flyer distributed to businesses. Project staff did not speak to people at the U District Farmers Market in Phase 2, but focused engagement on approximately 70 businesses along 45th Street, 11th Avenue NE, Roosevelt Avenue, and University Avenue between 47th Street and 43rd Street. In addition, major nearby apartment buildings were visited, including Twelve at U District and Bridges at 11th Avenue.
The Phase 2 survey was available from November 4 through November 31, 2021, and generated a total of 457 responses.

**Participant demographics**

Sound Transit asked demographic questions in the survey to gauge representation of potentially impacted and historically underrepresented communities. All demographic questions were optional.

54 percent of survey respondents identified as male, and 42 percent as female, with four percent choosing a gender not listed as an option. 69 percent of respondents reported that they do not speak a language other than English at home. Of those who do, Mandarin (41 percent) and Spanish (20 percent) were most commonly selected. Most survey respondents said they go to the businesses, restaurants, and services nearby (70 percent), live nearby (69 percent), work nearby (25 percent), or go to the University of Washington (14 percent) or attend school nearby (9 percent).
Community Feedback Themes

Phase 1 key themes
The Phase 1 survey found that affordable housing is the top priority for this site.

Respondents emphasized that Sound Transit should:
- Maximize the number of new housing units in the neighborhood
- Include family-sized units in the mix
- Prioritize housing opportunities for people with very low incomes, people who are experiencing homelessness, and youth and young adults

Other community priorities include:
- Creating a great pedestrian environment, with elements such as street trees, safety buffers from traffic, and wide sidewalks
- Providing spaces that serve the broader community, such as small and medium-sized retailers, food/grocery market, and public open spaces
- Delivering an environmentally friendly and energy efficient building

Phase 2 key themes
The Phase 2 survey found there is strong support for a tall building on the property, and for consolidating the property into one building site by reconfiguring the alley.

- The overwhelming majority of respondents (88 percent) support a tall building on this site, especially if the building provides affordable housing. Only 11 percent do not support a tall building.
- Respondents support reconfiguring the alley to consolidate the property into one building site, if this enables more affordable housing, or more housing overall.
- Respondents also support reconfiguring the alley to maintain and/or improve pedestrian access from 11th Avenue to Roosevelt Way, or to provide access to NE 45th Street.
- Only 7 percent do not support any changes to the alley.
Implementing the feedback

Community feedback will inform Sound Transit’s selection of a development partner for the U District TOD site. We partner with nonprofit and private developers to build new uses on our TOD sites. With guidance and approval from the Sound Transit Board of Directors, we plan to use a competitive bidding process called a ‘Request for Proposals’ (RFP) to select a development partner. In this process we will ask proposers to demonstrate not only their capacity and track record in delivering successful projects, but also their understanding and incorporation of the community’s needs and vision—including local planning efforts and the community feedback collected through this outreach effort.

The next steps for this project include:

- Share the community engagement report on Sound Transit’s website and with stakeholders
- Prepare development strategy
- Receive policy direction on strategy from the Board of Directors
- Select development partner using a competitive bidding process (RFP)
- Development partner finalizes planning, design, and permitting, and constructs the project

We will continue to provide updates on our progress using our project website and email list to demonstrate how community feedback is reflected in the process and outcomes of this project.

- Visit our project website here to stay up-to-date: https://www.soundtransit.org/system-expansion/creating-vibrant-stations/transit-oriented-development/u-district

Next Steps
Appendix A: Phase 1 Survey Questions

Survey 1 was available in English, Spanish, simplified Chinese and traditional Chinese. All questions were optional and responses were anonymous. The survey included a map of the site area for reference while completing the survey.

1. What is your connection to the University District Station area? (Select all that apply)
   a. I live nearby
   b. I work nearby
   c. I go to school nearby
   d. I got to the businesses, restaurants, and services nearby
   e. I own a business nearby
   f. I pass through but don’t spend time there
   g. Other (please tell us more)
   h. I do not have a connection to the station area

2. What zip code do you live in?
   a. 98102
   b. 98103
   c. 98105
   d. 98112
   e. 98115
   f. Other (please write in zip code)

3. This property is located in the core of the U District and will contribute to its future. What principles do you think are the most important to achieve? (Select up to 3)
   a. Creating a pleasant and interesting pedestrian environment
   b. Offering the deepest levels of housing affordability possible
   c. Prioritizing building as many new affordable housing units as possible
   d. Building as many new housing units as possible, whether affordable and/or market-rate
   e. Prioritizing environmentally friendly and energy-efficient building design
   f. Creating space for community-serving retail, businesses or organizations
   g. Other (please tell us more)

4. Building height: Which of the following should we prioritize?
   a. Prioritize a shorter building (for example, seven or fewer stories, similar to some recent buildings int eh area), which can fit fewer housing units but may make affordable housing more feasible.
   b. Prioritize a taller building (potentially up to 30+ stories, similar to some proposed buildings in the area), which can fit more housing units and other uses but may only be feasible as mostly market-rate housing.
5. Mix of uses: Which of the following should we prioritize?
   a. Include more retail and office space in a building with fewer new housing units.
   b. Maximize the number of housing units that can be built, and include a smaller amount of retail and office uses.

6. Housing unit size: Which of the following should we prioritize?
   a. Maximize the total number of housing units by building smaller units (more studios and one-bedroom units).
   b. Include more units with room for families, but fewer overall units (more two- and three-bedroom units).

7. If we seek to develop the site for affordable housing, what do you think are the greatest needs in the U District? (Select up to 3)
   a. Offering homeownership opportunities
   b. Creating housing for those experiencing homelessness
   c. Creating housing for seniors and/or those with disabilities
   d. Creating units that are affordable for people with very low income
   e. Creating housing for youths and young adults
   f. Offering more than one housing style (such as apartments and townhomes)
   g. Other (please tell us more)

8. In addition to housing, development on our property could also include some other uses. Given funding and feasibility, what other features, community uses, types of businesses, and/or services would be most valuable to the neighborhood? (Select up to 3)
   a. Fresh food or grocery market
   b. Childcare/pre-school
   c. Public open space
   d. Medical and health services
   e. Community meeting/event room
   f. Small or medium format retailers (like a coffee shop or café)
   g. Spaces for smaller scale or emerging businesses
   h. Arts and cultural space
   i. Other (please tell us more)

9. Development on our property will contribute to the pedestrian experience in this area. Which of the following elements are most important to consider in the public areas alongside our property? (Select up to 3)
   a. Setbacks for seating and tables
   b. Landscaping
   c. Bike racks
   d. Green stormwater features, such as rain gardens
   e. Street trees
   f. Buffers between pedestrians and traffic
   g. Wide sidewalks
   h. Other (please tell us more)

10. Is there anything else you’d like to share about development on our property at 1000 NE 45th Street? (Open answer)
Optional demographic questions

11. Do you have access to a working motor vehicle at home that you can reliably use?
   a. No
   b. Yes

12. Do you rent or own your home?
   a. Rent
   b. Own
   c. Other (please tell us more)

13. How do you identify?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Not listed here

14. How old are you?
   a. Under 18
   b. 18-34
   c. 35-49
   d. 50-64
   e. 65+

15. How do you identify? (Select all that apply)
   a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   b. Asian or Asian American
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish origins
   e. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   f. White
   g. Other (please tell us more)

16. What language(s) are spoken at home? (Select all that apply)
   a. Arabic
   b. Cantonese
   c. English
   d. Korean
   e. Mandarin
   f. Russian
   g. Somali
   h. Spanish
   i. Tagalog
   j. Vietnamese
   k. Other (please tell us more)
17. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7
   h. 8
   i. 9 or more

18. What is your household’s totally annual earnings before taxes?
   a. Less than $25,000
   b. $25,000 to $49,999
   c. $50,000 to $74,999
   d. $75,000 to $99,999
   e. $100,000 to $149,000
   f. $150,000 to $199,999
   g. $200,000 or more
   h. I don’t know/prefer not to share
Appendix B: Detailed Phase 1 Survey Results

We received 1,375 responses in Phase 1. The survey responses are summarized below. In the graphics that follow, the number of total answers is indicated in parentheses following the question. Several of the questions allowed for the selection of multiple answers (see Appendix A). Questions 1-10 are the body of the survey, and questions 11-18 are optional demographic questions.

The chart below details the demographics of the survey respondents who chose to answer the optional demographic questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (n=1262)</th>
<th>Rent/Own Home (n=1269)</th>
<th>Race (n=1235)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (45%)</td>
<td>White (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (50%)</td>
<td>Asian or Asian American (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not listed (5%)</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=1259)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (race or racial combination (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34 years</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64 years</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people in home (n=1258)</td>
<td>1 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (42%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 or more (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to motor vehicle (n=1274)</td>
<td>Yes (70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1

Most respondents live and/or work nearby or frequent businesses in the area.

What is your connection to the University District Station area? (Select all that apply)

Base = all respondents (n = 1,375)
Multiple responses allowed. Total may be more than 100%.

- I live nearby: 62%
- I go to the businesses, restaurants, and services nearby: 60%
- I work nearby: 30%
- I go to school nearby: 11%
- I pass through but don’t spend time there: 9%
- I own a business nearby: 2%
- Other (write in): 5%
- I do not have a connection to the station area: 2%

“Other” includes former UW student, visit family/friends, attend religious services, use transit in area, commute through area, used to live nearby.
**Question 3**

*Top priorities are creating a great pedestrian environment, space for retail and businesses, maximizing affordable housing units, and designing an environmentally-friendly building.*

This property is located in the core of the U District and will contribute to its future. What principles do you think are the most important to achieve? (Select up to 3)

Base = all respondents (n = 1,375)
Multiple responses allowed. Total may be more than

- Creating a pleasant and interesting pedestrian environment: 58%
- Creating space for community-serving retail, businesses or organizations: 47%
- Prioritizing building as many new affordable housing units as possible: 47%
- Prioritizing environmentally friendly and energy-efficient building design: 46%
- Offering the deepest levels of housing affordability possible: 33%
- Building as many new housing units as possible, whether affordable and/or market-rate: 20%
- Other (write in): 8%

"Other" includes parking, park, no park, no tall building, community meeting space, safety, social services, no homeless housing, homeless housing.

**Question 4**

*Almost two-thirds (62%) prioritize a shorter building when given the context that it may make affordable housing more feasible.*

**Building height: Which of the following should we prioritize?**

Base = all respondents (n = 1,320)

- Prioritize a shorter building (for example, seven or fewer stories, similar to some recent buildings in the area), which can fit fewer housing units but may make affordable housing more feasible: 62%
- Prioritize a taller building (potentially up to 10+ stories, similar to some proposed buildings in the area), which can fit more housing units and other uses but may only be feasible as mostly market-rate housing: 39%

**A closer look at shorter vs taller**

Most respondents selected 'shorter building'. While we cannot know the motivation behind this choice, there is anecdotal evidence that some respondents made their choice based on affordable housing feasibility.

Numerous people wrote in that they preferred a tall building and affordable housing, maximizing the site’s development capacity, and/or questioned why a tall building with more affordable housing wasn’t feasible.

For example:

- Of those who selected a taller building, 189 provided a comment later in the survey and 29% of those comments were supportive of a taller building with maximum affordable units.
- Of those who selected a shorter building, 259 provided a comment later in the survey, and 25% of those comments were supportive of affordable housing.
Question 5

*More than two-thirds (68%) prioritize maximizing the number of housing units over commercial space.*

Mix of uses: Which of the following should we prioritize?

- Maximize the number of housing units that can be built, and include a smaller amount of retail and office uses (68%)
- Include more retail and office space in a building with fewer new housing units (32%)

Question 6

*More than half (59%) prioritize including more family-size units even if it means fewer units overall.*

Housing unit size: Which of the following should we prioritize?

- Include more units with room for families, but fewer overall units (more two- and three-bedroom units) (59%)
- Maximize the total number of housing units by building smaller units (more studios and one-bedroom units) (41%)
Question 7

The greatest perceived need for affordable housing was for people with very low incomes, people experiencing homelessness, and youths and young adults.

If we seek to develop the site for affordable housing, what do you think are the greatest needs in the U District? (Select up to 3)

Base = all respondents (n = 1,329)

Multiple responses allowed. Total may be more than 100%.

- Creating units that are affordable for people with very low incomes: 70%
- Creating housing for those experiencing homelessness: 49%
- Creating housing for youths and young adults: 44%
- Creating housing for seniors and/or those with disabilities: 31%
- Offering more than one housing style (such as apartments and townhomes): 29%
- Offering homeownership opportunities: 26%
- Other (write in): 6%

“Other” includes affordable student housing, common/green space, no homeless housing, safety, access to social services/childcare, parking.

Question 8

The most preferred other uses to include were fresh food/grocery market, public open space, and small/medium format retail and businesses.

In addition to housing, development on our property could also include some other uses. Given funding and feasibility, what other features, community uses, types of businesses, and/or services would be most valuable to the neighborhood? (Select up to 3)

- Fresh food or grocery market: 52%
- Public open space: 41%
- Small or medium format retailers (like a coffee shop or cafe): 41%
- Spaces for smaller scale or emerging businesses: 37%
- Childcare/pre-school: 36%
- Arts and cultural space: 34%
- Medical and health services: 17%
- Community meeting/event room: 14%
- Other (write in): 5%

“Other” includes parking, safety, green space/traces, restrooms for transit riders.
Question 9

Top public realm priorities were elements to improve the pedestrian comfort and safety (street trees, buffers, and wide sidewalks).

Development on our property will contribute to the pedestrian experience in this area. Which of the following elements are most important to consider in the public areas alongside our property?

(Select up to 3)

Base = all respondents (n = 1,305)
Multiple r

- Street trees: 58%
- Buffers between pedestrians and traffic: 51%
- Wide sidewalks: 48%
- Green stormwater features, such as rain gardens: 39%
- Setbacks for seating and tables: 35%
- Landscaping: 25%
- Bike racks: 24%
- Other (write in): 4%

“Other” includes physical accessibility, non-hostile seating, canopy coverage, lighting.

Question 10

Final comments reinforced support for affordable housing and offered other local insights and perspectives.

In Their Words

- “Affordable housing is a very important issue, and the development should prioritize affordable units.”
- “It’s a great place to build a ton of housing and really create the kind of density Seattle needs.”
- “45th is also a very unfriendly street for pedestrians, especially the development site, so the development should be designed in a way that improves the pedestrian access by widening sidewalks and protecting walkers and cyclists from car traffic.”
- “Our homelessness population has skyrocketed and Seattle HAS the money to fix this. Stop building million-dollar homes.”
- “Just make sure there are lots of trees and nice greenery. The main arterials in the U District are relatively barren. Trees do grow well here as long as they are cared for, especially when young and recently planted.”
- “Having medical and mental health care resources available would be a huge contribution to the community.”

444 people took advantage of an open-ended question to tell Sound Transit more about their thoughts on the importance of housing in the U District and other local needs. 40 percent of respondents used that space to reiterate their support for more affordable housing, and 22 percent asked Sound Transit to consider a taller building. Others emphasized the need to prioritize youth, unsheltered individuals, families, or other target populations for housing.
Appendix C: Phase 2 Survey Questions

1. One way to maximize the amount of housing on this site is to build a tall building (for example, 15 or more stories). Under which scenario would you support a tall building on this site? (Select one)
   a. Any scenario; I support a tall building on this site to maximize any type of housing
   b. If the building provides affordable housing
   c. If the building provides market-rate housing
   d. If the building provides housing for a mix of income levels
   e. None; I don’t support a tall building on this site

2. Consolidating our property into one building site would allow for more housing development. Assuming city approval, under what scenario would you support a change to the alley? (Select all that apply)
   a. If the change enables more affordable housing
   b. If the change enables more housing overall (affordable and market-rate)
   c. If pedestrian access (for example, through a corridor) from the existing alley to NE 45th Street is provided
   d. If pedestrian access from 11th Avenue to Roosevelt Way is provided
   e. None; I don’t support any changes to the alley

Optional demographic questions

3. What is your connection to the University District Station area? (Select all that apply)
   a. I live nearby
   b. I work nearby
   c. I go to school nearby
   d. I got to the businesses, restaurants, and services nearby
   e. I own a business nearby
   f. I pass through but don’t spend time there
   g. Other (please tell us more)
   h. I do not have a connection to the station area

4. What zip code do you live in?
   a. 98102
   b. 98103
   c. 98105
   d. 98112
   e. 98115
   f. Other (please write in zip code)

5. Do you have access to a working motor vehicle at home that you can reliably use?
   a. No
   b. Yes

6. Do you rent or own your home?
   a. Rent
   b. Own
   c. Other (please tell us more)
7. How do you identify?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Not listed here

8. How old are you?
   a. Under 18
   b. 18-34
   c. 35-49
   d. 50-64
   e. 65+

9. How do you identify? (Select all that apply)
   a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   b. Asian or Asian American
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or Spanish origins
   e. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   f. White
   g. Other (please tell us more)

10. Does anyone in your family speak any languages other than English?
   a. No
   b. Yes

11. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7
   h. 8
   i. 9 or more

12. What is your household’s totally annual earnings before taxes?
   a. Less than $25,000
   b. $25,000 to $49,999
   c. $50,000 to $74,999
   d. $75,000 to $99,999
   e. $100,000 to $149,000
   f. $150,000 to $199,999
   g. $200,000 or more
   h. I don’t know/prefer not to share
Appendix D: Detailed Phase 2 Survey Results

We received 457 responses in Phase 2. The survey responses are summarized below. In the graphics that follow, the number of total answers is indicated in parentheses following the question. Questions 1 and 2 are the body of the survey, and questions 3-12 are optional demographic questions.

The chart below details the demographics of the survey respondents who chose to answer the optional demographic questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (n=447)</th>
<th>Access to motor vehicle (n=450)</th>
<th>Rent/Own Home (n=454)</th>
<th>Race (n=442)</th>
<th>Income (n=447)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (42%)</td>
<td>Yes (68%)</td>
<td>Rent (52%)</td>
<td>White (72%)</td>
<td>Less than $25,500 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (54%)</td>
<td>No (32%)</td>
<td>Own (47%)</td>
<td>Asian (15%)</td>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not listed (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic (3%)</td>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age (n=450)**
- Under 18 (0.67%)
- 18-34 years (42%)
- 35 to 49 years (23%)
- 50 to 64 years (16%)
- 65 and over (18%)

**# of people in home (n=450)**
- 1 (30%)
- 2 (41%)
- 3 (15%)
- 4 (10%)
- 5 (2%)
- 6 or more (2%)

**Speak languages other than English at home (n=451)**
- Yes (31%)
- No (69%)

**Languages spoken at home (n=135)**
- English (41%)
- Mandarin (21%)
- Spanish (20%)
- Korean (5%)
- Russian (4%)
- Tagalog (4%)
- Vietnamese (4%)
- Cantonese (2%)
- Arabic (1%)

**Question 1**

*Most participants use businesses, restaurants, and services (70%) and/or live nearby (69%).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s your connection to the University District Station area?</th>
<th>Base = all respondents (n = 452)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I go to the businesses, restaurants, and services nearby</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live nearby</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work nearby</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend the University of Washington</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to school nearby</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pass through but I don’t spend time there</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a business nearby</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Other" responses include owning property, visiting childcare facilities, recently attending school, visiting friends, using transit, or attending a place of worship nearby and none.
Question 2

*One way to maximize the amount of housing on this site is to build a tall building (for example, 15 or more stories). Many participants support a tall building in any scenario (36%) or especially if the building provides affordable housing (33%).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under which scenario would you support a tall building on this site?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any scenario; I support a tall building on this site to maximize any type of housing.</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the building provides affordable housing.</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the building provides housing for a mix of income levels.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the building provides market-rate housing.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None; I don't support a tall building on this site.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 11 percent do not support a tall building on this site.

Question 3

*Consolidating our property into one building site would allow for more housing development. Most participants support change to the alley if the change enables more affordable housing (54%) and/or if the change enables more housing overall (52%).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assuming city approval, under what scenario would you support a change to the alley?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the change enables more affordable housing.</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the change enables more housing overall (affordable and market-rate).</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If pedestrian access from 11th Avenue to Roosevelt Way is provided.</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If pedestrian access (for example, through a corridor) from the existing alley to NE 45th Street is provided.</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None; I don't support any changes to the alley</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 7% do not support changes to the alley.
Appendix E: Notifications

For both Phase 1 and Phase 2 online surveys, Sound Transit notified the public of the feedback opportunity through a postcard distributed to residents and businesses in the University District Station area, along with paid social media ads on Facebook targeting the 98105 zip code. The postcard featured information in multiple languages, including English, Spanish, simplified Chinese, and traditional Chinese.

Phase 1 postcard

Front

Help us shape the future of our property in the heart of the U District

As our extension of Link light rail service from the University of Washington to Northgate nears completion, it is time to determine what's next for Sound Transit's property at 1000 NE 45th Street. We'd like your help.

Take our survey by June 30: UDistrictTOD.com

Back

You know the needs of your community

As neighborhood experts, you can best help us decide what comes next for our property at 1000 NE 45th Street. We're listening.

Take our survey by June 30: UDistrictTOD.com

Sound Transit supports transit-oriented development near Link light rail stations to help create vibrant, sustainable neighborhoods and transit ridership.

Questions?
Ryan Blanch: ryan.blanch@soundtransit.org or 206-553-3886

To request accommodations for persons with disabilities, call 800-201-4900 / TTY: 711 or email accessibility@soundtransit.org.
Phase 1 social media

Sound Transit
Sponsored · 🌐

Housing, shops, restaurants, community services...? Tell us what you’d like near U District Station: bit.ly/UDistrictTOD

SOUNDTRANSIT.ORG
U District Survey
Let us know what you think

Learn more
Phase 2 postcard

Front

Help us imagine future development near U District Station

Check out what we heard from the community this summer and answer two questions to help us refine our goals.

Visit our online open house by Nov. 28


Back

Sound Transit owns property at 1000 NE 45th Street, a few blocks from our new U District Link light rail station, and we’re making it available for development. Earlier this year we asked for your feedback on what would be most beneficial for your growing community. Now we’d like to share what we heard and get your input to help refine our goals.


Questions?
Sagar Ramachandran: sagar.ramachandran@soundtransit.org or 206-398-5453

To request accommodations for persons with disabilities, call 800-201-4600 / TTY: 711 or email accessibility@soundtransit.org.

A

Interpreter 800-823-9230
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Phase 2 social media

Help us imagine future transit-oriented development near U District Station. Check out what we heard from the community this summer and answer two questions to help us refine our goals.

BIT.LY/UDISTRICTTOD

U District TOD Open House
Visit by November 28.

Learn more
Appendix D: Data Collection

In both outreach phases, the postcards, social media advertisements, flyers, and other engagement strategies directed participants to online survey instruments (Appendix A). The survey was fielded through Alchemer in Phase 1 and through Social Pinpoint in Phase 2. In both surveys, open-ended comments were organized into themes through a data analysis process.