

Thank you to the Committee members for all of the work you've done around this and do on everything else.

I'm Kelsey Hamlin and I work at Sightline Institute, a sustainability think tank.

We are all aware of the climate crisis. But I want to emphasize how every. Single. Decision we make from this point forward--though it should have been long ago--is paramount. With that said, Sightline knows we need to build housing for Seattle's residents. Doing so to the scale we need in a green way means building things like apartments, which cut GHG emissions by about half *per person* compared to single-detached homes.

Sightline also knows how false it is to think building is at odds with the environment or green spaces.

The chance to revamp Fort Lawton is not one of this or that. We *can* build housing and still maintain green spaces. In fact, Seattle's tree growth happens most through urban development--not the lack of it.

I would be remiss if I didn't bring up that keeping Fort Lawton as is, meaning within walking distance only to people in homes averaging \$939,000 in Magnolia--is an equity issue. Studies show a huge gap of access to green spaces between incomes and between races. There are health disadvantages associated with this. By not building mass affordable housing on one of the rare spots of free land Seattle has left--which *will* inform rent prices--we pretend the climate crisis isn't already happening and that there's no have and have-not divide growing in Seattle.

It's a shame we aren't building even more housing, but it would be even more shameful to build none at all. Letting people live closer to their jobs means less people driving long commutes, less traffic and less pollution. This, too, has health implications: stress, financial burdens, the air we and our children breathe. We cannot afford, in every sense of the word--because who can afford it here, really--not to make the common-sense changes of adding multi-family housing to Fort Lawton.