
**YESLER TERRACE
CITIZEN'S REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

MEETING NO.: 4

LOCATION: Yesler Community Center
917 East Yesler Way

DATE: Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 5:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES: Committee Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Norman Rice, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quang Nguyen
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aregawi Abiraha	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kristin O'Donnell
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elise Chayet	<input type="checkbox"/> Father Hoang Phuong
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Herold Eby (alternate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adrienne Quinn
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Fox	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Ramos
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abdisamad Jama	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sue Sherbrooke
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Kelly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Staggers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timothy Leary	<input type="checkbox"/> Sue Taoka
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Littel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Donya Williamson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M. Michelle Mattox	<input type="checkbox"/> Norma Zavala
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mary McCumber	

SHA Staff

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judi Carter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Felton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Linda Hall
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judith Kilgore
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marty LaMar
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ayan Musse
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Leslie Stewart
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Tierney
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ellen Ziontz

Guest

Martin Regge and Liz Birkholz: NBBJ

Facilitator

Marcia Wagoner, Yvonne Kraus, and Katie Lemmon: Pacific Rim Resources

I. Call to Order and Welcome

Chair Rice called the meeting to order at 5:13 p.m. Committee members introduced themselves noting their agency or community affiliations.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the January 24, 2007 Meeting

Chair Rice asked for amendments or corrections to the minutes of the Committee's January 24, 2007 meeting. Fox distributed his comments on the meeting materials as he was unable to attend the January meeting. There were no other amendments or corrections; the minutes were approved as amended to include Fox's comments.

III. Discussion of One-for-One Replacement Housing

Wagoner stated that refinement of the definitions and guiding principles of social equity, economic opportunity and environmental/sustainable stewardship will be taken up at the next meeting. She asked that any additional comments be submitted tonight or sent to staff as soon as possible so they can be incorporated into the materials.

For the purpose of tonight's discussion on one-for-one replacement housing, Wagoner noted that there are currently 561 units at Yesler Terrace. The number of each type of housing units are as follows: 35 studios; 192 one-bedroom units; 229 two-bedroom units; 86 three-bedroom units; and 19 four-bedroom units. In response to a question from Fox, Carter said that there are currently six one bedroom units that are wheelchair accessible.

The Committee broke into four groups for approximately 25 minutes to discuss the meaning of one-for-one replacement housing.

Rice recessed the meeting for approximately ten minutes for the purpose of allowing attendees to conduct evening prayers. The meeting was reconvened.

Wagoner introduced Martin Regge of NBBJ, an urban planning, architectural and design firm engaged by SHA to assist the CRC in this process. Regge gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee with regard to the elements that make a desirable community in order to help the Committee in its discussions around one-for-one replacement housing and refinement of the core values. Regge began his presentation with a slide that identified the surrounding neighborhoods, noting the main uses of these areas and the prominent features and links that are provided by these neighborhoods. The second slide listed some of the existing positive community elements. The next nine slides identified elements that make a desirable community including, but not limited to: housing, jobs, schools/education centers, parks and nature, safe streets, public transit, shopping, recreation, community services, and culture and worship. The last six slides identified: major surrounding land uses; major thoroughfares and transit routes in the vicinity; major pedestrian and bicycle routes and the area that represents a five minute walk from the center of Yesler Terrace; existing nearby parks and open space and some community facilities; existing environmental factors such as views, slopes and climate; and known future projects in the vicinity.

Wagoner stated that the second exercise tonight is to discuss and prioritize a list of community values and explain the basis for prioritization. She said this exercise should be carried out in the context of the prior discussion on one-for-one replacement. The Committee broke into three groups to discuss and prioritize the following list of community values:

Affordability	Fiscal Impacts	Parking	Safe Streets
Community Facilities	Home Ownership	Parks & Playgrounds	Schools
Community Input in Development	Housing Variety	Pedestrian Friendly	Shopping
Community Safety and Security	Multi-generational	Privacy	Transit Access
Design Quality	Open Space	Proximity to Jobs	Tree Preservation
Diverse Community			

Discussion also took place among staff and the audience discussion was facilitated by Kraus, Lemmon and Community Coalition for Environmental Justice Interim Executive Director, Judith Vega. All of the groups used cards labeled with the above community values placing them on to a continuum with values ranging from *most important* to *less important* to *least important*. Blank cards were also provided for the purpose of identifying community values not listed above. Discussion took place for approximately 35 minutes and then members from each of the groups were asked to summarize both the discussion on one-for-one replacement housing and prioritization of the above-noted list of community values.

For **CRC Group #2**, Sherbrooke reported on the discussion on one-for-one replacement housing and Chayet reported on the prioritization of the community values. Key elements identified with regard to the meaning of one-for-one replacement housing were: the existing number of bedrooms should be replaced rather than the existing number of units; the configuration of the housing types should be driven by the needs of the community; distribution should not result in the segregation of members of the community based on affordability or housing status; it is acceptable to expand the boundaries of Yesler Terrace as long as the expansion is contiguous with the existing site and there is no net loss of bedrooms; the ability to implement these various elements is subject to an economic feasibility analysis. With regard to prioritization of the community values, the *most important* values are affordability, community safety, and transparency; *less important* are that the process is honest and information is disseminated as quickly as possible, fiscal impacts which should be redefined as financially viable and clarify that a diverse community includes a multi-generational community; and *least important* are housing variety, but this term needs to be clarified.

Littel reported for **CRC Group #1** on both the discussion on one-for-one replacement housing and community values. With regard to the meaning of one-for-one replacement, key elements identified were: the units should be replaced one-for-one, but housing variety should be based on needs of the community; addressing the lack of ADA accessible units is a high priority; location of job opportunities and services needs to be considered in conjunction with the location of replacement housing; and the quality of building design is a high priority while maintaining or expanding open space and replacing all units within the community. With regard to prioritization of the community values, the *most important* values are safety and a sense of community; *less important* are design quality and sustainability; and the underlying theme is that the relocation and construction processes will be very disruptive to the community and this issue needs to be addressed during the planning process. Eby offered the following additional list of *most important* values from a resident perspective: shopping, health care, schools, parking and information on the relocation process.

For **CRC Group #3**, Mattox reported on the definition of one-for-one replacement housing and the prioritization of community values. Main elements identified with regard to the meaning of one-for-one replacement housing were: replacement of the existing number of bedrooms is more important than replacing the number of units; replace the majority if not all of the open space with a focus toward pea patches and safe and well maintained play areas and parks; maintain or increase the number of family housing units; increase availability of parking for residents; consider physically challenged and elderly populations during relocation; replace low-income and affordable units; and temporary housing during relocation and permanent replacement housing is acceptable within the adjacent areas such as Downtown, International District, Squire Park, and Jackson Place. With regard to the community values the *most important* values identified are family and safety related issues such as schools and safe streets; *less important* are shopping, fiscal impacts and parking; and *least important* are housing variety, open space and parks and playgrounds.

Leary gave the remaining report on the meaning of one-for-one housing replacement as this discussion took place in four groups whereas the community values discussion took place in three groups. Main elements identified by **CRC Group #4** regarding one-for-one replacement housing were: no net loss of housing units; encourage current residents to return if they desire; consider increasing the density of Yesler Terrace; explore options for home businesses; consider creating opportunities for home ownership; explore public/private partnerships; consider a modified levy to help fund the project; utilize green/energy efficient building practices; and the process is critical to the project.

The discussions by the **Community Groups** were summarized by Vega and community member, Asha Mohamed. With regard to the meaning of one-for-one replacement housing, main elements identified were: low-rise buildings and moderate density; retain/create open space and parks; more units and units with private entrances; safety; family-sized units with accommodations for extended families; minimize disruption and relocation during construction; if temporary relocation off-site is necessary, it should be close to Yesler Terrace; provide accurate and timely information about the redevelopment process; provide assistance with the relocation process; utilize environmentally construction practices; provide assistance with maintaining small businesses; all residents should be allowed to return; and all SHA housing is replaced.

With regard to the prioritization of community values, Vega stated that the following additional high priority values were identified on the blank cards provided: home businesses including child care services; on-site community services; loan opportunities to open small businesses that are reflective of residents' culture and religion; multicultural place of worship; no replication of the negative aspects of redevelopment of other SHA communities; family friendly, culturally diverse and affordable; cultural and religious appropriate shopping; maintenance of buildings and grounds; partnerships with organizations such as Habitat for Humanity; fire department; improve street lighting; emergency call bells to hospitals; no displacement; and access to nearby markets.

Vega stated that the Community Groups prioritized some of the pre-identified community values listed above as follows: *most important* – affordability, transit access, community safety and security, parking, housing variety, schools, safe streets, home ownership, shopping, community input in development, parks and playgrounds, open spaces, community facilities, and privacy; *less important* – multi-generational, diverse community, tree preservation, fiscal impacts, parks and playgrounds, schools, home ownership, community input in development, community facilities, pedestrian friendly, proximity to jobs, and open spaces; and *least important* – shopping, pedestrian friendly, privacy, and design quality.

Due to time constraints, a report on the staff discussion from tonight's exercises was not provided.

Chair Rice asked for additional comments tonight's discussion. Williamson stated that she would like feedback from the community on the process for obtaining community input. She said that she'd like to know if the current forum is working from the community's perspective and if different methods for gathering community input should be employed.

Rice summarized the discussion tonight and highlighted the next step in the process. He noted the similarity in the results of the discussions between the Committee and community groups. He questioned one aspect of the discussion on the priority of community facilities and amenities under the values discussion: *Is there an assumption that community facilities and amenities currently exist and therefore they were not prioritized as highly as they may have been if they did not exist?* He said that some common themes he heard from tonight's discussion are that it is important to retain the integrity of the community and that, if the boundary of

Yesler Terrace is to be expanded, it should be expanded to adjoining property only. Rice said that the next step in the process is to summarize the discussions so far and to begin creating conceptual ideas for redevelopment. He said that reviewing the results of the discussions is very important in order to assure that what is being said at these meetings is being accurately reflected. In addition, Rice urged the Committee members to converse with the agency or organization that they represent so that the input of the agency/organization as a whole and their represented constituents are communicated during this process.

Speaking through an interpreter, Yesler Terrace resident Ruqiya Abdi asked about the results of the community's participation in this process. She said that if the community's input is not implemented in the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace, she does not want to continue attending the meetings and participating in the process. Rice responded that it is the Committee's desire to have the residents involved in the planning process so that the residents can provide input on the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace; at the end of this process there will be a framework for redevelopment that will reflect the input of the various groups that participated. Abdi stated that she would like a commitment from the Committee and SHA staff that the community's input will be incorporated into the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace. Rice responded that the planning phase is an ongoing process with continual opportunities to provide input; once this part of the planning process is complete, a framework for redevelopment will exist that the community will understand. He said that hopefully the community will agree with the framework, however, if they do not, the community will understand how the framework was developed.

O'Donnell stated that she feels the community needs to be notified prior to the hiring of consultants engaged to facilitate and participate in this process.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m.