

SEATTLE HOUSING AUTHORITY YESLER TERRACE PHASE II CITIZEN REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

| MEETING NO.: | 9 | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| LOCATION: | Yesler Community Center, 917 E. Yesler Way | | |
| DATE: | Wednesday, May 13, 2009, 5:00 p.m. | | |
| ATTENDEES: | Committee Members ☐ Germaine Covington, Chair ☐ Ruqiyo Abdi ☐ Audry Breaux ☐ Elise Chayet ☐ Brendan Connolly ☐ Herold Eby ☐ Jim Erickson ☐ Isabel Garcia ☐ Shurkri Guleith ☐ Fen Hsiao ☐ Fadumo Isaq ☐ Kent Koth ☐ Yin Lau CollinsWoerman Harold Moniz Jim Moore, Steve | Mary McCumber Fatumo Mohamed Quang Nguyen Kristin O'Donnell Mark Okazaki Adrienne Quinn Michael Ramos Bette Reed Sue Sherbrooke George Staggers Linda Taylor Julie West Alex Zankich | SHA Staff ☐ Judi Carter ☐ Virginia Felton ☑ Eddie Hill ☑ Brett Houghton ☑ Judith Kilgore ☑ Al Levine ☐ Andrew Lofton ☑ Leslie Stewart ☑ Brian Sullivan ☑ Tom Tierney ☐ Stephanie Van Dyke ☐ Shelly Yapp |

I. Call to Order

Chair Covington called the meeting to order at 5:16 p.m. She noted that Bette Reed is representing the Seattle Displacement Coalition and Alex Zankich is representing the Squire Park Community Council at tonight's meeting. Covington said that the minutes of the committee's May 2 workshop will be considered at the next meeting.

II. Comments from the Community

James McDowell stated that he is interested in serving on the Citizen Review Committee and that he would like to provide input with regard to the redevelopment process. Covington responded that in all phases of the project there are opportunities for the public to provide input on the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.

Covington responded to a comment that was submitted in writing at the April 8 meeting regarding how to apply for the green jobs that were discussed at the last meeting. She said that the application submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency was for technical assistance only and is the first step in assisting the housing authority to identify and develop pathways to green jobs generated by the redevelopment.

III. Consideration of Sending a Letter to the City Recommending a Streetcar Stop at Boren Avenue and Yesler Way

Committee member Erickson stated that he strongly favors the location of north/south stops at the intersection of Boren Avenue and Yesler Way for the voter-approved streetcar route that will connect the International District to north Capitol Hill: http://www.seattlestreetcar.org/future.asp He said that this will be very important to connect the community, particularly with regard to job and shopping opportunities. Erickson stated that a community group representing businesses interests along 12th Avenue has expressed strong support for the streetcar to run along 12th Avenue instead of Boren/Broadway. Erickson said that he would like this committee to write a letter to the city recommending that the route be retained as approved and that stops be located in the immediate vicinity of the intersection of Boren Avenue and Yesler Way.

Zankich asked about the possibility of the committee's support for the streetcar stops at Boren and 12th Avenues as a compromise, leaving open the potential for the streetcar to run along 12th Avenue. Erickson responded that this would not be satisfactory in his opinion. After discussion, committee members agreed to consider the issue at its June 9 meeting in order to review the pros and cons related to the route as currently proposed and modified to run on 12th Avenue.

IV. Continued Evaluation of the Site Concepts

Harold Moniz, Senior Planner for CollinsWoerman, reviewed the results of the committee's May 2 workshop where committee and community members evaluated the site concepts against criteria based on compatibility with the Yesler Terrace Guiding Principles. The evaluation document is available at: http://www.seattlehousing.org/redevelopment/pdf/YT_Evaluation_Of_Concepts.pdf With regard to the results of the evaluation, Moniz noted that: (1) a relatively small number of people participated in the evaluation; (2) the results provide an indication of trends, but it is important to consider the comments that accompanied the evaluations; and (3) even though one concept scored lower overall, it shouldn't preclude elements of this concept from being incorporated into a final design.

For each of the three site concepts Moniz reviewed the concept variables – topography, retail land use, office land use, circulation, open space, height/massing and connections/edges – and highlighted the evaluation comments and score compilations. He asked for the further input from the committee on which variables would have the greatest impact to enhance the community as well as which ones would have the least impact or detriment. Committee members reviewed the models and *Concept Evaluations* document for approximately ten minutes and offered the following additional comments:

Topography:

- The ability to phase the project should be considered with regard to major re-grading.
- Steeper slopes are not desirable because of the dangers of walking and driving in icy/snowy weather conditions.

Retail and Office Land Use:

- Evaluating the site concepts with regard to land uses feels like an arbitrary exercise. It is important to choose an option that will work.
- Consider the future market in terms of the amount office space to be developed.
- Locating the office space throughout the site will reduce congestion during commuting hours and alleviate parking problems. Similarly, retail should be located throughout in order to generate foot traffic and create a more dynamic community.
- It is better to centralize the retail spaces to make shopping more convenient.

Circulation:

- Improving circulation for vehicles may not a positive element if creating a pedestrian-friendly community is desired.
- Traffic congestion from Harborview will be a problem in all three concepts; therefore it will be necessary to install many traffic calming measures.

Open Space:

- Consider the elderly and families and the ability of these groups to access the site through parks and open space without having to cross streets.
- Maximizing open space is desirable, particularly contiguous open space that provides pedestrian connections.
- A variety of types of parks and open space is desirable.

Building Height and Massing:

- The combination of structures and mix of densities throughout the site that creates the greatest connections and sense of community is the best alternative. It's important not to segregate groups by income and develop a community that is livable, especially for the lowincome residents that SHA serves.
- Consider that the office space on the site will be occupied during the traditional working hours, but these structures will be more or less vacant after hours and on the weekends.

 Taller structures on the south side of the site will create a barrier to the adjacent neighborhoods.

Connections and Edges:

- It is important to improve the pedestrian connections from Yesler Terrace to Little Saigon by means such as the Harborview Steps.
- Design pedestrian walkways and connections with safety as a paramount concern.

With regard to the discussion about livability and the location of low-income housing, Kilgore stated that these units will be located in townhouses, low- and mid-rise buildings and potentially in the ground floor levels of the high-rise buildings. Moniz added that all of the concepts strive to integrate people with different income levels throughout the community. When asked what is missing from the site concepts, committee members offered the following comments:

- Single-family residences
- Private yards
- Houses of worship

V. Meeting Summary and Next Steps

Covington stated that the committee will hold its last meeting on June 9. She said that the comments offered at the meeting tonight will be incorporated into the site concepts for consideration at the June meeting. She said that the members of the committee with dissenting views may submit a minority report to accompany the committee's evaluation of the site concepts for consideration by the SHA Board of Commissioners at a future Board meeting.

VI. Comments from the Community

No one wished to speak.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Major Decisions

None