
**SEATTLE HOUSING AUTHORITY
YESLER TERRACE CITIZEN'S REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

MEETING NO.: 8

LOCATION: Yesler Community Center, 917 East Yesler Way

DATE: Wednesday, August 22, 2007, 5:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES: Committee Members

Norman Rice, Chair
 Elise Chayet
 Herold Eby
 John Fox
 Abdisamad Jama
 James Kelly
 Timothy Leary
 M. Michelle Mattox
 Mary McCumber
 Quang Nguyen

Kristin O'Donnell
 Father Hoang Phuong
 Adrienne Quinn
 Michael Ramos
 Sue Sherbrooke
 George Staggers
 Sue Taoka
 Linda Taylor (alternate for James Kelly)
 Donya Williamson
 Norma Zavala

SHA Staff

Judi Carter
 Virginia Felton
 Eddie Hill
 Brett Houghton
 Judith Kilgore
 Andrew Lofton
 Ayan Musse
 Leslie Stewart
 Tom Tierney

Facilitators: Marcia Wagoner and Yvonne Krauss, PRR
Marcia Tate Arunga, Arunga & Associates

I. Call to Order

Chair Rice called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m. Rice announced that Aregawi Abiraha has resigned from the Committee due to scheduling conflicts.

II. Community Comments

Chair Rice called for public comments. He clarified that additional opportunities will be available later in the meeting to comment on the definitions and guiding principles. No one wished to speak.

III. Approval of the Minutes of the June 27, 2007 Meeting

Rice asked for amendments to the minutes of the Committee's June 27, 2007 meeting. There were none. Sherbrooke moved to approve the minutes as distributed; Quinn seconded the motion; all those present voted AYE; the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Report on July and August Community Meetings

Arunga distributed her report dated August 22, 2007 to the Committee which contained an overview of her work with the community, summaries of the July 23 and August 6 community meetings and six recommendations of how SHA and the CRC should proceed with the planning phase of redevelopment. She read the report into the record highlighting the personal anecdotes contained within. She said that issues discussed at the community meetings include parking, healthcare, home businesses, home ownership, maintenance and safety. Arunga also highlighted the fact that in general residents welcome redevelopment in hopes that it will help address some of their needs and concerns. She encouraged the decision makers to consider the impact of redevelopment on the residents in their deliberations.

Arunga stated that a community meeting will be held on Thursday, September 6 at 5:00 p.m. at the Yesler Community Center and she encouraged the CRC members to attend. Rice stated that he will attend the meeting.

V. Report on Community Open Houses on Definitions and Guiding Principles

Wagoner provided a review of the open houses held on August 13 and 15, noting the number of attendees, the materials presented and comments received. She said that the open houses were an opportunity for Yesler Terrace residents and the general public to provide feedback on the definitions and guiding principles.

To facilitate the process, the newsletter was mailed to every Yesler Terrace resident and homes and businesses located within approximately a one-quarter mile radius of the exterior boundary of Yesler Terrace. Additionally, the newsletter was translated into the nine languages predominately spoken at Yesler Terrace and a copy was hand delivered to each non-English speaking household in the language spoken by the members of that household. Copies of the English and translated versions of the newsletters were also made available at several community facilities, including libraries and the Yesler Community Center. Wagoner said that answers to questions of the community regarding relocation and returning to Yesler Terrace after redevelopment were presented at the open houses. She said these questions and SHA's responses to these questions were also translated into the predominate languages spoken at Yesler Terrace. In conclusion, Wagoner said that the feedback from the open houses was consistent with that received at the CRC and community meetings.

In response to a question from O'Donnell, Kilgore said that approximately 20 business reply mailers from the newsletter have been received.

VI. Final Discussion on Definitions and Guiding Principles

Rice stated that the reason the agenda for tonight's meeting has been amended is to try and finalize the definitions and guiding principles. He provided an overview of the meeting format saying that the Committee will discuss potential substantive amendments to each of the core values; all minor edits should be documented on the copy of the newsletter distributed tonight and submitted to staff. Rice said that after the Committee discusses proposed amendments, Arunga will summarize the discussion to the audience which will then be interpreted to non-English speakers. The audience will have an opportunity at the end of the discussion to comment.

Wagoner asked each of the Committee members to offer substantive edits to the definitions and guiding principles. Proposed amendments are as follows:

Recorder's note:

Bold text - Committee additions

~~Strikethrough Text~~ – Committee's deletions

Highlighted text – Staff recommended text

Social Equity:

- Quinn: Expand the definition to include other status such as age, gender, religion, disability sexual orientation, etc: Human development that meets essential needs and improves the quality of life for present and future generations living within the Yesler Terrace community regardless of racial, cultural, or economic ~~or other~~ status through access to employment, education, medical care, social services and quality affordable housing, especially to those with very low incomes and gives priority to those most in need.

In response to a question from Leary, Fox said that the language he proposed in three locations under social equity and one-for-one housing replacement regarding redevelopment options that result in no net loss of units on site is a compromise he made and is in lieu of language that would guarantee all units would be replaced on site. He said that he feels it is important to replace the units on the current site of Yesler Terrace and therefore he proposed that the language appear in the three relevant locations. Fox said that he feels a minority report should be written and made available to the public through means such as the website. Sherbrooke stated that she feels it is not necessary to repeat the language.

- O'Donnell: Specify "current and future" in the language added by Fox in all locations referenced above: In addition, consider redevelopment options that would guarantee no net lost of very low-income housing serving **current and future** public housing eligible residents on the current site of Yesler Terrace.
- Ramos: In the definition, add access to nutritious food: Human development that meets essential needs and improves the quality of life for present and future generations living within the Yesler Terrace community regardless of racial, cultural, or economic ~~or other~~ status through access to employment, education, medical care, social services, **nutritious food** and quality affordable housing, especially to those with very low incomes and gives priority to those most in need.

Rice responded to Fox's comment above regarding replacement of all units on site saying that he feels either the language should be incorporated into the core values or a minority report prepared, but not both.

There was general discussion about the terms promote versus provide. Tierney clarified that SHA cannot promise to provide, for example certain amenities such as stores, but the proposed language directs that certain amenities should be promoted as part of redevelopment.

- Leary: Add a bullet point that addresses involvement in governance and decision making for underrepresented groups: **Establish a community governance structure that promotes involvement in decision making by all residents living within the redeveloped community.**

Arunga summarized the Committee's discussion to the community. The summary was interpreted to the non-English speaking members of the audience.

Economic Opportunity:

- Discussion regarding opportunities for living wage jobs and local hiring throughout redevelopment resulted in the following amendment to the seventh bullet point: Support training, apprenticeship and **living wage** job opportunities for residents **and those in adjacent communities** wherever possible in all phases of Yesler Terrace redevelopment from planning through construction.
- Chayet: Amend the fourth bullet point to state: **Promote the creation of** ~~Create~~ a micro-loan program or other access to capital to support residents in developing entrepreneurial businesses.
- O'Donnell/Sherbrooke: Delete the last clause of the second bullet point because it contradicts the first clause: Assist residents in transitioning out of subsidized housing through financial literacy, asset building and other educational programs ~~while ensuring they remain at Yesler Terrace if desired.~~
- Eby: Amend the third bullet point to state: Strengthen partnerships with social service agencies and institutions to address resident barriers to employment such as transportation, education, training, **language** and child care.
- Williamson: Does the fifth bullet point provide enough emphasis on the issue of home businesses from the stand point of residents?
- Sherbrooke: Add another bullet point in the fourth position that states: **Engage in partnerships to assist homeless families obtain stable housing and increase household income.**

Arunga summarized the Committee's discussion to the community. The summary was interpreted to the non-English speaking members of the audience.

Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability:

- Fox: Eliminate the second sentence of the definition of smart growth referenced in the first bullet point as it implies that Yesler Terrace is not a true neighborhood with a sense of community: A collection of planning, regulatory, and development practices that use land resources more efficiently through compact building forms, infill development, and moderation in street and parking standards. ~~One of its purposes is to reduce the outward spread of urbanization, protect sensitive lands, and, in the process, create true neighborhoods with a sense of community.~~ – American Planning Association
- Leary: Add another bullet point to address this core value beyond the reconstruction phase: **Foster education and awareness programs that promote earth friendly practices such as waste reduction, recycling, composting and the use of drought resistant landscaping.**

Arunga summarized the Committee's discussion to the community. The summary was interpreted to the non-English speaking members of the audience.

One-for-One Replacement Housing:

- O'Donnell: Delete publicly-regulated from the ninth bullet point so that housing serving 30 – 80% annual medium income lost as a result of the expansion of the site would also be replaced by SHA: If the footprint of Yesler Terrace is expanded to include ~~publicly-regulated~~ low-income housing, any lost units at those sites will be replaced in the neighborhood one-for-one at comparable rent and without sacrificing existing limited local funding, such as trust fund or levy dollars, to replace those units.

- Taylor: Under the last bullet point, replace the word schemes with programs: Encourage innovative homeownership opportunities for low-income people on site including tenant ownership **programs schemes** such as land trusts and cooperatives.
- O'Donnell: Under the first bullet point, add children as a resident group: Design housing mix based on geographic growth projections and the needs of present and future residents to accommodate families, **children**, single occupants, the elderly and those with disabilities.

Tierney summarized SHA's position on the issue of replacement housing and the sale of portions of the site to fund redevelopment and potentially increase the number of units that currently exist on the site. He said that SHA would like to examine the advantages and disadvantages of selling selected parcels of the site with the objective of expanding the current number of low-income units.

Arunga summarized the Committee's discussion to the community. The summary was interpreted to the non-English speaking members of the audience.

Committee members recessed for a break while Arunga facilitated discussion on definitions and guiding principles by members of the community.

VII. Community Comments on Definitions and Guiding Principles

Several community members provided comments on the guiding principles. Staff also reported back on interpreted comments from the community groups. The comments are summarized below:

- Residents need more time to review the principles.
- Consider adding language with respect to meeting LEED standards for neighborhood planning.
- Incorporate units with two ground floor doors and back yards for those with in-home childcare businesses.
- Parking needs to be improved/expanded, and parking control needs to be addressed, particularly with regard to adjacent uses. Consider permit parking.
- Encourage first time home buying, for example through programs such as tenant trust accounts.
- Further clarification is needed under one-for-one replacement housing on: the meaning of "growth projections" under the first bullet; how residents will be included in the decision making noted under the fifth bullet point; and the meaning of "assistance when necessary" under the sixth bullet point.
- Regulate noise generated by youth, parties, etc.
- Install more crosswalks and speed bumps and other traffic calming measures to address safety concerns.
- Consider renting portions of the site as an alternative to selling, for example rent parking areas to Harborview.
- Guarantee that residents will not have to relocate off site.
- Consider ways to improve the Harborview elder care response and support services.

VIII. Discussion of Remaining Work Program

Rice stated that the Committee will be discussing the ninth and tenth bullet points under one-for-one replacement housing at the September 26 meeting. He said that the Committee will consider adoption of the guiding principles at that meeting and begin discussing the planning concepts. Adoption of the planning concepts will be considered at the October meeting and conclude this phase of the process.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8.05 p.m.

**Arunga & Associates
17653 110th Ave. S. E.
Renton, Washington 98055
marciaarunga@hotmail.com
tel: 206 883 7810**

**Yesler Terrace Redevelopment
Facilitation summary and recommendations**

**Submitted by:
Marcia Tate Arunga,
Principal Consultant
August 22, 2007**

Summary

Let me begin by saying that I have truly enjoyed working with the community located at Yesler Terrace and I feel that overall, they are enthusiastic about the prospect of redevelopment. There were two community meetings held since our last report to the Citizens Review Committee (CRC). These meetings were well attended by a cross section of languages, ethnicities, physical abilities and ages, ranging from as many as 50 to 70 people in attendance. I have had the privilege of hearing the concerns and visions of the community both in meetings and have conducted a tour of the neighborhood. I have also had an interview with a past resident of Yesler Terrace who has provided insight to the unique aspects of history in this public housing facility.

- I was told by several current residents, that they welcome any changes to their existing housing facilities. They regard redevelopment as a positive initiative. They expressed relief that redevelopment will improve the quality of their lives both present and future. They believe that redevelopment may solve some of their concerns about rodents, garbage, security and vulnerability to an encroaching city, and the future of their home day care businesses.
- A gentleman approached me with his concerns about parking. It appears that finding adequate parking spaces in group lots are quite unstable. He is hopeful that they will soon be designated parking for him. He wastes a lot of gas and time trying to secure an appropriate parking space for his vehicle, needed for his employment.
- An elderly woman quietly conveyed her fears that at 82 years old, she may not feel the security of being close to the health care facilities. Also, that she would have to relearn new routes, new standards, and gain different access to regular amenities.
- One gentleman in a wheelchair, shared his hope to have ample space in a kitchen, front and back door exit and entrance. A young family expressed their concern for young teenage girls being vulnerable around strangers dwelling and working in the neighborhood.
- We heard from the elderly and disabled, whose personal security will be at risk due to changed location. We heard from families whose children will be transitioning to colleges hopefully in the area, and would like to ensure some stable housing during that time. There were people who have home based businesses that depend on the current locations, and this will be interrupted.

These were the repeated concerns that I have heard in the past few weeks. As we enter the planning phase, we want to be mindful of the people whose lives are physically affected by the changes.

Meeting on July 23, 2007

During the meeting dated July 23rd, we began to hear interpretation of results gained from a survey done. In the survey, community members were asked to identify amenities that they used in the area by putting a color coded stickers to identify current amenities. While the planner was able to ascertain data from this exercise, two points were raised for me.

1. We discovered that parents of children who attend Bailey Gatzert were not represented during the inquiry. The question is are educational institutions, and if so how can the voice of these parents be better represented?

2. Similar questions are raised about amenities that do not currently exist in the area. For example, residents are currently forced to leave the surrounding territory to conduct shopping, because adequate shopping centers do not exist. So the question to ask is: do people prefer to shop at the stores where they shop now or are their consumer options limited by what is currently available in the area? It may be useful to explore how greater access to amenities will occur as a result of redevelopment.

Meeting on August 6, 2007

At the last meeting on August 6th, we explored how the community's input to changes could enhance the redevelopment plan. We identified core planning preferences such as the heart of the community, preferred walkways, and main streets. A brainstorm about amenities was conducted.

The discussion of homeownership occurred at a very informative level. Families in attendance listened intently about strategies of home ownership from an active real estate broker, Jada Pettigrew of 5 Star Realty. She conveyed messages about property ownership being a part of the American Dream. She suggested that strategic planning, and creative financing, real estate is accessible to all. While some residents thought this an unrealistic dialogue for residents, many people benefited from the forward thinking that created hope. Overall, this was a beneficial exchange and should be promoted within the planning phase.

There has been some attempt to answer the questions that were posed by the community in the past several weeks. While the issue of immediately problems pertaining to parking, maintenance and safety may have been somewhat addressed, there is no indication that substantive changes have been made to date. This is related to the CRC because we want to be mindful of potential impediments to the process of building a cooperative relationship in redevelopment.

There has been increased effort to reach understanding about each items on the agenda through community liaison and language interpreters. It is unfortunate that the elimination of the community liaison role will leave a void and the current relationship between the CRC and the community may be compromised by this. Speaking to the goals of social equity, I urge you to consider how the community will continue to be included throughout the process.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Continued discourse in the direction of financial literacy and home ownership as well as entrepreneurial business incubation will empower the community and definitely assist in transitioning out of subsidized housing. Assisting residents in transitioning out of subsidized housing through financial literacy, asset building, home ownership and small business incubation will be highly effective if introduced alongside the planning process.

Recommendation #2: An ongoing check and balance system be put in place to ensure that residents quality of life is not drastically altered and that environmental conditions do not negatively impact current residents.

Recommendation #3: In order to retain and encourage a family friendly community, we must consider the current relationship between the CRC and the community. How will we continue building a trusting relationship between the community and the CRC in the absence of a community liaison staff.

Recommendation #4: Methodically and deliberately add more community slots to the CRC. Include at least one person for each language group which resides in Yesler Terrace and set expectation of accountability to their language groups. This will increase planning literacy and ensure inclusion of community members in the CRC process.

Recommendation #5: The purpose of Intercultural communications training, will be to enrich the outcome of the planning. This initiative will strengthen environmental stewardship by honoring and fostering a family friendly community. Through heightened cultural understanding in the redevelopment planning at the Yesler Terrace and commitment to the preservation of Yesler Terrace as the first integrated community in the country should be the hallmark of all principles.

Recommendation #6: the CRC explore incentives for promoting small businesses not only adjacent to but also inside Yesler Terrace. Explore ways in which current partnerships can create micro loan programs for incubating entrepreneurial businesses and home ownership.