I. Welcome and Statement of Purpose
Chair Rice called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m. He reviewed the purpose of the Committee, noting four core values that have been identified for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace: social equity, economic opportunity, environmental stewardship, and one-to-one housing replacement. He stated that redeveloping Yesler Terrace is necessary due to significant infrastructure and public safety issues. Rice outlined the three redevelopment phases: (1) Community Conversations, the current phase, is expected to last one year; (2) Design Development and Environmental Analysis is expected to take 12 – 18 months; and (3) Construction is anticipated to begin no sooner than 2009.

II. Introduction of Committee Members
Committee members introduced themselves, noting their agency and/or community affiliations.

III. Introduction of Seattle Housing Authority Staff
Tom Tierney, Executive Director of the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA), introduced staff members: Judith Kilgore, Sr. Development Program Manager for Yesler Terrace; Judi Carter, Yesler Terrace Property Manager, and Ellen Ziontz, Yesler Terrace Community Builder. Tierney said that the role of staff throughout this process is to support the Committee in its deliberations.

IV. Discussion of Committee Charge
Rice reviewed the Committee charge. Fox asked if the Committee will have the opportunity to review conceptual redevelopment alternatives. He stated that the Committee would need to know the feasibility of a given redevelopment option in order to provide analysis of that option.

In response to a comment from O’Donnell, Rice said that, in the future, the Committee may want to revisit the issue of membership as it relates to representation of the surrounding neighbors and businesses if these stakeholders feel their interests are not being represented by the existing membership.

V. Discussion of Committee Operating Assumptions
Rice read the operating assumptions into the record. With regard to Assumption #4, Rice said that the Committee may want to dedicate some additional time to interact with members of the community, through community meetings, for example, other than what is identified in the proposed Work Program. O’Donnell
stated that she feels Assumption #1 should be amended to state, “The Committee will hear comments from others at the beginning or the end of each meeting.” Williamson stated that she feels it should be left to the Committee’s discretion as to when it will receive comments from the public.

Fox stated that, where there is no obvious consensus on a policy issue, he favors a roll call vote of the Committee in order to clearly establish the majority view and the views of individual members. Williamson noted that in the case of a vote, the term majority needs to be defined.

VI. Review of Committee Work Program
Rice called for comments and questions on the proposed Work Program. In response to a question from Chayet, Kilgore said that the purpose of the “feedback loop” at the beginning of each meeting is to review the minutes of the previous meeting and to report back and follow-up on Committee information requests.

Taoka asked about the meaning of “Truthing” under meeting seven of the Work Program. Rice responded that this concept is for the purpose of assessing the Committee’s success in integrating the spectrum of views of the Committee and community.

Williamson asked for clarification on the meaning of the phrase “Ask permission of the group to refine brainstorming.” Kilgore responded that this is the appropriate opportunity for staff to ask permission of the Committee to develop conceptual alternatives, if the Committee wishes. Rice added that this helps to ensure that alternatives that may be developed are consistent with direction provided by the Committee.

VII. Next Meeting Discussion Topics
With regard to the meeting schedule, Taoka stated that the potential Saturday meetings noted on the Work Program should be scheduled as soon as possible.

Rice polled Committee members on their availability for the scheduled meetings on November 22 and December 27. Members generally indicated that they are available for the November meeting. However, several members indicated that they are not available for the December meeting, hence it was noted that the Committee may want to consider rescheduling this meeting.

In response to a question from Chayet, Rice said that, because Committee members represent certain agencies or constituencies, it is appropriate for an alternate member of the same agency/organization to attend the meeting in the event the appointed member cannot attend.

Zavala stated that Bailey Gatzert Elementary has an after school program on the scheduled meeting days until 5:30 p.m. O’Donnell suggested that the Unitarian Church may be able to accommodate future meetings of this Committee.

Fox submitted a one-page document dated October 25, 2006 into the record outlining additions to the Committee’s list of core values that the Seattle Displacement Coalition would like to have discussed at future meetings.

Rice called for comments from members of the audience.

James McDowell, Yesler Terrace resident, stated that he is interested in becoming a member of the Committee should there be a vacancy.

VIII. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:54 p.m.
Yesler Terrace Advisory Committee Core Issues we would like to see placed on the agenda for discussion/decisions at appropriate times during upcoming meetings:

Core Values of Committee:

- A commitment to no net loss on site of public housing units with a goal of actually expanding the number of public housing units within existing footprint

- In work program – the Committee will be given the opportunity to see performas, budgets, designs for all possible and viable alternatives for the site including consideration of a) modernization and renovation option and b) at least one no net loss on site option

- A commitment to design alternatives that to the maximum extent possible preserve site amenities such as views, parks, trees, ground related units, open space and recreational areas. Further, all populations regardless of income will have equal access to those amenities. Geographically segregating populations by income or housing status (“tenants here, homeowners there”) shall be avoided

- Recently acquired SHA properties adjacent to Yesler may be included in the footprint for new design of YT but 100 percent of any low income housing on those adjacent sites that are removed shall also be replaced on site at comparable rents (in addition to full replacement on site of all existing public housing within the existing footprint of Yesler Terrace)

- No plans shall be considered which cede or sell-off underlying land to private ownership – only those options shall be considered which retain underlying land in some form of public ownership

- No tax credit conversion of public housing replaced on site shall be considered. Or at minimum – other alternatives also shall seriously be considered with financing packages that do not pre-suppose converting public housing to tax credit or other types of very low income housing.