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번역된 안내서가 예술과 아트스 관리사무소, 작업 커넥션 및 커뮤니티 센터에 준비되어 있습니다.

가봉문화예술연구소 예술과가 운영하는 카운터 (Yesler Terrace Management, Job Connection and Community Center)의

向“工作聯繫與社區中心”(Job Connection and Community Center)的Yesler Terrace管理辦公室索取各種翻譯版本。

Gargaarichi unukka keenka anoo keessa Wejiray Bulchiisa Yesler Terrace, Wejiray waara
Dalagaan namaa quummaada (Job Connection) fi Yidugaleessa Hawasaata ni argamaa.

Waxaad ka helaysaa iyagoo la taajumay Xaafiska Maamulka Yesler Terrace, Xarunta Bulshada iyco Xirirka
Shaqooyinka

Hay versiones traducidas disponibles en la Oficina de Administración de Yesler Terrace, en Job Connection
y el Centro Comunitario.

Có các bản đã được phiên dịch tại Văn Phòng Quản Lý Khu Yesler Terrace, Job
Connection (Cô Quan Giúp Tìm Việc Làm) và Trung Tâm Cổng Động.
Dear Seattle Housing Authority Board of Commissioners, Residents and Community Stakeholders,

As your former Mayor, I came to know and appreciate the vitality and diversity at Yesler Terrace and the significant place it holds in our Seattle community. Like many of you, when I learned about the plans to redevelop Yesler Terrace, I was concerned about maintaining the integrity and connection of the neighborhood. How could Yesler Terrace adapt and grow but not lose the qualities that make it unique?

Over the past year as Chair of the Citizen Review Committee (CRC), I’ve been proud of how the committee and the community have responded to this challenge. The Citizen Review Committee was charged by the Seattle Housing Authority Board of Commissioners to identify the best services and amenities to meet community needs for another 70 years. The committee knew that in order to arrive at a successful outcome we needed to have a solid foundation from which to identify both the neighborhood features to foster and those to preserve.

To start, we looked at the community’s primary hopes and treasures in order to establish common values. Future committee meetings included active participation and discussions about economic opportunities, the human community, environmental stewardship and replacement housing. These discussions, built upon the framework of community values, led us to develop a set of definitions and guiding principles for redevelopment. Throughout the process the community helped us by voicing their concerns, providing design ideas and giving feedback about ways to enrich the Yesler Terrace environment.

At the CRC and public meetings, the diversity of voices and wealth of ideas brought forward was remarkable. Even though I believed I understood the significance of Yesler Terrace, after hearing from its residents and participating in this process, I learned even more about the pride and richness in belonging to a neighborhood filled with people of so many different backgrounds. From this perspective and as a representative of the Citizen Review Committee, I am pleased to submit the committee’s recommendations for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace. I look forward to seeing how their vision translates into a positive change with a brighter, healthier and more connected Yesler Terrace community.

Sincerely,

Norman B. Rice
Seattle Mayor, 1989 – 1997
Chair, Yesler Terrace Citizen Review Committee
The Citizen Review Committee

Working Toward a Community Vision

The Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) Board of Commissioners formed the Citizen Review Committee (CRC) with the recognition that designing a redeveloped Yesler Terrace would require the guidance and help of those who live and work in the neighborhood as well as other community members. The commissioners determined that the CRC would serve an important role in guiding the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace in relation to current and future community needs. Working in consultation with former Mayor Norman Rice, SHA commissioners then selected 18 committee members to represent a strong cross-section of Yesler Terrace residents, community stakeholders, the City of Seattle and affordable housing advocates. Beginning in October 2006, the CRC met ten times to provide direction about the future of Yesler Terrace.

The committee’s underlying objective was to develop recommendations for the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace that met affordable housing needs, was financially feasible and served the needs of its residents while providing amenities to the greater community. Chaired by Norman Rice, the CRC focused specifically on identifying community values and used this as a strong foundation to create and assess a set of definitions and guiding principles for redevelopment. The CRC also explored potential planning concepts that supported their newly created baseline vision for Yesler Terrace.

As part of their planning process, the CRC encouraged a wide range of community input. In order to hear from all stakeholders, CRC meetings offered interpretation services and translated materials in the predominant languages spoken by Yesler Terrace residents and included interactive exercises that used symbols rather than written language in a way that would allow diverse audiences the opportunity to work together. Community meetings at key milestones, in addition to CRC meetings, offered the broader public a chance to participate in the discussion about the desired features and qualities of a redeveloped Yesler Terrace.

Together with the community, in September 2007 the CRC finalized the definitions and guiding principles for the core values identified: social equity, economic opportunity, environmental stewardship and sustainability and one-for-one replacement housing. The CRC is pleased to submit these as recommendations for consideration by the SHA Board of Commissioners.
CRC Members

Norman Rice, Chair  Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy
Elise Chayet      Harborview Medical Center
Herold Eby        Yesler Terrace Resident (alternate)
John Fox          Seattle Displacement Coalition
Abdisamad Jama   Yesler Terrace Resident
James Kelly       Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle
Timothy Leary     Seattle University
M. Michelle Mattox Seattle Planning Commission
Mary McCumber     Futurewise
Quang Nguyen      Vietnamese American Economic Development Association
Kristin O’Donnell Yesler Terrace Community Council
Father Hoang Phuong Vietnamese Catholic Church
Adrienne Quinn    Seattle Office of Housing
Michael Ramos     Church Council of Greater Seattle
Sue Sherbrooke   Young Women’s Christian Association
George Staggers  Central Area Development Association
Sue Taoka        Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority
Donya Williamson Squire Park Community Council
Norma Zavala     Bailey Gatzert Elementary School

Public participants discussed their interests and concerns in small group sessions at the CRC meetings.

Results of a CRC exercise which identified community priorities.
Definitions and Guiding Principles

The Yesler Terrace Citizen Review Committee developed the following set of definitions and guiding principles over a year-long planning process. The definitions and guiding principles respond to a series of questions posed to the CRC, residents and the greater community to gather information about what the community values, what other amenities the community needs, and what they would like to achieve in terms of social equity, economic opportunity, environmental stewardship and sustainability and one-for-one replacement housing. The committee actively discussed and explored with the community how to translate the answers to those questions into clear and substantive direction to SHA concerning the redevelopment of Yesler Terrace. Each meeting included a summary and comparison of comments from the CRC, public and staff in order to carefully weigh the full range of perspectives, as well as to identify and bring forward the common themes identified by each group. The results of these deliberative discussions are presented in this section to guide the vision for redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.

Where We Have Been

FALL 2006

Meeting 1
CRC
Introductions, Form Work Plan

Key Hopes
- Don’t displace residents
- Keep affordable and diverse
- Model for sustainability

Key Treasures
- Central location
- Natural beauty
- Diversity

Meeting 2
CRC
Discuss Social Equity, Identify Hopes and Treasures

Key Hopes
- Don’t displace residents
- Keep affordable and diverse
- Model for sustainability

Key Treasures
- Central location
- Natural beauty
- Diversity

Social Equity

Draft Definition and Guiding Principles for Social Equity

WINTER 2007

Meeting 3
CRC
Discuss economic opportunity and environmental stewardship

Key Hopes
- Increased access to education and jobs
- Accommodate home businesses
- Economically diverse community

Key Treasures
- Improved transit access options
- Open spaces, trees, and view preservation

Environmental Opportunity

Draft Definition and Guiding Principles for Economic Opportunity

Meeting 4
CRC
Discuss one-for-one housing

Key Hopes
- Balance density with open space
- Blending of older and new buildings

Key Treasures
- Balance density with open space
- Blending of older and new buildings

1 for 1 Replacement Housing

Draft Definition and Guiding Principles for One-for-One Housing

The diagram above illustrates meeting topics, feedback exercises and work products of the CRC and the public over the past year. The process has resulted in finalizing the definitions and guiding principles in September 2007.
Public open houses in August 2007 updated the community about the Yesler Terrace redevelopment project and the CRC's progress.
Social Equity

Definition

Human development that meets essential needs and improves the quality of life for current and future generations living within the Yesler Terrace community regardless of racial, cultural, 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.
Guiding Principles

Promote a culturally and economically diverse community while continuing to prioritize the provision of housing and services for those most in need.

Include stakeholder involvement in major decisions throughout the redevelopment process.

Provide resources to improve economic, cultural and social opportunities for residents within Yesler Terrace and adjacent business and residential communities.

Foster positive interactions throughout Yesler Terrace and the community at large regardless of social, economic or cultural distinctions by employing creative urban design and architectural techniques while avoiding segregation by income, race or other differences and providing access to public amenities.

Promote social equality by encouraging inclusion of complementary social, educational and health services.

Meet the housing needs of current and future generations living within Yesler Terrace drawing from as many existing and new funding sources as possible in order to accomplish this goal.

Preserve and expand very low-income housing opportunities for current public housing eligible residents and, if possible, expand those opportunities in order to serve those who are most in need. In addition, consider redevelopment options that would guarantee no net loss of very low-income housing serving public housing eligible residents on the current site of Yesler Terrace.

Minimize impacts of displacement for residents during the redevelopment process.

Create a neighborhood that provides recreational and educational opportunities and services for children and families.

Utilize the City housing inventories and other resources to avoid displacement from the neighborhood.

Establish a community governance structure that promotes involvement in decision making by all residents living within the redeveloped community.
Economic Opportunity

Definition

Improve the overall economic conditions, opportunities and quality of life for current and future generations living within the Yesler Terrace community by fostering access to jobs, transportation, community services, safe low-income affordable housing and financial tools.
Guiding Principles

Support creation of living wage jobs for residents by creating and sustaining innovative partnerships with industry, surrounding neighborhood organizations and businesses to provide apprenticeship, entrepreneurial and business development opportunities.

Assist residents in transitioning out of subsidized housing through financial literacy, asset building and other educational programs.

Strengthen partnerships with social service agencies and institutions to address resident barriers to employment such as transportation, education, training, language and child care.

Engage in partnerships to assist homeless families obtain stable housing and increase household income.

Promote the creation of a micro-loan program or other access to capital to support residents in developing entrepreneurial businesses.

Preserve and foster home businesses for all residents within Yesler Terrace.

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.

Preserve and promote small businesses adjacent to Yesler Terrace.
Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability

Definition

Integrate sustainable design and implement equitable environmental and economic practices to achieve a positive and healthy community for current and future generations living within the Yesler Terrace community while preserving housing affordability.
Guiding Principles

Incorporate smart growth principles in the redevelopment process, but not at the expense of retaining and expanding housing opportunities for those most in need.

*A collection of planning, regulatory, and development practices that use land resources more efficiently through compact building forms, in-fill development, and moderation in street and parking standards. – American Planning Association*

Foster a safe and healthy community by incorporating a variety of housing styles, sizes and configurations and associated open spaces and gathering places to retain a family friendly community.

Incorporate urban design and architectural techniques that promote pedestrian interaction and positive relations with surrounding communities while maintaining a high level of public safety.

Use environmentally friendly and sustainable building techniques to produce healthy and quality housing, facilities and amenities.

Foster education and awareness programs that promote earth friendly practices such as waste reduction, recycling, composting and the use of drought resistant landscaping.

Ensure that low-income families, the elderly and those with disabilities are served and provide housing types, sizes and amenities that fully meet their needs while meeting the goals and intent of this guiding principle.
One-For-One Replacement Housing

**Definition**

Replace or exceed the current number of very low-income and low-income housing units at Yesler Terrace that serve public housing eligible residents and provide choice, options, site integration and affordability in a dense and culturally and economically diverse community. In addition, consider redevelopment options that would guarantee no net loss of very low-income housing serving public housing eligible residents on the current site of Yesler Terrace.
Guiding Principles

**Design housing mix** based on geographic growth projections and the needs of current and future residents to accommodate families, single occupants, the elderly and those with disabilities.

**Provide the best possible affordable housing** that offers choice, options, affordability and access to public amenities with attention to social justice and economic realities while promoting the integration of economic, social, cultural and racial groups throughout Yesler Terrace and the community at large.

**Consider expanding site boundaries** in the immediate neighborhood and increase density to achieve project goals recognizing that expansion of the Yesler Terrace boundaries and permitted uses would allow a greater array of development options.

**Phase development to minimize resident disruption** and construction impacts, and guarantee a home at Yesler Terrace for those residents who want to return and are still eligible under the current rules.

**Include residents in the housing design and development decisions** by providing easy access to information and transparent public process.

**Provide nearby affordable housing relocation options** and assistance when necessary.

**Provide replacement housing** at costs consistent with public housing rent formulas and continue to serve very low-income residents. In addition, consider redevelopment options that would guarantee no net loss of very low-income housing serving public housing eligible residents on the current site of Yesler Terrace.

**Ensure reasonable physical accessibility** within Yesler Terrace for all residents and visitors.

**If the footprint of Yesler Terrace is expanded** to include low-income housing, any lost units at those sites will be replaced in the neighborhood one-for-one at comparable rent.

**Pursue those alternatives** for Yesler Terrace which will result in the greatest balance between the development of low-income public housing and the maintenance of the land in public domain.

**Encourage innovative home ownership opportunities** for low-income people on site including tenant ownership programs such as land trusts and cooperatives.
Minority Report

Minority recommendations and comments on Yesler Terrace Citizens Review Committee’s Majority Report & Approved “Definitions and Guiding Principles”

We are writing on behalf of the Displacement Coalition and as members of the Yesler Terrace Citizens Review Committee (YTCRC) to offer comments, thoughts, and recommendations regarding this first phase work of the CRC and the process to date established by the Seattle Housing Authority for the work of the committee leading to a final proposal for redevelopment of Yesler Terrace.

In general, we are very appreciative of the work of SHA staff and especially other members of the CRC and its Chair Norm Rice in getting us through Phase I of the work of the committee. We wish to thank those task force members and staff for their hard work and respect very much their efforts and the thoughtful discussions which produced the majority report.

While we are in agreement with most of the final set of definitions and guiding principles, we feel a need to flag strong concerns of ours and to offer additional suggestions and guidance to SHA, our elected officials, Yesler Terrace residents, the media, and larger community who will be reviewing this report. These comments are especially directed at those elected leaders, SHA board members and staff of SHA who soon will be making critical decisions regarding specific redevelopment plans for Yesler Terrace.

I. The only alternative redevelopment options for Yesler Terrace that should be examined as we move into Phase II are those which guarantee No Net Loss On-Site of public housing units and which respect the wishes of current Yesler Terrace residents.

Several key recommendations were not included in the majority’s final set of definitions and guiding principles. In other cases the majority did not take as forceful a position as they should have to ensure that whatever plans ultimately are pursued by the housing authority, those plans do not sacrifice existing public housing opportunities on site or that they do not needlessly sacrifice existing limited housing dollars that could otherwise be spent elsewhere in our community to expand our stock of low income housing. We also want to underscore that we take very seriously those principles and definitions outlined in the majority report that reference the need to adhere to the wishes of existing Yesler Terrace residents.

II. In the event that SHA removes housing on adjacent properties and expands the boundaries of the current Yesler Terrace site, all units within these expanded boundaries also will be fully replaced at comparable rent and without sacrificing existing valuable limited housing resources – without use of city levy, county HOF, state trust fund dollars, existing Section 8 allocations, or limited 9% state tax credits.
We are concerned about plans by the housing authority to redevelop areas adjacent to Yesler Terrace and to include those areas within an expanded Yesler Terrace redevelopment footprint. We feel strongly that the committee did not receive adequate information about these plans and it did not adequately weigh in on this matter or forcefully enough to ensure that no low income housing is lost in those surrounding areas or in the event that SHA removes that housing on these adjacent properties, all the units will be fully replaced at comparable rent and without sacrificing existing valuable limited housing resources – without use of city levy, county Hot, state trust fund dollars, existing Section 8 allocations, or limited 9% state tax credits.

III. As designs and plans are pursued at Yesler Terrace by SHA, they should consider only those alternatives which maintain the vast bulk of the site in public ownership and in perpetuity.

No plan should be pursued which privatizes vast chunks of the site either through sale or long-term lease arrangements. Further, the housing built on site that does serve low income and public housing eligible residents, ownership must be structured in such a way so as to retain long-term ownership of those units in the public's hands.

If financing schemes, such as tax credits are pursued which require creation of partnerships with financial institutions and private investors under lease or similar arrangements, then those schemes must also carry with them covenants and/or other binding commitments ensuring that the property will revert to full public ownership when those tax credits expire. The land and buildings must be maintained and used for the purposes of maintaining an equal number if not for purposes of expanding housing opportunities in perpetuity for public housing eligible residents and those with incomes at or below 30% of median.

IV. SHA should pursue only those design options that preserve if not expand the number of very low income opportunities and public housing units on site while reducing the amount of existing housing dollars that have to be tapped to achieve this goal. A modernization and renovation option must also be considered and included among design alternatives for phase II.

Since 1997, SHA has launched four Hope VI redevelopment projects at Roxbury Village, Holly Park, Rainier Vista, and High Point. At a cost of over one half billion dollars in limited local, state, and federal funds, over 2000 public housing units were demolished to make way for mixed and higher income developments. Only about half the existing public housing units ever were replaced on those sites.

The claim that the remaining public housing units lost at those sites were replaced off-site simply is not accurate. Millions more in existing limited local, state, and federal dollars that otherwise would have been used to expand our city's very low income housing stock simply were drained away to create those so-called off-site replacement units. It was a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Any design option for Yesler Terrace that relocates existing public housing to so-called "off-site" replacement sites
simply will replicate this fallacy. The Housing Authority will have to tap existing limited housing dollars to buy the land and build these projects. That’s dollars and land that otherwise would have been used to expand our stock of limited low income housing.

By contrast, a redevelopment plan that guarantees no net loss of public housing on site eliminates the cost of going out and acquiring additional land. Further, much of the capital costs for on-site development of low income housing can be off-set through “internal subsidies”. Other market rate uses, office, commercial, high end residential development on the site can generate income to “internally” subsidize much of the cost required to maintain if not expand the number of public housing and very low income units. These economies are lost, and land and additional scarce housing resources must be sacrificed if replacement units are located off-site. To repeat, we are simply robbing Peter to pay Paul – taking away land and funds we could have used to expand the stock of public housing and very low income units.

In each of the four previous HOPE VI developments – there were numerous economically viable redevelopment options that could have been pursued at far less cost to the community in federal, state, and local dollars and without requiring the removal of any public housing on any of these sites. These options included a number of renovation and modernization alternatives as well as tear-down and replacement plans that could have been readily pursued without removal of any public housing. Further, these developments could have also included “mixed and higher income” housing and met the range of other objectives SHA sought to accomplish – all without any loss of public housing units. There would have been no need at all to tap millions more in existing limited housing dollars to provide off-site replacement units.

As we move to a design phase for Yesler Terrace, we expect that the Committee be given the opportunity to see, proformas, budgets, designs for several alternatives for the site that presuppose no net loss on site including consideration of a) modernization and renovation option, b) redevelopment options that presuppose no net loss on site including one at lower density and one at higher density, and c) an alternative that expands the number of public housing units on site.

We also believe strongly that at least one design alternatives be drawn up and presented to the maximum extent possible preserves site amenities such as views, parks, trees, ground related units, open space and recreational areas while guaranteeing no net loss of public housing on site. Further, all populations regardless of income will have equal access to those amenities.

V. If a tear down and redevelopment plan is pursued – which is likely given the current biases of SHA and elected leaders – then added densities and other uses placed on the site should be added for one primary purpose – to facilitate the housing authority’s ability to replace and expand the number of quality public housing units on site. The tail should not wag the dog or worse become the dog.
We would prefer a modernization and renovation option to a tear down and replacement redevelopment plan for Yesler Terrace. This also is what residents of Yesler Terrace prefer and have made that very clear in community forums held to date. We believe strongly that at least one design alternatives be drawn up and presented that to the maximum extent possible preserves site amenities such as views, parks, trees, ground related units, open space and recreational areas while guaranteeing no net loss of public housing on site. Further, all populations regardless of income will have equal access to those amenities.

But if a tear down and redevelopment plan is pursued – which is likely – then added densities and other uses placed on the site should be added for one primary purpose – not for “sustainability” “smart growth” “vanity” or planning awards and not to satisfy contractors and developers who would profit – but to facilitate the housing authority’s ability to replace and expand the number of quality public housing units on site. This is the only goal that is paramount and it is the only rationale for removing the existing units rather than modernizing them. It is the only rationale for forcing low income tenants to live in more crowded and denser conditions, farther from public spaces and play areas, and in units that are not ground related or in more confined quarters. To the degree that SHA adds new more lucrative uses to the site and adds more density on site… every effort must be made to retain as much of these livability values and living conditions for existing public housing residents as possible. Any erosion in these values should only be done and only to the degree it serves the purposes of expanding our ability to serve more public housing eligible households while still maintaining a level of quality and livability.

VI. Any residents who are displaced will be guaranteed comparably priced, comparably sized units in the neighborhood of their choice and pay no more than they are currently paying as a percentage of their income. Any relocation should be minimized and only temporary. All those who wish to remain on site shall be given that opportunity.

Many of the residents who were displaced from these four previous HOPE VI sites simply were given vouchers and relocated to privately owned rental units far from friends, family, services, or their jobs. Some of these units were substandard. Some of these tenants were forced to pay more than 30 percent of their income on rent or left the city. Less than one-third of those displaced were ever relocated into public housing somewhere else in the city. We cannot see this repeated at Yesler Terrace. Any residents who are displaced will be guaranteed comparably priced, comparably sized units in the neighborhood of their choice and pay no more than they are currently paying as a percentage of their income. Any relocation should be minimized and only temporary. All those who wish to remain on site shall be given that opportunity.

VII. This task force shall continue its work and be involved throughout the process as prescribed under the Rainier Vista Legal Settlement – and especially now as SHA moves into a design phase where there will be actual plans and alternative and financing schemes to review and comment upon.
We want to emphasize that we expect this process of task force review to continue beyond development of guiding principles and definitions. The real work of a task force and its more substantive role has yet to begin. Further, the lawsuit settlement for Rainier Vista spells out clearly that the role of a citizens task force at Yesler Terrace must continue through the entire process of developing and implementing a redevelopment scheme for Yesler Terrace. To date, the task force has seen no specific plans, drawings, alternatives, nor have we been apprised of any plans for rezones or other land use changes that may be needed to facilitate SHA’s plans.

Whether it’s this group of task force members or another group of citizens, SHA has a responsibility to re-convene this task force of community leaders and citizens for the purpose of following along this entire process and in reviewing specific plans, designs, drawings, proposed land use changes, etc as they evolve and as they are reviewed by SHA and elected officials. To reiterate terms of the legal settlement establishing the CRC, the CRC as outlined specifically in that agreement is entitled to:

1. Participate in and comment on development of any redevelopment and renovation plans for Yesler Terrace by the City and SHA.

2. Make recommendations to SHA and the City on all land use proposals and housing redevelopment/reconfiguration proposals for Yesler Terrace.

3. Make recommendations/comments to SHA and the City that assist in the protection of resident rights.

4. Make recommendations to SHA and the City on any variances, rezones, or proposals regarding preservation of low income housing.

5. Full involvement with the city and SHA in any and all planning efforts involving Yesler Terrace.

6. The CRC also must include at least one representative of the community council and the Displacement Coalition.

Conclusion
We will not stand by and let a similar situation occur at Yesler Terrace that occurred at the other four garden communities where our public housing stock was decimated. We call on our city leaders and SHA officials and board members to commit fully to No Net Loss on site and to implementation of a plan that reflects resident wishes.

John V. Fox
SEATTLE DISPLACEMENT COALITION

Kristin O’Donnell
YESLER TERRACE RESIDENT
Dear Judith and Seattle Housing Authority,

Thank you for convening the Yesler Terrace Citizens Review Committee. I have felt honored to serve on the committee and to participate in the deliberations over the last year. I believe the process has been meaningful and can significantly shape the redevelopment at Yesler Terrace as a critical – and historic – public asset.

I would like to communicate several points very briefly related to our current place in the process. While this is neither part of a “majority” or “minority” report, I believe that these could serve as an addendum to assist in ongoing discernment related to the future of Yesler Terrace.

First, one-to-one replacement on site of comparable units should be a priority. I believe that the models shared – including the possibility of increasing height and density – could easily yield a “no net-loss” result. Even with the substantial economic challenges that SHA faces, the unique character of Yesler Terrace suggests the need for added creativity to yield the best outcome for maximum community benefit.

Second, there is an opportunity for further integration of Yesler Terrace into an overall neighborhood approach that keeps existing low-income housing intact and enhances accessibility for community-building assets, such as stores and locally-run businesses. Perhaps SHA can help bring together such a conversation.

Third, please consider our small contribution to the CRC as a beginning of a longer term process as redevelopment plans emerge. Many of the members would like to continue to be of assistance as planning proceeds. In addition, the culturally-competent consultants that you engaged to ensure resident input suggested a model for continuing resident and public participation in this process.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to have been part of the CRC and look forward to contributing to this monumental project.

Sincerely,

Michael Ramos
Church Council of Greater Seattle
Next Steps

During the first quarter of 2008, Phase II of the Yesler Terrace redevelopment project will begin. As with Phase I, a Citizen Review Committee (CRC2) will be formed to help guide the process. The CRC2 will focus on reviewing conceptual site alternatives, preliminary design guidelines and draft resident relocation plan policies based on the definitions and guiding principles that were adopted during the first phase. From this work, recommendations will be developed by the CRC2 and forwarded to the SHA Board of Commissioners. Also as with the first phase, Phase II will be a transparent process and include extensive input from current residents and other community stakeholders. Portions of the work relating to the relocation plan policies may extend into 2009. Construction is planned to begin in 2010.
Yesler Terrace holds both the legacy of serving low-income residents for nearly 70 years and the potential of serving them for another 70. Our challenge is to balance the significance of its distinguished history with the needs of future generations.
Seattle Housing Authority’s mission is to enhance the community by creating and sustaining decent, safe, and affordable living environments that foster stability and increase self sufficiency for people with low incomes.

Seattle Housing
Thomas E. Tierney, Executive Director

120 Sixth Avenue N.
P. O. Box 19028
Seattle, WA 98109-1028