North Transfer Station Stakeholder Group Compendium

Chapter 10: Workshop 5

Stakeholder Workshop Documents

Conceptual Design Documents

Workshop 5: June 29, 2011

Agenda...……...……..……..…....3

Summary...…….……...…....5

Seattle Public Utilities

North Transfer Station Stakeholder Group

Workshop 5 – Meeting Agenda

June 29, 2011
5:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Location

Lake Washington Rowing Club
910 N. Northlake Way
Seattle, WA 98103

Meeting Purpose

- Review and finalize the Stakeholder Recommendation Report
- Discuss next steps for project

5:00 p.m. **Welcome and Introductions,** *Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues*
- Introductions
- Review Workshop #4 summary

5:15 p.m. **Design Commission Update,** *Tim Croll, SPU*
- Design Commission feedback
- Stakeholder discussion and recommendation

5:30 p.m. **Review and Finalize Stakeholder Recommendation Report,** *Stakeholders*
- Review of Stakeholder Recommendation Report editing process
- Discuss and finalize report

6:30 p.m. **Next Steps,** *Bill Benzer, SPU*
- Community amenities process moving forward
- Wallingford Community Council Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Request for Proposals (RFP) process

7:00 p.m. **Wrap-up and Thank You**

8:00 p.m. **Adjourn**

Seattle Public Utilities

North Transfer Station Stakeholder Group

Selected Meeting Ground Rules

Roles and responsibilities of members

- All participants recognize the legitimacy of the concerns and interests of others whether or not they are in agreement with them.

- Members will seek to state their own concerns and interests clearly, listen carefully to others and explore issues from all points of view before forming conclusions.

- Members are encouraged to express all points of view and perspectives on issues and alternatives and to seek to identify areas of agreement as well as reasons for different points of view in providing their advice to the City.

- Members are asked to represent the points of view of their general interest area, including but not limited to the particular organization from which they come.

- Members will seek to share discussion time, encouraging everyone to participate fully.

Observers

Stakeholder group meetings are open to the public. Observers are welcome at all stakeholders group meetings but will not be seated at the table or participate in discussions. A time may be set aside in the agenda of each meeting for comments or questions from observers.

Meetings

Meetings will begin and end on time.

North Transfer Station
DRAFT Stakeholder Workshop #5 Summary
June 29, 2011
Lake Washington Rowing Club | 5:00 – 8:00 PM

ATTENDEES

Stakeholders
Eric Johnson
Trish McNeil
Erik Pihl
Bob Quinn
David Ruggiero
Rob Stephenson
Toby Thaler
Cathy Tuttle
Jessica Vets

Seattle Public Utilities
Nancy Ahern
Tim Croll
Bill Benzer
Ken Snipes
Jeff Neuner

EnviroIssues
Penny Mabie (facilitator)
Erin Tam
Alissa VandenBerghe

HDR
Dan Costello
Olivia Williams

Observers
Murphy McCullough, Skanska
Terrill Chang, URS
Sarah Sariskas, Triangle Associates
Steve Moddemeyer, CollinsWoerman
John Teutsch, Teutsch Partners
Barbara Swift, Swift Company
Tom Aura, Mortenson
DJ Dean, KPG
Tom Cole, Lydig

MEETING PURPOSE
The purpose of this meeting was to review and finalize the Stakeholder Recommendation Report and discuss the next steps for the project.

AGENDA ITEMS AND DISCUSSION

Welcome and Introductions, *Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues*
Penny convened the meeting, asked everyone to introduce themselves, and reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting. Penny discussed the purpose of the workshop and explained to the observers that the stakeholder group went through two rounds of edits to the Stakeholder Group Recommendations Report prior to the meeting.

Design Commission Update, *Tim Croll, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)*
Tim Croll, SPU, reminded the group that SPU was recently asked to present a project update to the Seattle Design Commission. At the briefing, the Design Commission members commented on the amount of green space in the plans and explained that from an urban design point of view, it would make more sense to have commercial space in the southern corner of Woodlawn Avenue N to “anchor” the corner and the open space. The Design Commission suggested allowing it to be zoned and developed as a small business, such as a yoga studio. Tim said he told the Design Commission that he would bring their suggestion to the stakeholder group to allow the stakeholders the opportunity to weigh in on this potential change. Tim explained that the group has several options:

1. Leave Concept C as it is currently designed.
2. Keep Concept C as it is currently designed (no commercial development), but give direction on the planning of the green spaces to have a strong design emphasis on the northwest corner of Woodlawn Avenue and N 34th Street.
3. Modify Concept C so that the southern portion (that portion which is opposite the commercially zoned property on the east side of Woodlawn Avenue N) be sold for low rise commercial development.

Tim went on to explain that Option 3 would need to be researched fully and there is a potential that it wouldn't be possible. He said that SPU doesn't want to be a landlord so the space would need to be sold.

Erik Pihl, stakeholder, noted that the Design Commission may not fully understand the depth of the stakeholders discussions to date regarding the green space along Woodlawn Avenue N. He said he wasn't interested in changing the design at this point, especially because no one in the community has expressed the desire to commercially develop the open space portions of the property.

Eric Johnson, stakeholder, added that changing the concept so drastically would mean it no longer met the design criteria the stakeholder group developed. A third stakeholder, Jessica Vets, agreed and said that even though she supported retail along N 34th Street, she doesn't support this change. She explained that the experience along N 34th Street has already been greatly improved by moving the station as far south as possible.

Bob Quinn, stakeholder, then pointed out that the South Wallingford Amendment to the Wallingford Plan calls for a pedestrian experience along N 34th Street with as much retail space as possible. However, he continued, he believes it's too late in the process to make this kind of a significant change. He also said that he believes it is too small of a space to sell.

Toby Thaler, stakeholder, suggested adding language to the recommendation report that a neighborhood-oriented committee be tasked with the responsibility of planning the green space along Woodlawn Avenue N.

Bob Quinn asked Tim to clarify if we are required to follow the Design Commission's suggestions. Tim explained that the group should consider the recommendations, but they do not necessarily need to be adopted. He explained that the stakeholder group represents the community and long discussions about community desires and values and if the group doesn't want to commercially develop the space that this would be a very defensible decision.

Trish McNeil, stakeholder, expressed concerns about the impact another commercial development would have on parking in the neighborhood. Erik noted that the green space is mitigation for the project and the uninterrupted space is what makes it so beneficial to the community.

Tim said he had a very clear understanding of the group's reaction to the suggestion and that he would follow up with the Design Commission.

Review and Finalize Stakeholder Recommendation Report, *Stakeholders*
Penny explained that the purpose of this round of review was to catch any last minute edits, not to drastically change the language of the document. The group started with the cover letter addressed to SPU Director, Ray Hoffman.

Toby explained that he was frustrated about the language in the cover letter regarding the 1998 Master Plan. He said that even though SPU believes the siting of the facility was addressed in the plan, he disagrees and wants the language of the letter to express that. Trish explained that she has read the Master Plan document several times and agrees that there is no mention of the facility siting.

Several stakeholders felt that adding a minority statement in the cover would appease both sides of the argument and the stakeholders in agreement with Toby's language could sign their names to the statement. Penny suggested further discussion as it seemed that not enough disparities had been heard to require a minority report.

The group discussed several versions of a reworded statement that could be attributed only to the particular stakeholders who support the statement. Toby explained that he felt the statement was vital to the letter because the Seattle City Council has not heard about the results of this process. At that time, the City attorney will have the opportunity to present SPU's side of the situation, and the stakeholders will have an opportunity to make a statement as well. Jessica added that, although she doesn't support the statement, it's important from a historical standpoint to document that there was disagreement over the location of the station.

The stakeholders discussed at length the wording of the section about the 1998 Master Plan. Some felt it was out of the scope of the group – the stakeholders were tasked with providing input on the design of the station, not the location of it. Others felt that the community was giving up certain zoning protections, and it was important to protect their interests by noting that the community believes that SPU did not address the siting of the station through the proper methods.

The stakeholders eventually came to an agreement on the language and order of the cover letter. Nancy Ahern, SPU, said she understands the stakeholders' need for the language regarding the 1998 Master Plan, but the City disagrees with the validity of the statement. She added that the stakeholders should use the language they agree on because the letter is from their group, not from SPU. Erik said he thinks

this statement actually strengthens the letter because it shows that SPU and the stakeholder group have come a long way.

Trish asked that the letter more clearly identify the trade-off between the community agreeing to needed zoning changes as long as SPU stays true to the stakeholder recommendations. The stakeholders agreed and the additions were incorporated.

Toby asked what course of actions the stakeholders will have after they sign the report, especially if SPU doesn't follow through on their commitments. He asked if signing this document would prevent him from suing the City during the zoning process if SPU doesn't commit to the conditions the stakeholders have set.. Nancy responded that the Stakeholder Recommendation Report was not a binding document and doesn't prevent anyone from future legal action. Tim added that SPU was in the process of developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Wallingford Community Council.

When the group finished editing the letter, Penny reviewed the changes incorporated into the report. Trish asked that SPU commit to more specific language in the recommendation section regarding certain setback distances and avoid using terms like "slightly" as they are too broad and open to wide interpretation. Bill Benzer, SPU, explained that since the project is still in the conceptual design phase they can't be more specific because there are many factors that will need to be taken into consideration during the final design of the station that would affect the calculations.

The group made other minor revisions throughout the document and by the end of the discussion the group came to a consensus regarding all of the specific language. Penny explained that final grammatical edits will be made to the document over the next few days and a final version of the report will be sent by the end of the week. A signature sheet was passed around the room and all stakeholders in attendance signed off on the report. A stakeholder asked how absent members would be included. Penny responded that EnviroIssues will contact the absent members, provide them with the revised draft report, and arrange to obtain their signature if they decide to support the recommendations report.

Next Steps, *Bill Benzer, SPU*
Bill explained that the community amenities process moving forward would involve its own community involvement process, possibly in the form of another stakeholder group made up of surrounding community members and neighbors. Jessica and Trish both said they would be interested in participating in the design of the community amenities.

Bill also discussed the ongoing discussions with the Wallingford Community Council to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that SPU and the WCC would sign to provide certainty for both parties about station design and operation commitments and would ensure WCC support for needed zoning changes for the new station.

Bill also explained that HDR and SPU will continue to work on the design specifications for the procurement documents. Bill noted that any stakeholders who wish could have the opportunity to review the procurement language in the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) that will be shared with the design community. Several stakeholders signaled an interest in participating in the RFP review.

Wrap-up and Thank You, *Everyone*
Nancy concluded the meeting by thanking the stakeholders for their time and commitment over the last three years. She said the most exciting part of this process is the fact that SPU has a much better project because of each stakeholder's comments and perspectives.

Several stakeholders thanked the project staff as well as the stakeholders and observers not in attendance who have been involved in the project since the beginning. Jessica added that she has never, as a stakeholder, received this amount of careful listening attention from a City project and thanked SPU for the process.

For more information about the project, please visit: www.seattle.gov/util/transferstations.