

Attachment C

Notes from Community Meetings

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Surplus Property Disposition Study

Delridge Neighborhood District Council

Youngstown Cultural Arts Center, Room 106
Wednesday, June 19, 2013; 7:00 pm

This was a presentation to the Delridge Neighborhood District Council. The primary objective of this presentation was to discuss City Light's Southwest Surplus Property Disposition Study, to solicit the District Council's advice for community outreach, and to offer to attend and discuss the study with any of the District Council member organizations.

City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation regarding the disposal process with emphasis on the three former substations located in the Delridge Neighborhood District Council's area of representation. Meetings are planned with the Southwest and Southeast District Councils for the same purpose. Questions and answers are paraphrased in these notes, reflecting in most instances a conversational exchange.

Q1: If there is antiquated equipment on the properties, does City Light clean them up?

A1: Yes. All of the electrical equipment has already been removed from the nine properties in this study. They are also tested for any soil contamination and cleaned up if any is found. In last year's Surplus Pilot Project, three properties were clean and three required cleanup.

Q2: Is there an offset for clean-up?

A2: No. There would be an environmental cleanup credit if any of the properties were sold with contaminated soils, but not for the cleaned up properties.

Q3: To what level is City Light required to clean up the properties?

A3: Cleanups are done to the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act residential standards. What that really means is that we test, remove any contaminated soil, test again, and remove additional soil until all the contamination is gone.

Q4: What if contaminants migrate from the site to adjoining properties?

A4: We have not experienced that. These sites typically have surface contamination from small spills, but do not contain sources of migrating contamination like underground storage tanks.

Q5: How is the true and full value of property determined?

A5: City Light obtains appraisals which reflect the value with highest and best use of the property. These appraisals are used to evaluate offers, but are held confidential by City Light.

City Light is now in the process of closing the sale of four properties in Northeast Seattle, resulting from the Surplus Pilot Project conducted last year. Offers for these properties were solicited through a commercial broker, with the highest prospective purchasers given the opportunity to increase their offers. This is the process that the City used to sell several surplus fire stations last year, and City Light is very satisfied with the results.

Q6: What happens if there is no interest in a property?

A6: We have not experienced that. Most of the former 4 kV substations are located in residential neighborhoods and are very desirable. These sites would be desirable even in a down market, but right now there is very strong demand.

Q7: Regarding the former Ambaum Substation, does the appraisal take into account the cost of rezoning the property if that seems desirable?

A7: No. Properties are appraised for the highest and best use under current zoning.

Q8: Why is the former Dakota Substation not on the August 22nd meeting agenda?

A8: Two community meetings are being set up. The August 22nd community meeting is intended to primarily discuss the four former substations in the Delridge Council District: Andover, Delridge, Dumar, and White Center.

A later community meeting is being set up to primarily discuss the two former substations in the Southwest Council District, and two in the City Light service area south of the City: Dakota, Fauntleroy, Ambaum, and Glendale. Of course, anyone attending these meetings can comment on any of the nine properties in this study.

Q9: How is this meeting a part of the process?

A9: City Light first met with Department of Neighborhood staff to get their recommendations for community outreach in the area of Southwest Seattle. Tonight's meeting is the first of three meetings with District Councils having surplus properties in their Districts. Our primary purpose in this meeting is to offer to meet with each Councilmember's individual neighborhood group.

Later, City Light will conduct its own community meetings for nearby residents and owners, followed by formal public hearings. City Light will then submit a report to the City Council with all community comments, together with City Light's recommendations.

Q10: What if the community says that the best use of the property is for a park?

A10: All community comments are forwarded to the City Council. Parks has already reviewed all nine of the properties in this study and determined that none of these properties are suitable for park use. Nonetheless, when community comments are

received recommending that a property be used for a non-utility City purpose, the City Council has asked City Light to resubmit that property to the appropriate department (in this case, Parks) for further review.

Key considerations for Parks will be the park gap analysis conducted for the 2000 Pro Parks Levy, and again for the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy, and the availability of funds to pay true and full value for a transfer.

City Light note: The current transfer of the former Morningside Substation to Parks was discussed, including the gap analysis that identified the need for a park in the Wedgwood Neighborhood, and funding for the transfer through the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy.

Q11: The former Delridge Substation is a wetland and not buildable. Shouldn't SPU take this property?

A11: Right now, there's flowing water in the ditch on the east side of 23rd Avenue SW. This water passes under 23rd in a culvert, into a man-made ditch on the Delridge Substation property, and out of City Light's property in a culvert under SW Findlay Street. SPU has reviewed this property and indicated that it did not meet their system needs. City Light needs to give additional consideration to any building constraints resulting from this drainage.

Q12: How are you doing outreach to diverse groups, such as those who do not speak English?

A12: City Light is committed to the City's Race and Social Justice Initiative, making sure that all our citizens who may have interest in this study have the opportunity to participate. We have interpreters, and written communications are produced in a variety of languages. Photos of last year's Surplus Pilot Project were shown, which reflected a diverse racial and ethnic participation.

City Light note: The address of the former Glendale Substation was corrected during the presentation; it is 2423 S 132nd Street.

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Surplus Property Disposition Study

Southeast District Council

Rainier Community Center
Wednesday, June 26, 2013; 6:30pm

This was a presentation to the Southeast District Council. The primary objective of this presentation was to discuss SCL's current Surplus Property Disposition Study consisting of nine properties. This study is a follow-up to last year's Surplus Property Disposition Pilot Project.

City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation regarding the disposal process with emphasis on the disposal of the former Wabash Substation, which is the only property in the SE District Council's area of representation. The former substation is located at 5122 S. Cloverdale St.

The City Light presentation outlined the current plan for disposal of nine surplus former substation properties and noted the following regarding the planned surplus property disposal generally:

- All of the electrical equipment has already been removed from the nine properties in the current proposal. They are also tested for any soil contamination and cleaned up if any is found.
- Cleanups are done to the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act residential standards. What that really means is that City Light tests, removes any contaminated soil, tests again, and removes additional soil until all the contamination is gone.
- These sites typically have surface contamination from small spills, but do not contain sources of migrating contamination like underground storage tanks.
- City Light obtains appraisals which reflect the value with highest and best use of the property. These appraisals are used to evaluate offers, but are held confidential by City Light.
- The Parks Department has already reviewed all nine of the properties in this study and determined that none of these properties are suitable for park use.
- By law, utility assets such as these may not be used to serve the non-utility functions of general government unless there is payment of true and full value.

Seattle Public Utilities has indicated that it would like to acquire the former Wabash Substation for drainage detention, so there was little discussion.

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Southwest Seattle Surplus Property Disposition Study

Southwest District Council

Southwest Pool and Teen Life Center
Wednesday, July 3, 2013; 6:30pm

This was a presentation to the Southwest District Council. The primary objective of this presentation was to discuss City Light's Southwest Surplus Property Disposition Study, to solicit the District Council's advice for community outreach, and to offer to attend and discuss the study with any of the District Council member organizations.

City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation regarding the disposal process with emphasis on the disposal of the three former substations located within the SW District Council's area of representation. Meetings have previously been held with the Delridge and Southeast District Councils for the same purpose.

Q1: Are the properties offered first to other city agencies?

A1: Yes, other city departments, including the Parks Department, were given the opportunity to review all nine of the properties in this study to determine if any of the properties are suitable for city use.

Q2: Are the properties also offered to non-profits for consideration prior to the general offer?

A2: No.

Q3: Who has been spray painting the grass at the former Dakota substation?

A3: Most likely surveyors.

City Light note: The current need for additional parks in White Center was discussed. City Light staff noted that community members could request that the sale of a specific property be delayed to allow the community to pursue funding to purchase that property for a park. The community desire that the land not be used for condominiums was discussed with City Light staff noting that this was an issue for the Department of Planning and Development.

Q4: Have you done appraisals?

A4: If the City Council authorizes any sales, City Light will obtain appraisals which will be used to evaluate offers, but the appraisals are held confidential. A prospective purchaser should obtain his or her own appraisal. The King County assessed values can sometimes provide an initial guide.

Q5: How are the sales conducted?

A5: Offers for these properties will be solicited through a commercial broker, with the highest prospective purchasers given the opportunity to increase their offers.

Q6: Are you required to take the highest offer?

A6: Yes.

Q7: What is the status of the substation at 48th and Erskine?

A7: This is the Morgan Substation. It is still an active 4KU substation.

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Southwest Seattle Surplus Property Disposition Study

Community Meeting
August 21, 2013; 7:00 pm
Youngstown Cultural Arts Center
4408 Delridge Way SW

This was a presentation to the Southwest Community organized by Seattle City Light. Meeting notice signs were posted on the former Andover, Delridge, Dumar, and White Center properties, and postcard meeting notices were mailed to all, property owners and residents in the surrounding outreach areas.

The primary objective of this presentation was to discuss City Light's current Surplus Property Disposition Study consisting of a total of nine properties.

In attendance was Naomi Henry, Land Use Planner at the Department of Planning and Development (identified as DPD below). City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation, with questions during and after. Questions and answers are paraphrased in these notes, reflecting in most instances a conversational exchange. The questions were generally site-specific and have been organized accordingly.

Andover Site

Q1: What is the size of the site? The City Light materials indicate 8,000 square feet, but it seems smaller.

A1: The 8,000 square feet is from County tax records.

City Light Note: Verified in City GIS.

Q2: What is the slope of the site?

A2: DPD: It has a 45 degree slope. This would trigger SEPA and a geotechnical analysis for development. This property is in a low rise zone.

Q3: Could the neighborhood rent this site as a P-Patch?

A3: It is possible, but the property would have to be rented to a responsible entity at full and true rental value. The City's Department of Neighborhoods has six P-Patches on City Light property. If the City Council wanted to make any of the surplus properties in this study into a P-Patch, that property would have to be transferred from City Light to DON for true and full value.

Dakota Site

Q4: The parcel is 9,791 sq ft, zoned SF 5000. Could this property be subdivided into two residential lots?

A4: DPD: The original zoning underlying this property was for three and part of a fourth lot. The original lots were 50% of the minimum lot size, so under current zoning, a developer could probably build three houses on this site.

City Light Note: This analysis was reviewed by DPD and revised in later presentations to indicate that this property could be used to build two houses.

Delridge Site

City Light Note: Comments were received that there is a man-made drainage ditch across the property and a stand of mature cottonwood trees. In winter this property is very wet with standing water. The culvert draining the property has been blocked in the past, resulting in substantial ponding on the property. If the property is a designated wetland, perhaps it could be used as a rain garden.

Q5: What are the constraints if the property is deemed to contain wetlands and how could the property be used?

A5: DPD: The City's critical areas map shows a wetland on the property, so a wetlands delineation study would be required, and a wetland buffer would be required. The lot is 20,000 square feet. More research would be required regarding the minimum lot size and the width of the wetland buffer. If the trees are over 2 feet in diameter at breast height, the cottonwoods on the property would need to be replaced if cut down.

Q6: What will be done with the landscaping plants currently on the parcel?

A6: These are plants that are being stored in the fenced substation enclosure by City Light for landscaping projects in Southwest Seattle.

Q7: We saw a recent cleanup being done on the Delridge property. What was that?

Q7: The former Delridge Substation is the most recent substation to be deactivated. When the equipment was removed, the site was tested and a small area of soil contamination was found and cleaned up.

City Light Note: City Light has since obtained a wetland delineation for this property. Almost the entire site north of the fenced substation enclosure was classified as wetland.

Dumar Site

City Light Note: Comments were received that this property is at the intersection of SW Holden Street and 16th Avenue SW, that the northwest and southeast corners of this intersection are zoned commercial, that there is a fire station on the northeast corner (FS

#11), but that this property is zoned residential. Some members of the community would like to see this property rezoned commercial and this intersection become a community commercial center.

Q8: Why is this property zoned residential? This does not seem appropriate for its location.

A8: DPD: I am unsure of the explanation for this zoning. I would have to check the history.

Q9: Have you approached King County Metro and Sound Transit with this property? It would make an awesome transit stop.

A9: No, these properties are only circulated to other public agencies when a public use seems reasonable. City Light has several agreements with King County Metro for bus shelters on City Light property. These agreements are usually for a small area of the property close to the street and can be cancelled by either party on short notice.

City Light Note: City Light noted that a letter had been received from a nearby neighbor opposing the use of this parcel as a park because of the potential for illicit activities that a park might attract. A comment was received that there are often undesirable or illicit activities in the 7Eleven parking lot across the street.

White Center Site

Q10: Have you approached other agencies regarding this property because of its rich historical significance? Parks and transportation uses were suggested.

A10: Yes. Before City Light began the community outreach for the surplus Southwest properties, they were circulated to all other City departments. Parks and SDOT responded that they did not need any of these properties. However, the procedures adopted by the City Council for our study of these properties require that if a citizen proposes a non-utility use, City Light is required to resubmit that property to the appropriate City department for further review.

General Questions Regarding All Nine Sites

Q11: How much money is available under the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy to purchase these properties?

A11: The acquisitions portion of the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy was based on a “gap analysis” by the Parks Department that identified specific areas in the City that needed parks, with specific funding for each of those projects. A representative from the Parks Department will attend the August 27th community meeting to provide more detailed information on the funding issue.

Q12: Could solar panels be installed on these sites?

A12: City Light has a couple solar programs. Under the Community Solar Program, we place solar facilities on other public agencies’ properties with grant funding. The grant

allows City Light to fund these facilities on other City departments' land, but not City Light land. Our customers are able to invest in these projects and receive credits against their electricity bills. The Jefferson Park and Aquarium solar projects are two examples.

City Light also encourages the installation of solar panels on private homes and businesses. City Light buys back the power not used by these installations.

But the installation of solar panels on City Light's urban properties is not economically viable. The cost of the land would be part of the capital cost, and the cost of the kilowatt hours produced would be far too high compared with other available sources.

Q13: Why is there pesticide residue on so many parcels?

A13: City Light has not been able to find any records regarding pesticides used, and our longest-term employees do not remember any such use. Whatever the source, if the contamination exceeds standards adopted under the Washington State Model Toxics Control Act (MCTA), City Light is obligated to clean up the property to MCTA standards. City Light will clean up any of these properties where contamination is found regardless of the future disposition the properties.

Q14: Is there an opportunity to have a design competition to ensure that the properties are developed with the most compatible design for their respective neighborhoods?

A14: DPD: There is no design review for residential building unless it entails building three townhouses at the same time. As long as setbacks, garage appearance rules, and other requirements are observed, there are few restrictions.

Q15: How does the City Council balance the opposition of some neighborhoods toward development of these properties against the need for sales revenue of City Light?

A15: We know that the City Council is interested in and will listen to citizens' comments; that's why City Light was directed by the City Council to do this community outreach, but we cannot predict the Council's decisions.

Q16: Would a preference be given to a developer with a superior design as determined by a competition?

A16: If a property is sold to a developer, City Light can only consider the highest offer.

Q17: Are tax assessed values on the King County website?

A17: Yes, and in today's market, these values are often close to actual market values, but not always.

Q18: Is City Light attempting to get the most money possible for each of the parcels?

A18: The "gold standard" for property sales is an open and competitive bidding process. For the properties sold after last year's Surplus Pilot Project, City Light used the services of a broker who marketed the properties, took offers, and then negotiated again between the highest offers.

When a property is transferred to another City department or another public agency, City Light obtains an M.A.I. appraisal.

Q19: Would a group of citizens be able to work to raise money to buy a property for a local park?

A19: Yes. In the past, the City Council has delayed a surplus disposition to allow a group of citizens to work to raise money to buy a property. The usual objective is to raise sufficient funds to pay for a transfer to the City department providing the desired use; for instance, to the Parks Department for a park, or the Department of Neighborhoods for a community garden.

Most community groups would not want to take title themselves because of long-term liabilities and maintenance costs for a public use. In most cases the community groups have not been successful. The exception was the disposition of the Soundway property near South Seattle Community College. A group of citizens was able to get a State grant to pay for the transfer of that property from the City Street Fund to Parks, for use as part of the Duwamish Green Space.

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Southwest Seattle Surplus Property Disposition Study

Community Meeting High Point Community Center, 6920 34th Avenue SW Tuesday; August 27, 2013; 6:30 PM

This was a presentation to the Southwest Community organized by Seattle City Light. Meeting notice signs were posted on the former Ambaum, Dakota, Fauntleroy, and Glendale properties, and postcard meeting notices were mailed to all property owners and residents in the surrounding outreach areas,

The primary objective of this presentation was to discuss City Light's current Surplus Property Disposition Study consisting of a total of nine properties.

In attendance were Art Pederson of the Department of Planning and Development (identified as DPD below) and Chip Nevins of the Parks and Recreation Department (identified as Parks below). City Light presenters were Dave Barber, Real Estate Manager, and Lynn Best, Director of the Environmental Affairs & Real Estate Division.

Neighbors of the Dakota Substation prepared a presentation and display with photographs and an inventory of trees and plants present on the site.

City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation, with questions during and after. Questions and answers are paraphrased in these notes, reflecting in most instances a conversational exchange.

Q1: What happened to the properties in Northeast Seattle that were approved for disposal?

A1: City Light has sold four of the properties.

Q2: Were developers able to get variances on these properties to construct projects that exceeded zoning?

A2: City Light does not track the development of the properties after the land is sold.

A comment was made from the audience that the neighbors of the former Dakota Substation are concerned that if that property is sold, the City would permit some form of high-density development or development inconsistent with the character of the nearby single-family neighborhood. A comment was made that it is important to know how the properties can be developed and whether developers are able to obtain variances.

Several comments were made from the audience regarding the former Dakota Substation, that if that property cannot be used for a P-Patch or park, the speakers would prefer single family residential development, to retain consistency with the neighborhood.

Several comments were made from the audience regarding the former Fauntleroy Substation, that while there had been well designed landscaping on the property, it was not well maintained now. Neighbors were concerned about bark beetles and falling limbs. Neighbors now mow the parking strip along 46th.

Q3: Does Parks have funds to purchase the former Dakota Substation for a park?

A3: Parks: There were funds for park acquisition in the 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy. The areas where parks were needed were determined by a “gap analysis,” a determination of whether there are available parks within a reasonable walking distance. There are no unallocated funds in the 2008 levy.

People have often wanted former substations to be turned into parks. The 2000 Pro-Parks Levy allowed the acquisition of four substations for parks in response to neighborhood plans and the documented need for parks in underserved areas.

Q4: Why not wait to dispose of these former substation properties until the Parks Department has the funding to acquire them?

A4: Parks: A Parks gap analysis does not indicate that the area of the Dakota property is an area needing additional parks. There may be another Parks levy in the future; however, if there is, it will likely be focused on maintenance of existing park properties, not acquisition. Parks does not have adequate funding to maintain the properties it already manages.

Q5: Has City Light approached non-profit groups like Foreterra, Foresta, or Green Partnerships to purchase the properties?

A5: In the past, neighbors have explored working with intermediary groups to acquire City Light surplus properties for parks, but that has never been successful to date. Our experience is that (501) (c)(3) groups are more interested in preserving wilderness lands, but City Light would be willing to work with an intermediary group if they were interested.

Q6: If a builder offers a large sum, does Parks have to exceed that offer to acquire the land for a park?

A6: No, the properties are first offered to City departments. If there is a City need for a property, it will be transferred to that Department for appraised value, and will not be considered for private sale.

Q7: Would a group of citizens be able to work to raise money to buy a property for a local park?

A7: In the past, the City Council has delayed a surplus disposition to allow a group of citizens to work to raise money to buy a property. In most cases, this hasn't worked because the citizens were unable to raise full and fair market value.

A comment was made from the audience that a Gap Analysis map helps Parks to determine where new parks are needed.

Q8: How has property owned by Seattle Public Utilities become a P-Patch in the past?

A8: We'd have to look at the specific property and circumstances. It could be that the Department of Neighborhoods received funding to acquire the property for true and full value, or that the P-Patch is a secondary use for a property used for some active SPU purpose. City Light has several P-Patches in its transmission line corridors.

A comment was made from the audience that at a community meeting regarding the Dakota Substation, the consensus was that, due to the increased number of children in the neighborhood, a new park would be appropriate.

City Light responded that the Parks Department has already reviewed this property and determined that it was not needed or suitable for park use, but when a public comment is subsequently received that a surplus property should be utilized by another City department, City Light will resubmit the property for a second review by that department.

Q9: Why is City Light legally required to get full and fair market value for these surplus properties?

A9: The requirement that city utilities receive true and full value for the use of their properties for non-utility purposes is a requirement of State law. There's a separation between the utility and general funds of a city. The City of Seattle has been sued and lost in the *Okeson* series of decisions, and in *Lane*, for the use utility assets for non-utility purposes.

Q10: How is it that the Port of Seattle can operate parks?

A10: The Port has the ability to tax and has to provide mitigation for damages to the Duwamish, which may result in green space.

Q11: Would City Light consider rezoning the Fauntleroy property from Residential to Commercial to maximize sales price?

A11: City Light does not plan to request rezoning for any of the properties.

A11: DPD. The Comprehensive Plan determines zoning with one objective to maintain consistently zoned areas. It's not easy to change that designation, particularly in the middle of a residential zoned area.

Q12: How is City Light dealing with its fiduciary responsibility regarding the properties and the nuisance created by the lack of maintenance?

A12: Unfortunately, City Light has limited funds for maintenance of these properties. We will make note of the issue. A transfer to another City department, or a private sale, would have the added benefit of removing a property from City Light's maintenance responsibility.

Q13: If the neighbors agree to maintain the Dakota Substation property, can City Light take it off the surplus list?

A13: City Light land cannot be used for a non-utility purpose such as a park. This is prohibited by State law.

Q14: What is the value of the Dakota Substation property?

A14: We don't know. However the King County tax assessed values, available to the general public on-line, are a good indicator.

Q15: Could the Fauntleroy property be used to build more than one house?

A15: DPD. The Fauntleroy property cannot be subdivided. Context appropriate lots would be required; one house would be appropriate.

Q16: When will the results of the environmental testing of the Fauntleroy site be available?

A16: Testing has not been scheduled for Fauntleroy.

Q17: What is the typical footprint of a small park?

A17: Parks: The Parks Department goal is at least 10,000 square feet. A smaller park costs just as much to maintain, while offering less space to the public for recreational activities.

A comment was made from the audience that trees offset carbon dioxide emissions and contribute to property values.

City Light noted that it is greenhouse gas neutral and actively works to maintain its properties in a sustainable manner.

Q18: Can City Light attach deed restrictions or covenants to the deeds to control how the land is developed?

A18: We are not sure, but will look into that.

A18: DPD. DPD staff referred attendees to the DPD website for information regarding zoning.

City Light Note: A comment was made to City Light staff person after the meeting, by a person who owns that property adjoining the former White Center Substation, that he would be interested in purchasing the City Light property.

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Southwest Seattle Surplus Property Disposition Study

Highland Park Action Committee
1116 SW Holden Street
September 25, 2013; 7:00 pm

At meetings of the DON Neighborhood District Councils, and at later meetings hosted by the utility, City Light offered to meet with local community groups to discuss the Surplus Property Disposition Study, and individual properties in their neighborhoods. This meeting was requested by the Highland Park Action Committee to discuss two City Light surplus properties in their neighborhood, the former Dumar and White Center Substations.

This meeting was attended by Rick Nishi of Seattle Parks and Recreation who attended the meeting to discuss Westcrest Park improvements (identified as Parks below), and also by John Phillips and Jo Sullivan of the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Wastewater Treatment Division (identified as King County below), who attended the meeting to discuss the King County surface and stormwater management plan in the Highland Park area.

City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation on the Surplus Property Disposition Study, with questions during and after. Questions and answers are paraphrased in these notes, reflecting in most instances a conversational exchange.

Q1: Has the Parks Department considered purchasing City Light's surplus properties and making them into parks?

A1: Parks. Yes, however, we are prioritizing park acquisitions for areas lacking parks such as urban villages. We do an analysis of the whole City and prioritize our efforts according to needed space. None of the properties in this study are in areas identified as needing parks, so purchasing any of these properties is unlikely.

Q2: Is King County interested in possibly purchasing the White Center substation?

A2: King County Wastewater. Yes, King County was approached by the Highland Park Action Committee and asked to consider whether the White Center property might be part of the County's surface and stormwater management plan in this area. King County may be interested. We would need to analyze the purchase and it would need to go through our approval process by the Executive and the King County Council.

City Light Note. Following this meeting, City Light granted a right of entry to King County to conduct geotechnical testing on the White Center property. The County's analysis is continuing.

Q3: Has King County Wastewater considered purchasing any other City Light properties?

A3: King County Wastewater. Yes, we reviewed all the properties in the current Surplus Property Disposition Study, and none of the others would meet our needs.

Q4: Will the money from selling the substation properties go to Seattle City Light?

A4: Please keep in mind that City Light has not made any recommendations to the City Council and the Council has not authorized the sale of any of these properties. If the City Council does authorize the sale of any of these properties, the proceeds will be deposited in the City Light Fund.

Q5: The (former) White Center Substation was gifted from a community member to City Light, so shouldn't the money come back to the community?

A5: City Light is not aware that this property was acquired as a gift. If it was a gift, unless it was acquired under some form of reversionary deed, the proceeds of a sale would still be deposited in the City Light Fund. We'll have to look into it.

City Light Note: Later research indicates that the former White Center Substation was purchased from a private individual at market value. City Light acquired a half interest and the streetcar system acquired the other half. City Light later purchased the streetcar system's half. This history was reported later at the Public Hearing October 2nd.

Q6: Does this meeting count as a public hearing?

A6: No, this is just an informational meeting being held at the request of the Highland Park Action Committee. Formal comments can be made at one of the upcoming public hearings, by letter, or through the City Light website during the comment period.

Q7: What is the (former) White Center Substation property worth?

A7: You can get an idea of the value from the assessed value listed on the King County Assessor's website. In today's market, the County's assessed value is often close to actual market value, but not always. For sale to another public agency such as the County, City Light would base the sale price on an M.A.I. appraisal.

Q8: What are the boundaries for the (former) White Center Substation?

A8: The slide from the PowerPoint presentation was shown. This property is long and narrow and extends into the tree line. People are currently using this property for parking, but City Light is in process of cleaning up and fencing the property.

Q9: The (former) White Center Substation has some cultural history. This property was used for a trolley barn. Why can't we get transit here? It would be a good story, trolley barn to transit center?

A9: The property would have to be needed by King County as part of the Metro Transit System, and then purchased from City Light by the County for true and full value. King County Metro has agreements to place bus stops on several City Light properties, but the

White Center property does not appear to have the size and location characteristics of a Metro transit center.

City Light Note. Later research did not provide any record of the White Center property having been used as a trolley barn. City Light has King County Metro rectifiers on several of its substation properties, which convert AC to DC current for use by the electric buses. This may be the intent for the streetcar system's participation in the original purchase of the property, but there is no record of a rectifier having been placed on the property either.

Q10: The (former) Dumar Substation property is nearby. Can we discuss this property too?

A10: Certainly. This property is zoned for single family residential housing. City Light has received one letter from a nearby landowner asking that this property not be used for a park because it would attract illicit activities from across the street.

Q11: The (former) Dumar Substation is located at the intersection of 9th Avenue SW and SW Holden Street. There are commercial developments on two corners of this intersection and a fire station on the third. Several neighbors would like to see this intersection developed as a small, neighborhood commercial center. Would it be possible to rezone the City Light property before selling it?

A11: City Light would not request rezoning. We would not have a utility purpose for doing so.

A comment was made from the audience that community members had spoken with Naomi Henry at DPD, who indicated that the property owner would need to apply for the rezoning, but that approval of a rezoning would be unlikely.

Q12: A rezoning and development of the Dumar property as a commercial business would be better for our "walkability" and would give us a place to go. How do we lobby to City Council that this property would be better as commercial? How can we push this through?

A12: You could discuss this proposal with the Department of Planning and Development or any member of the City Council.

Q13: What is your timeline for selling the Dumar property and are you selling for sure?

A13: No, City Light has not made any recommendations for the disposition of this property to the City Council and the Council has not authorized the sale of any of these properties.

A comment was made from the audience expressing surprise that other people want the Dumar property to be commercial. The speaker noted that Cmart and Zippy's Burgers had struggled at that location. The speaker suggested that the Dumar property might be better used for a rain garden or some sort of public space?

Another speaker responded that that neighborhood already has a lot of parks but no walkable core. The speaker commented that Zippy's Burgers moved because there was no parking, that the other restaurants were crummy, that the neighborhood needed a coffee shop or somewhere to go, that the neighborhood has a grab and go coffee shop, but that the neighborhood would like a sit down café.

Q14: So if we want to pitch this proposal to City Council, will this community interest appear in your meeting minutes?

A14: Yes.

Q15: The Dumar property has an active bus stop that is not a part of the West Seattle Transit. What about a temporary park and ride?

A15: Like the White Center property, the Metro Transit System would need to purchase this property from City Light for true and full value. But this property does not appear to have the size and location characteristics of a Metro transit park and ride.

Q16: Could the Dumar property be used as some sort of artistic solar area? If a blackout occurred it would be a place we could go and charge phones. It could be a place we could go if we can't plug into the main grid. Why can't we turn it into a solar array? Maybe some solar powered flower art?

A16: The installation of solar panels on City Light's valuable surplus substation properties doesn't make economic sense. These would be home-scaled, as opposed to utility-scaled solar installations. The land cost would be part of the capital cost, and the cost of the kilowatt hours produced would be astronomical compared to other sources.

This is not to say that home-based solar is a bad idea. City Light supports home-based solar by buying back excess power produced by the home owner. The solar installed on your rooftop has no land cost, and the initial installation cost can be recovered in just a few years.

Q17: Solar is still your line of business though, so why not use the property for solar?

A17: Nearly 90% of City Light's power is low cost hydroelectric. Our largest current investment in new power is actually for conservation. A 100 watts saved is 100 watts you don't need to generate. City Light has an Integrated Resource Plan that predicts the use of more solar in the long-term future, but utility-scale solar is still very costly compared to other power sources, including conservation, today.

A comment was made from the audience that solar arrays had been installed in Central Park after Hurricane Sandy. The speaker indicated that he did not understand why City Light was not building solar on public property that City Light owns, but want the public to pay into solar on property they own?

Another person suggested that one of the properties could be used as a rain garden, and that solar could be added.

Mary Fleck introduced herself as a member of the Genesee-Schmitz Community Council, and indicated that her group wanted the City to consider other uses for all of the properties in the Surplus Property Disposition Study, instead of selling them for development, such as parks, open green spaces, or solar pavilions.

Ms. Fleck expressed a concern that City Light would be submitting its report and recommendations to the City Council in the very near future, and indicated that her group wanted City Light to delay until the community could explore other means to preserve these properties as parks or open spaces. Ms. Fleck invited the people in this meeting to sign a petition, and to attend a meeting of her group in the High Point Library.

Meeting Notes

Seattle City Light Southwest Seattle Surplus Property Disposition Study

Public Hearing High Point Community Center Wednesday; October 2, 2013; 7:00 PM

This was the second of two Public Hearings organized by Seattle City Light to take formal comments on the Surplus Property Disposition Study. Hearing notice signs were posted on all the properties and postcard hearing notices were mailed to all property owners and residents in the surrounding outreach areas.

This meeting was held in three parts. First, City Light gave a short PowerPoint presentation on the Surplus Property Disposition Study and each of the properties. A representative of the Parks Department gave a presentation on how the need for new parks is determined and park funding. This was followed by an informal question and answer session. And finally, the formal public hearing was conducted.

City Light presenters were Lynn Best, Director of the Environmental Affairs & Real Estate Division and Dave Barber, Real Estate Manager. Chip Nevins, Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation (identified as Parks below), attended the meeting to answer questions about potential park use of the properties. Bill Devereaux of Seattle City Light served as Hearing Examiner.

These meeting notes paraphrase the discussion in the informal question and answer session. The formal Public Hearing was videotaped and a transcript prepared.

Q1: Under what circumstances has the City not done anything with surplus City Light properties in the past?

A1: In the past, there may have been a reluctance to authorize disposal of surplus City Light properties because there was not a clear, determinate process. At the request of the City Council, City Light has now developed, and are applying, a defined process with extensive public outreach, which is designed to reach a more definite outcome.

Q2: How would we find out where these properties come from?

A2: These are all City Light properties, acquired since 1914, and paid for with ratepayer funding.

Q3: How does the City Council decide not to make these into parks?

Q3: Parks. The City Council would also have to consider whether these properties were suitable for parks, whether it had funds to purchase these properties from City Light for parks, or whether it had higher park funding priorities.

Q4: It sounds as if the properties will be sold and the City Council cannot stop the sale.

A4: No, only the City Council can authorize the sale of a City property.

Q5: Do you take into account contamination when determining the price of the land?

A5: No, because we will clean up the properties prior to sale.

Q6: Do you have appraised values for these properties?

A6: No, but City Light will obtain appraisals if any of these properties are authorized for transfer to another City department, a public agency, or for sale.

Q7: Would a group of citizens be able to work to raise money to buy a property for a local park?

A7: City Light would support that. However, in most cases, this hasn't worked because the citizens were unable to raise full and fair market value.

Q8: Please explain the sale process.

A8: If any properties are authorized for sale, City Light will arrange for broker sales through the City's Department of Finance and Administrative Services. Sales will be made to the highest bidder for at least the appraised value. If an adjacent landowner or a community group offers appraised value, we will sell to the adjacent landowner or community group. In general, City Light tries to maximize the return to the ratepayers.

Q9: Who were all the properties in last year's Surplus Pilot Project sold to?

A9: One went to the Parks and Recreation Department. Two will probably sell to an adjacent landowner. Four were sold to builders or developers through the City's brokers.

Q10: If someone had a unique idea for a parcel, how would they get that considered?

A10: They could make comments into the record to be presented to the City Council.

Q11: Neighbors of these parcels may need more time to get funding together (to acquire these properties for parks or open space). How does City Light view this?

A11: We would prefer to see a clear likelihood of the funds being raised. In the past, this hasn't been successful because the citizens were unable to raise full and fair market value.

Q12: What happens to the proceeds of the sales?

A12: The proceeds go into the City Light general fund.

Q13: What guaranty do I as a taxpayer have that developers won't be able to get variances on these properties to construct high density projects that exceed current zoning? The developers can then sell the properties at a much higher price. It seems to be the trend in Seattle to subdivide lots to get more density.

A13: A purchaser can always apply for a variance or rezoning. However, representatives of the City's Department of Planning and Development attended earlier

meetings about these properties and indicated that the City would not be likely to approve these types of exceptions in an established residential neighborhood.