MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, February 9, 2016

Time: 4:30pm
Place: Bush Asia Center
        409 Maynard Avenue S.
        Basement meeting room

Board Members Present
Carol Leong, Vice Chair
Miye Moriguchi
Martha Rogers, Chair
Herman Setijono
Valerie Tran

Absent
Marie Wong

020916.1  APPROVAL OF MINUTES
December 8, 2015
MM/SC/VT/HS  3:0:1 Minutes approved. Mr. Martin abstained.

020916.2  BOARD BRIEFING

652 S. Dearborn Ave. – Spic’n Span Cleaners
Presenter: Eric Geissinger, PE, Aspect Consulting

Informational briefing on proposed remediation/clean-up (via electrical resistance heating - ERH) of soil and groundwater contamination, including installation of construction fencing and treatment equipment.

Jeremy Porter, Aspect Consulting, provided context of the site and explained that solvent spills to groundwater over time necessitate remediation / clean-up. He said that the cleaning process – thermal remediation – had been submitted to and approved by Department of Ecology. He said that electrodes will be installed.
underground that will apply current and heat to evaporate the solvents. He said that clean vapors will be discharged – water to sewer and air to atmosphere. He said they are going through permitting process.

Mr. Porter said that equipment will be below ground in the parking lot and other areas it will be above ground – the south portion of the property. He said 5 electrodes will be placed within the right-of-way. He stated that they intend to install a fence with privacy slats or visual barrier to surround the equipment at the surface. The work will take place over an eight month timeframe – two months to install equipment and six months for it to run. He said then the above-ground equipment will be removed and the site monitored for two years – one year to cool down and another year to prove contamination is gone. He said then they would decommission everything below ground, pull it out, remove transformer and repave parking lot. He said the water cooling and carbon treatment tank portion is 17’ tall and will extend above the fence. He said there will be a temporary power pole near the carport area with power meters on it. Responding to questions he said that there will be no pedestrian impact.

There was discussion about the proposed fence material (chain link with slats). Members of the board concern about the fencing material and how graffiti would be addressed. Staff asked what alternatives have been considered.

Joel Ostroff, property owner representative, said that they’ve used slats in the past. Another option would be wood panels, wrapped in plastic, so that the plastic could be changed out.

It was recommended to consider visually activating the space in some way. Staff commented that wood art panels by Urban Artworks that were removed from another site may be available for use here. Staff will send BIA contact information.

A board member asked if the fence would penetrate the ground.

Mr Ostroff said that it would not. Heavy footings would be used.

Eric Geissinger, Aspect, said that there will be lights, cameras and alarm inside.

Ms. Leong stressed the importance of lighting for security of the area; she said it would protect the equipment and be helpful overall in the area. She said the existing street lamps are not good. She asked about community risks to air and water and how that would be addressed.

Mr. Geissinger said that they will have a permit through Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) who will do a weekly sampling to make sure they are in compliance.

Mr. Porter said they are required to provide monitoring data on site. While they do not do a public report they do audits of the system and will provide reports to PSCAA. He said that SEPA review would be done and public comments associated with that are accepted. He said that they will be doing monitoring and reporting monthly.
Board members stressed the need of the community to have access to information.

Mr. Porter said there is no impact to drinking water as this is not the source of the City’s drinking water. He said that there is a lot of monitoring to make sure it is safe and they can provide that information to the public although it will be technical in nature.

Ms. Leong said that even a summary would be helpful so that the community knows the process. She asked the process for questions.

Mike Omura, SCIDPDA, encouraged integration of art to beautify screening and discourage tagging. He asked about SPU permitting. He said that given contamination issues he wants to restate health and safety concerns. He asked about impact of 90˚ heat to potable water pipes and noted there are lots of old pipe – possibly lead. He asked why they are cleaning – if they are required to or are they getting ready for potential development.

Mr. Porter said both. He said that they are following requirements but that it would be more difficult to develop if contaminated. They have no development plans at this point.

Mr. Ostroff said Dept of Ecology requires remediation, but this is voluntary clean up to comply with State regulations.

Mr. Porter said the heating is localized but that they will look at what utilities are in the ground and can re-route if necessary. He said there is no potable water there but they can speak to that in the application.

Ms. Frestedt asked about how site could be activated after the equipment is removed.

Mr. Ostroff said that once they understand the timeline more they can determine the use of space. He said the building is 7,000 square feet and the site is 13,000 square feet. He said the site is safe to use during the cool down period.

**GUIDELINE REVISION WORK SESSION**

Board review and discussion of proposed guideline revisions. The focus of this session will be the guidelines for Exterior Materials, Detailing and Colors, Signs and Mechanical Systems and Rooftop Equipment.

Ms. Frestedt gave an overview of past work on the guidelines, starting with a bulleted outline and then expanding on the text to align more closely with guidelines for other districts and to help the Board in the review of applications. She summarized the research and inspirations that have been integrated into this draft.

Review started at the top of Page 14 of the draft.
Ms. Frestedt said that guidelines are intended to give Board the tools and criteria to consider proposed changes. In response to questions from the Board she said that the guidelines are intended to cover renovations and exterior alterations as well as new construction.

There was discussion about how to integrate the relevant sections of the land use code and make it easily accessible. Ms. Frestedt said that she can create hyperlinks in the electronic version.

Ms. Leong said that adding the link could be helpful.

Ms. Frestedt went through proposed changes as shown in the draft document. She noted that transparency is a requirement in the Asian Design Character District (ADCD). She said that there has been interest in extending a transparency priority or requirement to the remainder of the District, outside of the ADCD. She asked for feedback from the Board. She noted past discussions on transparency related to the hookah lounge on S. Dearborn Street, which is located outside of the ADCD. There was discussion about increasing transparency within the massage spas along S. Jackson St.

Ms. Leong said that the board is not singling out a specific industry but noted how transparency impacts the community.

Ms. Frestedt said that consistency throughout the district helps. She said compliance is challenging; enforcement is managed through the Seattle Dept. of Construction and Inspections (SDCI). She said that 23.66 covers Asian Design District; the guidelines build on that. The guidelines give a way to review a submittal.

**Rooftop Equipment**

Ms. Frestedt went over the proposed guidelines for rooftop and mechanical equipment. She said this would include, but would not be limited to: penthouse overruns, mechanical, minor communication utility equipment and solar panels. She said the guidelines would give direction what is appropriate and preferred for these types of applications.

In response to a question about when screening might be appropriate or required, Ms. Frestedt said the board could grant exceptions to screening requirements in the underlying code. The intent is to minimize the aesthetic of equipment but sometimes screening is more impactful and creates an adverse visual effect.

Ms. Leong said the board could decide that screening adds to the problem.

Ms. Moriguchi said that A and B contradict – ‘where possible’ and ‘shall be’. What if not possible? Use of ‘shall’ is stronger language.

**Fire Escapes**
Ms. Frestedt presented language for giving preference for retaining fire escapes as character-defining features of historic buildings. She said this language was borrowed from the Pioneer Square Design Guidelines.

Mr. Setijono said that to repair or decommission costs more than just taking down. Ms. Moriguchi said that each case should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and by taking stock of the whole building.

Mr. Martin agreed that they are character-defining features.

Ms. Moriguchi said that the location has a lot to do with whether or not it impacts defining features.

Mr. Setijono said they were a necessity in the past and now they are just a relic.

Ms. Frestedt said fire escapes speak to the era in which the building was constructed and commented on modifications that have been allowed to decommissioned fire escapes to retain the framework, but remove treads (for safety).

020916.4  BOARD BUSINESS

Adjourn