



City of Seattle
Seattle Planning Commission

Tim Parham, Chair
Vanessa Murdock, Executive Director

SEATTLE PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 22, 2018

Approved Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Michael Austin, Eileen Canola, David Goldberg, Sandra Fried, Grace Kim, Ellen Lohe, Rick Mohler, Tim Parham, Marj Press, Kelly Rider, Julio Sanchez, Amy Shumann, Lauren Squires, Jamie Stroble, Patti Wilma

Commission Staff: John Hoey, Senior Policy Analyst; Katy Haima, Planning Analyst

Guests: Eric McConaghy, City Council Central Staff; Lish Winston, City Council Central Staff; Spencer Williams, Legislative Aide for Councilmember Rob Johnson; Tom Hauger, Ubax Gardheere, and Michael Blumson, Office of Planning and Community Development

In Attendance: Erica Barnett, Cindi Barker

Seattle Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion.

Referenced Documents discussed at the meeting can be viewed here:

<http://www.seattle.gov/planningcommission/when-we-meet/minutes-and-agendas>

Chair's Report & Minutes Approval

Chair Parham called the meeting to order at 7:32am.

ACTION: Commissioner Patti Wilma moved to approve the March 8, 2018 meeting minutes. Vice-Chair Michael Austin seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes passed.

Chair Parham provided an overview of the meeting agenda and upcoming Commission meetings.

Announcements

John Hoey, Seattle Planning Commission staff, informed the Commissioners of several upcoming community events.

Briefing: Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process

Eric McConaghy, City Council Central Staff

If you would like to view the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process presentation, it is included in the supporting documents found in the minutes section of our website.

Mr. McConaghy provided an overview of the proposed schedule for consideration of Comprehensive Plan amendments. Mr. McConaghy noted that some of the deadlines have been moved to accommodate the Planning Commission's meeting schedule, including an additional two weeks during the docketing process to provide adequate time for analysis and developing a recommendation letter.

Mr. McConaghy then discussed the proposed changes to the docketing criteria with the Commission.

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners noted the timeline of the most recent review process, recognizing that the 2017-2018 docketing overlapped with the 2016-2017 recommendations, and how this caused frustration for parties submitting proposals.
- Commissioners noted that criterion B.5 is still vague about "near future," and noted this could be challenging to interpret consistently.
- Mr. McConaghy explained the changes to Criterion D to clarify the rationale for rejecting repeat proposals. Commissioners recommended deleting the word "significantly" from this criterion. Commissioners noted that if a proposed amendment is not docketed due to criterion C.2, but then returns another year when there may be more resources available, Criterion D may present a challenge to the proposal being considered again. In addition, Commissioners were concerned about being informed enough about City department workplans and budgets to not docket an amendment based on criterion C.2. Mr. Williams noted that part of the value of having the proposed amendments reviewed by the Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD), City Council, and the Planning Commission is that each body can add knowledge about the processes or workplans that they coordinate.
- Commissioners asked if there might be some additional exploration of requirements for conducting inclusive community engagement as part of Criterion E. Commissioners expressed concern that a minimal amount of community engagement might be done and still satisfy the criteria. Mr. McConaghy noted that this criterion might allow some room for the Planning Commission to include discussion on what the outreach was. However, Commissioners noted that it may be more beneficial for those who are submitting proposals to be aware of how any outreach will be evaluated as they are shaping their proposal, instead of at the end of the process.
- Commissioners requested more details regarding the intent of Criterion F. Mr. McConaghy noted that this criterion is intended to evaluate if a proposed amendment is at a visionary level appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan, and that it would physically manifest "on the ground", such as zoning changes. Mr. Williams provided an example of the air quality amendment that could result in changes to the allowed uses and zoning near highways.
- Commissioners noted that Criterion G was constructed in a different format, making it more confusing to understand, and questioned if it might be written as a series of bullets instead of "and" conditions followed by a series of "or" conditions. Mr. Hauger noted that the Future Land Use Map does not need to be changed unless a significant change of a large area is requested, and that the language in Criterion G is intended to clarify what constitutes "large" and a "significant change."

Briefing and Discussion: Equitable Development Initiative

Ubax Gardheere & Michael Blumson, OPCD

If you would like to view the Equitable Development Initiative presentation, it is included in the supporting documents found in the minutes section of our website.

Ms. Gardheere provided an overview of the goals and objectives of the Equitable Development Initiative (EDI), and how the program is being built and designed to achieve and address the Race and Social Justice (RSJ) goals in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Gardheere explained that the EDI framework focuses on people and place, and she outlined the six “equity drivers” that need to be applied together to achieve holistic change. She then provided an overview of targeted place-based strategies the EDI is pursuing to mitigate displacement risk, including advancing economic mobility; preventing displacement; and building on cultural assets. She noted that the EDI interim advisory board co-created the values by which the EDI operates.

Commission Discussion

- Commissioners requested an update on the initial EDI projects. Ms. Gardheere and Mr. Blumson noted they are all in different stages, and provided the following information:
 - The Southeast Economic Opportunity Center is intended to be a multi-service center including financial education, job training, and workforce training. Mr. Blumson noted that they are partnering with Spectrum Development to create market-rate housing units. HomeSight is leading the development of limited-equity cooperative housing units in a different building that balances creating equity with continuing long-term affordability. Other uses on the site potentially include a healthcare clinic, multi-lingual childcare, the Green Dot charter school, and the Multicultural Community Center (MCC). Currently, the multiple organizations within the MCC coalition are working on setting up a governing structure and exploring building spaces to suit the various programs.
 - The Rainier Beach Food Innovation District is looking into site acquisition alternatives and creating models to fit a variety of site configurations. Mr. Blumson noted they are in a tricky situation of having site-specific programming without yet having a site and partners are prioritizing strategies to support site control.
 - The William Grose Center for Cultural Innovation was originally exploring repurposing Fire Station 6, which has been put on hold due to the Mayor not being briefed on the status yet and the Mayor’s desire to think through the larger strategy regarding all City surplus lands. Commissioners encouraged staff to advocate for pulling this property out of the larger surplus lands strategy in order to not delay the project.
 - The Little Saigon Landmark Project involves three main stakeholders (Friends of Little Saigon, SCIDpda, and Wing Luke Museum) who were originally looking for a larger parcel and are now looking at alternative sites and models. Potential components of the project include affordable commercial space, a community center, a night market, and affordable housing.
- Commissioners requested more information on the voting process for round two of funding. Ms. Gardheere noted that the applications were due March 5, and that they are currently in the process

of reviewing about 35 applications. There was a range of requests, including funding for capacity building, childcare, affordable commercial space, housing, and community centers. Some projects are in the initial stages of planning, and others need funding to close a gap. There is an interdisciplinary team consisting of staff from the Department of Neighborhoods, Office of Housing, and Office of Economic Development, Office of Arts and Culture, as well as the Interim Advisory Board that will be weighing in on the applications. After the initial review, a scoring process will evaluate how the projects meet the EDI equity criteria. The scoring process is modeled after the Social Justice Fund. Ms. Gardheere estimated that about seven projects will receive funding, to be announced in June.

- Commissioners asked if there was coordination with Communities of Opportunity or Best Start for Kids for investing in EDI projects. Ms. Gardheere indicated that she sits on the governing board for Communities of Opportunity and is in close coordination with staff at the county as COO is funding 3 of the initial 5 EDI projects.
- Commissioners asked questions regarding the following, which were not addressed due to time constraints:
 - Commissioners asked for a snapshot of the types of applications that came in for round two of funding.
 - Commissioners wanted to explore the connections between the EDI and the Comprehensive Plan Equity Indicators being developed.
 - Commissioners wanted to learn more about unexpected challenges that arose during the process of reviewing applications and awarding funding.
 - Commissioners requested more information about the EDI approach to economic mobility.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 am.