



The City of Seattle

Pike Place Market Historical Commission

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

MINUTES

MHC 109/22

Wednesday, August 24, 2022

4:30 p.m.

Virtual meeting via WebEx

COMMISSIONERS

Chris Bown

Sam Farrazaino

Grace Leong

Golnaz Mohammadi

Lauren Rudeck, Vice Chair

Stephanie Young

Staff

Minh Chau Le

Melinda Bloom

Absent

Lisa Martin, Chair

Vice Chair Lauren Rudeck determined that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

She reminded Commission members to announce any conflict of interest or ex parte communication prior to review of applications.

Ms. Rudeck: Well, as of a few meetings ago, I believe the commissions preference was to accept comments on a section by section basis, rather than front loading them. People identify which section they're speaking to. So that's the bold face headings on the agenda.

And then public comments get addressed at that time.

082422.1 INFORMATIONAL BRIEFING

082422.11 Public Right of Way

Pike Pl and Stewart St, NE and SE corners of intersection

Christina Kapoi, Seattle Department of Transportation

Preliminary briefing on potential replacement of curbs and ramps.

Christina Kapoi, SDOT provided an overview of the project and noted repairs to sewer mainline are complete and they are now planning permanent restoration. She said the corner is heavily used and new ramps are needed. She said the existing ramps don't

Administered by the Historic Preservation Program Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

point pedestrians across Stewart, there is no detectable warning, and the ramp slopes and landings are non-compliant. She proposed curb bulb, two standard double ramps or a bisector ramp for better facilitation of pedestrian traffic. Conceptual ADA ramp improvements direct pedestrian flow across intersection, meets code requirements to the maximum extents feasible, prevent vehicle loads on the areaway, prevent parking at the intersection, and accommodates future construction at the Market.

Ms. Young asked if the proposed work would impact cobblestones.

Ms. Kapoi said curb bulbs would remove existing cobblestones.

Ms. Young cited 3.8.2 which says the cobblestone should be restored.

Ms. Kapoi said temporary asphalt patches in road will replace brick or cobblestone; if they do new, they need to put in concrete sidewalk.

Ms. Young asked about loading impacts for delivery trucks.

Ms. Kapoi said most businesses receive deliveries on Pike Place, so it won't impact them.

Ms. Young said there could be competition for parking.

Ms. Rudeck cited 2.3.1 about maintaining and enhancing the pedestrian experience; this would enhance accessibility of Market

Ms. Kapoi concurred.

Ms. Mohammadi said it enhances access and she had no problem with it.

Ms. Young said if Option 2 is preferred to reduce bulb size.

Matt Fewins, SDOT said they could do that.

Ms. Mohammadi preferred the bisector option.

Ms. Buker cited 2.3.2 and said there is preference for pedestrian access over parking and she preferred Option 1.

Mr. Fewins said there is a bike corral so no loss of parking.

Ms. Young said the ramps create uneven pavement. She preferred Option 2 and noted there are fewer uneven places.

Mr. Fewins said the ramps shown are the bare minimum; the size can be tweaked.

Mr. Bown said it is tough to use a wheelchair on cobblestone.

Ms. Rudeck conducted a straw poll for commissioner opinion about project.

Mr. Bown supported the project; preferred to see three options.

Ms. Mohammadi supported the project; preferred Option 2.

Ms. Young supported the project; preferred to leave the way it is and enhance it.

Mr. Leong supported the project and wanted more information.

Ms. Buker supported the project; leaned toward Option 1.

Ms. Rudeck supported the project; preferred Option 2 and wants to see more on both options.

Ms. Le asked if the commissioners wanted another briefing or Certificate of Approval.

Ms. Rudeck said another briefing presenting all three options presenting all three options.

Ms. Le said they could present multiple options with commission deciding on one. She asked applicants if it would be worthwhile to do final designs for two options and present or would they prefer to come back with a more detailed than today conceptual level with multiple options.

Ms. Kapoi said it would be better for them to advance to a 30% or 60% design level with more information that they could present at a briefing with one selected to advance to final design.

Mr. Fewins said they would want to go in with initial approval and then come back with both options that would at that point, select 1 to advance to a final design.

Ms. Le said the applicants have the commissions feedback for the next step will be an informational briefing with additional levels of detail .

082422.2

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL – USE & DESIGN

Willie's Shoe Shine

93 Pike St, Atrium common area

Willie Williams, Business Operator

Withdrew application.

082422.3

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 11, 2022

Tabled. Minutes not read.

May 25, 2022

Tabled.

082422.4 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

No report.

082422.6 REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES

DRC: no report.

URC: no report.

082422.7 STAFF REPORT

Administrative approvals to date 2022

Ms. Le: Administrative approvals to date - none made since the last report out 14 days ago. I will have the report that you all have been requesting after this meeting's over.

Transition to hybrid public meetings updates

Ms. Le: we are looking at an approximate fall date.

Commissioner recruitment updates

Ms. Le: the four positions have not been reposted yet. When they are, it'll be 2 residents, one merchant and one architect.

Vaccination attestation information for Commissioners

Ms. Le: the form that will be required of all commissioners who plan to attend in person.

Rules & Procedures revision: check-in

Ms. Le: You all have received 1 public comment related to that from Ruth Danner and it was dated August 13th.

And then I'm just doing a check in as we discussed last week. I'm looking for direction as far as how you would like to proceed to next steps. And what those timelines would be.

Ms. Rudeck: maybe it's something we could have on next agenda. And hopefully all the commissioners are here, I think it's something that we should speak about as an entire group.

Ms. Le: I'll plan on putting it on the next agenda., but we won't go so far as to say a closed session with the attorney or a final vote, because we're not going to be there in 2 weeks. Is that fair to say?

Ms. Rudeck: I think that's fair. I think it'll give us all time to read through it and then comment on all of the changes.

Ms. Le: Kind of decide what the next steps will be. Okay. That's great. So, the more I know the more I can plan for whatever piece that you feel is next to be there. such as

postings that I need to make and publications prior to a final vote. An invitation to the attorney or anyone else, who might need to be around et cetera, so we'll move forward with having it as a discussion item next time around in September.

Mr. Bown: what difference does it make what we do. As the commission is there some timeline that the city has or whoever that has to look at it review it say yes say no say partial respond do anything. Are there any timelines on that side? Because I think that, like, for I just see this one that we already have just been sitting here.

Ms. Le: unfortunately there's not, so the law review was the big piece. So, that has concluded for now and so you all are weighing. The that that new information.

Mr. Bown: So, we could spend time on this again and then we could go back and just be waiting another year or two, or whatever just we have no idea what's going to happen on the other side.

Ms. Le: the legal review that is now concluded was the main piece of it. So the Department of neighborhoods is not, has not and does not plan to add things. It's waiting for the legal review, that has now been concluded. And so it's a discussion piece of to what extent you would like to and can incorporate or reject the legal comments. And then from there, it's a matter of you all accepting it and I think there's a 14-day window where I post something in a publication prior to your final vote.

Ms. Rudeck: So, if we decide to remove any of the proposed language does it have to go before law in or then we vote on it?

Ms. Le: Well, I would recommend inviting Dan back for asking those specific questions. So, to what extent are these suggestions and to what extent are they requirements. Are there non-negotiable items? And if so what are they from a legal standpoint? I think that would warrant a conversation. And from what I've seen, every time I have invited him, he has been able to come to the Wednesday afternoon meetings.

Ms. Young: Okay, that it might be efficient to have him at our next discussion about the documents as we discussed as a group or do we want a private session first, and then 1 with him or?

Ms. Rudeck: I agree, it'd be helpful to have him there so we can just discuss what we want to keep or reject and then he can give us his opinion and we can move forward on it.

Ms. Buker: I think it would depend on knowing if the rest of the commission will be present. I noticed that in the version that was public there were several questions added to the section on committees and executive committee and questions related to process. What will the selection process be? Will there be interviews who will attend the interviews? Will Department of neighborhood staff be there do you know where those questions came from?

Ms. Le: All of those comments are the results of the law review. when I sent around the documents, there was a desire on our part to make the draft accessible and known to the public however, there are certain rules we have to follow about not publicly sharing out Attorney client privilege information so the way the documents went out was sort of a way. To keep the attorney client privileged content confidential, as it's meant to be while also sharing out with the public, the results of everything being discussed in this current round where the law review has concluded.

Ms. Buker: we made it very clear that we don't want Department of neighborhoods in the interview; it should be up to the historical commission and these questions get at. Why isn't the Department of neighborhoods there? We don't want them there. So, I want to discuss that with the group.

Mr. Bown: When we say, we don't, we don't want them there. What do you mean?

Ms. Buker: we received perhaps the last draft that the commission drafted in 2021. we received that in an email last week, and it had notes in red as to what was there and why? And it basically said that we, the group at the time believed that Selection and interview of potential candidate should be made by the commission and then those four should be sent to the Department of neighborhoods and the mayor.

Mr. Bown: we've sent something for legal review. But we just have something that's been decided on by a commission of volunteers and then the city can just sit on it for a year that just doesn't make sense to me, cause you're just wasting the volunteers time.

Ms. Buker: commented on the MHC recruitment process. She noted the frustration with the lengthy process and lack of control the Commission has in that and other processes. The commission should be the driver.

Mr. Bown: love serving on the market board, because it just doesn't seem right to be to spend this much time, you know, every week and then all of a sudden the city can come back and go. You know what? I won't answer. Yeah, I don't have to so all the time that I spent, you know, away from family away from doing whatever. Yeah. Whatever. And that's not cool. And we wonder why people don't want to serve on the boards.

Ms. Buker: I totally agree. I don't think it's cool and it's very easy and quick for myself personally to become very jaded with the entire thing. Like, it, it starts to decline and I'm.

Mr. Bown: We were down in the market last week. I mean, we've been last couple of days. I'm trying not to be, but this is hard for me. So, there we are,

Ms. Mohammadi: I think a lot of us share your same feelings Chris. Yeah, it's, it's it's frustrating.

Ms. Rudeck:
Being ignored by the city and constantly brushed off with like, we've been working on these. Since 2019, it's a very frustrating process.

Ms. Mohammadi: Absolutely, I, thank you for at least talking about your concerns. I think that's important and we feel the same. I also feel the same way. Yeah, not the only 1 and I don't want to make it seem like we can't turn this around.

Mr. Bown: expressed frustration with the lengthy process; feels like a waste of time.

Ms. Mohammadi: What was the point is finding the time I mean, the document that was made by it by us, it was changed so much. Uh, I'm so happy Actually Christine sent the original document and I was able to review.

Mr. Bown: This could have been a year ago, or not approved a year ago. Yeah. Just say no. Yeah and then we go on and we do something else we keep going with the same rules. We have we do the work that we have with the rules that we have. That's okay as well. I mean, I don't mind that. No and no is great, but a quick yes. Or a long no is worse. I think.

MCL: I just wanted to be clear that the copy that was sent to law was what the commission created. And so what we're looking at now is the result of the law review, I guess I've heard a few times that. Changes were made in between I just wanted to reassure you all. That's not the case. So, I've heard a couple of things regarding the next immediate step. So I heard that there could be an interest in having the attorney. Come to answer the questions. I think there are some things we can extrapolate when reading, uh, track changes, but perhaps it would be useful to just ask the person. Um. What was the intent to what extent are these items suggested to what extent for the required? Are there negotiables and non-negotiables and if so what are they. And I also heard that there could be a benefit in having a conversation with more commissioners. Before the attorney returns, so the group would like to move forward with the processes that have a sense what? The next immediate step would be the meeting 14 days from today.

Ms. Buker: Before we decide that is it required or appropriate to see if there's any public comment on this matter.

Ms. Le: Yeah, I had shared out that there was one so it was the public comments. Um, but I just called out Danner.

Ms. Buker: I was wondering, yeah, if anyone, joining the call was planning to make a public comment on this agenda item.

MCL: Nobody had signed up to. I have one public commenter for item number 8. So I understand that there's frustration around things not happening in a timely fashion, so I just want to understand now that there is some new momentum. What is the next step so I can prepare for that whether it is the publication, whether it is an invitation to the attorney, for example, whatever that may be.

Ms. Rudeck: It sounds like Leslie, you would like us to do a meeting without the attorney, a public meeting, and then have a follow up meeting with the attorney.

Ms. Buker: I think it would be helpful for us to address the questions that he asked. So we know what our perspective is, and then touch base with him. But what does everyone else think.

Ms. Leong: I am fine with that. Can we be all be prepared to discuss this on the 14th? Of course, this is contingent on not having many applications to review. We have a lot of applications we might not have time for discussion. Mm. Hmm.

Mr. Bown: I could be, but the other question is it possible to get is the, the only. Ah, the only feedback that we have from the, when this was originally done is the red lines. Is that correct? And if we want to go forward with that, that's cool.

Ms. Le: provided overview of the iterations of the draft rules and procedures documents and the process

Ms. Rudeck: I think we should move forward with having this on the agenda for our next meeting to go through as a group and then meet with the lawyer the following meeting. And would be helpful if you Maybe a message to all the commissioners that our intention is to review it as a group just so it's brought to their attention in addition to the agenda.

Ms. Le: Kind of make sure everyone's there right? Does that sound good for everyone?

082422.8

NEW BUSINESS

Continued discussion regarding proposed legislation related to land use

Ms. Rudeck: That we should have our, we should table the discussion for the next meeting and then have the lawyer at the following meeting. I was asking if she could message all the commissioners to let them know that we intend on discussing this. So they don't miss it on the agenda. They know that we hope that the whole group is there. Okay, yeah, I mean, sure, it looks like Ruth Danner has a public comment. Is it. Okay to let them speak.

Public Comment:

Ruth Danner spoke in opposition to the proposed changes to administrative review.

Skip Knox: expressed frustration with lack of support for commissioners by DON, he thought agenda didn't provide for public comment, dial in public comment process is frustrating, minutes are useless.

MCL: The access code does change with every meeting. And so it looked as if he had printed out the agenda from a meeting that was not today.

Ms. Rudeck: Should we move on to new business? So anything for new business.

Bob Messina: spoke against Department of Neighborhoods intrusion into rules and procedures, administrative approval, and selection of candidates for commission positions.

Heather Pihl: said she was concerned about the language and rules and procedures that was added for special meetings – that it would hamper ability of public to find out about meetings. She said in addition to the electronic application process the commission should also accept paper copies to make it easier for applicants.

Ms. Le: Thank you I don't see any other ways hands. Right. So we're in section 8 of the agenda and have just had a few public comments. There are none more than I am aware of.

Ms. Rudeck: I would suggest to keep this issue on the agenda Going forward I know the chair asked to take it off, but I think it's important that we keep the discussion going, and we stay on top of what's happening.

Ms. Buker: I don't know if you need a 2nd, but I would 2nd that and it allows space for a public comment ongoing as well.

Ms. Mohammadi: Absolutely. I agree with you guys, thank you.

Ms. Young: Clarify there that this is new business includes public comment about topics that have not been previously addressed in the agenda before, so that people have feel like they have an opportunity to talk about whatever.

Ms. Mohammadi: That's a great idea.

Ms. Rudeck: Are people allowed to submit a paper application right now? We're not currently accepting paper, um. Move to an online system from what I've heard from people who have had to apply is that it is a very clunky system and that half of the time the application gets hung up in that process. Instead of just being able to submit and then have it reviewed within that 28 days.

Ms. Le: there's definitely upsides and downsides. One of the upgrades is that it's traceable and timestamped in a way that paper applications aren't. I also think with office operations not yet returned to normal nobody collects mail, for example, or checks. That is what are the advantages of the online application.

Ms. Rudeck: Because it's all there, it seems like it might not be equitable for everyone If they don't have the technology to submit it.

Ms. Le: we've not heard from people that they're not able to access it for lack of access to a computer. So, for the comments I've heard or more things about the system itself. perhaps a day could return when paid for applications are accepted, but just given the changing nature of the physical office space. And mail collection, people handling checks and all of that. It's a different environment than it was when we were in an all paper

situation, it's really good to track the way things have been done any new advance and really look very carefully at all of the pros and cons.

Ms. Buker: who has the authority to decide if we allow paper applications.

Ms. Le: Hopefully, I would start with the manager, the historic preservation program. it seems like the new application though, online asks for a lot more information than their original application.

Ms. Rudeck: Asked for double checking people's LLCs versus their DBAs and stuff that Wasn't asked for before people had to submit their Business paperwork, but if someone's submitting for something that Has nothing to do, like, say, that's already been approved it's asking for that to be submitted.

Ms. Le: And only ask, it only requires that of use applications and that is consistent with before the database. So we've always requested business details and documentation.

Ms. Rudeck: For use applications, so, if a use application was already approved, say, for the business to exist, and the business wanted to change. The store hours, or something that it's carrying, it would have to resubmit its business. Paperwork not as the LLC wasn't changing.

Ms. Le: the current application process requires that. You could simply write a note that says there's no change. So with every application user design, there will always ask you for the full gamut of what might be required, but there's ways to skip. So, for example, when that comes up a lot is a statement for reason of demolition, that doesn't apply to all projects and so they can just say no major demolition happening here.

Ms. Leong: I'll make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Young: I'll 2nd.

Minh Chau Le
Commission Coordinator
206-684-0229