

From: [Barnett, Beverly](#)
To: [Belz, Sara](#); [Hohlfeld, Amanda \(DON\)](#); [Pesigan, Nelson](#); [Bates, Tim](#); [Whitson, Lish](#)
Cc: [Gray, Moira](#)
Subject: Community Engagement Plan for Sound Transit proposal at 1000 45th
Date: Friday, March 25, 2022 1:09:40 PM

Happy Friday DON! I would like to introduce Tim Bates with Sound Transit. I think some of you were at the kick off meeting on March 21 that introduced the proposal from Sound Transit and the Ofc of Housing to vacate the alley and convey the Sound Transit property for affordable housing. At the meeting we talked about the council goal to streamline the vacation review both in terms of time and level of information required. We are looking at more of a concept than a specific development proposal and working to figure out what we need to know condition the proposal and the RFP.

Sound Transit does pretty extensive work in the community and has raised the idea of housing development on the site now that Sound Transit does not need it for staging for the University station. We would like to meet with you and see if the work that has been done would cover their obligations under the Director's Rule.

I am out most of next week and then Tim will be out but we could meet the middle of April. I am sending this now so I don't forget. We can ask Sound Transit to share more about their community work and then see if there is anything you think they should do. Thank you!

From: [Barnett, Beverly](#)
To: [Pesigan, Nelson](#); [Bates, Tim](#)
Cc: [Whitson, Lish](#); [Pacheco, Abel](#); [DuBois, Jeanette](#)
Subject: FW: U District TOD: alley vacation supplemental engagement
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 11:18:43 AM

Good morning! It was great to meet with you on Friday and talk about Sound Transit's proposal to supplement their Community Engagement Plan to more specifically address the vacation process and the public benefit obligation. Nelson, thank you for your input. It is my understanding that DON can support the ideas from Sound Transit which are attached below. In addition, Nelson will forward the Community Engagement Plan for Grand Street Commons, an affordable housing project and also for Taylor & 6th and a recent example. Nelson has also indicated that he can suggest community groups and review language proposals if that is needed.

This was very helpful and I believe we have a good plan to move forward. Thank you all!

CAUTION: External Email

Proposal from Sound Transit to supplement the Community Engagement Plan specific to the alley vacation process.

Our current thinking for the engagement content is as follows:

- Provide an update on how we're acting on feedback from engagement last year (e.g., alley vacation petition)
- Introduce the idea of public benefits related to street vacations (the intent, what types of things qualify)
- Offer some ideas that ST & OH have come up with thus far (east-west pedestrian connection; Cultural Space Agency)
- Ask several (1-3) survey questions to gauge community feedback on these ideas, and allowing additional suggestions

From: [Barnett, Beverly](#)
To: [Nelson, Alyse](#)
Cc: [DuBois, Jeanette](#); [Gray, Amy](#)
Subject: FW: Public benefit Engagement
Date: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 8:55:39 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

This poses a challenge. I will meet with them next week and hear the concern but I think this will ultimately be a council decision. The idea of the nonstandard process was to reduce uncertainty in order to secure bids on the property and leaving open questions on the public benefit could concern bidders. More to come.

From: Olson, Laurie <Laurie.Olson@seattle.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2022 5:12 PM
To: Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>
Cc: Bates, Tim <Tim.Bates@soundtransit.org>; D'Angelo, Mara <mara.dangelo@soundtransit.org>
Subject: Public benefit Engagement

Greetings Beverly! Hoping to catch you on the request for more public engagement specifically related to the public benefit portion of the project.

Similar to the alley vacation, we are not 100% sure what is going to be built here, so engaging the public about the public benefit now, would be a bit of a cart before the horse scenario. Wondering if we could include this requirement in the RFP to ensure it occurs, but not wanting to preempt the developer from what they can build.

I am booked solid this week, but hoping we can touch base next week.

Thanks in advance!
Laurie

Laurie Olson
Capital Investments Manager
City of Seattle, [Office of Housing](#)
206.615.0995
[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

From: [Thoreson, Hannah](#)
To: [Olson, Laurie](#)
Cc: [Whitson, Lish](#); Tim.Bates@soundtransit.org; [Pacheco, Abel](#); [DuBois, Jeanette](#); [Barnett, Beverly](#); [LaBorde, Bill](#)
Subject: Re: ST vacation and public benefit/community engagement
Date: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 2:08:24 PM

Hi Team,

Thank you for reaching out regarding the timeline of Community engagement and the RFP Process. We remain upbeat that vacating the alley would enable optimal use of the land for affordable housing units. I have spoken with the Chair and Council Central Staff and the request could be accommodated with the following stipulations:

1. Before starting the RFP Process, one of the public benefit conditions should be that the new project will reserve at least 35 units for at or below 30% AMI, to replace the number of units at Rosie's Village.
2. Conditional alley vacation approval will require that after a developer is selected through the RFP process and community engagement has occurred, this will need to come back to committee for additional Seattle City Council review once all the public benefits are crafted.

We're happy to meet and discuss if you have questions or concerns!

Thanks,

Hannah

Hannah Thoreson

Legislative Assistant

District 4, Seattle, WA

Office: 206-818-7536

hannah.thoreson@seattle.gov

www.seattle.gov/council/Pedersen

From: Whitson, Lish <Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:34 AM
To: Pedersen, Alex <Alex.Pedersen@seattle.gov>
Cc: Thoreson, Hannah <Hannah.Thoreson@seattle.gov>
Subject: FW: ST vacation and public benefit/community engagement

Good morning Councilmember Pedersen,

Beverly and I are continuing to work with Sound Transit and OH on the alley vacation at 45th and

Roosevelt.

We have received a request from OH and Sound Transit to delay further outreach and engagement on the street vacation until after a developer is selected.

As you remember, there was early outreach and engagement that led Sound Transit to feel comfortable with moving forward with an affordable housing project on the site and with pursuing an alley vacation. However, there has not been any outreach regarding what public benefit features would be appropriate for this project.

The street vacation policies state that outreach and engagement should inform the public benefit package for a street vacation project.

OH's argument, as described below, is that a future developer needs to be part of the discussion of what public benefit features are part of the project. There is some merit to that – we would typically require more modest public benefits as part of an alley vacation project that supports the development of a supportive housing project compared to a vacation that supports a mixed-income residential tower.

However, this would require the Council to approve a vacation without a good sense of what the public benefit package would encompass.

I'm happy to talk through options with you, if that would be helpful.

From: Olson, Laurie <Laurie.Olson@seattle.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 4:32 PM

To: Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>; Whitson, Lish <Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov>

Cc: Bates, Tim <Tim.Bates@soundtransit.org>; Pacheco, Abel <abel.pacheco@soundtransit.org>; DuBois, Jeanette <Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov>

Subject: RE: ST vacation and public benefit/community engagement

Greetings Beverly, my apologies for the delay.

The Office of Housing is seeking consideration of Council to delay a requirement of Community Engagement until after a developer is selected through a joint RFP process for the disposition of the site at 45th. The Office of Housing has a robust policy related to community engagement as part of requirements for funding. Delaying the requirement until a sponsor is identified will provide a much more fruitful and effective outcome related to community engagement, as the developer and program proposal will be known. The Office of Housing worked with SDCI and the Department of Neighborhoods in drafting of this policy and both departments feel that it goes well beyond their own requirements for EDG submittal.

<https://www.seattle.gov/documents/Departments/Housing/HousingDevelopers/ProjectFunding/Community%20Relations%20Plan.pdf>

Below is the Office of Housing, Council approved, policy requirements that will be incorporated into

the RFP for receiving OH resources related to the site:

II. Community Relations

The City of Seattle supports affordable housing production and preservation in neighborhoods throughout the city. Organizations seeking OH funding for a housing development must give neighbors and local community members opportunities to learn about the project and to provide input, and maintain communication during construction and operations. The policy applies to all rental housing projects and to homeownership developments with four or more for-sale homes. It applies to applications for permanent and bridge financing for new construction and acquisition/rehabilitation projects. Applications for projects that will renovate an existing building without a change in ownership must conduct only Neighborhood Notification and any community engagement required for Design Review.

A. Objectives

- Promote open, ongoing communication between developers and neighbors. This requires cooperation by developers, the City, and neighborhood residents. A positive, open relationship between housing developers and neighbors can prevent misunderstandings, facilitate prompt resolution of any inadvertent misunderstandings, and provide a fair, thoughtful, dependable means of ironing out differences.
- Provide information about the proposed project including the design, permitting and construction schedule, opportunities to provide input and submit comments, and eligibility requirements and application process for those interested in renting or purchasing the affordable housing.
- Give neighbors and community members an opportunity to communicate any concerns about design, construction, operation and management of a project and to work collaboratively with housing developers and/or residents to identify ways to address those concerns.

The City supports affordable housing projects that will preserve and enhance the strengths of Seattle's neighborhoods. Housing developers and neighbors should keep OH informed of any issues or concerns throughout the development and operation of the project. It is the policy of The City of Seattle that OH funding of affordable housing not be refused solely on the basis of concerns expressed by neighbors and other community members. The City supports and is committed to promoting diversity in Seattle neighborhoods. Consistent with local, state and federal fair housing law, housing may not be excluded from a neighborhood based on characteristics of the persons who will live there.

B. Notification and community relations requirements The steps outlined below describe minimum notification and community relations requirements. Project sponsors should tailor community relations efforts to best serve each individual project and neighborhood. OH may make exceptions to these requirements due to the unique circumstances of a proposed project (e.g., housing for victims of domestic violence with confidential location).

1. Consultation. Prior to releasing purchase and sale agreement contingencies for site acquisition:

- Consultation with OH: OH will help identify developers of other affordable housing in the neighborhood(s) being considered and suggest organizations to contact, which will include

both neighborhood-based organizations and other community groups who may be interested in the project.

- Contacts with other affordable housing owners. Housing owners in or near the neighborhood can provide information about a neighborhood's historical and current housing- and development-related concerns. Neighborhood notification. Prior to submitting a funding application:

- Neighborhood notification: Notify neighbors (including all residential and commercial property owners, and tenants as feasible) within at least 500 feet of the site using a written notice, letter or flyer ("notification letter"). Include basic information about the sponsor organization and proposed project (e.g., estimated schedule, contact person, and neighborhood organizations that have also been notified about the project). The neighborhood notification letter must be sent within one year before the application is submitted.

3. Draft Community Relations Plan. Included in the application for funding, a summary of completed activities and a plan for actions to be undertaken following a funding award:

- Documentation of completed notification: include a copy of the neighborhood notification letter and a list of recipients.

- Community outreach: Completed outreach and planned future activities for maintaining ongoing communication with immediate neighbors and community organizations throughout the project's pre-development, design, construction, and operation phases.

- Inclusive community engagement: strategies for engaging historically underrepresented communities, including communities of color and communities for which English is a second language. This community engagement can be designed to meet affirmative marketing requirements in Section IV below, particularly when a project is in an area at high risk of displacement.

- Outreach for Design Review: community outreach prior to early design guidance, including outreach to historically underrepresented communities for projects located in Equity Areas. Requirements can be found at SDCI Director's Rule and DON website.

4. Strategies for communications with neighbors and community organizations. The community relations plan may include presentations at regularly scheduled neighborhood organization meetings, invitation to a meeting hosted by the housing developer, formation of an advisory committee, and/or regular project updates in neighborhood organization publications or posted at local libraries, community centers, etc. Information the housing developer should provide at meetings includes the following, to the extent that it does not compromise the safety, confidentiality, or well-being of the residents:

- Project design and intended resident population, and planned supportive services for residents if applicable

- Estimated schedule for construction and completion

- Experience of the project team in developing and operating affordable housing

- Information about eligibility, affirmative marketing and how to apply for housing

- Opportunities to provide input on the project

- Mechanisms for ongoing communication once the housing is operational

5. Communication during construction and after opening.

During development and, for rental housing developments, once the housing is operational, applicants must implement the Community Relations Plan and maintain communication with neighborhood organizations and neighboring residents and businesses. This may include updates on any changes to design or construction timing and invitations to any project open houses or other events. Rental housing owners should also keep OH apprised of any issues related to the building, promptly address emerging issues, and share stories of success during the operation of the building.

From: Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 10:14 AM

To: Olson, Laurie <Laurie.Olson@seattle.gov>; Whitson, Lish <Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov>

Cc: Bates, Tim <Tim.Bates@soundtransit.org>; Pacheco, Abel <abel.pacheco@soundtransit.org>; DuBois, Jeanette <Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov>

Subject: ST vacation and public benefit/community engagement

Good morning! Laurie and Lish, I wanted to follow up on our October 5th meeting. The subject of the meeting was the proposal from OH and ST that further Community Engagement and refinement of the public benefit obligation be deferred and addressed as conditions on the RFP. SDOT had asked that the work be done as part of the vacation review process but OH and ST proposed the work for later as it could be more detailed and specific when done by the future developer related to a specific project. As I understand it, CM Pedersen was inclined to be supportive of this idea but had requested that OH and ST provide some justification and a rationale for the change in the process. I believe that Laurie said she could provide something in about 2 weeks?

I haven't seen anything and I don't know if I missed something or if this is still being developed. I do think it is important that OH and ST provide something to CM Pedersen. It is also important for me to have something in the record that provides for a different process for this vacation and the rationale for it.

Can you provide an update on this? Thanks!