

**Comment Sheet for 200 Taylor Ave N: REVISED 11.15.2022 (v3)**

Department/Agency	Author	Comments	Response to Comments 11/15/2022
SDOT Parking Operations	KellyHall	The presence of the alley provides a location for commercial vehicle loading and solid waste collection by SPU. If the alley is vacated eliminating these opportunities, the project must document approval by SPU for on-site solid waste collection and also demonstrate that on-site loading is usable by trucks (including on site turnaround) and complies with on-site loading berth requirements in the land use code. Curbspace will not be available in current redesigns of Thomas St and may be limited on other adjacent streets in the future.	Understood. Coordination is ongoing with SPU to provide below grade solid waste and on site, below grade, truck turnaround. A coordination call occurred on 10/20/22 and resubmittal via the SPU Solid Waste review has occurred.
SDOT Urban Forestry	Ben Roberts	Alley currently contains substantial Utility infrastructure. Vacation of the alley will require this Utility infrastructure to be moved, the proposed re-location of the Utilities must not impede the ability for installation of code required street trees and associated soil volume requirements on all adjacent frontages.	Noted. Utility revisions are being coordinated with City agencies and street tree soil volumes are included in the proposed landscape approach.
SPU Development Services Office	Beth Finn	The only SPU infrastructure in the alley is the drainage structure on the north side. SPU will not have a need for a drainage structure if the alley is vacated. Will the project team be removing this structure?	Correct, upon successful completion of alley vacation petition, drainage structure to be removed.
Comcast	Jessica Lee	Comcast doesn't have objections to the alley vacation. We do not have any structures within the targeted areas. We'd like to be part of any Joint Trench options.	Noted.
MCI/Verizon	Raeann Anderson	No comments from MCI/Verizon on this.	Noted.
Seattle City Light Network	H. Zadehgo, M. Gebrewold, T. Taffesse and N. Nguyen	<p>1. These review comments are exclusively for SCL Network. This plan also needs to be reviewed by SCL Street Lighting, URD Engineering and Transmission Engineering groups.</p> <p>2. We would like to acknowledge the subject design is the product of joint work between SCL Network system engineering and the Customer.</p> <p>3. For acceptable clearances from SCL, please see SCL Construction Standard 0214.00. Locations, dimensions and depths of SCL's vaults, manholes, hand holes and duct banks within the plans affecting areas must be verified (e.g. pothole) prior to construction to avoid any damages to existing SCL facilities.</p> <p>4. Trees and other vegetation shall not be planted within 2ft of SCL vaults and ducts per SCL Construction Standard 0214.00. Also, please note that NO "planter boxes" will be allowed to be installed directly above SCL facilities.</p> <p>5. New pavement should not affect any SCL facilities. Within design review process, please contact SCL should there be any changes in elevation of street/sidewalk/curb ramp which will require elevation change of the manhole risers.</p> <p>6. SCL has duct banks with energized primary (13,000 volt) cables within the project boundary, contractor needs to exercise care in excavating. Contractor must contact Seattle City Light to arrange a safety standby when working within 5 feet of SCL's electrical facilities.</p> <p>7. Please notify SCL's Paje Chase at 206-730-1076 (Paje.Chase@Seattle.Gov) four weeks prior to the start of this project.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Confirmed - SCL construction standards are being used for design coordination.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p> <p>6. Noted. This requirement has been shared with the project's general contractor team.</p> <p>7. Noted. This requirement has been shared with the project's general contract team.</p>
SPU Solid Waste Division	Adam Maurer; Clayton Scott	<p>While SPU solid waste is supportive of the alley vacation/closure for 200 Taylor Ave N. and 205 6th Ave. as a general concept, we have significant concerns with the solid waste plans that the applicant team has provided thus far. Given the concerns outlined below, we cannot support the alley vacation until these concerns are addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both properties- The height of the entire garage where trucks are driving must be minimum 14' overhead clearance.</li> <li>• Both properties- they must provide the specs of the truck they used for AutoTurn analysis.</li> <li>• 200 Taylor- the proposed location of the garbage and food/YW compactors would require SPU trucks to swing too close or in some case, into a structural column. This must be rectified.</li> <li>• 205 6th- We need minimum 16' OH where the dual compactor is</li> <li>• 205 6th – We need more space on the sides of the compactors, so the SPU trucks can safely load/unload.</li> </ul> <p>11/15/2022 UPDATE: Per SPU Clayton Scott, their concerns have been met at this point and they are working on a final approval letter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both properties - 14'-0" minimum clear height is provided at all locations where trucks are driving and accessing.</li> <li>• Both properties - truck turning radius' studies are based on the 35'-0" truck, SU30, per the 2019-2029 Solid Waste Truck Specification document from SPU.</li> <li>• 200 Taylor - this issue was discussed with SPU and was a graphic issue on the plan drawings. Truck turning radiuses are clear of the structural columns.</li> <li>• 205 6th - the dual compactor has been eliminated and only low profile compactors are proposed to comply with the 14'-0" vertical clearance requirement.</li> <li>• 205 6th - compactors have been rearranged and consolidated onto the West Building. Side clearance has been provided to enable loading/unloading.</li> </ul> <p>These comments have been coordinated with SPU and the SPU Solid Waste package has been resubmitted showing the current design.</p>
PSE	Emily Twigg	<p>Contact Maprequest@pse.com for updated gas maps of area.</p> <p>Please add notes for the following:</p> <p>Maintain a minimum 1' vertical separation when crossing gas mains or services</p> <p>Maintain a minimum 3' horizontal separation when running parallel to gas mains or services.</p> <p>If HP or &gt; 4" Pipe is encountered, please add a note to contact PSE PI Inspector before working near HP or &gt; 4" gas mains:</p> <p>Glenn Huden   (206)-396-4159 Glenn.Huden@pse.com) Glenn covers downtown.</p> <p>Troy Peterson   (206-396-0730 troy.peterson@pse.com) covers S Seattle</p> <p>Mitch Balzer   (253-377-9539 mitchell.balzer@pse.com) covers N Seattle.</p> <p>Coordinate with PSE Customer Construction Services at 1-888-321-7779 and a PSE project manager for relocation of gas mains and services as needed.</p> <p>Locate and protect all gas facilities in the field.</p>	Noted. Coordination with PSE and utilities is ongoing.
SDOT Development Review	Jackson Koch	No outstanding issues that would prevent SDOT Development Review from conceptually supporting the vacation.	

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [DuBois, Jeanette](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Thomas St Project: Public Benefit Leveraging Opportunity  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 5:26:46 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

For the file please

---

**From:** Castleman, Kris <Kris.Castleman@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 5:07 PM  
**To:** Kambuj, Aditi <Aditi.Kambuj@seattle.gov>; Stefan, Francisca <Francisca.Stefan@seattle.gov>; Godwin, Chris <Chris.Godwin@seattle.gov>; Yao, Yanming <Yanming.Yao@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Rwamashongye, Julius <Julius.Rwamashongye@seattle.gov>; Krawczyk, Tracy <Tracy.Krawczyk@seattle.gov>; Moore, Ryan <Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov>; Yesuwan, Kay <Kay.Yesuwan@seattle.gov>; Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>; LaBorde, Bill <Bill.LaBorde@seattle.gov>; Hankamer, Joanna <Joanna.Hankamer@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Thomas St Project: Public Benefit Leveraging Opportunity

Looping in [@Godwin, Chris](#) and [@Yao, Yanming](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Kambuj, Aditi <[Aditi.Kambuj@seattle.gov](#)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:55 PM  
**To:** Stefan, Francisca <[Francisca.Stefan@seattle.gov](#)>  
**Cc:** Rwamashongye, Julius <[Julius.Rwamashongye@seattle.gov](#)>; Krawczyk, Tracy <[Tracy.Krawczyk@seattle.gov](#)>; Castleman, Kris <[Kris.Castleman@seattle.gov](#)>; Moore, Ryan <[Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov](#)>; Yesuwan, Kay <[Kay.Yesuwan@seattle.gov](#)>; Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](#)>; LaBorde, Bill <[Bill.LaBorde@seattle.gov](#)>; Hankamer, Joanna <[Joanna.Hankamer@seattle.gov](#)>  
**Subject:** Thomas St Project: Public Benefit Leveraging Opportunity

Hi Francisca,

The private development [at 200 Taylor Ave](#) has petitioned the City for an alley vacation. They briefed the Seattle Design Commission (SDC) last week. The Commission was not won over by their on-site public benefit concepts, and they are leaning toward requiring off-site public benefits, should the vacation be approved. It could be an excellent partnership opportunity to work with a private developer to deliver the plaza at 5<sup>th</sup> Ave and the multiuse path between 5<sup>th</sup> and Taylor Ave next to the skatepark. This block is our main unfunded section.

Our design is at 100% and we have costs broken down by block. Provided the SDC and Council support this concept, and the developer is interested, the idea would be they write us a check to build out that project segment.

I wanted to run this update by you for your feedback and situational awareness. If there are no

concerns in following up on this opportunity, our next step would be to connect with McCollough Hill Leary who represent the developer to discuss the idea. The SDC expects the developer to come back to the Commission around January, and ideally, we would want to connect with the developer in advance of that.

Please let us know asap if any concerns with reaching out to the developer.

Thanks,  
Aditi

**Aditi Kambuj**

Urban Design Manager, Policy & Planning

City of Seattle, [Department of Transportation](#)

M: 206-775-4394 | [aditi.kambuj@seattle.gov](mailto:aditi.kambuj@seattle.gov)

[Blog](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Customer Service](#)

*she/her/hers*

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [DuBois, Jeanette](#)  
**Subject:** FW: T6 Public Benefits - Thomas St Improvements  
**Date:** Monday, December 19, 2022 1:29:08 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[Thomas St. 5th to Taylor Plan Extents.pdf](#)  
[Plaza Perspective Views.pdf](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

For the file

---

**From:** Kambuj, Aditi <Aditi.Kambuj@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 19, 2022 9:50 AM  
**To:** McCullough, Jack <jack@mhseattle.com>  
**Cc:** Moore, Ryan <Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov>; Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: T6 Public Benefits - Thomas St Improvements

Hi Jack,

Thank you for the call last week.

Please find attached a snipped plan showing the proposed plaza and multi-use path improvements between 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N and Taylor Ave N. We would like to suggest the project area outlined in orange as a potential off-site public benefit related to the T6 alley vacation.

The 100% stage cost estimate for the improvements in the orange polygon is ~\$2.1m. This assumes SDOT delivers the project and it is inclusive of engineers estimate, contingencies, soft costs etc. We are also open to discussing a private entity building the proposed improvements per our 100% approved drawings.

As I had noted, this SDC reviewed project emerged from a community conversation. The art element is approved by the Public Art Advisory Committee and is fully funded through the Office of Arts. SDOT intends to advance to the construction phase for the remaining Thomas St corridor improvements between Taylor Ave N and Dexter Ave N in 2023.

We are committed to building out the vision for Thomas St and are excited to potentially partner with community to do so.

I have also attached a few plaza renderings for your reference. Please let me know if any questions or if I can provide additional information.

Thank you,

Aditi

**Aditi Kambuj**

Department of Transportation

M: 206-775-4394 | [aditi.kambuj@seattle.gov](mailto:aditi.kambuj@seattle.gov)

*she/her/hers*

---

**From:** Kambuj, Aditi

**Sent:** Thursday, December 1, 2022 2:02 PM

**To:** McCullough, Jack <[jack@mhseattle.com](mailto:jack@mhseattle.com)>

**Cc:** Moore, Ryan <[Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov](mailto:Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov)>; Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>

**Subject:** T6 Public Benefits - Thomas St Improvements

Hello Jack,

I lead the SDOT team working on the [Thomas St streetscape project](#) between 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N and Dexter Ave. I understand your firm is working on several projects considering ROW vacations in the general vicinity of our project and that the T6 development team may be looking to enhance their initial public benefit proposal per Design Commission feedback.

The SDOT Thomas St streetscape project was generated through an intensive community design effort and is championed by City Council. We are currently at the 100% design document stage. The project has been reviewed by the Design Commission. We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you to discuss partnership concepts to help advance the community vision for this corridor through the public benefit proposals under consideration.

Would you have availability to meet in the next week or two? The following times look open on our end, but please feel free to suggest alternative times if these don't work.

- 12/8 at 3pm
- 12/9 at 2pm
- 12/12 at 3pm
- 12/14 at 9am

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Aditi

**Aditi Kambuj**

Urban Design Manager, Policy & Planning

City of Seattle, Department of Transportation

M: 206-775-4394 | [aditi.kambuj@seattle.gov](mailto:aditi.kambuj@seattle.gov)

**1/30/2023: Walk through slide deck/project update with project team (presentation by Jack)**

- Trying to improve the alley, important to the grid - starting point.
- Commissions input: are you paying enough attention to Thomas?
- Worked with Nathalie Quick to start a secondary outreach plan in February (before next public trust meeting)
  - Working with Cascade Bike Club, doing Walking Tour in neighborhood, etc.
- Showing more open space. Trying to show the open space provided in the diagonal connection.
- No vacation option: would continue to be a service alley.
- Phase 1, east building (along Taylor). Phase 2, west building (along 6th)
  - What would happen if the 2nd phase didn't happen??
- The buildings have been pushed back out of the diagonal connection to create better open space connection between Thomas and John
- Beverly's comments:
  - Interior uses and visual into them while walking down the alley. (ex looking at people working out). Would be better to see a restaurant or a use that the public can use.
  - We don't want an "inside-out" project where all the cool uses are on the inside. Enhance the amenities so that the walk-thru is more interesting/more of a balance.
  - Streetscape: this is really critical, figuring out what is code required and what they are elevating to look at public benefit
- Windy's comments:
  - See's more emphasis in the exterior in the new plan. This plan has activated street edges and created a pleasant alley experience.
  - They addressed all of Windy's notes.
- What is the status of the DRB process?
  - They submitted their MUP application, but they are working through the packet with Joe and thinking of scheduling in March.
  - Need to get in for public trust.
  - Draft DRB packing will get to Joe either tonight or tomorrow morning.
- **March 2nd** at 2:30pm or April 6th > full commission options for public trust meeting. Prefer March 2nd.

## 8/7/2023 Seattle Design Commission Prep

Jack McCullough, Brad Rock (Biomed Realty), Ryan Moore (SDOT Cap Projects), Aditi Kambuj (SDOT Urban Design), Beverly Barnett (Street Vacations), Jeanette DuBois (Street Vacations)

- Ensure development team has all the comments to date in case they need to incorporate anything into the design before next week.
- We want to be up to speed on everything and make sure we have shared everything with the design team
- Contact Jackson for update:
  - Can also ask Katie if they are in discussions with SPU and SDOT still. "Will there be a clear answer before the SDC meeting?"
- In general: 1st meeting is looking at how things function with the loss of the alley
- 2nd meeting looks at LU impacts, public benefit, community engagement, etc
- Send comments out again and ask if there are any resolutions or responses we should know about before the meeting.
  
- Questions:
  - How do they see SPU activities interacting on John St?
    - Loading dock orientation and truck traffic would be the same with or without vacation
    - Single curb cut with proposal and more green space is proposed to create a safer ped corridor.
    - Subterranean activities - all services, parking, etc is below grade
    - Also proposing that bike parking is on 1st floor rather than subterranean to avoid conflicts with truck traffic and vehicles
  - When was ped counts performed?
    - Performed prior to building being torn down - with motel and previous businesses
    - Still studying pedestrian impact
  - How will someone experience the space - safety and access
    - Well lit, will have 24/7 security, can see through to other side
  - There is a 30 foot long 20 foot wide section in the middle, the rest is more open and inviting
    - Recommended/required by commission?
  - Circulation: More information about the Thomas Green St and John St (classified as a class 3 st).
    - What is a more desirable place to move through? What are the proposed plans for these streets?
  - Circulation: how did they factor in potential lack of access or turning movements on John
    - May not be able to use Thomas in future (Green St - think of Bell). Their proposal seems disconnected with plans that we know about Thomas.
    - How are people going to get to site in a vehicle?
    - Answer from Jack: understand that Thomas is not an access and that vehicular levels will go down on Thomas.
    - Feels like there is a potential of barriers for vehicle movement - how does the curbside activity affect how people are getting to site?
  - They want a better understanding of the streetscape - want them to come back

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Krawczyk, Tracy](#); [Nelson, Alyse](#)  
**Cc:** [Kambuj, Aditi](#); [Sheldon, Elizabeth](#); [DuBois, Jeanette](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Thomas St - Public Benefit Funding Opportunity  
**Date:** Thursday, August 10, 2023 10:06:29 AM

---

Good morning. Thanks for checking! Yes, Aditi and I have met and discussed this question a number of times. I do think the idea of the developer contributing 2.1M for implementing Thomas Street is a good one and would be an appropriate public benefit. My questions relate to the timing of the work and whether the money proposed is adequate. It would be problematic if we accepted the money with the anticipation of the improvements coming on line around the time the development comes on line and find that the money is adequate. Would SDOT step in? I think we need to atlk through timing, level of financial support and what obligations might accrue to SDOT. Thanks to all for looking into this.

---

**From:** Krawczyk, Tracy <Tracy.Krawczyk@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 9, 2023 11:16 AM  
**To:** Nelson, Alyse <Alyse.Nelson@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Kambuj, Aditi <Aditi.Kambuj@seattle.gov>; Sheldon, Elizabeth <Elizabeth.Sheldon@seattle.gov>; Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Thomas St - Public Benefit Funding Opportunity

Hi Alyse –

As a follow up to the discussion at Senior Team today, here is the DO Weekly article P&P submitted this week on Thomas St and the potential public benefit contribution via an alley vacation. **By way of this email, I am asking Aditi to ensure Beverly is looped into relevant discussions.**

#### **Thomas St Phase 2 – \$2.1m Public Benefit Funding Opportunity and Risks; Kambuj, 775-4394**

- Thomas St project team and Street Use have been in high level public benefits discussion with the biomedical development proposed at 200 Taylor Ave N, represented by McCullough Hill, PLLC. The development is proposing to vacate an alley.
- The developer (BioMed Realty) is willing to fund SDOT's unfunded Phase 2 Thomas St project (estimated at \$2.1M in 2022) as a portion of their public benefit. Project team is developing an updated 2023 estimate based on recent bids to share with the developer.
- The developer is willing to provide ~\$2.1M prior to their private development project completion. This is an unusual risk the developer is willing to take, wherein they will pay for the public benefit, but may or may not build their project, depending on market conditions.
- This could be an excellent public-private partnership, which could allow the City to complete the Thomas St project. There are currently no other funding sources identified



for Phase 2. However, there are certain risks and scenarios to consider:

- To meet the requirement for their public benefit, SDOT would be committed to building the project even if bids come in higher than the funds provided by the developer. SDOT would ideally have some local funds identified to cover any costs over developer contributions. These local funds will need to be identified. Project could be constructed in 2024 or 2025.
- SDOT could refine the 100% design project scope to meet funds available prior to bidding, leaving aside a healthy contingency for higher bids. However, the project scale is small, so potential for value engineering is limited.
- SDOT could return to the developer and ask for a reimbursable basis amount that is linked to the bid costs; however, this is unlikely to get traction with the developer.
- If SDOT decides to not pursue this public-private partnership, we would need to identify a fund source for the entire project upwards of ~\$2.1M. The project has broad support from South Lake Union and Uptown stakeholders but does not score highly on equity metrics for full funding through local sources or grants.
- We are requesting a discussion and direction from Deputy Director Stefan, Director Spotts, and Director Castleman on how to respond to this opportunity and whether SDOT would be willing to commit local funds in 2024 or 2025 to complete the project if bids come in higher than the developer provided funding of ~\$2.1M.

Tracy

Tracy Krawczyk

Policy and Planning Director

City of Seattle [Department of Transportation](#)

O: 206.733.9329 | M: 206.255.7351 | [Tracy.Krawczyk@seattle.gov](mailto:Tracy.Krawczyk@seattle.gov)

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Nelson, Alyse](#); [Gray, Amy](#); [DuBois, Jeanette](#)  
**Subject:** T6 update  
**Date:** Friday, December 8, 2023 11:36:56 AM

---

Good morning! I was just in a meeting on the T6 project across from the Skate Plaza in Uptown. As you will recall, the developer proposed to provide funding for the street concept plan that Aditi's group has been developing. The developer proposed \$21.M to fund the work. SDOT has indicated that it is likely the \$2.7M or more would be needed to build out the street concept. I had indicated that there needed to be certainty that the money could be used for the stated purpose in a timely manner for it to be considered a public benefit.

We have been meeting with the developer and had asked whether they could increase the public benefit contribution. Here is where we are after today's meeting.

- \$2.1: the developer cannot exceed the \$2.1M proposed for the public benefit,
- Early payment: they are willing to provide the money soon after the vacation approval and MUP issuance rather than waiting till the end of the development process.
- Alternative public benefit: they will work on developing an alternative public benefit proposal after the 1<sup>st</sup> of the year with city staff
- First priority and 2<sup>nd</sup> priority in public benefit: we will develop a preferred public benefit proposal and an alternative if money is not identified for the street concept buildout.
- Ask Council: developer will ask council for additional funding for the plan or include in the levy?

So, I think this will work. As you know I was worried we would get the money and it could sit for a long time if the project wasn't funded. We want to see the public benefit come online when the development is underway. We will be looking at picking specific elements for the public benefit in the Uptown area and whether this is an opportunity to fund something in an under resourced area.

Thanks

## 5/14/2024 | T6 Conditions and Timing

Attendees: Jeanette DuBois Katie Kendall, Jack McCullough, Beverly Barnett

- With MUP they can shift this to be within xx amount of days and then SDOT gets the public benefit funding
- Trying to figure out the funding package and WHEN this funding is coming
- We want to be able to get and use the money within a timeframe that will benefit the public
- How will the ordinance phasing work? << question from Beverly
  - Building phasing should be ok, but when does the 2.4 million come in
  - It has been difficult thus far to get the client to commit to the 2.4 without the project being finished.
  - We would want the phasing clearly built in (timing, design commission review, interim conditions, etc)
  - We want to make sure that there isn't another boarded up site for years on an empty site.
- The interim conditions to SDC process?
- Katie and Beverly will get draft language over to Beverly. They have a meeting with their client today at 4pm.
- Need to have enough time in next few weeks for Lish to think of issues that are nonstandard and for Lish to weigh in on the recommendation.
  - Jack will give Lish a call separately to give him a background
- We will need to consider the implications of what we are going to do so that we not creating a nonstandard process in the system.

**From:** [Moore, Ryan](#)  
**To:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**Cc:** [DuBois, Jeanette](#); [Macek, Ian](#)  
**Subject:** RE: T6 timing and public benefit payment  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 14, 2024 4:43:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Thomas St: 5<sup>th</sup> – Dexter Phase 2, which is the implantation phase of the larger Thomas St Redefined plan, would be the name I would suggest, although it doesn't have much zing to it.

I think specifying it is for the plaza (not sure if we need to say "public" plaza) component might be enough. That is bounded by 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N, and the alley between 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N and Taylor Ave on Thomas St.

**Ryan Moore**

*Project Manager, Capital Projects Division*  
City of Seattle, [Department of Transportation](#)  
O: 206.256.5478

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2024 3:24 PM  
**To:** Moore, Ryan <[Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov](mailto:Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov)>  
**Cc:** DuBois, Jeanette <[Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov](mailto:Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov)>; Macek, Ian <[Ian.Macek@seattle.gov](mailto:Ian.Macek@seattle.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: T6 timing and public benefit payment

Excellent. Thanks for the quick response. We will have a vacation condition that specifies that a portion of the public benefit obligations includes a \$2.4M financial contribution to the SDOT implementation of the Thomas Street concept plan. Is there a fancy name for the plan? Should we specify that the money should be expended on certain elements or within certain street boundaries? I have asked for more specifics on a payment date and will share when I get something from them.

This seems to be working out! Thanks for all your help.

---

**From:** Moore, Ryan <[Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov](mailto:Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2024 1:39 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>  
**Cc:** DuBois, Jeanette <[Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov](mailto:Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov)>; Macek, Ian <[Ian.Macek@seattle.gov](mailto:Ian.Macek@seattle.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: T6 timing and public benefit payment

Hi Beverly,  
Thanks for the update.

In general, I'm assuming we will receive payment by the end of the year. The developer indicated MUP in August when we last met. Not sure how accurate that still is given how notoriously long MUP issuance tends to take so an update would be good to hear.

While I have raised the potential of a shortfall resulting from the bid prices there's not been any concern

or resolution about that from Finance or others so my interpretation is we proceed regardless.

I can't think of any conditions we need to include, but let me know if you want to discuss as I haven't worked on something like this before so maybe there are considerations you're thinking of. Or Ian may think of some.

As far as I know we're ready to proceed. The plaza component of the design still lives in the original 100% project plans that existed prior to creation of a Phase 1 and Phase 2. Once payment is received the design team will pull the plaza out of those to create a stand alone advertisement set, which will take a few months likely. I'm thinking the earliest we will put this out for bid will be February/March depending on when we receive their payment.

**Ryan Moore**

*Project Manager, Capital Projects Division*

City of Seattle, [Department of Transportation](#)

O: 206.256.5478

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2024 11:10 AM

**To:** Macek, Ian <[Ian.Macek@seattle.gov](mailto:Ian.Macek@seattle.gov)>; Moore, Ryan <[Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov](mailto:Ryan.Moore@seattle.gov)>

**Cc:** DuBois, Jeanette <[Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov](mailto:Jeanette.DuBois@seattle.gov)>

**Subject:** T6 timing and public benefit payment

Good morning. We anticipate that the T6 project will go to the Transportation Committee on July 16. The committee hasn't confirmed the date yet but we are working on getting everything ready. I wanted to let you know about the proposed date so we can make sure everything is set for the use of the \$2.4M for implementing the Thomas Street plan. The earlier discussions focused on SDOT receiving the money after the MUP and any MUP appeal are completed. I have asked for more certainty in the date since we will need to plan to receive and use the money.

Are we still set to implement and complete the street concept plan with the use of the developer money. Can we cover it if there is any shortfall?

Is there anything that needs to be said about the use of the money or the timing of the receipt of the money that should be a vacation condition?

I will forward on the draft recommendation for your review. Any issues or concerns?

**BMR T6 Project**  
*Thomas Street Green Street Funding*

BRE-BMR 6th LLC (BMR) has applied for development of a new office/life-science project on the block bounded by Taylor Avenue N., Thomas Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue N. and John Street (the “T6 Project”). The T6 Project includes the vacation of the alley in the Project block. The existing alley area would be repurposed as a pedestrian connection and the T6 Project would include various on-site public benefits in support of the alley vacation approval. The T6 Project is intended to be developed in two phases, with the western half-block constituting Phase 1 and the eastern half-block constituting Phase 2. Certain on-site public benefit features would be associated with each phase.

The T6 Project site is located on Thomas Street, a green street connecting Seattle Center to South Lake Union. Public funding has been dedicated to the completion of the green street improvements on Thomas Street, with the exception of the block between 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N. and Taylor Avenue N., which remains unfunded. The Seattle Design Commission (SDC) has encouraged the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to secure private sector funding partners to complete this unfinished portion of the Thomas Street green street plan.

BMR has been invited to join this public/private partnership to complete the Thomas Street green street plan, as part of its alley vacation proposal for the T6 Project. The City is planning to undertake the other portions of the Thomas Street improvements in the next year. Unfortunately, alley vacation public benefits are not required to be provided until the last stages of private project development, which given the building permit and construction process will take several years for the T6 Project. However, in light of the importance of this public benefit feature and its unique timing requirements, BMR is prepared to consider an early provision of public benefit funding for this green street project, prior to development of the T6 Project and regardless of whether the T6 Project is even developed.

This early public benefit funding would be extraordinary and would pose a risk to BMR. However, BMR is prepared to engage in this public/private partnership on certain conditions:

- BMR would make a \$2.4 million payment to SDOT as the principal public benefit item for the T6 Project alley vacation, which funds would be dedicated solely to the build-out by SDOT of the unfunded section of the Thomas Street green street plan between 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N. and Taylor Avenue N. Other than this payment, BMR would have no obligations with respect to this improvement project.
- Instead of waiting until completion of project development to make this payment (perhaps several years from now), BMR would make the \$2.4 million payment in full 90 days after the end of the appeal period on the T6 Project MUP decision, with no appeals having been filed. Assuming City Council conditional approval of the alley vacation petition in early summer 2024, BMR anticipates issuance of the MUP decision in August 2024 (+/-).

- The payment would be contingent upon Design Commission recommendation of approval of the alley vacation petition with the current public benefit package (including this funding item) and City Council conditional approval of the alley vacation with the current public benefit package.
- In addition, in consideration of the accelerated payment in support of this public benefit, the alley vacation conditional approval would include:
  - Approval of a phasing plan, whereby onsite public benefits associated with the Phase 2 (eastern) building on the block (e.g., canopies, sidewalk and landscaping improvements) would be deferred to completion of Phase 2, allowing the alley vacation to be completed to final ordinance upon completion of Phase 1 and prior to the development of Phase 2. The alley vacation PUDA would memorialize these onsite public benefits as a covenant (PUDA) on the Phase 2 property.
  - Approval of a 7-year initial term of the alley vacation conditional approval (within which time construction of the T6 Project must commence).
  - Allowance for the vacation to be finalized by ordinance upon completion of Phase 1 development. This would include payment of the compensation due for the value of the alley area, recording of the PUDA and deferral of the Phase 2 on-site public benefits.
  - Post-approval modifications to the T6 Project and the on-site public benefit features that are consistent with the intent of the public benefit package may be approved through the normal entitlement process, with the concurrence of the Seattle Design Commission, but without the need for City Council approval.

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Bruce A. Harrell**  
Mayor

**Rico Quirindongo**  
Director, OPCD

**Jill Crary**, Chair

**Kevin O'Neill**, Vice Chair

**Adam Amrhein**

**Jay Backman**

**Phoebe Bogert**

**Elizabeth Conner**

**Ben Gist**

**Puja Shaw**

**Matt Aalfs**

**Molly Spetalnick**

**Michael Jenkins**  
Director

**Valerie Kinast**  
Strategic Advisor

**Windy Bandekar**  
Planner

**Juliet Acevedo**  
Administrative Staff

**Office of Planning and Community  
Development**

600 4th Avenue, Floor 5  
PO Box 94788  
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

**TEL** 206-615-1349

**FAX** 206-233-7883

[seattle.gov/designcommission](http://seattle.gov/designcommission)

**February 15, 2024**

Convened 9:00am

Adjourned 12:00 pm

**Projects Reviewed**

Commission Business

**T6 (200 Taylor) Alley Vacation – Public Benefit**

**Commissioners Present**

Adam Amrhein

Jill Crary

Kevin O'Neill

Elizabeth

Matt Aalfs

Molly Spetalnick

Jay Backman

**Commissioners Excused**

Phoebe Bogert

Ben Gist

Puja Shaw

**Staff Present**

Michael Jenkins

Valerie Kinast

Windy Gay





### **Commission Business (9am-10am)**

The following items were discussed:

1. Farewell to commissioners Puja Shaw, Elizabeth Conner, and Matt Aalfs
2. Project Briefing for T6 Public Benefit
3. Minutes vote on Morgan Junction - Approved

### **T6 Public Benefit (10am-12pm)**

T6/200 Taylor Ave. N is a proposed full block development for new biomedical offices that includes one 9-story and one 8-story building with underground parking for approximately 400 vehicles. The site is bounded by Taylor Ave. N. to the west, Thomas Street to the north, 6th Ave N. to the east, and John Street to the south. The site is currently developed with a hotel structure built in 1979; three office buildings built in 1959, 1961, and 1962; and two surface parking lots. All the existing structures will be demolished.

The Commission received a presentation on the **Public Benefit** phase of the project.

#### **The following people were presenters:**

1. Jason Henry, Berger partnership
2. Brad Rock, BioMed Realty
3. Ryan Bussard, Perkins and Will

#### **The following people were present:**

1. Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill (gave public comment)
2. Chris Park, KPFF
3. Katie Kendall, McCullough Hill
4. Beverly Barnett, SDOT
5. Amy Gray, SDOT
6. Elyse Fujimoto, SDOT
7. Meredith Grope, SDOT
8. Kelsey Blommer, OAC
9. Kelly Schnell, Perkins and Will

#### **Following the presentation, the Commission provided the following recommendations and conditions:**

1. Subcommittee for Interim Uses: The project team must return to a subcommittee focused on interim uses and phasing ideas, particularly around phase 2 of the project. The goal is to enhance the project site with fencing treatments, striping of 6th street to enhance accessibility, or other programs to improve the public realm during the interim period. The subcommittee should occur prior to the issuance of a Master Use Permit. This includes striping of 6th street in the interim condition to enhance accessibility.

2. Interim Conditions Between Buildings: Update the plans in the middle of the site, between phase 1 and 2 buildings during interim conditions. The goal is to have active uses or other solutions that enhance visibility, safety, security during the interim period. One solution would also include potentially incorporating art as part of the strategy.

3. Refinement of Conditions for Open Space Areas: Working closely with the city to refine the conditions of the open space areas between phase 1 and 2 buildings, ensuring they align with the overall vision and public benefit goals of the project.

**The Commission voted 7 to 0 in support of the project.**

---