Committee Members Present: Jackson Schmidt, Gloria Skouge, John Finke, Matt Hanna, Patrick Kerr, Bruce Lorig

Other Council Members Present: James Savitt, Ann Magnano, David Ghodhousi, Gerry Kumata

Staff Present: Ben Franz-Knight, Joe Paar, Tamra Nisly, Lillian Hochstein, Tom Weed, Dianna Goodsell

Others Present: David Miller, Peter Steinbrueck, Howard Aller, Caitlin Evans, Haley Land, Bob Messina, Joseph Eisenschmidt, Carol Wolf, Jonny Hahn, Robert Shinbo, Sally Christopher, Ann Brown, Janet Bean, Brian Bean, Sarah Goldenberg, Kat Allen, Perry Wright

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m. by Jackson Schmidt, Chair.

I. Administrative
   A. Approval of Agenda
      PC1N and Heritage House Discussion (Closed Session Per (RCW 42.30.110(l)(b)) was stricken from the agenda.
      The agenda was approved, as amended by acclamation.

   B. Approval of June 5th, 2012 Minutes
      The minutes were approved by acclamation.

   C. Announcements and Community Comments
      Haley commented that Ben had held a meeting last Friday for the daystall tenants regarding PC1-N, in which thirty four people attended. He noted as there seems to be much interest around PC1-N, there has not been a lot of unfamiliar people at the WRC meetings. He added that people have concerns with PC1-N and have many questions needing answers.

      Ben stated that there will be another community meeting tomorrow at 8am. He noted that the meeting will be predominantly focused on views and the potential development of the PC1-N site. There will be two components of the meeting: the first portion will include a presentation given in the Atrium Conference Room and the second portion will include a field trip out to the Desimone Bridge.

      Jonny Hahn commented that is makes much sense to have empathy with the daystall tenants. He noted that with any design option for PC1-N which takes away the views of the water and the mountains from the Desimone Bridge would be wrong.

II. Reports and Action Items
   A. Miller Hull Architects Presentation
Ben gave a brief introduction and work background on the PC1N and Waterfront project. He added that there has been over thirty years of in-depth study on PC1-N, in which there is a lot of context that needs to be framed before the Miller Hull Presentation. Ben’s introduction and background of PC1-N included:

- The Roles of the PDA in relation to PC1-N
- The twelve Converging Alaskan Way Viaduct Projects
- PC1-N History, Guiding Principles, Priority Uses, Goals & Aspirations and Program Use
- PC1-N General Building Program and Preliminary Site Analysis.
- Next Steps for PC1-N - Summer 2012 and Key Dates

Ben noted that we have seen four design options for the PC1-N site to date. He stated that with tonight’s presentation, you would see further refinement in the designs. He added that with the advanced technology used, it is a virtual world where the designs can look and feel real: he noted that we have a long way to go before getting to that stage. He lastly added that on June 28th, there will be a Full Council meeting in which there is aim to have a preferred concept design for PC1-N by then.

David Miller and Brian presented the further refinement of design options for PC1-N, which heavily focused on view studies. David stated that the design illustrations shown tonight were very preliminary. The beginning of the presentation overviewed qualities that make the Market the Market which included: Vibrant and Urban Mix of Uses, Local and Organic Character, Encourages Discovery, Breathtaking Views. David continued the presentation in addressing how the architecture of the Market supports the several qualities listed previously; Pedestrian Scale, Active Terrace Space, Transparency of the Western Edge, Western Frame, Concrete Armature, Heavy Timber Structure.

With the initial four rendered design options for PC1-N, The Miller Hull Team worked to develop and refine them further. David M noted that they had come up with two condensed options from the original four design schemes. David M reviewed the initial four design illustrations for PC1-N and discussed the process for developing and refining those designs. David M and Brian presented several illustrations of Options A and B, including view studies from each Option.

David M and Brian also overviewed the new Foot Print analysis for the two options. The new Foot Print Analysis for both Options A and B would be considerably similar in sizing including: 18,000 to 25,000 square feet of Retail Space, 9,000 to 12,000 square feet of Living and Work Space, 13,000 to 25,000 square feet of Low-Income Housing and 23,000 to 25,000 square feet Open Public Space. It should be noted that there is an 8 percent increase of Pike Place Market Retail and Residential space with the new foot print analysis.

David noted that those virtual snapshots of the design options are very preliminary; the architecture will be developed in subsequent presentations and phases.

There was a question and answer period from the committee that followed

Jackson stated there is a lot to be absorbed.

Patrick commented that totally eliminating everything above the floor plane of the Desimone Bridge would solve the problem from the views from the arcade and from the south. Patrick stated that we do not want the views blocked.

Matt mentioned that there were four initial designs options previously; he wanted to know how the Miller Hull Team came about the process of narrowing the choice down to two options.
David stated, essentially we have compressed the four initial design options with all of the various elements into two options.

Ann M inquired again about the views of Mount Rainer in relation to a view study from the Market; she would like to know if the views of Mt. Rainer would be blocked.

Bruce L left at 5:51 pm

Matt stated that to what extent to when we can assume, are we in a situation where we need to balance out view preservation with income from the PC1-N sight.

Ben noted that the first step is that we have to have programing for this site; once we can fit the programs in then we can discuss costs.

John F stated this is an incredibly complicated project on a timeframe that is difficult to work with. He added that the views are very important. He noted that he couldn’t distinguish which views were new views from the presentation. He added that we may end up with newer and additional views that people may be more attracted to than before. He lastly inquired about financing of the project including what costs would be covered by debt or philanthropy. He stated that the retail component will have to generate enough income to cover the debt coverage.

David G stated that in the perspective of a developer, he thinks the architects did a great job in maximizing the most return out of the site. He added that as a normal person, he does not believe that design options exemplified what the Market is about; he wanted to see more open and public space. He noted that he was not in favor of any of the design options.

Jim Savitt noted his concerns with several of the comments from tonight’s presentation. He stated that there is not an effort to maximize revenue for the PC1-N space. He noted that the concerns expressed tonight are valid, including the concerns with the view. He had stated though, if we do not have a proposal to take over the PC1-N space, the city will take over it. He added that he was very concerned with the views as well.

Jim proposed completing an economic analysis of the square footage below the floor level of the Desimone Bridge at the North End.

Matt noted that we could establish a range of scenarios for the economic analysis’s of PC1-N and get a sense of the viability of the projects.

III. Next Steps
Ben discussed the next steps for the PC1-N project. He noted that there will be a meeting tomorrow morning in which he would spend time with the members of the community to hear their concerns about PC1-N. He noted that the community meeting would be focused on views and would be an opportunity to really get valuable feedback. He stated that there will be continued collaboration with the architects to achieve more refinement of the PC1-N designs, including the balancing of programs with the views and the economic viability of the project.

Matt left at 6:21 pm

IV. Concerns of Committee Members
None

V. Public Comment
Joseph Eisenschmidt wanted to know the value of the views; he noted we are going in the opposite direction.

Howard Aller questioned about having a view study of an open angle from the Desimone Bridge. He mentioned that our wonderful view from the Desimone Bridge was accidental and organic; we may lose some views to gain much more views.

Carol Wolf stated that she paints and sell the Market views to all over the world. She noted that if you clock the views from Stewart down from pine, you could not replace that with timber and concrete. She lastly added that those views are valuable and belong to us.

Leanne Clarke had thanked the Miller Hull Team for the presentation. She had noted that several of the presentation slides did not show a panoramic or accurate represent of the views from the Market. She had stated that this is a one-time process where we can make a mistake; she hopes that the ideas from the community and public are carefully listened to.

Robert Shinbo inquired about an economic analysis for the PCI-N project. He stated that he had been involved in several related projects in which the economic analysis comes first. He also had requested if the Market restaurants have been contacted regarding the PCI-N discussions; he noted that those businesses should be individually contacted. He lastly inquired about economic aspects of the PCI-N project, including how the first phase of the project would be financed. He stated that the economics and risks involved with PCI-N may be more important than with the issues of the views.

Bob Messina commented of Jim’s proposal of an economic analysis of the space under the Desimone Bridge. He inquired about looking for alternative ways to incorporate commercial and retail space, having consideration of both the North and South ends of the Bridge.

Haley Land commented with the issue of views at the Market and added that we need to look at these concerns carefully. He noted that there are public views and business views; there are a lot of concerns with business views, since the views are an integral part of their business. He stated that there has not been adequate outreach in the community about PCI-N. He noted that we need to pay closer attention to the people and their comments and that there needs to be a good interface from both sides. He had lastly mentioned about a possible extension of the Desimone Bridge, in which a lot of people he had spoken to were not opposed to the option.

VI. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 6:39 p.m. by Jackson Schmidt.

Meeting minutes submitted by:
Dianna Goodsell, Administrative Services Coordinator