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Executive Summary

Project Background

In June 2020, the University of Washington (UW) transferred three parcels located adjacent to the Mount Baker Link light rail station, including the former UW Laundry site, to the City of Seattle to redevelop as affordable housing, childcare, and an early learning research facility. Sound Transit (ST) seeks to redevelop its adjacent East Portal site as affordable housing, and both sites have the opportunity for potential open space. This project, called the Mount Baker Station Area Development, will help create a pedestrian-friendly and vibrant station area.

The Office of Housing (OH), in partnership with ST, the Office of Planning and Community Development, Department of Neighborhoods (DON), and Enterprise Community Partners, led engagement in winter/spring 2021 and summer 2021 for the Mount Baker Station Area Development. The objective was for community members to provide early and meaningful input on the project before a development team was selected. The development’s programming, or what is to be built on site, has been set by the terms of the transfer from UW. As a result, OH focused on receiving feedback on how the new development could look and feel.
The first round of engagement confirmed goals and priorities. These were shared with a consultant team of Walker Macy, Weinstein AU, and Perteet, who developed site design ideas. The second round presented the site design ideas for feedback. Responses were synthesized into qualities and outcomes desired at the new development.

This report summarizes the findings from both rounds of engagement, and will be attached as an addendum to all future redevelopment Request for Qualifications and Proposals (RFQ and RFP, respectively) for the Mount Baker Station Area Development. Respondents to redevelopment RFQ/Ps will be expected to consult this report before submitting bids.

Key Findings

The top goals and priorities identified by the community in the first round of engagement were:

- Enhance safety and security, specifically personal safety from crime and pedestrian safety from traffic.
- Create a vibrant and welcoming space with businesses, restaurants, and other uses.
- Develop open space, including natural open spaces for walking and sitting, and areas for gathering and activities.
- Support Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC) communities, such as small businesses and households who have been displaced, or are at risk of displacement.

These aligned with existing station area objectives presented in the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan Update (2010), the Mount Baker Urban Design Framework (2011), and ongoing City initiatives such as Accessible Mount Baker. The goals and priorities informed the site design ideas presented in the second round of engagement.

Site ideas were draft concepts and considered fixed environmental, financial, and construction constraints, existing street conditions, and the built and natural environment. They were not final plans. During the site ideas engagement, questions about building locations and features, open space locations and features, and affordable housing programming were asked.

The site ideas outreach strategy included the DON Community Liaison program to ensure feedback from low-income BIPOC communities in the Mount Baker neighborhood and North Rainier Valley. Community Liaisons conducted in-language outreach and extensive discussions with over 70 participants in Amharic, Cambodian (Khmer), Mandarin Chinese, Oromo, Somali, Spanish, Tigrinya, and Vietnamese. These languages were selected after reviewing Census data and conferring with DON and neighborhood community-based organizations on the most commonly spoken languages in the Mount Baker area. Outreach was conducted to current and former residents, small business owners, and visitors of the station area.
Key qualities and outcomes desired at the new development as identified in the second round of engagement were:

- Family- and community-centered design in buildings, open space, and programming.
- Design, features, and uses that celebrate and support the community’s history and diversity.
- A development that is inviting, welcoming, and integrated with the community.
- A positive living experience for building residents, including natural light in units and privacy from other buildings.
- Design and features that enhance personal and community safety, including pedestrian safety and safety from crime.
- Open space and programming that is well-used, promotes health and wellness, and serves all ages and abilities.

For more information and project updates, please visit the [project website](#). The Office of Housing, Sound Transit, Enterprise Community Partners, and the interagency team thank all the participants for sharing their time, expertise, and insight, and for shaping the future of the Mount Baker station area.

---

### Goals and Priorities

### Engagement Round Summary

In February and March 2021, the Office of Housing led an interagency engagement effort to understand community goals and priorities for how the Mount Baker Station Area Development could look and feel. Team members included OH, Sound Transit, the Office of Planning and Community Development, Department of Neighborhoods, and Enterprise Community Partners. The Mount Baker neighborhood has participated in community planning processes for decades, resulting in robust literature on station area objectives. However, 2020 witnessed the COVID-19 pandemic, protests against police violence, and an economic depression that fundamentally changed lives. As a result, the team connected with community to update and confirm existing priorities.

All engagement was done virtually or by phone. Input was collected through an online survey, in-language conversations held in Amharic and Mandarin Chinese, and outreach to community-based organizations.

The broad majority of participants were proud of the station area’s diversity and wanted to support it into the future. There was also strong support for affordable housing. However, many felt the area was unsafe, chaotic, and car-oriented, and saw development of the City-owned sites as a transformational opportunity. Feedback from the goals and priorities engagement informed the site ideas presented in the second engagement round.
Key Takeaways

The top goals and priorities were:

- Enhance safety and security, specifically personal safety from crime and pedestrian safety from traffic.
- Create a vibrant space with businesses, restaurants, and other uses.
- Develop open space, including natural open spaces for walking and sitting, and areas for gathering and activities.
- Support BIPOC communities, such as small businesses and households who have been displaced or are at risk of displacement.

The Asian Counseling and Referral Service (ACRS) and Refugee Women’s Alliance (ReWA), both community-based organizations serving low-income BIPOC communities, stated that staff, clients, and residents did not feel safe walking to and from the Link light rail station due to crime, cleanliness issues, and unsafe pedestrian paths. Organizations like Mount Baker Hub Alliance and many survey participants were excited about the potential opportunity for small businesses at the new development.

Several physical site features were identified as important to the look and feel of the new development. These included wide sidewalks, convenient pick-up and drop-off areas, walking and biking connections, and tables and seating.

There was overall support for affordable housing, and the Community Liaison conversations in Amharic and Mandarin Chinese relayed additional support for permanently affordable homeownership opportunities. Participants detailed gentrification concerns and asked for support of BIPOC-owned businesses and housing that would serve those who had been displaced or were at risk of displacement.

Developing open space in the station area, a longstanding goal of the community, was still a key priority. Franklin High School students have been active in creating murals in the station area. They, and other participants, asked for local and culturally diverse art be integrated into the new development through architecture, sculptures, installations, and other means.

Goals and Priorities Engagement Numbers

- 765 completed responses to online survey
- 300+ emails sent through agency and community listservs
- 8 media outlets with advertisements, including ethnic media
- 2 Community Liaisons surveyed dozens of community members in Amharic and Mandarin Chinese
- 5 community-based organizations provided input

An online survey was open from February 16 to March 3 and received 859 responses, of which 765 were complete. The survey was publicized through print and online media and ads, email listservs, signage at the light rail station, and by community-based organizations. In addition, two DON Community Liaisons surveyed community
members in Amharic and Mandarin Chinese.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents to the online survey were White and 11% spoke a language other than English at home. Approximately half of the participants lived in either the 98144 or 98118 zip codes.

Engagement Round Summary

In June 2021, the Office of Housing and Sound Transit shared site ideas through an online presentation and asked for community feedback, in order to develop qualities and outcomes desired at the new development.

To ensure input from the diverse populations of the North Rainier Valley, OH partnered with DON’s Community Liaison program to hold in-language focus group discussions with local residents and businesses. Focus groups were held in Amharic, Cambodian (Khmer), Mandarin Chinese, Oromo, Somali, Spanish, Tigrinya, and Vietnamese. Languages were selected by reviewing Census data and conferring with DON and community-based organizations on the neighborhood’s most spoken languages.

Facilitators interpreted the online presentation and used the survey questions as a discussion guide. Most focus groups occurred online with 5-8 participants, but some were one-on-one conversations. Many participants lived in south Seattle and used local businesses and services, while others were current or former residents.

OH and ST also connected with community-based organizations to present the project, answer questions, and advertise the online survey. Organizations were recommended by the interagency team and included ACRS, Coalition of Immigrants and Refugees and Communities of Color (CIRCC), Franklin High School, Lighthouse for the Blind, Mount Baker Hub Alliance, Mount Baker Mutual Aid/ArtSpace Lofts, and ReWA.

Site Ideas
Key Takeaways

The top qualities and outcomes desired at the new development were:

- Family- and community-centered design in buildings, open space, and programming.
- Design, features, and uses that celebrate and support the community’s history and diversity.
- A development that is inviting, welcoming, and integrated with the community.
- Positive living experience for building residents, including natural light in units and privacy from other buildings.
- Design and features that enhance personal and community safety, including pedestrian safety and safety from crime.
- Open space and programming that is well-used, promotes health and wellness, and serves all ages and abilities.

Participant views on implementation varied, and several site features received both support and opposition. For example, on the issue of safety and open space, some felt that locating open space away from busy streets was safest, while others believed open space located close to busy streets and the light rail station would maximize use and safety. While the final development will most likely differ from the site ideas presented, the look and feel of the site should aim to achieve the qualities and outcomes stated here.

Site Ideas Engagement Numbers

548 completed responses to online survey
300+ emails sent through agency and community listservs
8 media outlets with advertisements, including ethnic media
7 Community Liaisons surveyed over 70 community members in Amharic, Khmer, Mandarin Chinese, Oromo, Somali, Spanish, Tigrinya, and Vietnamese
6 community-based organizations provided input

An online presentation and feedback survey were available from June 9 to June 23. The online survey received 754 responses, of which 548 were complete. The survey was publicized through print and online media and ads, email listservs, signage at the light rail station, and by community-based organizations. In addition, in-language focus groups with over 70 participants were held.

Almost two-thirds of the survey respondents lived in the 98144 (51%) and 98118 (24%) zip codes. Over 40% of respondents lived in a household with three or more people (43%), and 22% spoke a language other than English at home. Over 75% of online survey respondents were White (77%), and all focus group members were people of color.
Introduction

The online presentation divided the site into different sections (Central, South and Southwest, West and Northwest, East) and identified challenges and opportunities for each section. Survey questions addressed building locations, preferred building features, open space locations, and potential open space programming. Focus groups followed the survey as much as possible. The full survey and results are located in the Appendix.

To begin, participants were asked to describe the future station area they wanted in one word. Popular responses were “vibrant,” “safe,” “accessible,” “welcoming,” “walkable,” and “affordable.”

Building Locations

Two location ideas for buildings were shown, and respondents were asked to rank each idea on a scale of 1-5 stars, with 5 being the most liked. Participants were asked to explain if, and why, they liked each idea.

Idea 1 included two parallel buildings in the Central section. Townhouses were located on S Forest St south of the light rail tunnel, but were discussed in the West and Northwest section.

Idea 2 presented a larger building in the Central section, and a smaller building in the South section on Winthrop Street. Townhouses were located on S McClellan St north of the light rail tunnel.
BUILDING LOCATIONS - IDEA 1

For illustration and discussion purposes only

BUILDING LOCATIONS - IDEA 2

For illustration and discussion purposes only
In general, participants preferred Idea 2. Key points are outlined below:

**Transit-oriented development opportunity:** Focus group participants applauded creating affordable housing with access to cultural communities, resources, jobs, education, and other opportunities. Many focus group members were interested in living in the new housing. Online comments also supported affordable housing near the light rail station and buses.

**Design:** The majority of participants preferred Idea 2 over Idea 1 because it felt more open and inviting, and less likely to have congestion in and around the buildings.

**Density:** Online participants showed mixed responses to the proposed height and bulk. Eight-story buildings are the most cost efficient because they maximize the amount of affordable housing while considering construction and financing constraints. Some participants wanted more height for more housing, while others said the buildings were too big. Others suggested varying building heights to break up the density.

**Light and air:** The majority of focus groups desired large building windows for maximum daylight into the residences. Survey respondents agreed, but asked if the south building would block sunlight.

**Pedestrian safety:** The majority of participants and community-based organizations wanted safer walking and biking routes to the new development and light rail station. Some organizations, such as ACRS and Franklin High School, were heavily involved in ongoing City efforts to enhance pedestrian safety in the area, and saw this as an opportunity to implement those strategies.

**Personal safety:** Personal safety from crime was a frequent concern from all. Several organizations stated that recent crime and violence in the station area had affected residents, staff, and clients, causing fear and anxiety. Ideas to better ensure safety varied.

Homeless encampments were also identified as an issue, and the safety of neighbors and visitors was a reoccurring concern. Organizations and online participants asked how encampment residents could be given permanent housing.

**Privacy:** The Cambodian, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, and Vietnamese focus groups, and the majority of survey comments preferred the dispersed building locations in Idea 2, believing it would offer more privacy for building residents.

**Separate courtyards:** Two-thirds of focus groups members, and the majority of online respondents preferred the privacy of each building having its own courtyard. However, some preferred a shared courtyard, saying it could help create community.

**Noise:** Several focus group members and online participants asked if the buildings and residents would be affected by noise from the light rail and Rainier Ave. Some asked if the building shapes in Idea 2 could exacerbate noise.
**Ground floor activation**: A childcare and early learning facility is required in the new development due to the terms of the property transfer. Other uses will be considered given available financing and space. Many, including Mount Baker Hub Alliance, ACRS, focus group members, and online respondents, were excited about the potential opportunity for small businesses and other uses on the ground floor.

**Parking**: Some online participants, small business owners, and the Somali and Tigrinya focus groups asked about parking, stating it was scarce.

“Affordable, high density housing close to transit and other services feels important for the future of the city.”

**Building Features**

Building features can connect buildings to the surrounding neighborhood and make them feel more welcoming. The survey presented several building features and asked participants to select all the ones they wanted to see at the new development.

The majority of focus group participants and approximately half of the online participants selected ‘Art, murals, or designs that reflect the history and diversity of the neighborhood’ as an important feature. Franklin High School (FHS) students have painted many murals at the intersection of Rainier Ave and MLK Jr Way S. FHS staff highlighted this project as an opportunity to involve students interested in art, architecture, and urban planning. The Somali focus group stated the area was experiencing gentrification, and that reflecting the area’s diverse culture was critical.

Two-thirds of the online participants and focus group members wanted ‘Buildings set back from the street to make space for wider sidewalks and landscaping.’ The Chinese, Spanish, and Tigrinya focus groups also preferred ‘Features and details that make the new development feel new and unique,’ including bright colors and bold motifs.

The buildings in the station area use the colors red and gray, and some are made of bricks. Continuing these colors and materials could be another way to connect the new development to the surrounding neighborhood.
What participants said on buildings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Separate courtyards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Building feels open to the neighborhood [in Idea 2], with no dead corners.”</td>
<td>“I like separate courtyards.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I like this [Idea 2] more than the first option, a little more spread out and open.”</td>
<td>“The courtyard in the middle could function as a gathering space for neighbors or playground.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“These buildings [in Idea 2] look more open and won’t look into each other as much.”</td>
<td>“Too big too tall. Will overwhelm neighborhood.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The parts of the buildings facing each other have a view of the other buildings [in Idea 1].”</td>
<td>“That lot can fit a lot of housing…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light and air</th>
<th>Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“There is ‘breathing room’ between buildings [in Idea 2] and it opens up space for outdoor/community. Opens up the light that would enter into the apartments.”</td>
<td>“This would be close to busy streets and loud trains. Any way to cut down on noise?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“South building would obstruct some views and sunlight during winter months.”</td>
<td>“[In Idea 2, the U-shaped c]ourtyard could potentially be an echo chamber for noise.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal safety</th>
<th>Ground level activation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I like how the buildings [in Idea 1] create a ‘sheltered’ area in between them so that you can have an enclosed space that protects, or at least slows, small children down from the traffic.”</td>
<td>“It would be crucial for there to be ground-floor retail, office, and restaurants.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The space between the buildings [in Idea 1] feels closed and hidden. Doesn't feel safe.”</td>
<td>“I’d like to see first floor business spaces, subsidized to hold local small businesses and arts organizations.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Many low income [people] drive for a living and need parking space.”</td>
<td>“We need place to park our cars and so do our clients!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPEN SPACE LOCATIONS - IDEA 1

- Multifamily buildings
- Courtyard
- Open space
- Walking and biking paths
- Viewpoint of perspective drawing

OPEN SPACE LOCATIONS - IDEA 2

- Multifamily buildings
- Courtyard
- Open space
- Walking and biking paths
- Viewpoint of perspective drawing
Open Space

Two ideas for open space locations were shown and respondents were asked to rank each idea on a scale of 1-5 stars, with 5 being the most liked. Participants were asked to explain if, and why, they liked each idea.

Idea 1 located a large open space in the South section next to Winthrop Street. Idea 2 located a large open space between the two buildings in the Central and South sections.

Community members were enthusiastic about co-locating open space with affordable housing and other community benefits. Participants wanted the open space to be well-integrated with the light rail station. Below are key feedback points:

Programming and activities: All focus group participants and community organizations that served BIPOC communities advocated for programming that was multi-generational such as playgrounds, community gardens, and walking paths. Connection with the outdoors was tied to mental and physical health, specifically by the Cambodian focus group who mentioned it could help with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

Enhanced safety and privacy: Participants preferred the idea they felt was safer from crime, car traffic, noise, and unwanted activities, but there was no clear preference for Idea 1 or Idea 2. The Cambodian, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Somali focus groups and many online participants preferred Idea 2, believing an enclosed open space between two buildings would offer more safety. However, others felt that Idea 1 was a better option. Potential homeless encampments were a frequent concern for online respondents and some focus group members.

Access and usage: The Chinese and Tigrinya focus groups believed Idea 2 would provide more direct access from public transportation to the open space, and therefore would be better used. Focus group members and online participants wanted open space that could be used in all weather. The Cambodian and Chinese focus groups also felt that Idea 2 could be easily divided into smaller spaces and used by different groups without feeling crowded.

Light and shade: Many focus groups and online respondents liked the sunlight in Idea 1, but others, including the Spanish focus group, appreciated having sun and shade options.

Maintenance: Several online comments noted the importance of keeping the open space clean.

"Thanks for considering active play, sports, and fitness as well as resources like community gardens and cultural gatherings/celebrations."
What participants said about open space:

**Programming and activities**

“I understand there may be safety concerns about the nature area and crime, however, access to nature is vital for the community’s health and well-being.”

“Outdoor public exercise equipment to encourage fitness to the community.”

“Put in a futsal soccer court. Atlanta put one in under a transit station that has been a huge success!”

**Light and shade**

“Good to have more sun.”

“[Idea 2 will be dark without southern exposure.”

“I like the shade aspect [in Idea 2] as one may want to be outside but not in direct light…”

**Enhanced safety and privacy**

“I like that the street [Idea 1 is] on is calm and quieter. More inviting for park users.”

“Not as likely to have encampments between buildings [in Idea 2]. Playing kids in green space will have more eyes on them.”

**Maintenance**

“Open space is good as long as it is maintained and used.”

**Access and usage**

“I like that the open space seems more accessible and visible from both Winthrop and 27th [in Idea 2]. I frequently walk on foot between Cheasty and Forest St, so it would be great to have a connecting path.”

“[Idea 2 is m]ore accessible by both buildings.”
West and Northwest

Two ideas for the West and Northwest section incorporating both buildings and open space were shown, and respondents were asked to rank each idea on a scale of 1-5 stars, with 5 being the most liked. Participants were asked to explain if, and why, they liked each idea. The buildings in this section were townhomes for permanently affordable homeownership, as the ground’s slope makes building taller difficult and expensive.

Idea 1 featured ten townhomes south of the light rail tunnel off S Forest St, a dog park on S McClellan Street, and a natural area with a walking trail from S Forest St to 25th Ave S.

Idea 2 featured townhomes north of the light rail tunnel on S McClellan St, space for a community garden or play area off S Forest St, and a natural area without public access east of 25th Ave S.

Much of the discussion and comments echoed the buildings and open space conversations. Below are key feedback points:

**Programming and activities:** The community garden in Idea 2 resonated with nearly all the focus group members. Participants said a garden would provide an opportunity to grow culturally relevant food, help residents connect
across generations, and provide a physical and therapeutic outlet. The Vietnamese and Somali focus group also valued playgrounds and other activities that served children and families.

**Walking trail:** Many online survey participants and the Cambodian, Somali, and Vietnamese focus groups strongly supported the walking trail from S Forest St to 25th Ave S in Idea 1. Focus group members liked the option of low-impact and accessible exercise for families and older adults, and online participants offered suggestions for more connectivity between the light rail station and the neighborhood.

**Potential homeless encampments:** Many online participants and the Chinese and Spanish focus groups expressed concern about potential homeless encampments in the open space, given there are existing encampments in the Cheasty Greenspace. Many emphasized the importance of keeping the open space and potential walking path clean and safe.

**Townhomes:** Many online respondents supported permanently affordable homeownership. Participants considered noise and integration with the neighborhood when deciding on the best location. Some focus groups members felt the townhomes in Idea 2 were isolated from the rest of the development.

---

**WEST AND NORTHWEST SECTION - IDEA 2**

*For illustration and discussion purposes only*
Unit Sizes and Community Preference

The final number and size of the affordable housing and homeownership units is undetermined. All developments have to balance trade-offs. For unit sizes, participants were asked if they preferred more affordable units with fewer bedrooms (studios and 1-bedrooms) or fewer units with more bedrooms (2- and 3-bedrooms).

Many participants desired a range of units from studios to 3-bedrooms to serve different household sizes, but approximately two-thirds of the focus groups and survey respondents advocated for larger units with more bedroom sizes. The Somali focus group emphasized that it was difficult for families to find market-rate housing with larger unit sizes.

The City of Seattle also has a Community Preference policy that allows affordable housing developers in high displacement risk neighborhoods to prioritize certain applicants who apply for housing. More information is available on the Office of Housing website. Mount Baker qualifies for Community Preference, and participants were asked which of the existing OH-approved preference types they wanted to see implemented at the new development. These preference types are (1) applicants who are current residents, (2) applicants (or kin) who are former residents, and (3) applicants who have community ties or use community services in the neighborhood.

All three OH-approved preference types had approximately the same selection percentage. Many focus group members wanted to move into the new development for its access to opportunities, and because displacement pressures jeopardized their ability to stay in the neighborhood.

"Please build affordable three bedroom units. Families won't fit into studio or one bedroom units."

Additional Comments

Below are key points from the additional comments received by focus group members and online survey participants.

Farmer’s market or food trucks: Many online respondents supported the idea for food options like a farmer’s market or food trucks.

Accessibility: By law, the new development and open space will be accessible to people with disabilities, but several online comments and the Lighthouse for the Blind highlighted the importance of accessibility. Focus group members also emphasized the importance of buildings and open space being accessible for the elderly and families.

"Please build affordable three bedroom units. Families won't fit into studio or one bedroom units."
What participants said about the west and northwest section:

**Programming and activities**

“I like the inclusion of the community garden and play area. More things like this help activate the space and provide more ways that people with multiple interests and needs can use the space.”

“With all the affordable housing there are going to be a lot of kids in a small area. Best to have a play area they don’t have to walk across a street to get to.”

“Work with the Hmong farmers to replicate the terraced gardens at MLK & McClellan.”

**Walking trail**

“I love the path from McClellan to 25th! The greenbelt is a wonderful opportunity to connect the valley with the hill without having to navigate steep sidewalks or stairs and to connect with nature!”

“I’d like it better if the trail was more connective: Add a connection in the southeast to Cheasty.”

**Townhomes**

“We really, really, really need affordable homeownership!”

“Townhomes on McClellan [in Idea 2] makes more sense. Engages the community and other developments better.”

“Townhomes disconnected from rest of housing and on a busy street [in Idea 2].”
Redundant programming: There were various opinions on activities the open space should have. Some participants felt the options presented already existed in the neighborhood, while others were excited about them.

Themes from Goals and Priorities outreach: Many themes from the February 2021 engagement effort were restated including support for affordable housing, requests for parking, support for arts and murals, and relocation the Mount Baker Bus Transit Center to the west side of Rainier Ave.

Sound Transit and King County Metro continue to evaluate relocation of the Mount Baker Bus Transit Center as a potential opportunity, although no funding is currently allocated for relocation. OH interacts frequently with these agencies and is willing to ensure the Mount Baker Station Area Development does not impede the potential future relocation of the Transit Center.

The Mount Baker Station Area Development engagement rounds resulted in community-identified qualities and outcomes for the look and feel of the new development. These qualities refine the goals and priorities without being rigid to how the final development should look. They reflect the expertise and lived experience of community members and organizations, and show how the new development can foster a vibrant and pedestrian-friendly station area.

Themes of community, equity, safety, and health and wellness can be found throughout all the feedback received. Hundreds of online participants, extensive discussions with BIPOC community members, and conversations with community-based organizations contributed to this report. It will be critical for development teams to refer to this document when creating their proposals. The selected development team will also continue outreach to the community throughout design, permitting, and development process, but these engagement efforts aimed to center community input and holistic place-making early in the process.

Thank you, again, to all the participants.
Site Ideas Survey Questions and Results

1. Describe your connection to the Mount Baker station area.
   Number of responses: 738
   - I live there: 341 (46.21%)
   - I work there: 42 (5.69%)
   - I go to school there: 11 (1.49%)
   - I go to the businesses, restaurants, and services there: 497 (67.34%)
   - I use the buses and/or light rail: 531 (71.95%)
   - I pass through but don’t spend time there: 97 (13.14%)
   - Other: 45 (6.10%)

2. How do you typically get to the Mount Baker station area?
   Number of responses: 736
   - Walking: 429 (58.30%)
   - Biking: 144 (19.57%)
   - Driving: 394 (53.53%)
   - Bus: 199 (27.04%)
   - Light rail: 427 (58.02%)
   - Other: 13 (1.77%)
Building locations

3. Do you like the first idea?
Number of responses: 596

![Bar chart showing preferences for building locations in the first idea.]

4. Do you like the second idea?
Number of responses: 579

![Bar chart showing preferences for building locations in the second idea.]

5. What building features or details would you like to see at the new development?
Number of responses: 533

- Building locations and windows that maximize sunlight in the housing units: 263 (47.6%)
- Buildings set back from the street to make space for wider sidewalks and landscaping: 366 (66.18%)
- Materials, patterns, or colors similar to other buildings in the area: 52 (9.40%)
- Art, murals, or designs that reflect the history and diversity of the neighborhood: 300 (54.25%)
- Work by local artists throughout the site: 220 (41.41%)
- Sidewalks, seating, and signs that share the same colors and style: 135 (24.41%)
- Features and details that make the development feel new and unique: 195 (34.54%)
6. Would you rather have fewer affordable homes with more bedrooms or more affordable homes with fewer bedrooms?
Number of responses: 566

7. Mount Baker is a neighborhood at high risk of displacement and qualifies for the City's Community Preference policy. This policy allows affordable housing developer to prioritize certain applicants. Which of these applicants would you like to see prioritized?
Number of responses: 577

Open space locations
8. Do you like the first idea?
Number of responses: 546
9. Do you like the second idea?
Number of responses: 543

West and northwest section
10. Do you like the first idea?
Number of responses: 529

11. Do you like the second idea?
Number of responses: 522
12. What is your race or ethnicity?
Number of responses: 530

13. What is your age?
Number of responses: 537

14. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?
Number of responses: 535
15. What language(s) are spoken at home?
Number of responses: 533

- English: 519 (97.37%)
- Cantonese: 11 (2.08%)
- Amharic: 3 (0.55%)
- Moroccan: 3 (0.55%)
- Khmer: 3 (0.55%)
- Mandarin: 17 (3.19%)
- Somali: 3 (0.55%)
- Spanish: 27 (5.07%)
- Tigryna: 0 (0%)
- Vietnamese: 11 (2.08%)
- Other: 42 (7.88%)

16. What zip code do you live in?
Number of responses: 531

- 98108: 76 (14.31%)
- 98118: 120 (22.99%)
- 98122: 12 (2.24%)
- 98134: 0 (0%)
- 98144: 275 (51.41%)
- Other: 41 (7.72%)

[Bar charts for language distribution and zip code distribution]

December 2021