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Purpose of the Report
This report provides a record of the robust community engagement process that took place as part of the Rainier Valley Transit Oriented Development Project during summer 2019. The report describes the various community outreach activities and events, summarizes public feedback received and discusses the project’s next steps.

Sound Transit TOD Program Overview
Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is a term used to describe development patterns and strategies that integrate transit and land use by promoting transit ridership, while supporting community land use and development visions. These strategies focus urban growth around transit facilities, such as light rail stations, to produce both regional and local benefits including increasing transit ridership, developing walkable communities and improving access to jobs.

In May 2018 the Sound Transit Board officially recommitted the agency to facilitate TOD on its surplus property. The Board’s TOD policy includes a priority to offer surplus property for the development of affordable housing. Washington’s State Statute RCW 81.112.350 requires Sound Transit to offer 80% of its surplus property that is suitable for housing to qualified entities to develop homes affordable to households with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income.

In addition, Sound Transit has adopted an Equitable TOD Policy (Resolution No. R2018-10), which commits the agency to “inclusive planning and decision-making processes, resulting in development outcomes that accommodate future residential and employment growth, increase opportunity and mobility for existing communities, and enhance public health for socially and economically diverse populations.” Under that policy, Sound Transit has worked to ensure the processes to plan, develop and implement TOD are inclusive and reflect the local community; that TOD outcomes benefit and support existing low-income communities and residents of color; and that station areas include housing options for families of many sizes and income levels and provide social and economic opportunity for current and future residents.

Project Background
To build light rail in the Rainier Valley, Sound Transit purchased several small pieces of property for construction adjacent to the line in 2002-2003. Now that Link light rail is operating, these surplus properties are available for a different use.

For years the Rainier Valley community has been requesting more affordable homeownership opportunities, and these sites offer an ideal opportunity for that outcome. They are zoned for residential use and are accessible to transit, but are too small to accommodate the scale necessary for affordable rental housing. Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing partnered in the summer of 2019 to gather public feedback on the potential initiative. In early 2018, the agencies began exploring opportunities to make 12 of these sites near the Mt. Baker, Columbia City and Othello light rail stations available for the development of affordable homes for purchase.

The 12 sites selected for the initiative are primarily located along Martin Luther King Junior Way South. They range from 2,000-13,000 square feet. The smallest site can accommodate up to two homes, and
the largest can accommodate 40 homes. Three of the sites allow for the development of nonresidential ground-floor spaces as well, enabling the building of businesses alongside housing.

In Seattle, affordable homes for ownership are typically matched to families at 65-80% of area median income. In 2019 a family of four earning at or below $88,250 would be eligible. As part of this proposed initiative, housing would be “permanently affordable,” with houses reselling to qualifying families at affordable prices\(^1\). Through partnerships with various stewardship entities, the city invests in this type of “permanently affordable homeownership” to create a supplemental market of homes that are affordable to today’s income-eligible homebuyers and for future generations of income-eligible homebuyers.

After gathering and analyzing community input, Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing aim to develop and share an update on next steps for how to move forward with these sites in 2020.

**Summary of Findings**

Through this outreach, decision-makers sought feedback to better understand the community’s desires, inform the agreement between Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing for the transfer of the properties, and contribute to the content of requests for proposals (RFPs) from potential site developers.

Key areas of input included:

- While the Rainier Valley community had been asking for affordable homeownership opportunities, Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing wanted to more deeply gauge and understand the nuances of community support for permanently affordable homes for ownership on each of the potential parcels.
- The development of sites will likely take place in small groups over a 10-year time frame. Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing sought input on which sites community members wanted to see activated first.
- The project necessitates making tradeoffs between density (total number of homes on each site) and unit size (number of family members each home can accommodate), as well as between affordability and speed of development (the more affordable the homes are, the longer it will take to capitalize the development on the sites). Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing wanted a deeper understanding of community priorities related to these tradeoffs.
- Three of the sites in consideration for this initiative have zoning that includes ground floor nonresidential space along with housing. Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing sought input into community preferences for retail or community uses of those nonresidential spaces.

\(^1\) This type of homeownership is resale-restricted or shared equity. The City of Seattle, defines “Resale Restricted Homes” as subject to recorded restrictions intended to require that, for a period of at least 50 years, upon resale, the homes must go to eligible homebuyers at a sales price that is likely to be affordable to a low-Income homebuyer. Resale restrictions must be in the form of a ground lease, covenant or other recorded document approved by Seattle Office of Housing.
Sound Transit collaborated to undertake several community engagement methods, including targeted community meetings, an online survey, public events and email/phone conversations. Several common themes emerged, including:

- Broad support for the use of the sites to create affordable, transit-accessible housing for ownership.
- A desire to develop sites that accommodate the greatest number of homes first, and a priority for sites 1 and 6.
- A desire to accommodate a range of household sizes on the sites.
- Prioritization of affordability over speed of development.
- A preference for dedicating nonresidential spaces to cultural and/or community uses and as space for locally owned businesses.

A discussion of findings in greater detail is available later in this report.
How Did We Engage the Community?

Public Engagement Goals
Sound Transit values open, honest and respectful communication in each interaction with members of the public. In conjunction with partners, the agency developed the following goals for this project:

- Clearly communicate transit oriented development opportunities and how the public can provide meaningful feedback.
- Make it easy for the public to get involved, and implement strategies for engaging diverse audiences.
- Receive meaningful and substantive public input that informs project development.
- Build public understanding of the project and set realistic expectations about likely outcomes of the process.
- Grow interest and excitement about future permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in the Rainier Valley.

Targeted Communities & Stakeholders
There have been significant changes in the Rainier Valley over the past 10 years. In 2010 the Rainier Valley ZIP code, 98118, was America’s most diverse. It was home to speakers of 59 languages, with African Americans representing close to one-third of the population. Today South Seattle remains, by far, Seattle’s most racially diverse area. However, as the area has gentrified, for the first time, 2013-2017 Census data shows that white people comprise its largest racial/ethnic group. At the same time, home values and rents have risen exponentially in Seattle, but particularly in South Seattle, and the Department of Planning and Development’s Displacement Risk Index gives this area the highest rating possible.

As a result, Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing were committed to advancing an inclusive community outreach process around their proposed affordable homeownership initiative in the Rainier Valley. This meant proactively seeking voices from long-standing, historically underrepresented communities and using an array of outreach methods. Sound Transit made efforts to engage various segments of the community including the single- and multi-family residential communities, families with children, and members of Limited English Speaking (LES) populations.

Historically Underrepresented Communities
Rainier Valley-based members of South Communities Organizing for Racial and Regional Equity (SouthCORE) graciously hosted in-person meeting opportunities through a contract with Puget Sound Sage, a nonprofit organization that seeks to turn community visioning into policy through community-based participatory research. They reached out to an array of groups representing Limited English Speaking and other historically underrepresented populations, and ultimately scheduled six meetings. Host groups received funding for child care, food and interpretation. All SouthCORE member groups received background information about the initiative and other opportunities to offer input.

---

3 https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/data/as-south-seattle-gentrifies-white-people-become-largest-racial-group/
4 https://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cs/groups/pan/@pan/documents/web_informational/p2273984.pdf
Limited English Speaking Communities

Sound Transit offered an online survey to reach those in the three most populous LES languages: Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese. The website included a phone number for anyone who preferred a different language to request a phone translation of the survey.

In-person community meetings facilitated by Puget Sound Sage took place with Cham, Amharic, Somali, and Vietnamese-speaking populations. Sound Transit translated outreach materials into Amharic and Somali in addition to Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese for use during in-person meetings. Cham community representatives indicated a preference for oral translation.

Rainier Valley Vicinity
Limited English Proficiency (est.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>73,470</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (incl. Mandarin, Cantonese)</td>
<td>5,310 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>3,250 4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and unspecified languages</td>
<td>3,040 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2,120 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian and Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>2,070 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog (incl. Filipino)</td>
<td>1,200 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>140 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>130 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>90 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian, Polish or other Slavic languages</td>
<td>40 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Haitian or Cajun</td>
<td>20 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German or other West Germanic languages</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2017, five-year estimates.
General Public
Rainier Valley community members also received information through in-person public events, targeted online social media to Rainier Valley ZIP codes, signage on the properties, a dedicated project webpage and Sound Transit blog posts.

Engagement Activities and Tools
Based on the project’s public involvement goals and targeted communities, Sound Transit implemented a variety of engagement tools. The following section summarizes these tools; samples of outreach materials are available in the appendices.

Notifications
The agency used a variety of methods to inform the community of the project and alert them to upcoming opportunities for engagement. These included letters mailed to 1,481 addresses approximately 500-feet from surplus properties (please see Appendix A for a copy of this letter); signage posted on each site; and online content including a dedicated webpage (which received about 850 unique visits), and a blog post on Sound Transit’s *The Platform* blog.

Project Folio
Sound Transit staff created a project folio and translated it into Chinese, Spanish, Vietnamese, Amharic and Somali. The folios provided general project information including goals, timelines, maps and photos.
of the potential development sites, as well as information about upcoming events at which agency staff would be available to answer questions. Staff printed the folios for in-person meetings and events and made them available on the project’s website, where they downloaded more than 100 times. See Appendix B for an English-language copy of the folio.

Targeted Community Meetings

Through a contract with Puget Sound Sage, Sound Transit and Office of Housing staff held six community meetings in August and September with member organizations of SouthCORE based in the Rainier Valley.

Sound Transit provided translated materials, and coordinated each event with a host organization, which received compensation for organizing efforts, meeting space, food and interpretation services.

These 90-minute meetings took place in August and September with the Cham Refugees Community, Co Lam Pagoda, East African Community Services, Horn of Africa Services, the Rainier Beach Action Coalition and Got Green, and St. Michael Ethiopian Orthodox Church.

Online Survey

Sound Transit published an online survey that captured input from community members. Translated versions of the survey in Chinese, Spanish and Vietnamese were also available through the project website and promoted in translated materials and public notices. Survey distribution took place as follows:
• **Online:** An electronic version was available on the project’s website from Aug. 5, to Sept. 6, 2019, and was advertised on the project website, in letters to residential property owners/residents, in printed outreach materials and in online blog posts.

• **In-person:** Sound Transit staff solicited feedback from the public at in-person events by accessing the survey via iPad.

• **Partner outreach:** Seattle City Light, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Seattle Public Utilities and the Office of Housing’s social media accounts promoted the survey; sent it to Chinese Information Services and Friends of Little Saigon; shared the survey with affordable homeownership developers to publicize with their networks; emailed it to council central staff and Councilmembers Mosqueda, Herbold, Harrell, Sawant and Gonzalez; featured it at the Community Living Connections event in August 2019; and publicized it via Puget Sound Sage.

• **Additional outreach:** In order to increase participation among speakers of the largest LES community in the Rainier Valley, a targeted Facebook post provided outreach to Chinese-speaking populations in three Rainier Valley ZIP codes. The ad reached 4,410 people and resulted in 157 clicks.

**Public Events**

As part of this outreach effort, Sound Transit staff attended three public events located in the Rainier Valley. These included the Columbia City Farmers Markets (Aug. 7, 14) and the Othello Park International Festival (Aug. 11). Sound Transit staff were available to engage in conversations about the project, provide translated materials and encourage community members to fill out the survey via iPad.
Email and Phone Feedback
An email address and phone number appeared on the project webpage and in outreach materials, and organizations that had engaged with Sound Transit around these properties in the past received a direct email link to the survey. The agency received approximately a dozen emails providing feedback on the initiative.

Community Engagement Outcomes
Findings Summary
Outreach efforts sought to collect input on a potential initiative to transfer 12 Sound Transit sites along Link light rail in the Rainier Valley to the Seattle Office of Housing for the development of permanently affordable homeownership opportunities. Specifically, outreach efforts sought feedback about:

- Community support for permanently affordable homeownership outcomes on each site under consideration.
- Prioritization of sites to develop first.
- Preferences for density (total number of homes on each site) versus unit size (number of family members each home can accommodate).
- Preferences for retail or community uses of nonresidential spaces on sites that can accommodate them.

Feedback received via targeted community meetings, a survey, public events and email/phone touched on several common themes, including:

- Broad support for the use of the sites to create affordable, transit-accessible housing for ownership.
- A desire to develop sites that accommodate the greatest number of homes first, and a preference specifically for sites 1 and 6.
- A desire to accommodate a range of household sizes on the sites.
- Prioritization of affordability over speed of development.
- A preference for dedicating nonresidential spaces to cultural and/or community uses or locally owned businesses.

There were also some differences in what we heard in community meetings that primarily reached historically underrepresented groups, versus the survey, whose participants were less likely to identify as people of color, LES or low income. The primary differences were:

- Community meeting attendees were more likely to prefer that homes have a greater number of bedrooms to accommodate larger families, while survey respondents were more likely to prioritize maximizing the number of homes on each site.
- Community meeting attendees were more likely to prioritize Site 12, while survey respondents were more likely to prioritize Site 3. (Survey respondents more heavily prioritized the capacity of a site to accommodate the largest number of homes, while meeting attendees placed a higher priority on sites that offered nonresidential spaces).
• Community meeting attendees were more likely to raise localized and/or community-specific concerns, such as a desire to accommodate zero-interest loan options and provide culturally relevant services in nonresidential spaces

Targeted Community Meetings

In-person meetings convened by Puget Sound Sage and hosted by SouthCORE members engaged historically underrepresented and LES populations. Approximately 115 people attended six community-based meetings. Participants were people of color, most of whom reported currently or previously living in the Rainier Valley and having household incomes of $60,000 or below. The average household size was 4.6 people.

Each meeting consisted of three exercises:

1. **Site Preference Exercise**
   The Seattle Office of Housing estimates it will take at least 10 years to develop all 12 sites under consideration for this initiative. Given this timeline, participants received small stickers to use to mark on a large map the two sites they wanted to see developed first.

2. **Housing Size and Density Exercise**
   There will be tradeoffs between the number of bedrooms each home offers and the total number of homes the sites can accommodate; the larger the units, the fewer total units can fit
on each site. Sound Transit and Puget Sound Sage staff led community members through an exercise that required participants to decide between those two trade-offs. This exercise included using different colors and shapes of paper to represent the number of bedrooms in various units and the relative space they would require on each parcel. These included one-bedroom (blue square), two-bedroom (purple square), three-bedroom (aqua square) and four-bedroom (orange square) properties. Meeting facilitators asked participants to arrange the squares on a grid based on their preference for number of bedrooms in relation to the overall number of homes the set of properties could accommodate.

3. **Commercial Space Discussion**

Three of the sites in consideration for the initiative have zoning for ground floor nonresidential space. In the final exercise, facilitators asked participants what types of non-housing uses they might like to see alongside housing on these sites.

At the end of each exercise, participants shared the reasons behind their responses and clarified their feedback. A note taker recorded all input on flip charts that staff photographed and saved.

Key Findings

**Support for the initiative:** Community members expressed support and enthusiasm for permanently affordable homeownership outcomes on all the 12 Sound Transit sites.

**Site selection:** Across all listening sessions, the top sites community members prioritized for development first are sites 6 and 1, with sites 12 and 5 receiving the next highest number of votes. Site 6
sits directly adjacent to listening session host, St. Michael Ethiopian Orthodox Church, whose representatives want to partner with the Seattle Office of Housing and Sound Transit in the development of that property.

**Unit size and mix:** Across all listening sessions, participants voiced the need for more housing to accommodate larger families and multi-generational households. This includes both three- and four-bedroom units as well as larger units, if possible. Most participants noted the need to have a mix of unit sizes to accommodate smaller family and household types.

**Nonresidential uses:** Commercial uses prioritized included: healthy affordable food/groceries and restaurants; small community-owned businesses, including microbusinesses like those being displaced in SeaTac and Tukwila; health care; child care; and the creation of jobs and economic stability for residents.

**Other:** Additional topics emerged across multiple listening sessions. Many organizations expressed a desire for continued partnership, either in decision-making or in the actual ownership and stewardship of these properties. Several organizations voiced the need for zero-interest loans to accommodate Muslim homeowners, and the need in the neighborhood for indoor and outdoor recreation and/or green space. Depth of affordability was also a top concern with listening session participants. How will the agency ensure the deepest level of affordability and enable low-income families to access wealth-building opportunities? Multiple organizations had additional parking needs. As displacement continues for their communities, transit services still do not meet the transportation needs of all.

Please see Appendix C for Puget Sound Sage’s detailed report on the findings from these meetings.

**Online Survey**

A digital, translated survey asked participants to provide feedback on their preferences in terms of which sites to prioritize; how to balance trade-offs between affordability, speed of development, number of bedrooms and density; and desired nonresidential uses on the sites zoned to include them. Approximately 945 people completed the survey. Three quarters of respondents identified as white. Most were residents of the Rainier Valley with incomes of $50,000 or above. The average household size was 2.7 people.

**Key Findings**

**Support for the initiative:** Eighty-seven percent of respondents expressed that they wanted to see all 12 sites developed into affordable homeownership opportunities. In the narrative section of the survey, respondents widely expressed that affordable housing was an important priority for their community.

**Site selection:** Survey respondents prioritized sites 1, 6, 3, and 5 for development, with a site’s ability to accommodate the largest number of homes being the top criterion. Respondents also preferred sites closest to the Columbia City light rail station.

**Unit size and mix:** Survey respondents prioritized density and affordability above having more bedrooms in homes.

---

---

5Muslim law prohibits Riba or usury; this means that for some community members we met, owning a home is only possible with the use of an interest-free homeownership model.
Nonresidential uses: Survey respondents felt businesses owned by Rainier Valley residents, child care facilities and cultural spaces should be the top priorities for nonresidential spaces on the sites.

Please see Appendix D for a detailed report on the results of the survey.

Public Events
Sound Transit attended three public events located in the Rainier Valley. Events included two Columbia City Farmers Markets (Aug. 7 & 14, 2019) and the annual Othello Park International Festival (Aug. 11). (Note: the Othello Park International Festival was a shared booth with Sound Transit Customer Service, who provided general Sound Transit information). Outreach staff chose these events based on their proximity to the Columbia City and Othello light rail stations as well as proximity to the surplus parcels. Additionally, these well-established community events provided the broadest potential audience for engagement.

These in-person events provided the public the opportunity to learn more about the project, have conversations with project staff and complete the online survey via iPad. Translated project materials were also available.

Nearly 210 people interacted with staff at these events.

Key Findings
Participants in the public events were less likely to offer feedback about specific sites or unit sizes, and, whenever possible, staff directed them to take the survey; however, participants did largely communicate familiarity with and support for the initiative.
### Event Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>People Engaged</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia City Farmers’ Market</td>
<td>Wednesday, Aug. 7, 2019; 3-7 p.m.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>- Support for affordable housing on these Sound Transit sites.</td>
<td>“I’m happy you’re finally doing something with these sites.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Detailed questions about how the permanently affordable homeownership model works in Seattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Many people had received the letters sent out to neighboring property owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello Park International Festival</td>
<td>Sunday, Aug. 11, 2019; noon-6 p.m.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>- Support for affordable housing on Sound Transit parcels and excitement about the initiative.</td>
<td>“Provide units for seniors.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enthusiasm for ownership.</td>
<td>“Sites 1 and 3 are desirable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for senior housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia City Farmers’ Market</td>
<td>Wednesday, Aug. 14, 2019; 3-7 p.m.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>- Familiarity with and support for the initiative.</td>
<td>“How will you support and educate first-time homebuyers?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Email and Phone

Sound Transit also provided a phone number and email address to participants who wished to share further comments. Nearly a dozen participants reached out to provide input directly using these contact options.

### Key Findings

Themes communicated by email and phone respondents included:

- Support for affordable homeownership outcomes on these sites.
- A request for live/work space for artists.
- A desire for density on the sites.
- An interest in preserving trees and green space along with development.
- A desire to ensure that the community hears the results of Sound Transit’s engagement efforts.
Implementation of Feedback

Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing will take several immediate next steps based on community feedback through this outreach effort, including:

- Posting this report on Sound Transit’s website, and sending it to the SouthCORE groups who provided feedback and other interested parties.
- Holding follow-up meetings with groups that identified outstanding issues in need of resolution (for instance, St. Michael’s interest in realizing mutually beneficial outcomes on Site 6).
- Drafting an agreement between Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing that reflects community priorities.

The transfer of these properties from Sound Transit to the Seattle Office of Housing for the purposes of affordable homeownership development will be subject to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), subject to Board and mayoral approval. Key priorities, as informed by community input, will be reflected in the MOU, and in the requests for proposals from developers of the sites. These priorities include:

- **Prioritizing Site 1 to be among the sites for the first phase of development.** Site 6, a second top priority, requires additional engagement related to St. Michael’s existing use of the site for parking.
- **Giving priority to proposals that include family-sized units for these sites.** Evaluation criteria will give preference to proposed projects that accommodate families of four members or more, and that support a mix of housing sizes.
- **Seeking opportunities to deepen affordability.** The Seattle Office of Housing will seek to pair local funding sources with state, federal and private dollars in order to make these homes as affordable as feasible.
- **Working with developers whose proposals are chosen to facilitate relationships with community organizations and local businesses looking for commercial space.** The Seattle Office of Housing will engage the Office of Economic Development, Business Impact NW, SouthCORE member organizations and others to create relationships that will encourage the meeting of priorities of the community, including locally owned businesses, childcare facilities and cultural spaces.
August 2, 2019

Dear Neighbor:

You are receiving this letter because you live on or own land near a Sound Transit-owned property that may be part of a new initiative.

Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing are exploring a partnership that would create permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in the Rainier Valley close to Link light rail stations. We have identified 12 Sound Transit-owned sites along Martin Luther King Way S. near the Mount Baker, Columbia City and Othello light rail stations that may be right for this project.

Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing want to hear from you about what types of development you prefer and which sites we should prioritize for housing.

Here’s how you can get involved:

- **Visit our website:** To see a map of the sites and learn more about this initiative, go to soundtransit.org/tod-rainiervalley.
- **Take our survey:** Find the link to our survey at soundtransit.org/tod-rainiervalley and share your feedback.
- **Meet us in your community:** Sound Transit staff will be attending various community events throughout August. You can find us at:
  - Aug. 7 and 14: Columbia City Farmers’ Market, 37th Ave. S and S Edmunds St.
  - Aug. 11: Othello Park International Festival, Othello Park, 4351 S Othello St.
- **Contact us:** Email us at TOD@soundtransit.org.

Sincerely,

Mara D’Angelo  
Senior TOD Project Manager

---

Information in other languages  
For information about the project, call 1-800-823-9230.  
Para información acerca del proyecto llame al: 1-800-823-9230.  
如果您需要此信息翻译成中文 请致电 1-800-823-9230。  
프로젝트에 관한 정보는 다음으로 연락하십시오:  
1-800-823-9230.  
Звоните 1-800-823-9230, чтобы получить информацию о проекте.  
Para sa mga proyektong impormasyon lumawag sa  
1-800-823-9230.  
Để biết thông tin về dự án gọi 1-800-823-9230.
APPENDIX B: RAINIER VALLEY TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT FOLIO - ENGLISH VERSION

What is permanently affordable homeownership?
Affordable homes are typically matched to families at 60-80% of area median income. In 2019, a family of four earning at or below $68,250 would be eligible. Because permanent affordability is “permanently affordable,” after a home is sold, it goes to another qualifying family at an affordable price.

What is the timeline for this project?
Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing will be gathering input from the community on this partnership this summer. Based on community feedback and further assessment, our goal is to develop and share a plan for the sites by early 2020. Design and construction could begin in 2021 and conclude in 2025, creating more than 150 affordable homes in Rainier Valley.

Affordable homeownership
TOD opportunities in the Rainier Valley

When Sound Transit built Link light rail in the Rainier Valley, several small pieces of property were purchased and used for construction. Now that these properties are no longer needed, Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing are exploring opportunities to make them available for the development of affordable homes for purchase. Twelve potential sites near the Mount Baker, Columbia City and Othello light rail stations are under consideration.

Parcel addresses, locations:

1. 4804 M.J. Jr Way S
2. 4804 20th Ave S
3. 4804 M.J. Jr Way S
4. 4804 20th Ave S
5. 4804 M.J. Jr Way S
6. 4804 20th Ave S
7. 4804 M.J. Jr Way S
8. 4804 20th Ave S
9. 4804 M.J. Jr Way S
10. 4804 20th Ave S
11. 4804 M.J. Jr Way S
12. 4804 20th Ave S

• Potential for an estimated 2 townhomes or 10 condos
• Potential for an estimated 6 townhomes or 25 condos
• Can include ground floor space for uses other than housing

Meet us in your community: Sound Transit staff will be attending various community events throughout August. You can find us at:
• Aug 7 & Aug 14: Columbia City Farmers’ Market, 37th Ave S and S Edmunds St
• Aug 11: Othello Park International Festival, Othello Park, 4501 S Othello St

Take our survey: Visit soundtranstransit.org/vsurvey

Affordable homeownership near transit in Seattle’s Rainier Valley

We want to hear from you!
Your feedback will inform decision makers and ensure the community’s vision for these parcels is included in the plan for these sites. Here’s how you can get involved:

Take our survey: Visit soundtranstransit.org/vsurvey

For information about the project, call 1-800-823-9230.
Para obtener información sobre el proyecto, llame al 1-800-823-9230.
Para sa impormasyon tungkol sa proyektong ito, tumawag sa 1-800-823-9230.
За информацией об этом проекте обращайтесь по 1-800-823-9230.
프로젝트에 관한 정보를 위해, 1-800-823-9230로 전화 부탁드립니다.

Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing are working with Puget Sound Sage to engage community-based organizations and traditionally underrepresented communities in the Rainier Valley to inform the initiative.

Timeline
Seek community input Goal: Summer 2019
Develop and share a plan for the sites Goal: 2020
Design and construct housing Goal: 2021-2025

Take our survey: Visit soundtranstransit.org/vsurvey

Contact us:
• soundtranstransit.org/tod-rainiervalley
• TOD@soundtranstransit.org

As part of our commitment to equity and inclusion, Sound Transit and the Seattle Office of Housing are working with Puget Sound Sage to engage community-based organizations and traditionally underrepresented communities in the Rainier Valley to inform the initiative.

Legend
Map Date: 7/5/2019

Take our survey: Visit soundtranstransit.org/vsurvey

Map
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Lessons and Findings from Rainier Valley Homeownership Equitable Community Engagement Pilot
Puget Sound Sage September 2019

Over the last five years Puget Sound Sage and South Communities Organizing for Racial/Regional Equity (South CORE)- a coalition of over 20 organizations in the Rainier Valley advocating for community controlled and inspired development- have been encouraging Sound Transit to center Equitable Transit Oriented Development in the build-out of the regional transit system. For Sage and South CORE, Equitable TOD must: reflect a community driven an informed process; equitable outcomes such as affordable housing, anchored community institutions, culturally relevant businesses, affordable commercial space, etc.; and prioritize those most impacted by displacement to own and control land. We derived these outcomes directly from our research and organizing work with communities of color and low-income people who are at most risk of displacement resulting from new infrastructure investments in their neighborhood. We advocated for an Equitable TOD and community engagement framework at Sound Transit, many parts of which the Agency adopted in the board approved Equitable TOD policy in 2018.

As Sound Transit began planning for the implementation of these new policies through a pilot focused on their surplus properties in the Rainier Valley, in partnership with the Seattle Office of Housing, staff reached out to Puget Sound Sage to help imagine what Equitable TOD and especially equitable and inclusive community engagement could look like in practice.

Process

The Seattle Office of Housing contracted with Sage to help shape an equitable engagement process that could then, in turn, inform how both agencies update their internal practices and processes.

Office of Housing and Sound Transit Role:

- Coordinate and pay for food, childcare, interpretation, translation of materials.
- Co-develop workshop content and print workshop materials
- Present materials at workshops

Sage Role- Trust Community Advocate:

- Communication with South CORE member hosts, Sound Transit and OH to schedule community meetings,
- Ensure that South CORE member hosts understand the tasks related to hosting the community meeting – see below for responsibilities of host organizations,
- Coordinate workshop-planning session to co-develop workshop content, with attendance from Sound Transit, Office of Housing.
- Assist with the co-development of workshop content.
- Contract with Community Partners
• Coordinate South CORE members to organize and host for 5-7 culturally based/language-based community meetings with no fewer than 10 participants.
• Submit a report summarizing the community feedback, make basic recommendations about next steps and include aggregated demographic information about who attended each meeting.

Community Partner Role

• Develop outreach material, including material translation in coordination with Sound Transit, as appropriate, and conducting outreach to ensure satisfactory attendance at each community meeting (at least 10 attendees),
• Secure or providing adequate meeting space and equipment (chairs, tables, etc.) for the number of participants,
• Coordinate the provision of food and refreshments,
• Coordinate and orchestrating childcare as appropriate,
• Engage an interpreter and/or providing language interpretation, if needed, at the meeting.

Equitable Community Engagement Principles

• Prioritize people of color, low-income people, LGBTQ populations, and people with disabilities to focus outreach. These communities are at highest risk of Sound Transit and City of Seattle investments negatively affecting their well-being.
• Center those most impacted by displacement- who have both lived experience and the technical knowledge and expertise- in the creation of solutions to displacement.
• Meet Community where they are. Contract directly with community based organizations and institutions (religious, educational, healthcare etc.) to host meetings or identify accessible locations and appropriate times of day, coordinating with other community events if possible.
• Build flexibility into the workshop agenda. Community meetings may start late, have fewer or more people than you expected, participants may not follow instructions or agree to meeting frameworks, the community you are working with may have different decision-making norms than you are used to- adjust to accommodate the needs of participants.
• Create meaningful opportunities for engagement where participants have real opportunities to make decisions. Only ask for feedback on points where participants actually have power to shape and change the outcomes. If you only need to disseminate information, consider other strategies that take less time and energy for community members.
• Recognize and accommodate broader community feedback. Community members may have concerns and feedback unrelated to the topic at hand. Listen, thank participants for bringing up their concerns, and direct them to the appropriate staff person if you are unable to respond. While you might be there to communicate on one topic, for community members issues are interrelated and intersecting and cannot be isolated.
• Resource organizations and participants for their time: organizing requires mobilizing individual relationships, which takes upwards of 1 hour per person recruited to attend. Additionally, bring gift cards or other incentives for participants who are taking time out of their busy days and schedules to provide their expertise.
Tell participants how you plan to incorporate their feedback and decisions made during the meeting.

Communicate how participants can stay involved in the project.

Report what you heard and how you incorporated participant feedback into the final work.

Common Themes across Listening Sessions

Site Selection: The top sites that community members prioritized to be developed first across all listening sessions are site 6 and site 1, with site 12 and site 5 receiving the next highest number of votes. Site 6 sits directly adjacent to one of the listening session hosts, St. Michaels Ethiopian Orthodox Church, who stated their interest in pursuing a partnership with OH and ST in the development of that property.

Unit size and Mix: Across all listening sessions, participants voiced the need for more family sized housing to accommodate larger families and multi-generational households. This includes both 3 and 4-bedroom units as well as larger units, if possible. Most participants noted the need to have some mix in unit size as well to accommodate smaller family and household types.

Non-residential uses: Commercial uses prioritized included: healthy affordable food- grocery and restaurants, small community-owned businesses- including microbusinesses like those being displaced in SeaTac and Tukwila, healthcare, child care, and creating jobs and economic stability for residents.

Other: Additional topics emerged across multiple listening sessions. Many organizations expressed a desire for continued partnership- either in decision-making or in the actual ownership and stewardship of these properties. Several organizations voiced the need for zero-interest loans to accommodate Muslim homeowners and the need in the neighborhood for indoor and outdoor recreation space. Depth of affordability was also a top concern with listening session participants- how will the agency ensure the deepest level of affordability for low-income families to access wealth-building opportunities? Multiple organizations had additional parking needs, as their communities continue to be displaced and while transit service still do not meet the transportation needs of all.

Next Steps

1. Respond to request for immediate follow up with St. Michael’s Church regarding their desires to acquire and redevelop site 6.
2. Develop a mechanism to report back to community partners and their members. This should include near term communications on what you learned from the listening sessions as well as a proposed timeline for implementation, including key decision points over the next several years. Additionally, the agencies should give periodic updates to report on project implementation and opportunities for partners to stay involved.
3. Work with community partners to develop retail and community services recruitment strategies for commercial space on surplus sites.
4. Work closely with community partners to develop a community preference policy and affirmative marketing strategies for housing developed on these sites that recognize the increased displacement pressures created by light rail in the Rainier Valley.
5. Implement the recommendations from these listening sessions in the development of the project scope and requests for proposals for prospective developers.
Outcomes from Individual Listening Sessions

Cham Refugees Community: Cham Refugees Community first opened its doors to serve the ethnic Cham population from Vietnam and Cambodia more than 30 years ago. Today, it is a non-profit agency serving the local Muslim refugee and immigrant communities in Seattle and the surrounding areas by providing family and community-focused services. The organization continues to serve ethnic Cham populations, and newly arrived refugees from East Africa, Iraq and Burma (Rohingya). Annually, the organization sees more than 1600 individuals and families in Seattle and South King County, who utilizes their facility and services.

We had 20 participants at the Cham Refugees Community listening session on August 3rd, 2019.

Site selection: In terms of prioritizing sites for development, this group identified site 6 and site 12 as properties they would like to see developed first predominately due to proximity to their community center and other assets in the neighborhood, such as schools and businesses. They voiced that their familiarity with those sites was compelling, but also the potential proximity for their members—both youth and seniors—to access their programs was a driving factor in selecting them. The larger size of these sites was a secondary reason for selecting site 6 and 12, which CRC members then commented would add site 11 as a top contender as well.

Unit Size and Mix: During this activity, a majority of CRC members included a preference for a mix of different unit sizes across the portfolio with most prioritizing at least half of all units as 3 and 4-bedroom units for families.

Non-residential space: CRC members prioritized small, community serving businesses, including women’s clothing shops. Currently, members shop at Bakaro Mall in SeaTac or other small businesses in Tukwila who currently face displacement from next to the light rail. They also prioritized halal restaurants.
Other Notes: CRC members noted several other important factors to consider as ST and OH develop parameters and criteria for homeownership opportunities on these parcels. Specifically, with a significant population of Muslim residents in the area, how will the agencies and subsequent developers support Sharia compliant loans? One suggestion from the group was to consider rent-to-own opportunities. Community members voiced concerns over adequate parking. One question that CRC members voiced related to staying involved with this project in the long term: how can community based groups stay connected beyond this engagement period? They wanted to continue to be part of long-term decision making and suggested tying these properties in with Seattle’s Equitable Development Initiative, which aligns well with the values and vision of the CRC to own land and develop community accountable projects including housing.

Co Lam Pagoda: Co Lam Pagoda is a Vietnamese serving Buddhist Temple. The temple opened in 2000 and serves more than 300 people each week through religious services and youth programs. Co Lam Pagoda is the largest Buddhist Temple in Washington State.

We had four CLP members join us on August 18th, 2019. CLP members, increasingly, live in the Rainier Valley and South King County.

Site selection: CLP members prioritized site 6 and site 1 to be developed first due to their proximity to the pagoda and the ability to develop commercial uses on the ground floor. Having ground floor retail is important to CLP members, especially vegetarian restaurants and delis that support the cultural
practices of the Vietnamese Buddhist population. Additionally, CLP mentioned the importance of having affordable senior housing near the Temple. As their membership ages, being able to live near cultural, religious, and other community spaces becomes increasingly important.

Unit Size/mix: Co Lam Pagoda participants prioritized two and three-bedroom units because they provide enough space to accommodate families and guests. They recognized that smaller units would allow for more homes, but wouldn't necessarily be practical. Even if there was a need for larger units (4-bedrooms), the cost—even at an affordable rate—may be prohibitive for low-income families. CLP members stated that they were willing to squeeze a larger family into a smaller unit to preserve affordability, that it is common for families to share rooms in their culture. They were willing to give up space if it meant deeper affordability and more units.

Non-residential space: In terms of possible uses for non-residential space, CLP members prioritized healthy food options—like a vegetarian deli, urgent care or health care facilities, childcare. Their members run many small businesses in the area, such as salons, delis, and groceries and that small businesses can be an important income generator for immigrant families. They noted that commercial rents have increased, forcing some businesses to close or relocate, and that landlords defer maintenance and tenant improvements that are desperately needed.

East African Community Services is a community-based organization with a mission to inspire East African immigrant and refugee families to achieve cradle to career success. The organization is based in New Holly, near the Othello Light Rail Station.

They hosted a listening session with over 15 members attending on August 2nd, 2019.

Site selection: EACS members prioritized sites 5, 6, and 1 for initial development due to their size and proximity to existing businesses, community centers, and places of worship. Larger properties would allow for more, larger units to accommodate families and multi-generational households. Additionally, members noted the need for affordable commercial space, especially as over 100 small businesses in
Tukwila and SeaTac that are important to the Somali community face displacement and eviction and need new locations.

**Unit Size and Mix:** Most participants voiced the need for 3 and 4-bedroom units in order to accommodate families with three or more children of multi-generational households. A few EACS members also noted the need for some smaller units in the mix for new families and small families as well.

**Non-residential space:** EACS members prioritized space for small businesses in a souk or small shopping mall format to support micro-businesses often run by women. These are exactly the types of businesses currently facing displacement in SeaTac and Tukwila- without these business hubs, EACS members noted, that their community doesn’t feel settled. Other commercial uses this group prioritized included: community spaces, gyms, halal grocery stores, places to worship in pray, space for Islamic schools to study religion, culture, and language, gathering halls for large parties like weddings, and beauty shops and salons.

**Other:** Similar to the Cham Refugees Community, EACS members pointed to the need for interest free loans. They also voiced concern over depth of affordability- who will these units be affordable to? EACS members earn between $35,000 and $40,000 per year and also need access to the stability of homeownership.

---

St. Michaels Ethiopian Orthodox Church was established in November 2001 and serves Ethiopian and Amharic speaking populations in Seattle and the region.

We had over 30 participants at this listening session on August 25th, 2019.

**Site selection:** St. Michael’s members prioritized site 1 for development first due to the proximity to the station and the church as well as its larger size which could support commercial uses. Additionally, participants prioritized sites 5, 3, and 7 for their size. St. Michael’s church participants and leadership
have been trying to acquire both the site of their church as well as site 6. Therefore, they did not prioritize the property for affordable homeownership but rather redevelopment in conjunction with their church. They would like to continue as a partner with Sound Transit and OH in this endeavor.

**Unit Size:** St. Michael’s participants voiced the need for larger units with more bedrooms to accommodate larger families with 3-4 children and multi-generational living. Similar to the conversation at Co Lam Pagoda, participants aired concerns over the cost of 4 or more bedroom units and said they would squeeze into a 3-bedroom unit because it was all they could afford.

**Non-residential space:** Participants voiced the need for affordable childcare, recreation space for youth, senior activities, East African grocery stores, and flexible space to accommodate events or recreation.

**Other:** St. Michaels Ethiopian Orthodox Church serves their community all week- through senior services, youth programming, as well as regular church services. They have a high demand for parking at their space and in the neighborhood to accommodate all of the different cultural and community centers.

They voiced the need to expand and redevelop their site to accommodate the growing needs of their community and would like to partner with Sound Transit and the Office of Housing to explore possible partnerships.

Horn of Africa Services is a nonprofit that serves the East African immigrant and refugee community in Seattle. We serve individuals and families from Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia, and neighboring countries that are living in the Greater Seattle area. Our services include social services,
educational assistance, youth programs, and economic empowerment to address the needs of the community.

HOAS hosted their listening session on August 28th, 2019 and had 20 participants.

Site selection: HOAS members prioritized site 6 and 12, due to the proximity to the church they attend and the hub of businesses at Othello, many of whom are facing or have already faced displacement. They also prioritized site 1 because of the ability to build more and larger units as well as childcare.

Unit Size/ Mix: Most participants voiced the need for larger units with smaller units mixed in to accommodate different family sizes. They noted that younger generations might not have the same large family sizes of older generations.

Non-residential space: Participants noted the need for childcare, hair salons, after school programs, affordable health grocery stores that cater to Ethiopian clientele, community owned businesses, urgent care clinics, and community space. They also voiced the need for playgrounds, gardening space, and parking.

Other: HOAS participants reminded us that displacement is a process that has a much larger impact than losing a home or a business, that displacement is the disruption of community and culture and the undermining of a financial and social safety-net that community provide. Additionally, they voiced concerns over deferred maintenance in rental housing leading to unhealthy living situations. Several members highlighted challenges living in subsidized housing, that tying rents to income meant that families who were finally catching a break were also seeing their rents increase.
Rainier Beach Action Coalition is a grass roots neighborhood development action coalition devoted to implementing neighborhood responsive renewal and development, focusing on the implementation of the Neighborhood Plan Update. RBAC works to promote quality education, living wage jobs, affordable transportation and housing, and build neighborhood capacity.

RBAC hosted their listening session on September 18th, 2019 and had over 15 participants in attendance, mostly youth.

Site selection: RBAC participants prioritized sites 6 and 1 due the possibility of maximizing number of units and allowing commercial space as well. Site 2 was also prioritized because of the proximity to the Columbia City light rail station where several participants live. Participants also voiced a general desire for more affordable homes in Othello and Rainier Beach because it might reduce the overall market price. As people of color have been largely displaced from around Columbia City station as prices have risen, participants prioritized having more affordable homes further South in the Rainier Valley to help prevent the displacement of people of color.

Unit Size/ Mix: In terms of unit size, RBAC members similarly prioritized larger bedrooms for families and multi-generational households- voicing the need for even larger units like 5 and 6-bedrooms- but noted the need for some smaller units to accommodate single adults and young people. Some participants wanted to see a mix of uses as well, including open and green space.
Non-residential space: Participants from RBAC focused their discussion regarding the non-residential space on who would own the businesses and who would have access to the jobs. There was a desire to have more local businesses, community owned, small businesses, and black owned businesses where community members, including youth would have access to any jobs created. Other specific types of businesses mentioned were affordable, healthy food retail, hair and beauty stores, childcare, foodbank, art spaces and galleries, and space for a mosque. Open space and parking were also prioritized.

Other: The conversation during this listening session centered on displacement and the challenges finding affordable places to live. Participants asked questions about affordability levels and about who might be able to access these homes, would certain communities be prioritized in the sale of these units down the line? Currently, community members are looking for housing in Rainier Beach, but can’t find affordable home so are moving south to Renton and Tukwila. Participants asked whether the building types were finalized (townhomes vs. stacked flats) and would neighbors be able to weigh in down the line? Finally, RBAC members prioritized local hiring for construction of these sites.
Evaluation survey results

Overall, participants felt that the sessions were successful: we went the right speed, that their ideas were heard, and that just enough information was shared.

N= 80. We did not collect surveys from all participants.

1. Do you live in the Rainier Valley?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I live in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I used to live in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but I want to live in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, none of the above</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you rent or own your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other arrangement</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you work in the Rainier Valley?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I own a business in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work for someone in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used to work in the Rainier Valley, but don’t anymore</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, none of the above</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please Select All that Apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I travel through the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend religious services or cultural activities in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have family or friends in the Rainier Valley</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit the Rainier Valley- area businesses or services.</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, none of the above</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genders not listed here</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-85</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 85</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Including yourself, how many people live in your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine or more</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many of the people in your household are under 18?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Under 18s</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. On average, how much money does your household make each month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $2,000 per month</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $2,001 and $5,000 per month</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $5,001-$7,000 per month</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $7,000 per month</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What is your race, ethnicity, or origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern or North African</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race, ethnicity, or origin</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction
Background Purpose

Recruitment and Fielding

Sound Transit is working with the Seattle Office of Housing to explore the possibility of creating opportunities to develop permanently affordable homes for purchase on 12 sites near the Mount Baker, Columbia City, and Othello light rail stations. Sound Transit gathered feedback in multi-lingual community meetings, at festivals, farmers markets, and through an online survey. Sound Transit received feedback on what types of development to prioritize, and which sites to consider developing first. This report shares findings from the online survey.

**Survey Period**
August to September 2019

**Who We Heard From**
945 people took the survey

This survey was part of a larger outreach effort with Rainier Valley residents, former residents, and businesses. Most survey respondents lived, worked, traveled, and/or accessed services in the Rainier Valley area. See pages 7 to 9 for details.

Survey region (Seattle-area)
The survey was translated into languages spoken by Limited English Proficiency populations that represented 2% or more of the Rainier Valley vicinity Census tracts:
- 19 responses in Chinese
- 890 responses in English
- 35 responses in Spanish
- 1 response in Vietnamese

Throughout the following report, we described someone who lives, owns a business, or attends services or activities in the Rainier Valley as a “Rainier Valley community member”.

Methods

In-depth Analysis

01 PRR used logistic regression to estimate how likely a respondent’s characteristics (e.g., income) were to influence their survey responses (e.g., wants affordable homeownership).

Odds ratios measure the strength of the relationship between characteristics and outcomes. Odds ratios of 1 mean that the influence on the outcome are equally likely across groups.

We report odds ratios of at least 1.4 (40% more likely) or less than 0.5 (half as likely), indicating a relatively strong relationship.

03 Only statistically significant relationships are discussed throughout the report.

When something is statistically significant, it means it is highly unlikely to be the result of random chance. To achieve the cut-off for statistical significance, estimates must have a 0.05 significance level (a 95 percent confidence level). Charts without statistical significance are omitted.

04 PRR used Fisher’s exact test to determine whether differences between groups of respondents (Group A vs. Group B) were statistically significant.

This report summarizes survey results using charts. Note that the totals in some charts may add up to somewhat more or somewhat less than 100% due to rounding or where respondents could provide multiple responses. Additionally, the total number of respondents varies from chart to chart based on how many people answered the question. Sometimes people skipped a question or groups of respondents saw different questions based on their travel behavior. Only statistically significant breakout charts appear in this report.
Demographic Profile – Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(s) not listed here</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial or Combination of races</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Race(s) not listed here | 35% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $200,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We include the 2017 American Community Survey estimates for informational purposes. This survey was part of a larger outreach effort with Rainier Valley community members, due to rounding or options where participants could select multiple answers, percentages may not sum to 100%. Rounding occurs on all demographic slides.

Demographic Profile – Part 2

Are you interested in purchasing a home in the Rainier Valley?

| Yes | 48% |
| No | 18% |
| Unsure | 19% |

Employment Status

| Employed (full-time, part-time, self-employed) | 17% |
| Retired | 7% |
| Stay-at-home parent / caregiver | 5% |
| Student (full or part-time) | 4% |
| Unemployed and seeking work | 3% |
| Unable to work | 1% |

Connection to the Rainier Valley

| I travel through the Rainier Valley | 86% |
| I visit the Rainier Valley-area businesses or services | 85% |
| I have family or friends in the Rainier Valley | 78% |
| I live in the Rainier Valley | 73% |
| I attend services or activities in the Rainier Valley | 69% |
| I work in the Rainier Valley | 15% |
| I used to work in the Rainier Valley | 8% |
| I used to live in the Rainier Valley | 6% |
| Other | 10% |
| No, none of the above | 3% |

Due to rounding or options where participants could select multiple answers, percentages may not sum to 100%. Rounding occurs on all demographic slides.
FINDINGS

Before reading about available sites, respondents answered questions on their general preferences for permanently affordable homeownership opportunities. Here is what we heard.
For most participants, affordability was the most important priority for this initiative.

- Affordability was the highest priority for developing affordable homeownership in the Rainier Valley.
- Speed of construction was ranked the least important for participants.

When answering the following question:

*What do you think is more important?*

- The respondents were asked to prioritize between two choices.
- We repeated this forced-choice exercise several times and calculated which choices were the favorite across respondents.

Most people prioritized sites with the potential for more homes or closer to the light rail stations, compared to sites that allow for mixed-uses.

- Larger sites, with the potential for the most homes, were the highest priority for developing affordable homeownership in the Rainier Valley.
- Sites with both affordable homeownership and non-residential uses were ranked the least important priority. Less than half (41%) chose this as their 3rd choice.
- People of color were less likely to prioritize mixed-use sites.

When answering the following question:

*We can’t develop the sites all at the same time. Which sites should be developed first?*

- We presented participants with choices for which priority was most important to build first.
- We also asked them to rank the other two priorities.
Without yet knowing anything about the specific sites, respondents preferred that those closest to Columbia City Station be developed first.

- Columbia City was the light rail station near which more people wanted affordable homeownership.
- People of color were less likely to prefer sites near Columbia City Station.
- Participants who wanted to buy a home in the Rainier Valley were less likely to prefer sites near Columbia City.
- Othello Station was the second-most popular choice; Mount Baker was third.

When answering the following question:

We can’t develop the sites all at the same time. Which sites should be developed first? Please rank from first to last.

To minimize bias, respondents saw this question before they had seen the twelve sites we asked about in this survey. Later, respondents learned that seven of the twelve sites are near the Columbia City light rail station. Rankings for this question reflect respondents’ general priorities for development and do not reflect responses to specific sites.

FINDINGS

After revealing available sites for permanently affordable homeownership opportunities, respondents answered questions about their site-specific preferences. Here is what we heard.
87% wanted permanently affordable homeownership opportunities on all sites

Respondents prioritized development at sites near each of the light rail stations.

- Sites near each of the stations appear in the top five site rankings.
- Sites like 1, 6 and 5 scored highly for survey respondents. These rankings are consistent with what we heard from the in-person listening sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Potential homes per site</th>
<th>Distance to light rail station (in miles)</th>
<th>Non-residential spaces on-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site 1: 4804 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Site 6: 6740 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site 3: 4736 31st Ave S.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Site 5: 4203 S. Kenyon St.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Site 7: 7860 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Site 12: 67601 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Site 2: 4851 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Site 4: 4733 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Site 9: 4865 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Site 10: 32015 S. Ferdinand St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Site 11: 5042 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Site 8: 7860 MLK Jr Way S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To rank the relative interest for each of the twelve sites, we scored each of the sites by the features most important, second-most important, and third-most important to respondents. When sites scored similarly for the first two priorities, sites that could also be used for non-residential were prioritized. We reduced scores for sites that had more opponents than others.
Most respondents prefer to include businesses owned by Rainier Valley residents in non-residential uses of affordable homeownership properties.

- About 4 out of 5 respondents reported that small non-residential spaces should be occupied by businesses owned by Rainier Valley residents.
- Almost three-quarters of respondents (72%) wanted non-residential spaces for childcare/pre-school and a little over half (57%) said they preferred a cultural space.

Listening session connections

Most respondents echoed what we heard from the listening sessions; small community-owned businesses (e.g., restaurants, childcare) were important to Rainier Valley community members.

A few of the sites can be used for both affordable housing and small non-residential uses. Which of these would you like to have on the ground floor?

Base: all respondents (n = 477). Multiple responses allowed. Percentages add to more than 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>First Priority</th>
<th>Second Priority</th>
<th>Third Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses owned by Rainier Valley residents</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare or pre-school</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural space</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical or healthcare office</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education or workforce development</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More likely

- White
- Rainier Valley community member

*Other includes: Businesses with no stated ownership preferences, grocery stores or food services, retail, green space, homeless shelter, or fitness center.

*After accounting for total responses per race group, we estimated that White respondents were still more likely to select “Businesses owned by Rainier Valley residents” than expected. This was not a pattern seen in other responses. For more details about the analysis, see page 6.