

BOARD WORKSHOP ON TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Summary Minutes**April 21, 2017**

CALL TO ORDER

The workshop was called to order at 1:37 p.m. by Vice Chair John Marchione, in the Ruth Fisher Boardroom, 401 South Jackson Street, Seattle, Washington.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair*(A) Dave Somers, Snohomish County Executive*Vice Chairs*(P) John Marchione, City of Redmond Mayor**(A) Marilyn Strickland, City of Tacoma Mayor*Board Members*(P) Nancy Backus, City of Auburn Mayor**(P) Joe McDermott, King County Council Chair**(P) Claudia Balducci, King County Councilmember**(P) Roger Millar, WSDOT Secretary**(P) Fred Butler, City of Issaquah Mayor**(P) Mary Moss, Lakewood Councilmember**(P) Dow Constantine, King County Executive**(P) Ed Murray, City of Seattle Mayor**(A) Bruce Dammeier, Pierce County Executive**(P) Paul Roberts, Everett Councilmember**(P) Dave Earling, City of Edmonds Mayor**(P) Dave Upthegrove, King County Councilmember**(P) Rob Johnson, Seattle Councilmember**(A) Peter von Reichbauer, King County**(A) Kent Keel, University Place Pro Tem Mayor**Councilmember*

INTRODUCTION AND AGENDA OVERVIEW

Vice Chair John Marchione welcomed the Board and introduced the workshop. The Sound Transit 3 (ST3) plan calls for an equitable TOD strategy and the new statute provides the agency with requirements and tools to ensure affordable housing as an outcome of TOD projects. Vice Chair Marchione provided an overview of the workshop agenda; staff will present information about Sound Transit's TOD program, equitable TOD in the region and the new law established last year by the state legislature. Then Board members will discuss a framework for future decision making, and how the Board wants to provide direction to staff.

Vice Chair Marchione noted that Board member McDermott would participate by phone until he arrived at the meeting in person.

CEO Peter Rogoff stated that the agency's TOD program has come a long way since the agency's inception, but still has a long way to go especially considering the challenges of the size of ST3 and the new standards of use for small land parcels. There will be TOD transactions before the Board as soon as the May full Board meeting, and so this workshop is timely for considering the initial agency decisions surrounding equitable TOD. The goals of the workshop include gaining initial direction from the Board on property disposition for 2017, gaining a better understanding of equitable TOD and necessary policy updates, discussing questions raised by the new state statute, providing initial feedback and staff guidance for the criteria of each project, and how to later collect Board feedback at key intervals.

TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT BACKGROUND

Ric Ilgenfritz, Executive Director of Planning, Environment, and Project Development, Brooke Belman, Director of Land Use Planning & Development, Sloan Dawson, Senior TOD Specialist, and Thatcher Imboden, Senior TOD Analyst provided information on the current agency TOD program that was created in 2012, and explained how it fits in with the new ST3 System Plan. The ST3 plan calls for the agency to implement equitable TOD in areas surrounding new stations. Equitable TOD is defined by several goals and outcomes, which include diverse and vibrant mixed use and mixed income communities, reduced costs for affordable housing development, increases in transit ridership, and space for small businesses that further these other outcomes.

In 2013, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) published a Growing Transit Community Strategy, which outlined the following goals: attract more of the regions residential employment growth to high capacity transit communities, provide housing options affordable to a high range of incomes near high capacity transit, and to increase the possibility of future residents in transit communities. These same goals are also reflected in the ST3 Plan.

Mr. Imboden then walked through the state statute that went into effect with the passage of ST3. It was noted that for the workshop, the term affordable housing applies to people, families, and unrelated persons living together whose adjusted gross income is at or below 80 percent of the area median income for the county where the property is located. When there is discussion of qualified entities, this is in reference to local governments, housing authorities, and nonprofit developers; these are parties included in the state statute.

There are four main components to the state statute:

- Sound Transit must implement a regional TOD strategy.
- Sound Transit must contribute to a revolving loan fund that supports affordable housing. (Four million dollars per year, for five consecutive years, totaling 20 million dollars to support the development of affordable housing. These five consecutive years must begin within three years of the passage of ST3.)
- Sound Transit must offer properties that are suitable for housing first to qualified entities before considering other purchasers.
- Sound Transit must report to the legislature on the above on a quarterly basis.

The workshop will focus primarily on surplus properties, as defined by the state statute, and the requirement of offering those properties to qualified entities for the development of affordable housing.

FRAMEWORK FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Brooke Belman, Director of Land Use and Planning, provided the staff presentation on the implementation framework. There are three primary considerations when considering the implementation of an equitable TOD plan:

- Suitability, meaning which properties are suitable for housing
- Value
- Method of Offer, which is how Sound Transit takes its TOD projects to the eligible market.

The goal of Sound Transit's TOD program is twofold: (1) to identify and work towards the best possible outcome for the agency, local jurisdiction, and the community (2) to do so in transparent way that the Board has shaped along the way.

Ms. Belman than turned the floor back over to Thatcher Imboden, Senior TOD Analyst, to walk through the three implementation principles.

Suitability

There are two sets of criteria for establishing the suitability of a property to be used for housing, threshold and discretionary. Threshold criteria are objective and logistical, including the consideration of zoning, permit requirements, and environmental requirements. Discretionary criteria are centered on equity and feasibility, which include financial considerations, and other possible uses of a property.

Vice Chair Marchione summarized the concept of suitability, and opened the floor to discussion and comments.

Board Member Murray spoke in favor of using TOD as an opportunity to serve underserved areas, and drive ridership in areas that could promote the development of new affordable housing communities. The overall strategy for the TOD program should be guided by equity.

Board Member Paul Roberts commented that using Everett as an example, there is station planning work going on, that illustrates the complexity of this TOD program work. He noted that there are many decisions which are difficult, maybe impossible, to make in public forums. He wanted to work with jurisdictions and other involved parties early to figure out how to use Sound Transit's investments as an anchor to bring further investments into new areas.

Board Member Johnson commented that decisions around TOD should be considered through a set of unified Board criteria, which can be used for each separate project. He asked for discussion of the long-term vs. short-term priorities of the program, and how those needs can be balanced.

Board Member Millar added that Sound Transit should contribute to the livability of an area, by prioritizing other uses and finding creative ways to develop parcels, and don't prioritize parking over all other land uses. This is especially important when considering purchases for park-and-rides. Those purchases should be developed in a way that does not denigrate the other purposes of the parcels in the surrounding area and maintains suitability for housing.

Board Member Backus agreed that guiding principles are very important. The way Sound Transit interacts with jurisdictions is important—what might be the perfect approach in Redmond is not the perfect approach in Auburn, or Kent, or Lakewood. Redmond and Bellevue are good examples of long term planning around transit. If Sound Transit is not working with the jurisdictions on long-term planning, they can just be creating an eye sore, or an opportunity for an obstacle.

Board Member Balducci continued the comments, noting that if jurisdictional plans are already in place and Sound Transit enters the conversation with differing regulations and requirements, the community's plans need to be taken into account. However, the other side of that coin is Sound Transit has an opportunity to help jurisdictions stretch their thinking about housing and development and where density can be, there is an opportunity for shared vision and being a catalyst.

Board Member Butler asked where the conversation with jurisdictions should begin. Some jurisdictions have completed comprehensive land-use planning around a general area where a station will be built, but it could be a missed opportunity if jurisdictional planning is completed before Sound Transit's station planning.

Board Member Upthegrove argued for the broadest definition possible of suitability when considering the availability of land for affordable housing, and commented that the spirit of the statute would not be met if the first choice of the jurisdiction was always respected. When the parcel is indeed suitable for housing, there should be flexibility in the vision to place an emphasis on creating housing.

Mr. Rogoff noted that the statute does envision that, and allows for the flexibility of locating the housing requirement not on the surplus property itself, but within a half a mile of the station, for circumstances when the surplus property is better suited to another use.

Board Member Moss stated that many of these comments are relevant to Lakewood and to Joint Base Lewis-McCord (JBLM) and what could factor into the decisions there regarding options for when land is sparse but affordable housing is needed.

Board Member Murray expanded upon earlier comments, stating that the agency has been given the opportunity to accomplish one of the most transformational changes that the region has ever seen. In addition to building out the light rail system that is fifty years overdue, the agency has been given a chance to address housing affordability. The work that the City has been doing to address affordable housing can be brought into the picture here, including data that was gathered from other parties and stakeholders to decide upon common data points and criteria to address this need. There are two things that drive the cost of living, and those things are housing and transportation, the vision this policy creates will be transformation to the region.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DISCOUNTING PROPERTY

Vice Chair Marchione thanked everyone for the comments, and transitioned the conversation to financial considerations and discounting property, introducing Sarah Lovell, TOD Manager, Joanna Valeri, Legal Counsel, and Brian McCartan, Executive Director of Finance and Information Technology.

Ms. Lovell introduced two important precursors to property valuation, which are Federal Transit Administration (FTA) participation in the property sale, and assumptions already made in the financial plan of the agency. Ms. Valeri went on to explain how the agency utilizes federal funds in the purchase of property, and how that relates to TOD policy development. Sound Transit receives grants from the FTA to build projects, and acquires properties for these projects using both federal grant and local dollars. The percentage of Federal Funds used to acquire property is what is known as the Federal Share or the Federal Interest. When surplus property is sold, the agency is required to follow FTA rules for real estate disposition. This includes acquiring approval to dispense the property, receiving an appraisal to determine its fair market value, and conducting an open and competitive procurement process. After the sale, the agency works with the FTA to determine what sale proceeds will be used for. Typically, the Federal Share is paid back, or the proceeds are transferred to another project to reduce the amount that will be needed in borrowings from the FTA. The Federal Requirements are designed to attain the highest possible value for a resale of property, if the FTA is considered as an investor in local transit, it is reasonable that they would expect to maximize their return on investment.

The new state statute stipulates that the agency is not required to abide by the new 80/80/80 rule when it conflicts with a grant agreement from a Federal funding agency. Ms. Valeri went on to describe a conflict between the FTA requirements and the state statute, as the FTA has determined that offering properties first to qualified entities for the purposes of building affordable housing does not meet the requirements for a competitive procurement, as it is unlikely to result in the highest possible sale price. Therefore, in order for the agency to offer properties first to qualified entities for this purpose, the agency will have to buy out the federal share.

Once the federal interest is released, in preparation for the sale of a property, Sound Transit will still need to comply with the new state statute, but Sound Transit no longer needs to follow FTA requirements for disposition. There is, however, a new tool available, which will maintain the federal interest in the land. Joint Development refers to partnerships between transit agencies and public or private developers that integrates transit and non-transit development. The FTA sees joint development as a chance to leverage their investment for important goals such as economic development and TOD. To accomplish Joint Development, the property is usually authorized for development through a long-term ground lease, and not sold outright. The primary benefit in pursuing Joint Development is that the

transit agency keeps not only the federal interest in the land, but also the lease revenue. Revenue from the lease is considered as program income that can be used for either capital or operating expenses.

Typically, to allow for the pursuing of Joint Development, the FTA requires the agency to show that over the life of the Joint Development, the agency will earn back at least the initial federal investment in the property. New guidance from the FTA allows the waiving of this policy if the property is to be used for affordable housing. Sound Transit is hopeful that the Joint Development tool will be helpful in meeting all the new state statute requirements, but there are several considerations to be discussed by the Board. First, FTA approval is required to pursue Joint Development, and not all properties will be deemed suitable, second, the federal interest remains in the land as long as the purpose of the land is qualified; however if the property is sold or if the use of the land changes to a non-qualified use then the federal interest must be repaid.

Ms. Valeri then introduced Brian McCartan, to discuss the financial assumptions for the sale of surplus property. Mr. McCartan began by stating that the agency has historically approached the revenues from property sales on a case-by-case basis when accounting for them in the financial plan. For ST3 however, there are no assumptions for the sale of real estate. The practice to date has been that the revenue from the sale of any property is returned to the sub-area that originally purchased the property.

Ms. Lovell then continued her overview of property valuation. If a property is deemed suitable for housing, than any appraisal of the property will provide the appraisal with that restriction in mind, which would likely lower the price. The Board can offer a discount on the property for the range between the restricted value, and a valuation of zero. This offers the Board of Directors a decision point about being discretionary participants in affordable housing projects that meet the statute. In thinking about discounts, there are threshold requirements for the agency, including suitability, if the properties developer is a qualified entity, and if the project is offering above 80 percent of units at 80 percent of area median income (AMI). Another consideration is the availability of public funding for affordable housing projects from other sources, either already designated funding or available funding for allocation, or where there is federal interest in property and the opportunity to pursue Joint Development. Ms. Lovell provided an example where if land value has been deemed suitable, but the value is high enough that it would be prohibitive as a potential affordable housing site, then the Board may consider discounting the value to increase the competitive nature of the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Vice Chair Marchione thanked Ms. Lovell for the overview, and concluded that the Board has flexibility and discretion in this area of the policy to set land values and to evaluate procedures for pursuing Joint Development. Vice Chair Marchione then opened the floor for discussion and feedback from the Board.

Board Member Murray opened discussion with comments about lessons learned during time as Chair of the House Committee on Transportation in the State legislature. Mr. Murray stated that he once believed that every penny dedicated to a transportation agency should go towards transit, and in the case of Sound Transit towards light rail. However, as the region has evolved, it has become clear that affordable housing and transportation are heavily intertwined, and not in opposition with each other. If there are conflicts with the FTA over the available properties, then it will fall to the agency to discount properties to make the avenue to affordable housing possible. Moving forward, Sound Transit should make sure there is a transparent and clear process about the disposal of surplus properties.

Board Member Balducci commented that the commitment to the voters made by the passage of ST3 should ensure that transit and the building out of the capital program is indeed the number one priority of the agency. She noted that it would be difficult to discern if 80 percent of the suitable property is being used for TOD when several projects do not enter even preliminary design for over ten years.

Ms. Balducci added that delivering affordable housing projects adds to the success of the transit projects, and is a great next priority. It should be considered with caution that the discussion has

already turned to budgetary impacts when the ST3 capital program is over 25 years in length and the region is due for a recession at some point during that length, and the delivery of transit projects to the voters is the first priority of the agency.

Board Member Constantine remarked that the ST3 plan included prioritization of affordable housing and development surrounding the new stations, and that the voters also voted for these TOD projects. The state legislature's mandate makes this program important for the agency. These projects will yield a much higher total value from the transportation projects this agency is carrying out, and the TOD projects are necessary and another element of our promise to the voters.

Board Member Millar asked about the federal funds that are being considered for this program, considering the federal share is already lowering around the country, and already here in Seattle. While joint development is a great opportunity, it adds another partner and layer of complexity to development, and tends to work on a different timetable. If there is discretion about the purchasing of property in terms of funding, properties that are suitable for housing should be purchased using local dollars to prevent any over complication of these projects.

Peter Rogoff offered that the agency is not able to subdivide a project into parcels that will prevent federal interest or share into certain aspects of an overall project. In addition, the agency has been heavily pursuing federal involvement in projects as an attempt to procure federal funding.

Board Member Johnson commented that a set of criteria for multiple sites is very relevant to the Roosevelt station site, which will be coming before the Board soon. It is important to consider the community's interest, which is to have 100 percent affordable housing at this site. This gets to the question of the vision of the jurisdiction, and if the agency should be pursuing a discount to ensure that the community's wishes can be met.

Ms. Lovell added that part of the reason for the aggressive pursuing of the affordable housing project at the Capitol Hill site was the result of a robust and lengthy public engagement effort, which led the agency to see the importance to the surrounding community of a large affordable housing component of any development. Mr. Rogoff also interjected that the agency was lucky enough to work with a very patient and sophisticated private sector developer.

METHOD OF OFFER

Vice Chair Marchione handed the floor back to Sarah Lovell to introduce Method of Offer. a lens for looking at the structure of an overall market offering, taking into account the suitability and valuation that has already been discussed, and remembering the new requirement by the state statute to first offer any land parcel to qualified entities. If a qualified entity presents an offer on a property, they will pursue an affordable housing project. If a parcel of land does not receive any offers from the qualified entity pool, then the agency has the opportunity to allow bids from the full developer community.

When considering how the agency would structure an offer, the land value, desired development timing, and project goals defined by community engagement are the foremost factors that need to be addressed. Other considerations include the presence of regulations provided by federal interest, other participating funders, and the agencies opinion about lease versus sale. There can also be zoning considerations, an interest in maximizing return to the agency, and strategy about how to get the best end result possible.

Vice Chair Marchione then posed two questions to the Board members for consideration: What guiding principles should be considered in determining the method of offer, and does the Board have a desire to be consulted as offers are developed?

Board Member Johnson elaborated that the method of offer comes in to play before an RFP is issued, and is largely staff work surrounding stakeholder engagement that determines what are the must-haves and nice-to-haves when heading out for bids. He also commented that this pre-work is very critical, and is a proponent for as early as possible engagement with stakeholders.

Board Member Balducci asked if this is always in regards to an RFP offering, or if this is in regards to other ways to offer land parcels for dispensation. Vice Chair Marchione replied that there are other ways that parcels can be dispensed, in terms of initial offerings to qualified entities, or direct sales.

Board Member Roberts remarked that his opinion about when to collect feedback from the Board on these property sales and considerations prior to offerings depends on where the property projects are. In terms of a project in his jurisdiction he would want to be involved from the beginning and highly informed, but for a property sale in another part of the Sound Transit district, all the information needed would be in regards to the agency taking proper steps and fulfilling all needs by the community, but much less information and engagement would be desired.

Board Member Backus commented that perhaps this question would be better posed after one or two of these projects have been completed, and there is a better understanding of the level of engagements possible and where Board member feedback is best utilized.

Board Member McDermott added that it will be of utmost importance to watch the sites that are developed in areas that do not have a member of the Board who is directly related to their jurisdiction.

Board Member Butler stated that Board member engagement is imperative at a time when there is still opportunity to help in matters of controversy or contention, stating that he wants to be involved when there can be the most positive impact.

TOD PROJECT ASSESSMENT AND BOARD GUIDANCE

Vice Chair Marchione then ceded the floor once again to Brooke Belman. Ms. Belman addressed the project development process in more detail, beginning with the proposal of an initial assessment on properties that would include such factors as urban design, financial feasibility, community development, and housing opportunities.

Ms. Belman explained that the Board engagement could begin with the initial assessment, and then the offer would then be put out, offers screened, and selected proposers would be brought back before the Board for discussion and feedback. The Board would then approve the final project selection. The assessment and pre-engagement step would take place after the Board takes a step to identify a transit project, has worked with jurisdictions to identify station locations, and talked about land use policy.

Vice Chair Marchione added that this implies that as soon as a property is purchased, the conversation about its eventual declaration as surplus and then plans for disposal can begin. As an example, community engagement can begin immediately for land purchased for staging to ensure the process is working for all parties. Ms. Belman added that as soon as an alignment is selected for certain projects, the areas affected are known and staff can begin to engage those communities about their vision. Mr. Rogoff commented that there are already some lessons learned in the arena of property acquisition.

SOUND TRANSIT PROPERTY INVENTORY

Vice Chair Marchione then introduced Sloan Dawson to discuss property inventory. Mr. Dawson introduced the current portfolio of Sound Transit properties and explained that they fall into three categories of parcel scale.

The first category is a single parcel, the second is the urban block, and the third is a masterplan development tract, which would contain more than two urban blocks, and has potential to be split out in different ways.

Sound Transit arrived at this diversity of scale in parcels due to the differing acquisitions during Sound Move, which mostly contains single development parcels, and the evolution of the agency to consider TOD earlier in the process, which has led to larger and more streamlined acquisitions which lend themselves better to development adjacent to Sound Transit projects.

Scale affects each of the factors that have already been presented as part of the new state statutory requirements. Scale effects the suitability of a parcel insofar as scale creates the opportunity for considering multiple Equitable TOD goals, including community, workforce, and economic development in addition to housing. Single parcels are a simple categorical decision, as they are either entirely suitable or unsuitable for housing. Urban blocks are more complex, as whole or partial blocks can be entirely suitable, and it is unlikely that an urban block parcel will be entirely unsuitable. With development tracts, there are substantial opportunities for affordable housing, sometimes in conjunction with other multi-use development opportunity. When considering each of these options, stakeholder and community engagement is important.

Single parcels can only be offered in entirety to qualified entities. Urban blocks can be split up, and sometimes offered to qualified entities or to other purchasers. Splitting up parcels requires more diligence and responsibility, as design and construction on sub-sections must be coordinated. Master development tracts present the largest number of possibilities for offering, as they can be offered in entirety, sub-divided into urban blocks, or sub divided into single parcels.

There are several tradeoffs that are important to contemplate when considering scale. Successful implementation of the 2012 TOD policy is creating the possibility of more and larger development opportunities, however, breaking down the scale of the opportunities puts the agency at more risk in terms of time investment and level of management of the properties. To ensure the involvement of qualified entities, they will be brought into the conversation ahead of an initial offering.

Vice Chair Marchione commented on the property pipeline that Sound Transit currently has to consider for projects, and mentioned that there are options for action as early as this year, and it should be considered to meet the intentions of the state statute as early as possible.

Board Member Johnson asked Mr. Dawson for the term he used in referencing community engagement before the consideration of a Request for Proposals (RFP) Mr. Dawson clarified that it would be a request for information, or expressions of interest.

Board Member Balducci commented that the questions of suitability, discount, method of offer, and then topped with the question of scale, creates an intense array of options. The answer to the importance of these factors is of course yes, and when it comes to scale, each jurisdiction is going to have its own priorities and each site is going to have its own outcomes.

SCENARIOS

Sarah Lovell presented several examples of currently owned properties for discussion. The First Hill Overview property, which is zoned for housing, could be built into about 250 units. An initial appraisal on the property gave a valuation of 8 million dollars if it were to be listed unrestricted. There is no federal participation in this property, which is rare for Sound Transit's portfolio. Sound Transit has performed a TOD analysis and found that the property is large enough for only one building. It was also found that the first hill real estate market is incredibly competitive, and this parcel has a close proximity to downtown, which makes it more attractive to developers. The study did look at the feasibility of

affordable housing and found a significant gap between what an affordable housing provider could offer and the market value.

It is anticipated that somewhere between 100-250 units will be built on the parcel, and because the zoning is residential-commercial, it is feasible that first floor retail could be built, and that will be made a requirement in the RFP. There is community support for a housing project on this parcel, particularly for affordable housing. This project will be brought to the Board for feedback in June of this year. There are a number of trade-offs to consider, including offering the property for 100 percent affordable housing, which may lower the density, or offering an RFP to encourage density, which would reach the full number of units possible, but likely with a lower number of those units being affordable.

Board Member Johnson asked about the consideration of the housing makeup of neighborhoods for potential projects, and examining how much discounted housing already exists in the area, would be a good consideration for these decisions.

Thatcher Imboden introduced the example of the Roosevelt station. This potential project has a very large available parcel, and is zoned for up to seven stories of development. However, it has a very high amount of federal investment, at just about 86 percent. This property also allows for construction of a TOD project even before the station is finished, it is available for co-development. A TOD analysis was completed last year, to examine feasibility and approach. This project will be brought for further discussion to the Board meeting in May.

Mr. Dawson discussed the example of potential projects surrounding the Operations and Maintenance Facility East (OMF-E) site, which is still within the Design/Build procurement process. The potential applicants have been instructed to plan their staging and construction needs to allow for simultaneous TOD development. This parcel is one of the largest in the Sound Transit portfolio at nearly seven acres, and located in a very desirable area of Bellevue. This property will likely be valued at over 30 million dollars at fair market value due to its large size and proximity to downtown Bellevue. Given this locations proximity to the maintenance facility, there is a portion of the property that may be better suited to commercial uses to provide a barrier between environmental impacts and a potential housing project.

Vice Chair Marchione remarked that the First Hill, Roosevelt, and OMF-E projects would all be coming to the Board for consideration and direction in the next quarter. He also commented that these three examples illustrate the tremendous variety of projects that are possible within Sound Transit's real estate portfolio, and the importance of continued Board engagement and diligence, as well as updating the existing TOD agency policies.

Board Member Balducci commented that although the agency can only purchase property for a transit purpose, it was a conscious decision to plan the East Link project in a way that the station location and all property purchased would create an atmosphere conducive to economic development and successful final projects.

NEXT STEPS

Vice Chair Marchione invited staff to provide a final summary for the Board members. Ms. Belman stated that a large takeaway from this workshop is that agency staff cannot plan and prepare for every possible outcome, due to the incredible variables that come with every project. The target timeline for creating Board policy is within the next eighteen months.

There will be a summary of guiding principles from this workshop brought to the Board at the May full Board meeting, as well as specific decisions to be made about the Roosevelt project. In June, specifics will be brought to the Board for discussion in regards to the First Hill project. Ms. Belman thanked the Board members for their extended time today.

ADJOURN

The workshop was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.



Dave Somers
Board Chair

ATTEST:


Kathryn Flores
Board Administrator

APPROVED on July 27, 2017, PA