

Pike Place Market PDA Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, January 17, 2024

4:30 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.

Location: Economy Building Classroom (1435 First Ave, 3rd Floor) **OR**

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82556314489?pwd=a0JLWmJQTORHVkp4ZVVhNzJDK2dSdz09>

OR dial +1 253 215 8782 US (alternate number 253-205-0468), Meeting ID: 825 5631 4489, Passcode: 805342

Committee Members Present: Patrice Barrentine, Devin McComb, Russell Monroe, Paul Neal, and Gundeep Singh

Other Council Members Present: Gina Karaba, Gordie McIntyre, Margaret Norton-Arnold, Nick Setten

Staff Present: Mary Bacarella, Karin Moughamer, EJ Griffin, John Turnbull, Juan Medina, Ashley So-Tang, Candace Damon, Deb Guenther, Evan Bourquard, Rosemarie Gregoire, Hillary Noll

Others Present: Annie Lannin, Lillian Sherman, Rowan Ring, Haley Land, Elisa Shostak, Kate Krafft, Christine Vaughan, Bob Messina, Joan Paulson, Liz Hughes, Skip Knox, and one other member of the public.

The meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. by Patrice Barrentine, Vice Chair.

1. Administration

A. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved by acclamation.

B. Approval of the October 18, 2023 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The October 18, 2023 meeting minutes were approved by acclamation.

2. Announcements and/or Community Comments

Bob Messina requested more details on the renovation or replacement of the Central Plant and what a potential levy would fund. He commented on the Overlook Walk and questioned what structures are being proposed as a part of the Master Plan. He noted on page 17 of the meeting's presentation, a section of Level 4 of the DownUnder was listed as potential public seating, retail amenities and support space. He wanted further details.

Joan Paulson commented on page eight of the presentation, which she felt indicating a process of turning the public market into a private one. She noted upcoming changes in the city government and PDA leadership.

Lillian Sherman commented sharing her disappointment in the lack of representation of social services in the Master Plan and the inclusion of the Food Bank under Capital Projects in place of funding for social services. She requested further conversations with the Market Foundation and other social services as the plan moves forward.

Gundeep Singh joined the meeting at 4:39 p.m.

3. Discussion Topic

A. Master Plan: Capital Project Phasing

Mary Bacarella prefaced the discussion noting this conversation on phasing was to determine what needed to be discussed and considered at the current stage of planning. Noting some of the materials in the presentation

would be familiar and were informed by previous meetings, surveys, and outreach. She reviewed topics that would need to be evaluated further, such as management of the street, sustainability, and the Central Plant. She emphasized the final Master Plan would be a living document and be flexible to needs as implemented. She cited the Seattle Center's plan as an example of the length of time and adaptability of a potential plan.

Deb Guenther agreed with Mary Bacarella's notes on the conceptual phasing plan, and added the ideas shared were ones the Mithun team had identified as interesting based on feedback. She encouraged the Council to comment on any missing ideas and help prioritize potential projects to help the plan progress.

She then shared the agenda for the discussion topic, which was:

1. Holistic Phasing Approach – Preliminary Integration of:
 - Tenant Curation and Revenue Strategies
 - Physical Investments, including Capital Needs Assessment and Sustainable Action Plan
 - Market Rules, Business Operations and Organizational Structure
2. Discussion

She reviewed the Master Plan's goals that informed the suggestions presented. Noting goals one and three, on the celebration of multiple identities in the Market and the preservation of the physical plant, were ones of particular importance. She next reviewed the guiding principles of physical strategies and noted they were considered in each proposed idea.

Devin McComb joined the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

Deb Guenther then shared the chart of physical ideas from the Scenarios Workshop in October. Numbers in green were ones the PDA Council had identified as the most important and pressing, numbers in yellow less so, and numbers in red were the least prioritized that may be revisited later. Evan Bourquard noted tonight would be the first time a real strategy on a schedule is being brought forward based on the big ideas shared throughout the process.

Nick Setten asked if there were the only options being evaluated. Deb Guenther answered there could be other ideas brought forward, but these were the ones identified through previous discussions as the most compelling.

Deb Guenther defined a phasing plan. She noted it was a roadmap and a living document. There would be opportunities identified for initial projects and programs and a strategy would be provided for future costs and funding opportunities. This plan does not include cost estimates, engineering or in-depth analysis.

She then presented ways to organize the phasing plan, which were phased by area and distributed phasing. She reviewed the different considerations one might take with each type of phasing.

Evan Bourquard shared the proposed phases of the plan. He noted there were three big phases and he would review the steps in each. He encouraged the PDA Council to ensure the correct prioritization of tasks.

Paul Neal asked for clarification on whether the ideas shared in the slides would show plans phased by area or distributed phasing. Evan Bourquard answered the plan shared tonight would be more of a distributed approach. This was informed by previous Master Plan discussions indicating a desire to see work throughout the Market, but the different organizations of phasing shared earlier was an example of different methods of implementation.

Gundeep Singh commented he had previously seen phasing thought out based on highest return on investment (ROI). He asked how the economic component was considered. Evan Bourquard answered that was challenging

as no capital costs were assigned yet. He noted phased one would include identifying potential costs. In phase one, projects generally would have the most benefit with the least amount of effort and lower costs. Later phases would likely need higher effort and have a larger cost.

Evan Bourquard started reviewing phase one's projects. He noted the work along Western Avenue would respond to the opening of the Overlook Walk and allow for better connection to the updated waterfront. He noted Heritage House would not be a part of this phase, but there would be work around there. On Pike Place, a street management plan would begin development, with outreach to the Market community and the City to build strategies. There would be Post Alley partnerships developed to strengthen the connection between Pike Place Market and Pioneer Square Historical Districts.

He shared a concept drawing of phase one for Pike Place. Concepts included:

- Expanding on the great activation of Pike Place
- Maintaining vehicle access
- Flexible dining and programming
- Incorporating flexibility for seasonality and particular days, including time of day

He then shared a chart of the schedule overview for phase one capital investment projects across different areas. He noted some projects in phase one would be preparing for a levy coming in 2028. He reviewed which projects would fall under phased one.

Evan Bourquard gave an overview of phase two's projects. This phase would fall after levy funding. He noted potential projects included:

- Marketfront/Desimone Bridge connection
- Pike Place Street improvements
- Soames Dunn Courtyard improvements
- Heritage House redevelopment
- DownUnder vertical circulation

He shared a concept drawing of the Heritage House redevelopment in phase two. Concepts included:

- Maintain oversize parking for Farm use
- New location for the Food Bank
- Food Life connection to the Main Arcade
- Additional total senior housing units
- Anchor Food Life tenant
- Food Life public plaza (limited to truck and fire access)

He noted the exact layout of the Heritage House was not determined, but these ideas were a vision of what it might include. Deb Guenther noted there were important considerations with the redevelopment, as the oversized parking for Farm could not be moved.

Nick Setten asked about the organizations that share the space along Western Avenue. Mary Bacarella answered that would be analyzed further in later conversations.

Evan Bourquard shared the schedule overview for phase two. He noted many of the projects would be larger and require levy funding.

He then presented phase three's projects, which included reconfiguration of the DownUnder for destination food or retail amenity and a new food lab in the Economy Atrium while also increasing visibility.

Gundeep Singh left the meeting at 5:19 p.m.

Evan Bourquard shared a concept drawing of phase three of the DownUnder's development. He noted this phase would have the opportunity to explore potential reconfiguration. He emphasized it was not decided where this would be and which tenants would be impacted. This phase would be when infrastructure renewal would take place and would be the time to evaluate potential space usage.

Devin McComb thanked the Mithun team for their conceptualization of the Capital Projects phasing and asked if the Council understood and agreed with the concepts.

Gina Karaba asked if the Pike Place street improvements would include covering the slabs and addressing the issues facing vendors on the slabs. Evan Bourquard answered it had been discussed at the workshops. There had been two major takeaways from previous discussions, which were getting a management plan in place and identifying immediate necessary fixes that would have a big benefit. Following these, there were tasks identified that would follow the levy or would need more time for planning. He noted the slabs would be a project to be considered and timing to be determined as part of street management discussions.

Mary Bacarella noted there was an internal meeting scheduled to discuss safety and the slabs for the following week. She added that in past there had been constraints on what could be done with the slabs to prevent blocking the view. With the Marketfront, those same constraints may no longer be an issue. Gina Karaba agreed and noted the vendors most opposed to obstructed views no longer occupied the retail space across from the slabs.

Evan Bourquard noted the list of projects was not comprehensive, and was meant to capture priority items heard during meetings. The key items identified at this stage would likely identify further projects over the course of implementation.

Paul Neal commented there needed to be a model that allowed for consistency in thinking and a model to use as leadership and staffing changes over the years. He felt it was helpful to have a timeline and that the timing might be ambitious for the Market. He urged caution in forming plans in relation to the redevelopment of the waterfront.

Nick Setten asked if there had been a levy prior to 2008. Paul Neal answered in conversations with Gerry Johnson, there had been an expectation from the creation of the PDA that there would be times the PDA would periodically go to the city for the funding of major infrastructural needs.

Nick Setten asked if there was a goal to move away from the levy process. Paul Neal answered the Master Plan draft noted there would be a need for a levy, but there was a need for broader financing options. There would still be a need for a levy, but it was important not to be completely dependent upon it for funding. Ray Ishii added there had been plans for years around the idea that following the Charter does not include following economically highest and best use. He cited the creation of Heritage House for low income senior housing instead of luxury condos.

Nick Setten asked whether the other councilmembers considered the Food Bank separate or part of other social services in the development of the Master Plan. Devin McComb asked for clarification of the question. Nick Setten clarified he wanted to know if there would be investment in all the social services or just the Food Bank. It was affirmed there would be support of all the social services and this was not the final plan.

Patrice Barrentine agreed with Paul Neal in that she would like to see phasing plans for things other than the physical components. She requested putting the 15 scenarios into the Excel phasing spreadsheet for clarity.

Margaret Norton-Arnold left the meeting at 5:51 p.m.

4. Public Comment

Christine Vaughan commented the Market control of the street would be the most important aspect of planning. Her second comment noted there could be a second program created to support farmers and bring farming and farmers back to the Market.

Bob Messina commented it remained unclear which businesses would be impacted by public seating and dining space in the DownUnder. He questioned the purpose of the coverings from the Desimone Bridge to the Marketfront Pavilion. He concluded his comments noting the slabs did not have an obstructed view as the Marketfront had windows. He suggested seeking alternatives.

Haley Land agreed with Christine Vaughan's comments noting a need to invest in farmers. He noted there were terms that are largely inaccessible to the general population used frequently. He questioned the impact of public comment on this issue, as he had raised the issue before.

Joan Paulson requested the removal of the phrase highest and best use. She added tenant curation could translate to shorter leases, fees being passed on to tenants to save on expenses, and felt it was a form of gentrification. She noted the boundaries for the Market Historical District were incorrect on page ten. She commented it was unlikely for MHC to approve the plan given proposed changes in use and she wondered if this meant MHC would be removed in the consideration of governance. She noted the absence of farmers in the plan. She requested the Council not choose any of the proposals given their cost. Lastly, she commented there were previously no planned changes for Heritage House and that had changed.

5. Concerns of Committee Members

Gina Karaba addressed Bob Messina's comment noting the designs for the slabs are transparent and would not impact visibility.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m. by Devin McComb, Chair.

Meeting minutes submitted by:
EJ Griffin, Executive Administrator