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

I. Administrative
   A. Approval of Agenda
      The agenda was approved by acclamation.

   B. Approval of February 7th, 2012 Minutes
      The minutes were approved by acclamation.

   C. Announcements and Community Comments
      Bob Messina commented on the building program and discussed a possible concern over the PC-1 site, referring to the viewpoint towards the Southwest when standing at the corner of Pike Place and Virginia Ave. He noted that the entire view is currently compressed and he would like the WRC to consider view impacts from the PC-1 building program.

II. Presentations and Discussion
   A. Update on Design Collaboration Efforts
      Ben updated the committee on the recent meetings with the Seattle Aquarium, JCFO, and the Design Oversight Committee. He noted that there has been a continued effort to collaborate with all involved entities. He emphasized the importance of PC-1; which is ultimately for Market uses. He added that there needs to be a continued active and direct role in further refining the design of the PC-1 space and uses. In continuation with the recent meetings for PC-1, concentration was placed on three key issues to identify opportunities and/or obstacles with the design plans. The 1st key issue was the Size, Scale and Character of the Fold. The 2nd key issue was Intimacy, Varied Experience and Nuance of the space and lastly, the 3rd key issue was the Year round use, Weather Protection and Housing aspect of PC-1. He mentioned that there has been interesting concepts starting to develop around integrating housing in PC-1, but nothing definite. Overall, the bulk of their conversations revolved around key issue 1; which resolving the issues with size, scale and character would be an objective for Jim Corner and his team.

      Ben distributed a few slide examples of the discussions he and Peter have had with JCFO regarding the scale and design of the fold, which is attached. He referenced a highlight from the discussion with JCFO, warranting attention to Hillclimb as a significant connector/gateway from the waterfront to the Market.
A brief question and answer period followed.

Ben stated drafting a letter of confirmation of issues articulated many months ago by the committee and full council would be valuable; specifically including formal comments on the design iteration He added that substantial focus be placed on PC-1 with the possibility of an MOA/MOU. He recommended a goal for WRC to meet in two weeks, constructing an outline of deal points to present at full council at the end of the month.

B. Rough Cost Estimates & Phasing for PC-1 North

Ben presented the proposed rough cost estimates and phasing for PC-1 North, which include retail, residential, replacement parking, storage, social services, public space, circulation and pedestrian passage. He introduced Joe Parr to explain the development and process of the initial estimates.

Joe gave an overview of the preliminary cost estimates for PC-1 North. He stated that he met with SRG Architects and a cost consultant (TBD) to put together the budgetary scopes. He discussed major elements of the project were quantified specifically, such as the square footage of parking deck and such. In regards to cost, he added that the tunnel, shoring wall and two levels of parking are unique to the site in addition to the movement of fluid coolers. Joe stated that the costs have been vetted and all those involved felt the figures were on target.

Ben stated that the budget was broken out into two strategic phases. Phase 1 would be started prior to the demolition of the viaduct to ensure a potential space for staging by the city and provide replacement parking. The estimated construction costs of Phase 1 amount roughly to 22 million; with adding design and soft costs it totals to 28 million. Phase 2 would include other program components including retail, public space and residential totaling 28.9 million in estimated costs. He stated that the total projected cost is around $57m with a 10% contingency. He added that other independent parties have studied the site, which was very close to the numbers that PDA & SRG produced.

A question and answer period followed

III. Next Steps

Matt Hanna discussed the proposed MOA/MOU and stated that the PDA’s approach must be exceptionally mindful of discussions of possibly owning PC-1 or controlling it. He noted the importance of acknowledging the City’s ownership but also maintaining development consistent with the Market. He suggested that initially, we will want to work in partnership to develop it in a way that involves the Historic Commission. He added that he would like to have the city’s involvement and support throughout the project.

Ben added that the PDA has applied for GC/CM certification with the state and noted that this will allow the committee to be prepared when the appropriate time comes.

Peter suggested that an analysis of the pros and cons of owning the PC-1 site would be helpful.

Jackson stated that the Market should get the control of the development of PC-1. Jackson commented on the Letter to the Waterfront Oversight Design Committee with adding a CC to city council. He stated that the letter should include specific concerns from the WRC, which would document the concerns expressed.

IV. Other Reports and Action Items

V. Concerns of Committee Members

VI. Public Comment

Bob Messina commented on the conceptual models of the current PC-1 design regarding retail shed structures. He stated that the shed structures should be glassed in on the Westside and possibly heated.
Tony Puma commented on the sketches that were distributed and noted that the designs appeared similar to a Park. He added that the proposed connection to the waterfront was not very feasible and that interaction with Hillclimb should be pursued.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. by Jackson Schmidt
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