



The City of Seattle

## International Special Review District

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649  
Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

ISRD 110/21

### MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, June 22, 2021

Time: 4:30pm  
Place: Remote Meeting

#### **Board Members Present**

Matt Chan  
Matt Fujimoto  
Russ Williams  
Tanya Woo  
Andy Yip

#### **Staff**

Rebecca Frestedt  
Melinda Bloom  
Maribel Stephens

#### **Absent**

Faye Hong

Chair Matt Fujimoto called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

Ms. Frestedt announced Vietnamese community liaisons, Tammy Dang and LeVine Tran would provide simultaneous interpretation.

Mr. Fujimoto explained this was the first meeting on new platform that would provide simultaneous interpretation. He said all verbal public comment would be provided at the front end of the meeting.

#### **062221.1 STAFF INTRODUCTION**

#### **062221.2 PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

#### **062221.3 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

#### **062221.31 611 12<sup>th</sup> Ave S. – Seattle Indian Health Board**

*Applicant:* Megan Nielsen Hegstad, Jones and Jones

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed construction of a 10' tall, ~230' long board-form concrete wall running along the southern edge of the property line. A 40'

**Administered by The Historic Preservation Program  
The Seattle Department of Neighborhoods**

"Printed on Recycled Paper"

long segment, adjacent to the sidewalk along 12th Ave. S. is 5' tall. The proposal involves removal of one tree, north of the property line. She said this site is located east of I-5, outside of the Asian Design Character District. She said it is the staff opinion that the opaque design of the proposed wall is not ideal, due to the lack of visual permeability. Staff appreciates that the applicant has explored options prior to coming up with this proposal. Staff has considered the language in SMC 23.66.302 E and does not believe that this proposal will improve visual and urban design relationships between buildings and open spaces in the District. However, staff recognizes the safety and security concerns presented by the applicant and acknowledges that the work can be reversed without resulting in an adverse impact to the District. It is for that reason that staff is recommending approval. In reviewing the application, staff also considered the Subsection A. General Requirements of SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes. She said she believes that this section may consider structures as well as buildings building finishes. Concrete is a material commonly used throughout Little Saigon.

Esther Lucero, Executive Director, Seattle Indian Health Board (SIHB) said they share the neighborhood, space and community, referring to a large encampment adjacent to the SIHB property. She said there have been challenges with the encampments along the south end of their property. She said for the first time they witnessed weapons, human trafficking, and lots of money. She said they are not anti-encampment/unsheltered and actually provide services to many within their programs. She said they are concerned with the safety issues the encampment presents: they have witnessed shootings, knife fights, drug trafficking, trafficking of young girls, and staff members being accosted. She said the chain link fence has been cut through. She said they have taken many measures and done what they can. She said they now employ armed security guards.

Ryan Gilbert, Chief Operating Officer, SIHB, said this is the first time that they have had to hire armed security guards. It comes at a cost of \$70,000 a month. He said the current chain link fence has been cut through repeatedly. He said people have set up camp in their building's crawl space.

Ms. Lucero said they have had six break-ins and they have had overdoses in their doorway. The cost of hiring security means that 2,000 less relatives are served a year. She said they don't have the resources to sustain it. She said a cement wall is proposed because it will stop a bullet; they plan to add a green living wall.

Megan Nielson Hegstad, Jones and Jones, went through photos showing context of the area and indicated proposed placement of wall on a non-primary streetscape that faces a gravel path. She said there is no visibility of the area, and the concrete will blend in with similar materials in the area. She said the fence will step down as it gets closer to 12<sup>th</sup> to a 5' height to allow for visibility. She said board-formed concrete is proposed, with a matte finish and anti-graffiti coat. She said a trellis of plants will soften the appearance. She provided elevations which show how the wall will respond to the sloping and conditions at the edge. She reiterated the 5' height closer to 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue is intended to meet the needs of the client and the neighborhood.

Ms. Lucero pleaded for support. She said Ms. Frestedt did an excellent job of due diligence in trying to set up a meeting with the Seattle Police Department. Ms. Lucero said that the police department confirmed that there are no other answers. She said they want to be sure the elders and staff are safe, and they have done everything they can.

Mr. Fujimoto asked the height of the panels, if it sufficient to limit trajectory of bullets.

Ms. Hegstad said the panels are 5' tall at the corner, as they move down there is a maximum of 10' height. She said the panels are 8' to 10' and height will vary per the grade.

Ms. Woo asked if the tree being removed is significant.

Ms. Hegstad said it is not.

Mr. Fujimoto asked if the neighborhood design guidelines are being followed and crime prevention strategies employed.

Ms. Hegstad said they are in compliance with SMC 23.66.336 B1, B2, B3 and B4; materials are earthen, and color is in keeping with adjacent bridge and structures, and the wall will be along a non-primary façade.

Ms. Lucero said they have been working with the Mayor's Office about paving Lane St and adding lights. She said the SPD is strapped for resources. She said she has spoken to Crime Prevention Strategies team in an attempt to explore all channels.

Jen Creighton, SIHB, said they talked with the captain of the West Precinct and the crime prevention staff. She said additional patrolling, other community involved strategies, and lighting were suggested but are not sufficient given the severity of activity.

Ms. Lucero said paying \$70,000 per month for armed security has an impact on the non-profit's ability to serve relatives.

Mr. Fujimoto noted CPTED principles to make decisions about design of space. He said he was happy to hear they had done so much work with experts.

Ms. Frestedt said the height of the fence from 10' to 5' was a CPTED response so there is visibility of who is in the area.

Mr. Fujimoto said he appreciated the way the applicant expressed this. He said there is no way to diminish violence and he appreciated the need for cement wall. He said the homeless neighbors are being exploited and the proposed intervention will create a device to separate the north from the south. He said while thinking of their own safety, they will be turning their back to neighbors to the south.

Mr. Chan said it is unfortunate and he appreciates the burden the organization has had to bear. He said the community is having to take on the burden of lack of City services where

safety of all is most important. He said he appreciates the effort and what the applicant is trying to accomplish.

Mr. Fujimoto said he wondered if when constructed, what about design allows it to minimize impacts during construction.

Ms. Hegstad said the foundations are on the SIHB site and pre-formed concrete will be used to reduce impact to area outside the site. She said the majority of work will be done on the SIHB site.

Ms. Lucero said they serve many who live in that encampment, and they will continue to do so. She said the barrier will reduce access to community; traffickers will have to come in from public street.

Mr. Yip said he appreciated SIHB's work and exploration of all options, meeting with SPD, SFC, the Mayor's Office and with Ms. Frestedt. He said crime is not unique to SIHB and that he didn't like barriers in any neighborhood, but it must be done for the health of staff and patients. He said he wished there were an alternative, but the applicant has exhausted all possible options.

Mr. Fujimoto said it is dystopic; there aren't enough resources, so it is up to property owners. He said the city has resources and should act on it.

Ms. Woo said she echoed other board member comments. She said it is unfortunate and she said she understands the weight, and the burden. She said safety is so important for the area and she hoped it would help.

Mr. Williams said he was empathetic, and it is sad it has come to this level in the city. He said he echoed Mr. Fujimoto's comments about the city and resources and the need to step up and address the needs of the community. He supported doing what was needed to protect the staff members of the organization.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for site alterations, as proposed.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 22, 2021\* public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This action is based on the **following applicable sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance and District Design Guidelines:**

**SMC 23.66.302– International Special Review District Goals and Objectives**

The International District is the urban focal point for the Asian American community. The International Special Review District is established to promote, preserve and perpetuate the cultural, economic, historical, and otherwise beneficial qualities of the area, particularly the features derived from its Asian heritage, by:

E. Improving the visual and urban design relationships between existing and future buildings, parking garages, open spaces and public improvements within the International District.

**SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes**

A. General Requirements. To retain and enhance the visual order of the District, which is created by existing older buildings that provide unique character and form through their subtle detailing and quarter-block and half-block coverage, new development, including exterior remodeling, should respect the architectural and structural integrity of the building in which the work is undertaken, through sympathetic use of colors, material and style. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area.

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards**

**#9.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

**#10.** New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/AY/MC            4:1:0    Motion carried. Mr. Fujimoto opposed.

Ms. Frestedt said it was a hard application to review and to navigate. She said she thought about the physical impact of the barrier but acknowledges reality.

\*Mr. Yip affirmed his intention of the June 22, 2021 date in the motion, not the January date.

062221.32

1001-1005 S. King St.

*Applicant:* Matt Driscoll, d/Arch, LLC

Ms. Frestedt explained the proposed demolition, use and preliminary design of an eight-story mixed-use building consisting of 100 apartments, ground floor commercial (approximately 3673 sq ft) and one level of underground parking (77). The proposal includes demolition of the existing building at 1001-1005 S. King St.

The applicant requests the following two Departures (see sheet CS06 of plan set for details):

Departure #1 – SMC 23.54.030G Site Triangles

Request departure to allow structural column and portion of structure in the vertical spaces between 32 inches and 82 inches from the ground on one side of the garage entry ramp in order to shift garage ramp closer to the south property line.

Departure #2 – SMC 23.49.162 Street Façade Requirements

Request to reduce the setback from 10' to 4' above 45' h podium.

The applicant has given two briefings to the Board since January 2019. The briefings took place on January 22, 2019, and October 8, 2019.

Presentation documents in DON file.

Matt Driscoll proposed demolition of existing building and construction of new eight story apartment building with 100 units and 55 parking stalls. He said the unit size will be 525 square feet.

Ms. Frestedt said an overview of the existing building was provided in the Historic Property Summary; this information has been presented to the board in January and October 2019.

Mr. Driscoll said the existing building was constructed in 1914-15 with most recent use as a nail supply business. He said the building is highly altered and in the 1970s housed a chrome plating building which may have left pollution issues. He said the proposed streetscape had been approved by SDOT. He said they had presented three options to the community: 1) looked at form on building 2) looked at massing, setbacks due to powerline and 3) massing as it relates to adjacent structures. He said Option B was preferred by community. He noted the exposed corner and how the massing ties into adjacent buildings. He said they brought the corner down to anchor the building. The option allows for community spaces, coffee shop. He said service and garage are at basement level. He said ground floor on King Street will have three commercial spaces and he pointed out how the elevation responds to grade changes. He said that commercial access is off King Street and the plaza. He said the plaza element is tied to Little Saigon entry and will catch light and provide activation with benches: he said they will work with neighborhood. He said roof will house a roof garden, mechanical, and solar collectors.

Mr. Driscoll said they will request a departure to allow structural column and portion of structure in the vertical spaces between 32 inches and 82 inches from the ground on one side of the garage entry ramp in order to shift garage ramp closer to the south property line; and to request to reduce the setback from 10' to 4' above 45' h podium.

Tien Ha, developer, explained the existing building has no integrity and the historic report found that it had no significant impact on the district.

Mr. Chan asked why they are requesting a departure of 4' rather than 10'.

Mr. Driscoll said they thought 10' was excessive and that 4' is enough to provide a break in the façade.

Mr. Chan asked if the voltage wires impacted their design decisions.

Mr. Ha said that they would set back, if they could, but that would mean they would have to go underground. They chose an alternate path.

Mr. Driscoll said they didn't want the building to look like it was on a podium as that is not inviting. He said they designed to the scale of the district's five – six story buildings and adjacent church. He said they picked up on datum lines and said they are perceived better if they are grounded into multiple elements.

Mr. Yip asked if there was any other reason for the 4' departure request.

Mr. Driscoll said the departure would provide greater benefit to the community; it allows the units to stack better and it is more economical.

Mr. Ha said it would help keep structural consistency for better function, more consistent floor plan, better constructability and better proforma.

Mr. Driscoll said it allows more ground floor commercial.

Mr. Fujimoto asked for clarification on bottom two massing diagrams on page 14.

Ms. Woo asked for more information about Green Street. She noted the 10' set back at level 5 and above and asked if that is code and if it is departable.

Ms. Frestedt said it is underlying City Code. She said it can be considered as a departure. She said the board should consider SMC 23.66.050. She the nature of a green street is to be pedestrian oriented and for new development to be in scale with that, so a building is not looming over the street.

Mr. Driscoll said the building is eight stories and they can't hide that, but setbacks make it less perceptible to pedestrians.

Mr. Fujimoto asked if there was a simpler drawing that would illustrate the setbacks.

Mr. Driscoll said there is no rendered section like that, but he showed a perspective that illustrated it.

Mr. Chan said he was troubled that the board was presented with a departure request without the opportunity to see what it looks like by Code compared to departure. He said a Green Street needs to be protected as much as possible and he didn't want to set precedent. He said there should be access to open sky and enough air space and no canyon effect. He said he was reluctant to grant the departure without seeing what it should be versus what they want it to be.

Mr. Fujimoto wondered if there was a further study that reflects a shallower setback, 6-8', for instance. He said King Street is a jewel of a street which the whole community is planning for.

Steven Lekan, d/Arch, LLC, said at previous meetings they presented a Code Compliant version which was Option A. He said the focus was on the corner plaza. He said they looked at carving space so as not to sacrifice units above.

Mr. Ha said they previously presented to the board which is how they ended up with this proposal. He said with Code Compliant setback the units become very small. He said they added 10 units of affordable housing spread throughout building and want to provide a quality environment. He said the setback impacts the size of the units.

Mr. Fujimoto said the board has no jurisdiction over interiors. He asked if there are ways to combine units to provide larger spaces.

Ms. Frestedt said that Ms. Woo and Mr. Williams attended earlier briefings.

Mr. Williams said he recognized the efforts made on modulation on prominent corner on King Street. He asked the sidewalk width.

Mr. Driscoll pointed out adjacent buildings with no setbacks.

Mr. Williams said there was another drawing with better representation of curb line.

Mr. Driscoll said the sidewalk is 12'.

Mr. Williams said he would like to challenge the designer to better engage / integrate indoor-outdoor space with shop or café. He asked applicant how that could be addressed.

Mr. Driscoll said façade elements are flexible, retail or café space could be opened up with garage door element. He said as one walks down the sidewalk floors 5-8 will not be seen. He said a 10' setback makes no sense from a pedestrian experience.

Ms. Woo asked for clarification on what the board would vote on.

Ms. Frestedt responded the application includes demolition of existing building, uses, preliminary design including bulk, mass and scale, height, form and modulation and the two departures. She asked if board members had enough information to make a decision or if elements needed further refinement. She said the board could support one departure and request additional information for the other.

Mr. Fujimoto wanted clarification on set back.

Ms. Woo asked for more information on the triangle departure request and for an outline of community outreach and when it was done.

Mr. Driscoll said in support package they included community outreach information and said there were three community outreach efforts.

Ms. Woo asked if presentations included deviations.



Mr. Driscoll said concern was raised about commercial space being available to small tenants and that can be accommodated. He said community comments noted a preference for services being located further south and away from green street. He said positive comments were received about open space at corner for a gathering point or symbolic start to Little Saigon.

Ms. Woo asked about egress between this building and the temple building.

Mr. Driscoll said there is no alley; the property line runs down the center with part belonging to the temple and part belonging to this site.

Ms. Frestedt said this came up at the last briefing. She said a member of the community who was hopeful the space could be opened up and used, not knowing that an easement between two property owners dates back to the 1950s.

Mr. Williams said the departure request now is for 2'.

Mr. Driscoll concurred.

Ms. Woo asked why they requested a departure for the triangle.

Mr. Driscoll said yes, for visibility for pedestrians while exiting garage.

Mr. Yip said that in the last presentation in October 2019 the board discussed and said there was no problem.

Mr. Fujimoto said it would be regretful if someone pulled in and hit a pedestrian at the triangle. He said the applicant has shown reasonability of that departure and the efficiency they get in that space. He said he was reluctant to approve the other departure without further study. He said the existing building is non-contributing. He said the project will be a wonderful asset to the community. Regarding the massing he said to study the urban scale analysis first.

Mr. Driscoll said departures don't set precedent; every condition is different. He said setback won't be perceived from anywhere but from down the street. He said they explored massing and presented arrangement of massing and brick projecting elements to community. He said they have moved ahead with design of that concept.

Mr. Fujimoto said he recognized the level of development and community outreach to advocate for conditions to create a wonderful green street.

Ms. Woo asked why they chose eight stories and noted the Thai Binh and Acme site are both six stories.

Mr. Driscoll said the Land Use Code allows 75'.

Ms. Woo asked if there would be impacts to other buildings during construction.

Mr. Driscoll said no.

Mr. Ha said a geo tech study will be done and there will be no impact to other buildings. He said the two buildings mentioned it would have been more costly to go taller.

Ms. Frestedt noted that both Thai Binh and Beam were reviewed by ISRD. The LIHI project was done before Little Saigon was part of the district.

Mr. Ha said the departure request is not quite 2'. He said loved to see the corner at the green street be used as night market, street food or as a plaza for gathering. He said he wants the vision to become reality.

Mr. Williams asked if they are giving back more on the corner than Code requires them to do.

Mr. Ha said yes.

Ms. Woo supported demolition of existing building and noted it has no significance. She supported to proposed use as well.

Mr. Yip supported demolition of existing building and proposed use.

Ms. Woo said she wanted to see more sight lines in the future and how the sight lines refer to the church and other buildings.

Mr. Fujimoto said he wants more views of the massing. He said if it is so close to complying but just needs an adjustment, he wants to see the study.

Mr. Chan said he supports the design and proposed use. He supported demolition of existing building. He said he was troubled by departure #2 and said that going from 10' to 8' is different from going from 10' to 4'.

Mr. Fujimoto concurred and said it needs clarification and suggested conditioning the approval.

Ms. Frestedt said it is a reasonable condition to include.

Mr. Williams said he agreed with Mr. Chan that clarification is needed to keep it within the 2' departure and to ask for further development of that study just to show it. He said it is a great project and the design has been taken into consideration a plaza and setback to take visual pressure off the church to provide a warmer or less-encroaching feeling on that corner. He said it is a nice move.

Mr. Yip appreciated Mr. Williams' clarification on departure request. He said a 2' departure is acceptable. He said it would not be perceptible to the community.

Ms. Woo said it needs more study – measure twice and cut once. She questioned how the departure request could be 10' and now it is 2'. She said it is hard to trust this information

and she couldn't make a vote on Departure 2. She agreed it is an amazing project and a beautiful building. She said 2' is not much but she wants to know exactly what she is voting for.

Mr. Lekan said the 4' setback was a typo and all the technical drawings are reflective of the 2'.

Ms. Frestedt said it is an important of clarification and it is worthy to take time to find the sheets that correctly describe the condition.

Mr. Driscoll said every other drawing shows the 8'; one departure page wasn't updated.

Mr. Ha said he appreciated Ms. Woo's concern but reiterated it is a typo. He said everything else, in every other drawing it is correct. The jog on the corner is not shown. He said he wanted to make it clear that this will give more air space, not take more. He said he wants to address every board member's concern and he wants to make something friendly and very inviting for the community

Ms. Woo asked for clarification on the lot line.

Mr. Driscoll said lot line to façade is 10" including brick; lot line to 6<sup>th</sup> floor setback is 2" He said they are asking for 1' 10" reduction.

Mr. Chan said to present conditionally. He said they need a simple statement, actual departure and state correct drawing.

Ms. Frestedt said the board could take action on the application, as presented, and defer a recommendation on departures pending submittal of requested drawings. Departure request could be updated and that those be included with final set. Discussion ensued about the appropriate verbiage to address correction of typo with details that clarify the request.

Mr. Chan moved to recommend approval with condition that the typo be corrected to reduce setback from 10' to no less than 8' above 45' in podium and the updated doc is submitted to board for approval.

Ms. Frestedt clarified in the Staff Report she included studies about verticality at corner; she said she did not hear it come up in discussion today. She said if it is not relevant the board may want to amend the motion to eliminate that part.

Mr. Yip said he would second and to defer Departure 2 pending information. He asked if Staff could administratively approve typo correction.

Ms. Frestedt said as stated it can be addressed in Final Design as stated in motion.

Mr. Fujimoto asked if board members had comments on verticality at northwest corner.

Messrs. Chan and Yip and Ms. Woo said no. Mr. Williams said no and stated the setback is greater than Code prescribes.

Mr. Chan said to eliminate second sentence: "As part of the Final Design review process the applicant shall explore alternative detailing and design treatments that reduce the building's verticality at the northwest corner".

Mr. Yip said he concurred and seconded the motion.

Action: I move that the International Special Review District Board recommend approval of a Certificate of Approval for Demolition, Use and Preliminary Design at 1001-1005 S. King St.

The Board directs staff to prepare a written recommendation of approval, based on consideration of the application submittal and Board discussion at the June 22, 2021 virtual public meeting, and forward this written recommendation to the Department of Neighborhoods Director.

This recommendation includes support for two requested departures:

Departure #1 – SMC 23.54.030G Site Triangles

Request departure to allow structural column and portion of structure in the vertical spaces between 32 inches and 82 inches from the ground on one side of the garage entry ramp in order to shift garage ramp closer to the south property line.

As a condition of approval, the applicant will submit an application for a Certificate of Approval for Final Design details. The applicant had requested a second departure, but the Board did not have enough information about that request to make a recommendation and included a condition of approval that the applicant return with details about the proposed setback associated with Departure #2 request.

This application does not include: Exterior building materials, colors and finishes, exterior lighting, construction details, exterior mechanical equipment on the face or rooftop, right-of-way improvements, signs or a building sign plan.

This action is based on the **following applicable sections of the International Special Review District Ordinance:**

**SMC 23.66.030 - Certificates of approval - Application, review and appeals**

**SMC 23.66.032 – Contribute structures; determination of architectural or historic significance**

**SMC 23.66.050 – Departure from Land Use Code requirements**

**SMC 23.66.302 – International Special Review District goals and objectives**

**SMC 23.66.308 – International District preferred uses east of Interstate 5**

**SMC 23.66.318 - Demolition**

**SMC 23.66.320 - Permitted uses**

**SMC 23.66.332 – Height**

**SMC 23.66.336 – Exterior building finishes**

- A. **General Requirements.** To retain and enhance the visual order of the District, which is created by existing older buildings that provide unique character and form through their subtle detailing and quarter-block and half-block coverage, new development, including exterior remodeling, should respect the architectural and structural integrity of the building in which the work is undertaken, through sympathetic use of colors, material and style. Exterior building facades shall be of a scale compatible with surrounding structures. Window proportions, floor height, cornice line, street elevations and other elements of the building facades shall relate to the scale of the existing buildings in the immediate area.
- C. **Exterior building design outside of the Asian Design Character District.** Outside the Asian Design Character District, earthen colors and masonry construction with nonmetallic surfaces are preferred. Concrete construction will also be permitted if treated in a manner or incorporated into a design that provides visual interest and avoids large unbroken surface areas.

**SMC 23.66.342 – Parking and access**

**Secretary of the Interior Standards**

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

MM/SC/MC/AP            5:0:0    Motion carried with conditions.

Ms. Frestedt said she appreciated the discussion. She said the design packet should strongly respond to board feedback provided. She recommended at minimum applicant come before ARC prior to full board review. She said it is useful to the applicants. She said because of the volume of information presented it makes more sense for applicants to make sure project is headed in the right direction before going to full board. She said doing a complete application with a full set of construction drawings takes time and presenting things along the way makes for a stronger finish.

**062221.4            BOARD BUSINESS**

Ms. Frestedt thanked the board for their patience during the various Zoom tests and said it seems like things went well with interpreters.

Interpreter Tammy Dang said it went well, there were no problems.

Ms. Frestedt thanked everyone for their participation and said it means a lot to the community. She said there are many projects in various stages of planning. She said she will be testing with Chinese interpreters and is open to input for making improvements.

She said she had no update about ISRD election.

**Adjourn      7:30 pm**

Rebecca Frestedt, Board Coordinator  
206-684-0226  
rebecca.frestedt@seattle.gov