



The City of Seattle

Pike Place Market Historical Commission

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649 Seattle WA 98124-4649
Street Address: 700 5th Ave Suite 1700

MINUTES

MHC 81/09

Wednesday, March 25, 2009

4:30 p.m.

PDA Meeting Room, 85 Pike Street, Room 500

COMMISSIONERS

Karin Link

Joanne Herron

Spencer Howard

Sara Patton

Alex Rolluda

Sharron Shinbo

Allyn Stellmacher

Susan Zuege

STAFF

Heather McAuliffe

Melinda Bloom

ABSENT

Valerie Bystrom

4:30 p.m. Chair Sara Patton called the meeting to order.

032509.1 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE APPROVAL

032509.11 PDA – Street Use Requests

James Haydu

Street use/right-of-way approval.

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for street use/right-of-way approval for:

- Craft overflow tables March 26 – December 31, 2009
- Farm overflow tables March 26 – December 31, 2009
- Farm season pole banners June 1 – October 1, 2009
- Summer Sundays June 7 – September 27, 2009
- Holiday tree November 23, 2009 – January 4, 2010
- Christmas tree sales November 28 – December 25, 2009

The PDA will return for design approval of pole banners when the design is ready for review. Holiday tree will displace a disabled parking spot; the PDA will create a new disabled parking spot to replace it while the tree is displayed. Christmas tree sales: vending structures will be taken down each night. Exhibits reviewed included written information from the applicant; maps; and a list of events. Guidelines that applied to this application included 1.3, 2.3, 2.9 and 2.11.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 1.3, 2.3.2, 2.9, and 2.11.2 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Erin Struck, PDA, explained their desire for blanket approval for events.

Public Comment:

Paul Dunn, resident, thought the Commission should think carefully about giving a blanket approval because he thought the Commission was ceding the ability to provide oversight.

Commission Discussion:

In response to clarifying questions Ms. Struck said the Christmas tree sales would take place at the three parking spaces near the information booth. The handicapped parking space will be relocated to make room for the Christmas trees.

Ms. Shinbo appreciated Mr. Dunn's comments. She said that because she has seen the events before she felt comfortable approving this.

Ms. Herron made a motion to adopt a resolution approving the application as presented.

MM/SC/JH/KL

7:0:0 Motion carried.

032509.12

Seattle Parks Department – Victor Steinbrueck Park programming
Victoria Schoenburg

Approval for events to be held June 1-October 31, 2009:

Staff Report: Ms. McAuliffe explained the request for approval for events to be held June 1-October 31, 2009:

- Dance performances
- Theatrical performances

- Poetry readings
- Public workshops for story-writing or movement
- Musical performances
- Interactive installations

The events will be coordinated by a curator (to be hired by Parks Dept.). Views will not be blocked except for 3-4 hours for a performance, 8 hours maximum. No music after 6 p.m. Musical performances limited to 3 hours. Example of interactive installation per the applicant at 3/28 URC – an artist installed a salt sculpture in Pioneer Square that melted over time. Applicant said there might be something installed for a day or two, such as an exhibit of stories that invite the public to add stories. Exhibits reviewed included written information from the applicant and a park site plan. Guidelines that applied to this application included 2.11.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee determined that the application conformed to Guideline 2.11.5 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Victoria Schoenburg explained the Parks Department's intent to activate the park and said that they will enlist a curator to coordinate the activities and artists. They have not yet chosen a curator so don't have specifics on activities but expect things like puppets, dances. Activities would be planned during times when the park is not crowded, so no Saturdays are planned.

Public Comment:

Ms. Patton stated she would respond to a public comment received in a detailed letter following public comments.

John Mason, a resident who lives across the street from the park, stated he wrote the letter to which Ms. Patton referred. He said he was fine with most of what was proposed for the park but some are problematic and have an impact on the neighbors. He asked that no loud instruments or amplification be allowed. He expressed frustration with the process and felt that neighbors were excluded from participating in the process. He asked that the decision be postponed because only one side of the issue has been heard. He cited 1.5.3 which talks about Public Review Committee hearings. It would be a win-win if the guidelines set appropriate limits on allowed types of noise – there wouldn't be meetings about whether it would be appropriate or not and it would be more clear. He said he drafted such a guideline, and under the Administrative Procedure Act he was supposed to hear back (from the Commission) about it and has not. He was told the Commission is working on it. He would like a hearing on his proposal for a guideline revision and stated it would be fair if the decision on this application were postponed until after this happened. He didn't think that would cause

problems for Parks at this time. He compared the application to a design application where detailed drawings are required before a Certificate of Approval can be granted. In comparison, no details have been provided on this application. He said the guidelines state that one of Commission responsibilities is the protection of the neighbors. He said he was available if the Commission had questions.

Phil Frederick, neighbor, concurred with the previous speaker and reiterated the concern about amplified noise and some un-amplified music such as marimba, drumming etc. He said that most activities last summer were pretty good and a couple they endured but asked that the noise issue be recognized.

Dave Martin, owner of the Champion Building, said if they stay within the constraints and finish by 6:00 p.m. it isn't a big issue. He said the plans are good and the park needs activity, which will help promote the energy of the park.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Patton next responded to the comments received in a letter from Mr. Mason that said the Commission has an obligation to treat neighbors with consideration and to apply a moral compass to the question. She responded that it is important to say that each Commissioner has a moral compass and moral code as well, but those moral codes are not written down nor are they subject to public review the way the guidelines are. Commissioners must apply the guidelines as they find them. She said the letter cited SMC 24.010 and guideline 1.4 and she said they are very helpful in general but don't seem to settle the matter here. 1.4 gives the Commission discretion in the way it applies the guidelines but it is not unfettered discretion. There are written guidelines and the Commission is subject to the Administrative Procedures Ordinance.

Mr. Mason brought up several defects he was concerned about in the Certificate of Approval. The consent of abutting neighbors is required for street uses and public rights of way. Victor Steinbrueck Park is not a street, sidewalk or public right of way so consent of abutting neighbors is not needed.

Mr. Mason's concern with a sufficient specificity: the Guidelines and the Commission's charge is different from many historical districts in that it is charged with looking at design but also at use. When a design is brought forth, the Commission needs to see what it looks like and that level of specificity in order to apply the guidelines. Use applications are different and don't require that level of specificity; they have to conform to the Guidelines and in this case we are talking about the guidelines in which music is limited to three hours and that those hours be between 12:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. every day and amplification is allowed only with Parks Department variance. As long as the application conforms to those guidelines that is the level of specificity we need to see.

The issue of the variance – the Guidelines doesn't cite the requirements that the Commission not responsible for, it doesn't talk about the plumbing code or the sanitation code etc. that are enforced by somebody else. It mentions the variance that is in the Parks Department responsibility and jurisdiction. It doesn't give the MHC the authority to rule on variance so we have to depend on the Parks Department for that just as we depend on DPD to enforce other applications.

Regarding Mr. Mason's concern with denial of public participation – this meeting is open to the public, noticed publicly and conforms to the Ordinance. Written comment received beforehand, staff provides this comment to MHC members early; this can be slideshows, documents, all kinds of different media etc. plus the actual opportunity to speak at the meeting which Mr. Mason just did. The Commission does not always take its Committee's recommendations and say "yes." There is the opportunity to listen and to get the public input two ways, written or recorded comments and oral comments at the Commission meetings, and the Commission looks forward to input because it helps in the deliberations. She thanked the members of the public for their comment.

Ms. McAuliffe noted that Mr. Mason brought up another issue during his oral comment; he requested the Commission postpone review until public hearing on Guidelines amendment he was proposing. The Guideline Revisions Committee received the proposed revision and the requirement in the Code is that either the Commission or the Committee deny the request or else start working on it – they were already working on it so they were in compliance with the Code. They are still working on it. Part of the Guidelines Revision process is that public hearing has to be set but that is only part of it. Right now the Guidelines Revisions Committee is working on proposed new language. Before that can be seen out in public it has to go to the Law Department and they are not there yet for the Victor Steinbrueck Park guidelines that would be changed. Once that happens, at least a one month's notice goes out to everyone on the agenda list and also the Daily Journal of Commerce stating that there will be a public hearing and that feedback is accepted. There is a process that the Commission must follow.

Ms. Patton interjected that it is in process and when a draft was brought just to look at, it took some time for the Commission to come to consensus on what it wants to propose. We cannot adopt a new set of guidelines until we have public comment and there will be another opportunity. In previous revisions of the Guidelines we have changed from a proposed revision in the final rule to reflect public comment better.

The Guidelines Review committee meetings are not open to the public because they are at the behest of the Chair. URC meets every 1st and 3rd Wednesdays and the public is welcome to come. The Guidelines Revisions are not discussed there. Ms. McAuliffe will add Mr. Mason to the distribution list for URC.

Mr. Stellmacher asked if the curator will be bound to the application relative to performance time based on what is stated in the application.

Ms. Schoenburg replied they would be; they may use multiple curators. Per Guideline stated in the proposal. She hopes to have the details by May and activities will begin in June. They are not planned to be destination type events here. As a method of gaining feedback they did Survey Monkey last year and will do so again and hopefully break down feedback by park.

Ms. Zuege clarified that the Commission is not approving the variance for amplification.

Ms. Patton said no, the Commission does not have that jurisdiction.

Ms. Schoenburg explained by issuing the permit they are creating a variance to the rule that does not allow amplified sound. Each time they permit amplified sound, they are allowing it. She approves the permit and does not take public comment on it.

Ms. Patton asked for a motion and requested specific language from 2.11.5 be added.

Mr. Stellmacher made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as submitted with the addition of special language 2.11.5 under Victor Steinbrueck Park especially pointing out the start time for music at 12:00 noon and the three-hour time duration as well as the 6:00 p.m. completion of those activities

MM/SC/AS/KL

8:0:0 Motion carried.

032509.2 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF USE/DESIGN APPROVAL

032509.21 Charlotte's Web
Matt Holland, PDA
1501 Pike Place #319, Fairley Building

Use: Change of ownership structure to an S-corporation and relocation of business to 1501 Pike #321. No change in use is proposed. **Design:** Interior and exterior improvements to 1501 Pike Place #321 related to relocation.

Staff Report, Use: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for change of ownership structure to an S-corporation and relocation of business to 1501 Pike Place #321. No change in use is proposed. The space is Zone 1, below street level, Food a-e and Retail a-b uses permitted. Former use (Twilight Artist Collective): Retail d. New use: Retail d - Retail sale of antiques and collectibles. Application is for change in location only; no change in use for Charlotte's Web is proposed.

Space is 507 square feet. Proposed ownership structure: S-corporation. Applicant owns 100% of the corporation. She is onsite daily operating the business. She does not have an affiliation with another business. Business is relocating so that the Pike Market Childcare and retail areas on this floor form contiguous instead of mixed areas. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, use approval MHC 139/98, and State of WA Master Business Application. Guidelines that applied to this application were 2.10, 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 2.10, 2.1.4, 2.4, 2.5.4 d, 2.6, and 2.7.2 b & d. The Committee recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Sharon Turner, owner, had no comment.

Matt Holland, PDA, supported the application.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Stellmacher commended the applicant for helping the Market by her willingness to move.

Ms. Link made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as submitted.

MM/SC/KL/SZ

8:0:0 Motion carried.

Staff Report, Design: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for interior and exterior improvements to 1501 Pike Place #321. Exhibits reviewed included a site plan, floor plans, photos, sign drawing and paint color sample. The work to be reviewed included painting – exterior only; base and trim color; furnishings – existing furnishings are being relocated and signage – one sign over entry door. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1, 3.4 and 3.6.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited guidelines 3.1, 3.4.1 a & c; 3.4.3 a, b & e; 3.6.1, 3.6.2, and 3.6.3 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Sharon Turner, owner, had no comment.

Matt Holland, PDA, said it was straightforward.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

The Commissioners determined they had enough information to make a decision.

Mr. Stellmacher made a motion to adopt a resolution approving the application as submitted.

MM/SC/AS/SH

8:0:0 Motion carried

032509.22

PDA – Market renovation detour signage
John Turnbull

Use: Street use/right-of-way approval for installation of three fiberglass pigs to serve as way-finding signage from April 23, 2009 through March 2010. **Design:** Approval for design of two signs and four fiberglass pigs to be installed as way-finding signage from April 23, 2009 through March 2010.

Staff Report, Use: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for street use/right-of-way approval for installation of three fiberglass pigs to serve as way-finding signage from April 23, 2009 through March 2010. The locations will be on Western Avenue. Location “C” is not within the historic district therefore is not subject to the Commission’s review. Applicant has met with the city’s transportation department (SDOT) and had the clearance approved for each of the pigs. Exhibits reviewed included photos and drawings. Guidelines that applied to this application included 2.3 and 2.9.

URC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said the Committee cited guidelines 2.3.1 and 2.9 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Brittany Farrow, PDA, had no comment.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Herron said she thought it enhanced the entry into the Market.

Mr. Rolluda made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as submitted.

Staff Report, Design: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application: Approval for design of two signs and four fiberglass pigs to be installed as way-finding signage

from April 23, 2009 through March 2010. She reminded Commissioners that Location “C” turned out to be outside the district’s boundaries therefore it would not be reviewed. Exhibits reviewed include photos and drawings. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.6 and 3.8.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.7, 3.8.1 and 3.8.8 and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Brittany Farrow, PDA, had no comment.

Public Comment:

Paul Dunn said the signage will be needed.

Commission Discussion:

Ms. Shinbo said it was a creative solution for wayfinding.

Ms. McAuliffe stated that since it is temporary and a designated length of time it is enforceable.

Ms. Zuege made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/SZ/KL

8:0:0 Motion carried.

032509.3 APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF DESIGN APPROVAL

032509.31 MarketSpice
Nancy Dewitt
85A Pike Street

Changes to floor, shelving and existing wall partitions.

Staff Report, Design: Ms. McAuliffe explained the application for changes to floor, shelving and existing wall partitions. Exhibits reviewed included floor plans and photos. Partition wall will increase in height from 6’ to 8’. The ceiling is 14’. Guidelines that applied to this application included 3.1 and 3.4.

DRC Report: Ms. McAuliffe said that the Committee cited guidelines 3.1 and 3.4.1 a, 3.4.2 a & c, 3.4.3 a, b & e and recommended approval.

Applicant Comment:

Nancy DeWitt, owner, said the new shelving will be like bookcases attached to the stronger part of the framing of wall. Brackets will be upgraded and the bookcases will be attached properly; height will remain the same. Window area will remain open.

Landlord Comments:

Brittany Farrow, PDA, spoke in support of the application.

Commission Questions:

Ms. Link stated the drawing was clear.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Commission Discussion;

Ms. Link stated the changes met the guidelines and including transparency.

Mr. Stellmacher made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the application as presented.

MM/SC/AS/KL 8:0:0 Motion carried.

032509.4 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

February 25, 2009

MM/SC/SH/AR 8:0:0 Minutes approved.

March 11, 2009

Ms. Herron made a motion to adopt a resolution to approve the minutes as submitted.

MM/SC/JH/KL 8:0:0 Minutes approved.

032509.5 REPORT OF THE CHAIR

032509.6 REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

032509.7 STAFF REPORT

032509.8 NEW BUSINESS

032509.81 Homeless Place of Remembrance

Clark Wiegman, Kim Lokan, Karen Kiest,
Briefing on revised conceptual design for a Homeless Place of Remembrance in Victor Steinbrueck Park.

Carol Cameron introduced the designers and members of the Homeless Place of Remembrance who were in attendance.

Ms. Patton recognized Richard Haag, designer of Victor Steinbrueck Park who was in attendance.

Applicants provided renderings as well as an original drawing of the park.

Kim Lokan showed the first design presented in October. She said that based on Commission comments they have scaled back their proposal. She went over the changes they had made since they last briefed the Commission. She said it would be a place for hope and healing and that like the Market it was a place for community. She said it has the feeling of home, is safe and peaceful, has an education aspect to it, and is representational of the circle of life. She cited Guidelines 3.1.1, 3.8.3 and 3.8.7, which related to concerns previously stated by the Commission about change, views and new elements in the park. She said they worked to protect the views by relocation of the vertical element. Because of the discouragement of memorials in the park, they now are focused on the healing and hope aspect. The memorial aspect will be in a right of way.

Karen Kiest went over the original design plan of the park. She went over the changes they had made to their proposed design and said they had moved the sheltering element to the Council Ring in another area of the park. They propose to put in seating for gatherings in the southwest corner. They plan to bring back low vegetation to frame the space but they have not spec'd plants yet. They propose to leave existing structural elements intact.

Ms. Patton called on designer of the Park, Richard Haag, for comments.

Mr. Haag read from a letter he prepared (full letter on file). While he was supportive of a place of remembrance for the homeless at an appropriate site he said "the proposal to infuse a "homeless place of remembrance" onto the Victor Steinbrueck Park is disrespectful of both the host and the would-be guest". The park was named for Steinbrueck as a tribute to the man who "saved Pike Place Farmer's Market from the wrecking ball".

Commission Discussion:

Commissioners asked about the scope area of the project and the elements to be placed in the public right of way.

Ms. Kiest said the scope includes sites outside of the Park and that they are working on where a memorial element can be located in the public right of way. She said Victor Steinbrueck Park was recognized as a significant place in the homeless community and that people can come and recognize themselves in the

place. She said the site was supported by Parks as the place to locate this place of remembrance. She said the actual plan had been presented to Parks already who didn't want to give approval until they decided how it would fit in with other plans for the park.

Mr. Stellmacher asked if other locations outside of Victor Steinbrueck Park had been looked at.

Ms. Cameron said the process started a long time ago when ten sites were selected. The homeless community chose Victor Steinbrueck Park.

Ms. Lokan explained the concept of "scatterings" being placed in sidewalks at various sites downtown.

Ms. Kiest said that Parks provided comments about plantings as they relate to security and said they haven't approved the final plant palette yet. Responding to a question about material on the vertical element she said the material will likely be metal. It is proposed to be 12' tall x 6'8" wide.

Ms. Link expressed concern that because of the height and the way it splays out it blocks views.

Mr. Stellmacher said the application would have to be viewed in relation to the guidelines and asked how the applicants would interpret 3.8.3 relative to what they are proposing.

Ms. Lokan said they are looking at other sites because they can't focus on the memorial here since it is not allowed in the park or in the District. A big aspect of the reason the Homeless Place of Remembrance committee exists is they wanted a place where they could feel comfortable gathering and be recognized. This is a place to where anybody can gather and be recognized as something created by the homeless.

Mr. Stellmacher clarified that it was a place of remembrance and asked how that was different from a memorial.

Ms. Lokan said the memorial part would be in the right of way in "scatterings".

Mr. Stellmacher said it sounds like the committee is not considering other locations for this at this point.

Ms. Kiest said this place gives the opportunity to celebrate life.

Mr. Stellmacher stated that this Commission deals with people with strongly held beliefs and visions that they want to bring form to. He expressed concern that

when the door is cracked open others will want to come in as well. The Commission has to think about these issues.

Ms. Kiest said that Susanne Friedman spoke for the Parks Department in October and said the use has been approved within the site and the question the Commission is being asked to grapple with is the form and how it fits within the guidelines.

Ms. Patton said that Parks has no authority to approve use under the Market Historical Commission guidelines; the Market Historical Commission approves Use and Design under its guidelines. The Parks Department has its own set of jurisdiction over this park and it is an overlapping situation.

Ms. Kiest said Parks has approved the use within the site which is different.

Ms. Patton explained the overlapping jurisdictional situation and Use and Design have to be approved by the Historic Commission.

Ms. McAuliffe clarified the Commission would not review use for this proposal, only design. If the Parks Department has already given approval to have it there it doesn't mean anything unless the Commission approves it. The Commission has final approval on this and if they do not approve it, it does not matter if Parks Department said it was okay.

Ms. Kiest replied they understood that.

Ms. Stellmacher strongly suggested looking at alternatives because it would be difficult for him to approve this.

Ms. Patton advised that Victor Steinbrueck Park guidelines are in the Use section of the guidelines.

Ms. Herron agreed with Mr. Stellmacher and said she would have a hard time approving this under the guidelines.

Mr. Howard cited 3.8.3, said recognition and not just memorial is listed and also cited 3.9. At the park the Commission looks at the landscape as having had a historic use. Memorial recognition is adding in a new use into the space and programming new use into historic use which will impact the physical character of the site and the significance of the site in terms of how it is used and recognized and perceived. Those are going to be points under 3.9.2 that the Commission would be giving close attention to in terms of how what is being proposed impacts the historic use and the physical components of that.

Ms. Lokan said they picked an underused site that was not being used as designed and this will improve the use of the park. The Council Ring is not used by

children and is not a desirable place for kids; the south end has a great view but the it is difficult for the public to go there comfortably. There is usually a dumpster there and people urinate there. They are hoping to improve the use and encourage the public to go to those spaces. She asked if either of those sites feel more “memorial” than the other.

Ms. Link said the north site looks better because it is away from the viewpoint and cited 3.8.7, which talks about protection of views. She said the present design still conflicted with the guideline because of its height, and suggested that something low to the ground and less intrusive would be better.

Ms. Zuege said it is still a change to the park per the Guidelines. It is a good concept to be somewhere in the City but there is trouble with it fitting at this park. It isn't one specific piece or another, it is the change itself.

Ms. Kiest said they are working within the context that the park is not as old as the Market but fits in the Guidelines. The park is an extension of the Market and they want to work within that framework. It is a change but it will be a non-structural change given that there will be review in the future about replenishments in the park that they don't want to interrupt Parks Dept. planning process.

Ms. Lokan cited 3.1 which addresses changing activities. She said the play area is no longer there and over time places evolve; this will improve that space.

Ms. Zuege said the applicants are identifying two constituent groups for this: a place for homeless people to gather and that also the applicants are saying the area is underutilized and you want people to use it. She asked who is targeted.

Ms. Lokan said they are not targeting the homeless – it is for the public. It needs to be inviting for all walks of life.

Ms. Zuege noted that homeless are there now and asked how they are incorporated and who would use the different benches and picnic tables.

Ms. Lokan said they would be improving the seating for them.

Ms. Kiest said the original design provided seating for everyone and they have not changed that that especially in the southwest corner. The Council Ring will provide seating opportunities for everyone.

Mr. Howard said he was hesitant to subdivide the park into various components as there has not been a prioritization of those components and urged all to observe it as one cohesive intact design element. He expressed concern about “scope creep” and said that the recognition program and Parks programming that came through with the levy is looking to address usage issues. This project has assumed that

role as well (addressing usage) and recognition is being loaded in with that; it would be easier if there is clarity between those different parts.

Ms. Kiest said they are trying to be clear that are not trying to scope creep.

Public Comment:

Matthew Steinbrueck, a Market business owner and son of Victor Steinbrueck, said he had mixed feelings; he said his father cared about the homeless and the man on the street. He supported Richard Haag's comments and said with money, time and effort it should be something with a bigger impact and that would help the homeless elsewhere. He thought this was tokenism for the homeless and thought the money should be used in a more constructive, less ornamental way. The Market celebrates life already.

Paul Dunn wondered if Parks said "okay" knowing the Commission would say "no" thus letting them off the hook.

Sally Kinney, a member of the Homeless Place of Remembrance Committee, said the religious community is the main provider of services and housing for the homeless. She said they are very involved and have talked with the homeless. The community feeling is it would be a place to honor and respect the people who have died. The homeless are a family unto themselves. When homeless die – there is not ceremony – just a group burial of ashes. There needs to be a place for a memorial.

Cassie Phillips said there is not a lot of seating in Victor Steinbrueck Park. The Park needs refreshment that would make people feel like gathering there.

Carol Cameron, a member of the Homeless Place of Remembrance Committee, stated that Victor Steinbrueck Park is the place because the homeless chose it. It is a place to go and remember for homeless people. She said she met with Marjorie Steinbrueck who told her Mr. Steinbrueck believe the park was unfinished. Ms. Cameron said to her this means there is room there.

Dave Martin, owner of the Champion Building, said he knew Victor Steinbrueck whose effort to save the Market was huge. This park is a tribute to him and not to anyone else. He was not supportive of the homeless memorial in this park. He said that parks just got 1.6 million dollars (from the levy) and it is an opportunity to think about what is going on in the park. The Commission obligation is to the park; any other memorial is superfluous of how we deal with the park. He expressed concern about the flood gates being opened to other groups if this is approved. Victor Steinbrueck Park was not created for a memorial – it is part of the Market.

Jan Gleason, a member of the Homeless Place of Remembrance Committee, said the greatest tribute was to acknowledge his design of the park as a place for all people. She said it will be a place of hope and healing and will be financed independently.

Heather McAuliffe, Commission Coordinator