



Little Saigon Landmark Project Feasibility Study

October 2014

Completed for the Friends of Little Saigon

by SCIDpda

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1
Introduction and Overview 2
Space Program 6
Site Selection..... 14
Massing Studies and Cost Estimates 15
Market/Economic Analysis 16
Conclusion..... 17

- Appendix A—Space Program
- Appendix B—Site Selection
- Appendix C—Massing Studies and Cost Estimates
- Appendix D—Market/Economic Analysis
- Appendix E—Vietnamese Cultural Center Feasibility Study
- Appendix F—Little Saigon Housing Needs Assessment

Executive Summary

The Friends of Little Saigon (FLS) group seeks to create a gathering place for the regional Vietnamese community in or adjacent to the Little Saigon business district. This can be accomplished by bringing together the district's cultural, shopping, and culinary aspects in a distinctive physical anchor—the Landmark Project—located in the heart of Little Saigon.

The mixed-use Landmark Project will consist of a cultural center, Southeast Asian grocery, Emerald Night Market, and restaurant as its main components. Affordable housing and parking will also be included to accommodate the region's growing Vietnamese population.

Each component of the development will reflect Vietnamese Americans' rich culture, history, and future.

- The cultural center will include exhibits of historical artifacts that represent the community's past and a hall for traditional and contemporary performances.
- The night market will contain specialty boutiques that serve as incubators for small vendors and emerging entrepreneurs—all in a unique architectural environment of permanently built small shops and portable kiosks.
- The Asian supermarket will stock affordable items to meet daily needs, as well as hard-to-find products, in a space comparably sized to mainstream supermarkets.
- The Southeast Asian restaurant and banquet hall will accommodate the needs of Asian weddings, celebrations, community fundraising, and other special events.
- The housing units will add an affordable option for families or working professionals to the scant housing supply in the area.

The co-location of the four main project components will not only attract a variety of customers on a daily or weekly basis and for special occasions; they will allow the development's space to be used efficiently. The cultural center will be adjacent to the restaurant/banquet hall so that both can access a performance hall on an as-needed basis. The night market space will be able to expand into the supermarket space for special events, or to be temporarily converted to public gathering space. In the long run, this co-location allows flexibility with regard to permanent expansion of one or more components.

The project will also include 4-5 floors of residential units for families or workforce households. Until 2008, Little Saigon was not zoned for multifamily housing; thus, very little housing exists in the area. There appears to be sufficient demand to accommodate a new 75- to 100-unit housing development in Little Saigon in the next 3-5 years.

This feasibility study has determined that the Landmark Project is financially sustainable given the following conditions: 1) a robust capital campaign for the Cultural Center, 2) creative funding mechanisms, 3) a compatible housing clientele, 4) knowledgeable component operators, and 5) broad community support.

Introduction and Overview

The Little Saigon area comprises the eastern half of the Chinatown International District, east of I-5. Beginning in the 1980s, a concentration of Vietnamese businesses established themselves around the intersection of S Jackson Street and 12th Avenue S; today Little Saigon is a regional hub of Vietnamese culture, economy, and community. As a destination for shopping, eating, and socializing, the area serves over 40,000 Vietnamese Americans from across the Puget Sound region. Little Saigon has historically held a mix of uses. Today, it contains low-rise commercial development populated by more than 100 small family-run businesses, some light industry, and scattered multifamily and single-family housing.

Major changes are in store for Little Saigon. The Livable South Downtown plan rezoned the area for much higher, denser mixed-use development. The First Hill Streetcar, slated for completion in early 2015, will make the area more attractive for transit-oriented development. And the Seattle Housing Authority is planning to completely redevelop the 30-acre Yesler Terrace site on Little Saigon's northern border.

Though these changes are not in themselves negative, many local businesses fear displacement due to development pressure and rising rents, and the broader Vietnamese community has recognized threats on several fronts to the Little Saigon area. As a result of these pressures—both real and anticipated—the Friends of Little Saigon (FLS) was formed in early 2011 to promote, plan, and advocate for the neighborhood. FLS is a grassroots community development organization with an active board.

On September 4, 2012, Seattle City Council approved Resolution 31403 following a major advocacy effort by FLS and local and regional partners. This resolution authorized the City of Seattle Office of Housing (OH), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), Office of Economic Development (OED), and Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) to work with FLS and other community members in Little Saigon to explore the feasibility of developing a “Landmark Project”: a mixed-use development that may include low-income housing, affordable commercial space, and a Vietnamese cultural center, with the goal of establishing a major cultural anchor and stabilizing presence in the area.

The Friends of Little Saigon selected the Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda) to assist it with this Landmark Project Feasibility Study. SCIDpda managed the feasibility study, performed the space program development and site selection, coordinated the massing studies work with GGLO as lead consultant, coordinated the construction cost analysis with Marpac LLC as lead cost estimator, and coordinated the economic analysis tasks with Heartland LLC as the lead economic consultant.

Massing Studies and Cost Estimates

The next step in the feasibility study was to perform a three-dimensional massing study to fit the space program at each of the three finalist sites and evaluate ingress/egress/staging requirements, ability to meet the zoning conditions, and use restrictions. GGLO, the architectural consultant, arrayed the space program of the four main project components onto floor plans within a two-story structure. Underground parking was then incorporated and 4+ floors of housing were stacked above the main components. GGLO also provided graphic information on vehicular and pedestrian ingress/egress and ensured that each massing study complied with the zoning conditions governing that specific site.



Figure 2. Massing studies for three finalist sites

The massing study results were submitted to Marpac LLC to perform construction cost estimates. Using its extensive cost base from comparable projects, the estimated construction cost on all three sites ranged from \$39.4 to \$40.9 million.

The final step in this portion of the study was for the Friends of Little Saigon Board to evaluate the comparative quantitative and qualitative result to make a final site selection. The board selected Site #3 because it had the best pedestrian and vehicular access, was rated highest for being near adjacent off-street parking, rated equal with the other sites for component functionality and rated the highest as a visible landmark in Little Saigon.

Refer to the Massing Studies and Cost Estimates chapter for more details.

Market/Economic Analysis

The initial economic analysis results performed by Heartland LLC showed that the required rental rates for all of the Landmark Project components were higher than the perceived affordable rental rates. Thus the first task in this step was to reduce the construction cost where possible. Using a value engineering approach, the total construction cost estimate

was reduced from \$40 million to \$33 million. Heartland then took these revised construction costs, revised the capital cost and created a new required rental rate analysis.

Concurrent to this work, for each of the Landmark Project components—Emerald Night Market, Southeast Asian supermarket, Southeast Asian restaurant, and Vietnamese Cultural Center—a preliminary demand analysis was performed via in-depth discussions with potential operators, and an operational analysis was performed examining the financial sustainability for a stabilized operational year. The major contributor to operational cost was staffing for each component. Where necessary, the space programs for each project component were further adjusted to maximize the sharing of spaces and reducing the operational costs. The bottom line result of this analysis was that each project component will be able to support the required capital costs for the development.

Overall Project Feasibility Findings

Based on the results of the study process described above and in the following Appendices, it was concluded that the Landmark Project will be feasible with a robust capital fundraising campaign, creative funding mechanisms to finance the first costs, a compatible housing clientele that will occupy the upper floor of the project, knowledgeable and capable component operators, and, most importantly, with broad-based community support.

Next Steps

This feasibility study is just the first, but very important step in bringing the Little Saigon Landmark Project to fruition. Using a sports analogy, if this is a 26-mile marathon race, we are now at the 4- or 5-mile mark!

The immediate next steps are to continue garnering wide-range community support for the Landmark Project concept, then proceed to the pre-design planning phase where each of the findings and assumptions of this feasibility study will be tested in the marketplace in real time. This could take 12 to 18 months after securing funding for the process.

The ultimate goal is to secure financing and construct the Landmark Project. Expected timing for project completion is between 2018 and 2020, depending on when funds are secured.

Space Program

The components in the Landmark Project evolved through a national research analysis, intercept surveys with community members, and focus group discussions. A special effort was made to include Vietnamese community members from around the Puget Sound region, not just Little Saigon, as one of the driving goals of the Landmark Project is to provide a gathering place for the entire community.

Research and visits to local cultural and community centers, including interviews with staff, informed the space program for the Cultural Center. The space programs for the Asian supermarket, Night Market, and restaurant were developed based on in-depth discussions with potential operators. The housing space program was guided by SCIDpda's experience in affordable housing projects and the Little Saigon Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix F).

Ideally, all four major components will fit on a single floor with housing above. If that is not possible, the Cultural Center and restaurant should occupy one floor and the Night Market and Asian supermarket another floor.

Additional details on the space program are available in Appendix A, Exhibits A1-A2.

Cultural Center

The Landmark Project embodies the Vietnamese community's vision to create a gathering place, and the Cultural Center represents the centerpiece of this vision. As such, this centerpiece must include the entire Vietnamese community in the Puget Sound area.

Major space needs

a) Lobby

The lobby will serve as the entry point into the Cultural Center. It will include space for a reception desk, art displays, and informational brochures; it will also serve as a gathering area. An area of 1,500 square feet is programmed.

b) Performance hall

The Cultural Center will contain a large hall for festivals, events, and performances, with a theater-style seating capacity of 700 to 800 people. High ceilings will ensure that all seats have views of a raised stage on one end. Ideally, a room divider will be included to accommodate two concurrent uses. The hall will also serve as a banquet hall for the restaurant on a rental basis, so must seat 450 to 500 people in a dining configuration.

c) Meeting rooms

The Cultural Center will also include a variety of flexible meeting rooms. Four meeting rooms will each accommodate 30 people. Each room will have a divider so that there can

be eight meeting rooms holding 12 people each; alternatively, the rooms may be adjusted incrementally to accommodate larger group meetings. The rooms will be acoustically soundproof.

d) Coworking space

Coworking office space will offer short-term lease/rental options for freelancers, entrepreneurs, and professionals who work remotely. The Cultural Center will contain 600 square feet to accommodate six to eight work stations.

e) Kitchen

A catering kitchen will provide space for outside caterers to prepare food for events at the Cultural Center, including those in the performance hall, meeting rooms, and coworking space. The kitchen is programmed to be 1,000 square feet.

f) Childcare center

A childcare center will occupy 3,500 square feet plus some outdoor terrace space. The center will be operated by a separate entity.

g) Office space

The Cultural Center will include three private offices for a general manager, scheduler, and one other staff member. It will also include one shared office space, one break room for staff, and a server room.

h) Storage

Separate secure storage areas for the restaurant, Night Market, Cultural Center, and Asian market are preferred. Non-important supply storage may be shared, but separated for security. The storage area for the Cultural Center will hold chairs, tables, equipment, and other Cultural Center supplies.

i) Dressing rooms

Two dressing rooms for entertainers who perform at the Cultural Center and restaurant will be included in the layout. These spaces are programmed at 250 square feet and include showers.

j) Outdoor terrace

The Cultural Center will include an outdoor patio area or terrace and an outdoor area of 400 square feet for the Childcare Center. In total, this space is programmed at 2,000 square feet.

k) Restrooms (shared with restaurant)

Two large restrooms (men and women) will be shared between the Cultural Center and the restaurant, with separate entrances from each component. Together, the restrooms will have the capacity to handle 500 guests.

l) Parking

Minimum desired parking is 300 spaces, with free parking for first two hours and paid parking after that. Parking as programmed is per City code for each potential site.

Design requirements

The Cultural Center design will have very professional and clean aesthetics, with an attractive welcoming lobby with visual displays. The outdoor terrace space will be adjacent to the lobby.

Synergy with other components

The Cultural Center will draw visitors from across the Seattle region to watch performances and attend special events, as well as local visitors who stop by daily to use the coworking and childcare services. Regional visitors are highly likely to make the Landmark Project a destination stop, visiting the Night Market and eating in the restaurant before or after performances. Local visitors are likely to stop by the Asian supermarket to pick up regular or specialty goods, and to run into the Night Market for a quick bite to eat or to buy small gifts. Visitors to all other components may stop by the Cultural Center to see displays or performances.

Emerald Night Market

Fifty to sixty vendors will make the Night Market vibrant, interesting, and profitable. Roughly half of these will be food vendors. A strong management team will be essential to support vendor needs.

Major space needs

a) Vendor kiosks

The Night Market will lease the vendor kiosks and small/large booths with short- and long-term leases, with longer leases offering a better value. Each vendor space will be priced based on square footage and visibility, with larger, more visible spaces paying higher rents. The kiosks will remain in place when not used, with casings or covers that are attractively designed as “art” objects.

b) Public seating areas

The Night Market will include 8 to 10 small public seating areas. Each area will seat 2 to 10 guests, with a total of roughly 40 seats available. These areas will be managed by the Night Market management team. In addition, each of the vendors will have “portable” seating spaces that they will manage. Small food vendor booths will have 2 or 3 seats, while large food vendor booths will have up to 5 seats. A 400-sf outdoor terrace will serve as a visitor gathering place and help create the desired ambience for the Night Market.

c) Bar/lounge

A bar/lounge in the Emerald Night Market will provide an affordable, low-key environment for adult visitors to make deals and decisions, hold small celebrations, and gather with friends. The bar will include 30 seats with a standing capacity of 50 guests. This capacity includes an indoor covered patio that will have a different ambience than the Night Market environment. The bar will have its own small kitchen and its own dry storage space.

d) Pharmacy/drop-in clinic

The drop-in clinic will be operated by 3 to 4 medical professions. It will include an administrative office and storage space, as well as a 2,000-squarefoot full-service pharmacy with a clean room, an IV & compounding room, storage, and an administrative office.

e) Restrooms (shared with market)

Two large restrooms (men and women) will be shared between the Night Market and the Asian market. Together, the restrooms will have the capacity to handle 500 guests.

f) Commercial kitchen

The commercial kitchen will be large enough to support 25 to 30 tenants that may require cooking space—roughly 3,000 square feet. A kitchen manager will be in charge of scheduling kitchen use. The kitchen will include dry storage space. The refrigerator, freezer, and dry storage equipment will have separate lockable containers for each food vendor.

g) Office space

The Night Market will include two private offices for a manager and kitchen manager, a shared office for security/maintenance personnel, and a break room with staff lockers.

h) Storage

Separate secure storage areas for the Cultural Center, Night Market, Asian market, and restaurant are strongly preferred. Ideally, the design will allow all consumable products to be refrigerated when deliveries arrive, with no need to carry goods to different spots.

i) Dressing rooms

Two changing rooms for entertainers who perform at the night market will be included in the layout.

j) HVAC, plumbing, and electrical systems

A heavy-duty HVAC system will minimize the transmission of odors throughout the Night Market. Hoods will be included in selected booths that will be charged higher rent. A strong plumbing system is important, especially in the kitchen. Each booth will have its own electrical meter, while a central meter will track electrical usage of all kiosks. Three to five larger food vendors will have booths that include a small refrigerator/freezer, a wok with hood, and a sink.

k) Additional uses

Additional uses for the Night Market are special events and festivals

Design requirements

It is preferable to have the entire Night Market located on one floor. It will include an atrium entrance so that arrivers can see the entire area and all its activities and an introduction to interesting kiosks and booths with user-friendly wayfinding signage. The main pathway will branch into many smaller pathways, each with its own street name and food service or non-food service vendors along each pathway. Some pathways will take guests to the Cultural Center and other commercial spaces.

The Night Market will be partly covered and partly open to the outdoors. Most of the covered portion will be decorated like the night sky with stars, fake trees (7'-10' tall) with large branches overhanging some shops and seating areas, string lights and Asian lanterns, and an illuminated moon that waxes and wanes according to the forecast of the day.

The Emerald Night Market bar will have a basic layout that is visually open to all night market visitors. The aesthetics of the space will be down-to-earth and easygoing.

Synergy with other components

The Emerald Night Market will complement the other commercial spaces and give Cultural Center patrons a place to spend time and money. Assuming the Night Market and supermarket are on the same floor and the restaurant and Cultural Center are on a separate floor, one large public restroom area on each floor will work.

Asian Supermarket

The Asian supermarket will occupy 20,000 square feet, including 5,000 square feet of storage space.

Major space needs

a) Kitchen

The supermarket will include a 1,000-square foot kitchen capable of preparing takeout food items.

b) Refrigeration

In the customer shopping area, the supermarket will have well-planned freezer sections and refrigeration sections that are easily accessible to the walk-in freezers and walk-in refrigerator. The back working area will include a large walk-in freezer and refrigerator, as well as a smaller walk-in freezer and refrigerator.

c) Storage

As discussed in the Night Market section, separate secure storage areas for the Cultural Center, Night Market, Asian market, and restaurant are strongly preferred. At least 5,000

square feet for staging and storage are required to support the supermarket; this space should be able to expand if needed.

d) Office space

The supermarket will include a private office for the owner; a large office space for the purchaser, accountant, and general manager; and a break room for staff that includes staff lockers.

e) Restrooms (shared with Night Market)

As discussed in the Night Market section, two large restrooms (men and women) will be shared between the Night Market and the Asian market. Together, the restrooms will have the capacity to handle 500 guests.

Design requirements

The supermarket layout will be extremely efficient and easily accessed by seniors, children, and others with limited mobility. It will employ smart, sustainable design to minimize waste. The ambience will be fun, helpful, bright, and lively.

Synergy with other components

The supermarket will compete with other Asian supermarkets for products and services. Anticipated to be one of the best Vietnamese supermarkets in the area, it will draw customers who may also patronize other components of the Landmark Project. It will also offer a convenient resource for people coming to other events or components of the Landmark Project who need to pick up a quick ingredient or two.

Southeast Asian Restaurant

The Southeast Asian restaurant will include two components: a restaurant and a banquet room/performance hall that is rented from the Cultural Center as needed.

Major space needs

a) Main dining room

The restaurant's main dining room will hold 150-200 seated guests.

b) Banquet room/performance hall (shared with Cultural Center)

The banquet room will be a separate space with a capacity of an additional 450 to 500 guests, seated at fifty 10-place tables. As discussed in the Cultural Center section, the room will include a simple, visible stage for speeches and simple performances. The stage will have the capacity to be expanded and will include a high-quality sound system.

c) Bar/Lounge

A bar/lounge in the restaurant will offer a place for happy hours, waiting, and small group functions. The bar's capacity is anticipated to be 50 people seated or 70 people standing. It will include a small kitchen for making bar foods and its own separate dry storage space.

d) Restaurant kitchen

The banquet restaurant will include a fully operational kitchen with two wok stations, two open-flame grill stations, two 10-range top stations, two walk-in refrigerators, one large walk-in freezer, and four sandwich refrigerators at waist height. This space is programmed at 2,000 square feet, including the dry storage space.

e) Office space

The restaurant will include private offices for the kitchen manager and the general manager.

f) Storage

Separate secure storage areas for the Cultural Center, Night Market, Asian market, and restaurant are strongly preferred. Ideally, the design will allow all consumable products to be refrigerated when deliveries arrive, with no need to carry goods to different spots. The restaurant storage area will also include staff lockers.

g) Restrooms (shared with Cultural Center)

Two large restrooms (men and women) will be shared between the restaurant and the Cultural Center, with separate entrances from each component. Together, the restrooms will have the capacity to handle 500 guests.

Design requirements

It is a priority to make the restaurant design green, sustainable, and extremely functional, with low operational costs. The design will consider efficiency and sustainability with regard to the garbage program, water usage, utility usage, and mechanical design, among others.

In terms of layout, the banquet room is the Cultural Center's performance hall. Therefore, it must have easy access to and from the Cultural Center, Asian supermarket, and Emerald Night Market while still feeling private. Its design will have an elegant feel.

The bar/lounge will have a classy modern design with clear Asian influences. It will feature an efficient layout with separate small kitchen.

Synergy with other components

The restaurant will fit with the other main components of the Landmark Project in several ways. It will:

1. Be a place to showcase Vietnamese cuisine, from street foods to formal wedding dishes. In this way, it will promote an essential piece of the Vietnamese culture to wider audiences.
2. Serve foods that one doesn't see in the Night Market or Asian supermarket—and will demonstrate how to cook ingredients that are available in the supermarket.
3. Provide a full-service restaurant, including on- and off-site catering. This will attract customers who may patronize other components of the Landmark Project and serve people who come to the Landmark Project for other reasons.

4. Pay rent to the Cultural Center when using its space, adding to the financial sustainability of this critical component.

Housing

All floors with housing units will be stacked on top of the main components. A ground-floor lobby with a separate secure entrance will provide access to the garage and each housing floor via two elevators. Two potential clienteles were identified to occupy the housing units above the Landmark Project: family and workforce households.

Two scenarios for each clientele were developed. See Exhibit A2 for details.

Site Selection

Selection of potential sites for the Little Saigon Landmark Project focused on the following factors: minimum site size to accommodate project needs; ingress, egress, and staging requirements; visibility and exposure to visitors; zoning conditions; and use restrictions. Twelve sites were selected and ranked according to the above factors. (See Exhibit B1.)



Figure 3. Potential sites for Landmark Project

Two sites (#6 and #7) were eliminated due to displacement of numerous small businesses. Two sites (#9 and #10) were eliminated because these sites had multiple ownerships. One site (#4) was eliminated because owner was entertaining a purchase offer during the site selection process. Site #2 would only be considered if Site #1 was unavailable. Site #11 was eliminated as it was deemed too close to I-5 for accommodating housing on the upper floors.

Site #1, #3, and #12 were determined to be the finalist sites for detailed study. (See Exhibit B2.) All three sites were able to accommodate the project needs, provided good visibility and exposure to visitors, and were located in or near the heart of Little Saigon.

Massing Studies and Cost Estimates

Using the three finalist sites and space program described earlier, a three-dimensional massing study was performed by GGLO to fit the program on each of the sites. These massing studies are in Appendix C.

- Exhibits C1 through C8 depict the massing study results on Sites #1 and #2. Due to the site topography, the underground parking occupies 2 floors. The Asian supermarket and Emerald Night Market are co-located on the first floor, while the cultural center and restaurant are co-located on the second floor.
- Exhibits C9 through C15 depict the massing study results on Site #12. Due to the large site, all four of the major component uses could fit on one level. There is one floor of underground parking.
- Exhibits C16 through 22 depict the massing study results on Site #3. The Asian supermarket and Emerald Night Market are collocated on the first floor, while the cultural center and restaurant are collocated on the second floor. There is one floor of underground parking.
- A summary comparison chart of the of the massing study results for all three sites is shown in Exhibit C23.

Using the massing study results, Marpac LLC performed an initial construction cost estimate using Site #3 as the sample as shown in Exhibit C24. This cost estimate was then apportioned to each of the project components for each of the three finalist sites. These are shown in Exhibits C25 through 27.

A summary of massing study results is shown in Exhibit C28, indicating that each site resulted in a very similar project size and cost. The quantitative and qualitative results of the massing study analysis are shown in Exhibit 29. Factors such as project component functionality, vehicular and pedestrian access, project visibility, parking, type of housing that could be accommodated, and achieving the vision of Friends of Little Saigon were evaluated.

The Friends of Little Saigon Board selected Site #3 because it had the best pedestrian and vehicular access, was rated highest for being near adjacent off-street parking, rated equal with the other sites for component functionality and rated the highest as a visible landmark in Little Saigon.

Market/Economic Analysis

Using the initial construction cost estimates, Heartland LLC estimated the capital cost for each component and for the overall project. Non-construction costs included all soft costs, allocated land costs, and required return on investment. These are shown in Exhibit D1, with an overall project capital cost of \$61 million. For each component, the required rental rates to support these capital costs are shown in Exhibit D2. These rates range from \$24 to \$43 per square foot annually. It was quickly concluded that these rates would not be achievable.

The space program and construction cost estimates were revisited to determine if these could be reduced. The end results of this analysis are shown in Exhibit D3 for the space program and Exhibits D4 through D6 for the construction cost. The construction cost was reduced from \$40 million to \$33 million. The resulting space program, as compared to the initial space program, is shown in Exhibit D7.

Exhibit D8 shows the revised capital cost analysis, with an overall project capital cost of \$51 million. Required rental rates were again computed, as shown in Exhibit D9, ranging from \$19 to \$35 per square foot annually. These rates were tested among various potential operators and were deemed to be achievable.

Along with the economic analysis, in-depth interviews were conducted with potential operators of the various project components to determine market demand and how operational costs will affect the ability to have a financially sustainable business. The results of these efforts are shown in Exhibits D10 through D15.

Conclusion

This feasibility study has determined that each component of the Landmark Project will be able to sustain itself financially. A robust capital campaign for the Cultural Center will be necessary to support construction and initial operation. Creative funding mechanisms will also be required to support construction. A compatible housing clientele, knowledgeable component operators, and broad community support will make the project sustainable in the long run.

If all these conditions are satisfied, the Little Saigon Landmark Project will be both feasible and successful.

Figure 4. Landmark Project financial summary (figures in millions)

	NIGHT MARKET	CLINIC	ASIAN GROCERY	REST- AURANT	CULTURAL CENTER	CHILDCARE CENTER	HOUSING	PARKING	TOTAL
capital cost	\$3.7	\$1.7	\$5.4	\$4.2	\$6.6	\$1.4	\$23.2	\$5.0	\$51.2
capital campaign	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2.0
new markets tax credit	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$3.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$5.0
other grants	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$17.3	\$0.0	\$17.8
owner equity	\$0.8	\$0.7	\$0.5	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$3.0
debt financing	\$1.9	\$1.0	\$4.9	\$3.2	\$1.6	\$0.9	\$5.9	\$4.0	\$23.4
sufficient cash flow to cover debt service	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Appendix A—Space Program

Exhibit A1—Landmark Project space program

Exhibit A2—Housing space program

Exhibit A1—Landmark Project Space Program

This space program includes the main components of the Landmark Project. See Exhibit A2 for the housing space program.

USE	NIGHT MARKET		ASIAN MARKET		RESTAURANT		CULTURAL CENTER		TOTAL <i>sq ft</i>
	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	
vendor kiosks (mobile)	30 kiosks at 20 sq ft each	600	none	0	none	0	none	0	600
vendor kiosks (fixed)	20 kiosks at 300 sq ft each	6,000	none	0	none	0	none	0	6,000
dining seating area	3-5 seating areas of 5 seats at 10 sq ft each	250	none	0	150 seats at 15 sq ft per; banquet seating is part of Cultural Center program	2,250	450 banquet seating for restaurant; also use as 900 seat performance hall	6,750	9,250
bar/lounge seating area	seating for 30 at 8 sf each	240	none	0	seating for 50 at 10 sq ft each	500	none	0	740
kitchen	2,000 sf commercial kitchen for night market use + 400 sf bar kitchen	2,400	1,000 sf kitchen to prep takeout food	1,000	main kitchen at 2,000 sf + bar kitchen at 400 sf	2,400	catering kitchen at 1,000 sf	1,000	6,800
storage space	for dry goods and equipment	1,000	for equipment and other stuff; includes walk-in refrigerator and freezer; this is staging area	5,000	for dry goods and table tops	400	for chairs and equipment and cultural center center supplies	2,000	8,400
lobby	entryway to market	300	part of market	0	part of dining room	0	entrance to cultural center, display area, gathering area	1,500	1,800

USE	NIGHT MARKET		ASIAN MARKET		RESTAURANT		CULTURAL CENTER		TOTAL <i>sq ft</i>
	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sq ft</i>	
office space	1 office each for gen mgr & kitchen mgr at 100 sf + 1 shared office at 150 sf + 1 break room @ 150 sf	500	1 private office for owner at 100 sf + 1 shared office at 150 sf + 1 break room at 150 sf	400	1 office each for gen mgr & kitchen mgr at 100 sf	200	3 offices for mgmt/staff at 100 sf + 1 shared office at 150 sf + 1 break room @ 150 sf	600	1,700
leasable office	none	0	none	0	none	0	600 sf co-working space + server room at 50 sf	650	650
pharmacy/clinic	2,000 sf pharmacy + 4,000 sf drop-in clinic	6,000	none	0	none	0	none	0	6,000
child care center	none	0	none	0	none	0	3,500 sf operation, outdoor terrace separate	3,500	3,500
meeting rooms	none	0	none	0	none	0	8 at 250 sf that can expand to 4 at 500 sf	2,000	2,000
market	none	0	14,000 sf market	14,000	none	0	none	0	14,000
performance stage	yes, 30 sf, part of circulation area	0	none	0	yes, part of dining room	0	yes, part of performance hall	0	0
dressing room	2 entertainer change rooms at 150 sf	300	none	0	none	0	2 dressing rooms with shower	250	550
restrooms	able to handle 500 people, share with Asian market	2,200	able to handle 500 people, share with Night market	0	able to handle 500 people, share with Cultural Center	2,200	able to handle 500 people, share with restaurant	0	4,400

USE	NIGHT MARKET		ASIAN MARKET		RESTAURANT		CULTURAL CENTER		TOTAL sq ft
	notes	sq ft	notes	sq ft	notes	sq ft	notes	sq ft	
outdoor terrace	part of gathering space	400	none	0	none	0	part is for child care center	2,000	2,400
TOTAL USABLE SPACE		20,190		20,400		7,950		20,250	68,790
useable to gross factor for mechanical/electrical rooms; hallways/corridors; stairs/elevator; wall thickness	1.2			1.05		1.2		1.2	
TOTAL AREA		24,228		21,420		9,540		24,300	79,488
PARKING									
maximum allowable for DMR zone	1 per 500 sf	48.5	1 per 500 sf	42.8	1 per 500 sf	19.1	1 per 500 sf	48.6	159.0
maximum allowable in YT zone	1 per 500 sf	48.5	1 per 500 sf	42.8	1 per 500 sf	19.1	1 per 500 sf	48.6	159.0
on Seattle Deli site	1 per 500 sf	48.5	1 per 500 sf	42.8	1 per 250 sf	38.2	1 per 500 sf	48.6	178.1
PARKING									
minimum required—commercial zone	1 per 500 sf	48.5	1 per 500 sf	42.8	1 per 250 sf	38.2	1 per 100 sf of assembly space + 1 per 1,000 sf office space	75.7	205.2

Exhibit A2—Housing Space Program

Two scenarios for family and workforce housing were developed. One scenario has four floors of residential units; the other has five floors. There is no minimum parking requirement, as all three sites are in a designated Urban Center Village.

Housing unit sizes:

Studio--450 sf

1 bdrm--650 sf

2 bdrm--850 sf

3 bdrm--1,050 sf

Family housing

4-FLOOR SCENARIO WITH 60 UNITS		5-FLOOR SCENARIO WITH 60 UNITS	
40 2-BR; 20 3-BR	Sq. ft	40 2-BR; 20 3-BR	Sq. ft
<i>per floor for 4 housing floors</i>		<i>per floor for 5 housing floors</i>	
2-bedroom units (10)	8,500	2-bedroom units (8)	6,800
3-bedroom units (5)	5,250	3-bedroom units (4)	4,200
circulation etc. at 25%	3,438	circulation etc. at 25%	2,750
total space per floor (GSF)	17,188	total space per floor (GSF)	13,750
total living space	68,750	total living space	68,750
<i>lobby on first floor</i>		<i>lobby on first floor</i>	
manager office	100	manager office	100
space for 2 elevators	160	space for 2 elevators	160
mechanical room	160	mechanical room	160
entry/lobby	1,000	entry/lobby	1,000
community rooms/amenities	1,200	community rooms/amenities	1,200
laundry room	300	laundry room	300
2 restrooms	120	2 restrooms	120
total space 1st floor	3,040	total space 1st floor	3,040
outdoor terrace/play area	2,000	outdoor terrace/play area	2,000
GRAND TOTAL SPACE (GSF)	73,790	GRAND TOTAL SPACE (GSF)	73,790

Workforce housing

4-FLOOR SCENARIO WITH 72 UNITS		5-FLOOR SCENARIO WITH 75 UNITS	
24 studios; 36 1-BR; 12 2-BR	Sq. ft	25 studios; 35 1-BR; 15 2-BR	Sq. ft
<i>per floor for 4 housing floors</i>		<i>per floor for 5 housing floors</i>	
studios (6)	2,700	studios (5)	2,250
1-bedroom units (9)	5,850	1-bedroom units (7)	4,550
2-bedroom units (3)	2,550	2-bedroom units (3)	2,550
circulation etc. at 25%	2,775	circulation etc. at 25%	2,338
total space per floor (GSF)	13,875	total space per floor (GSF)	11,688
total living space	55,500	total living space	58,438
<i>lobby on first floor</i>		<i>lobby on first floor</i>	
manager office	100	manager office	100
space for 2 elevators	160	space for 2 elevators	160
mechanical room	160	mechanical room	160
entry/lobby	1,000	entry/lobby	1,000
community rooms/amenities	1,200	community rooms/amenities	1,200
laundry room	300	laundry room	300
2 restrooms	120	2 restrooms	120
total space 1st floor	3,040	total space 1st floor	3,040
outdoor terrace/play area	2,000	outdoor terrace/play area	2,000
GRAND TOTAL SPACE (GSF)	60,540	GRAND TOTAL SPACE (GSF)	63,478

NB. For the Yesler Terrace site, only family housing scenarios were considered, as the requirement is 30% AMI tenants.

Appendix B—Site Selection

Exhibit B1—Potential sites for Landmark Project

Exhibit B2—Finalist sites for Landmark Project

Exhibit B1—Potential Sites for Landmark Project

SITE	SITE NAME	LOCATION	SITE SIZE (SF)		ZONING	EXISTING BUILDINGS	TOTAL SIZE OF BLDGS (SF)	POSITIVE FEATURES	NEGATIVE FEATURES	FIRST CUT SHORTLIST
1	Seattle Deli & Yesler Terrace block 5.3--9,10,11,17,18	west of 12th Ave. S., north of S. Main St.	9,600	37,862	NC-2 65 MPC-YT SE Sector--85/160 Main-Washington; 85/240 Washington-Yesler	1 retail bldg.?	5,065?	near heart of LS; high visibility off 12th Ave. S.	YT zone restricts retail usage; only viable access for trucks is at 12th and Main; site slopes up 40' westward; 2 separate ownerships	retain--will have one Yesler Terrace site as a finalist; prefer #1 due to flexibility for retail with Seattle Deli site included
2	Yesler Terrace block 5.3--9,10,11,17,18	west of 12th Ave. S., north of S. Main St.		37,862	MPC-YT SE Sector--85/160 Main-Washington; 85/240 Washington-Yesler	?	?	near heart of LS; high visibility off 12th Ave. S.; single ownership	YT zone restricts retail usage; only viable access for trucks is at Main west of Seattle Deli site; site slopes up 40' westward	retain--will have one Yesler Terrace site as a finalist; will use #2 if Seattle Deli is not a willing participant
3	Acme Poultry	between 10th Ave. S. and 12th Ave. S., bounded by S. Jackson St. & S. King St.		51,000	DMR/C 65/65-85	5 warehouse buildings--1 story	27,731	near heart of Little Saigon; on streetcar line; access from both Jackson and King; relatively flat site; single ownership	parcel 817010-0035 housed an auto garage/manufacturing business in the 1940s	retain
4	Asian Resource Center	between 10th Ave. S. and 12th Ave. S., bounded by S. King St. & S. Weller St.		36,000	DMR/C 65/65-150	1 story auditorium bldg	16,783	near heart of Little Saigon; access from both King and Weller; relatively flat site; single ownership	property is currently on the market	eliminate—owner entertaining purchase offer
5	Catholic Housing Services	between 12th Ave. and 14th Ave., bounded by E. Spruce St. & E. Fir St.		39,586	LR3	three 1 & 2 story buildings	14,494	access from both Fir and Spruce; relatively flat site; single ownership	both Fir and Spruce are narrow streets; not near heart of LS. Height limit of 3 stories	eliminate--height limit precludes putting housing on this site
6	Jackson Square	east side of 12th Ave. S. between S. Jackson and S. Main		23,108	DMR/C 65/65-85	2 story commercial/retail strip mall	13,835	in heart of Little Saigon; on streetcar line; access from S. Jackson and S. Main; flat site; single ownership	site may be too small for Landmark project. Would displace many Vietnamese businesses.	eliminate--site too small; displace too many businesses
7	Viet Wah site	just east of 10th Ave. S. and north of S. Jackson		80,568	DMR/C 65/65-85	1 and 2 story retail and warehouse with surface parking	29,631	in heart of Little Saigon; on streetcar line; access from S. Jackson; single ownership	40-50 ft. slope up north of Jackson. Would displace many Vietnamese businesses	eliminate--displace too many businesses
8	12th and Jackson/King site	west side of 12th Ave. S. between S. King and S. Jackson		29,891	DMR/C 65/65-85	3 separate parcels with 7,200 retail on one and surface parking on the others	7,200	in heart of Little Saigon; on streetcar line; access from Jackson, 12th and King; flat site	site may be too small for Landmark project. Would displace several Vietnamese businesses.; 3 separate ownerships	eliminate-site too small
9	10th Ave. large site on east side	east side of 10th Ave. S between S. King and S. Weller		48,000	DMR/C 65/65-150	4 separate parcels--general purpose bldg, warehouse, church & 2 vacant lots	28,400	near heart of Little Saigon; access from King, Weller or 10th; gradual sloping site	too close to I5 for residential? 4 separate ownerships; Inter*Im working redeveloping the King St. half of this site.	eliminate--other nearby sites offer better potential

SITE	SITE NAME	LOCATION	ZONING	SITE SIZE (SF)	EXISTING BUILDINGS	TOTAL SIZE OF BLDGS (SF)	POSITIVE FEATURES	NEGATIVE FEATURES	FIRST CUT SHORTLIST
10	Lam Seafood++	midblock spanning S. King and S. Weller	DMR/C 65/65-150	60,000	6 separate parcels--Lam's, 2 warehouses, small bldgs, parking lot	45,343	in heart of Little Saigon; gentle sloping site; access from S. King or S. Weller	displaces Lams Seafood Market; 6 separate ownerships	eliminate--too many ownerships
11	10th Ave. large site on west side	west side of 10th Ave. S between S. King and S. Jackson	DMR/C 65/65-85	44,333	3 warehouse bldgs and 1 storefront	23,406	near heart of Little Saigon; on streetcar line; access from King, Jackson or 10th; flat site; single ownership of all 5 parcels	too close to I5 for residential?	eliminate—too close to I-5 for housing
12	King County Elections Warehouse	between 12th Ave. and 14th Ave., bounded by E. Fir St. and Yesler Way	C2-65	75,251	1 warehouse building	42,000	on streetcar line; access from E. Fir, Yesler Way and adjacent 13th Ave.; flat site; single ownership	too close to elementary school? Not near heart of Little Saigon. Will have to rezone to get to 85' height.	retain

Exhibit B2—Finalist Sites for Landmark Project

SITE	SITE NAME	LOCATION	KING COUNTY PARCEL #S	SITE SIZE (SF)	ZONING	EXISTING BUILDINGS	POSITIVE FEATURES	NEGATIVE FEATURES
1	Seattle Deli & Yesler Terrace block 5.3--9,10,11,17,18	west of 12th Ave. S., north of S. Main St.	Seattle Deli--85910-0215; YT--part of 982170-0007	47,462	NC-2 65 (Seattle Deli); MPC-YT SE Sector--85/160 Main-Washington	one 5,065-sf retail bldg on Seattle Deli site; housing units on YT block 5	near heart of LS; high visibility off 12th Ave. S.	YT zone restricts retail usage; only viable access for trucks is at 12th and Main; site slopes up 40' westward; 2 separate ownerships
3	Acme Poultry	between 10th Ave. S. and 12th Ave. S., bounded by S. Jackson St. & S. King St.	seven parcels--817010-0025/0030/0035/0040/0075/0085/0090	51,000	DMR/C 65/65-85	5 one-story warehouse buildings totaling 27,731 sf	near heart of Little Saigon; on streetcar line; access from both Jackson and King; relatively flat site; single ownership	parcel 817010-0035 housed an auto garage/manufacturing business in the 1940s
12	King County Elections Warehouse	between 12th Ave. and 14th Ave., bounded by E. Fir St. and Yesler Way	806100-0045	75,251	C2-65	one 42,000-sf warehouse building	on streetcar line; access from E. Fir, Yesler Way and adjacent 13th Ave.; flat site; single ownership	too close to elementary school? Not near heart of Little Saigon. Will have to rezone to get to 85' height.

Appendix C—Massing Studies and Cost Estimates

Exhibit C1-C22—Massing studies

Exhibit C23—Comparative space programs for finalist sites

Exhibit C24—Landmark Project cost study

Exhibit C25—Analysis of 12/16/13 cost estimate—Sites # 1-2


Exhibit C26— Analysis of 12/16/13 cost estimate—Site #3

Exhibit C27— Analysis of 12/16/13 cost estimate—Site #12

Exhibit C28—Comparative massing study results


Exhibit C29—Massing study findings

OVERALL IMAGES



3D MASSING VIEW ALL SITES

OVERALL IMAGES




3D MASSING VIEW ALL SITES

SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE


Summary

This project site is made up of two parcels, located west of 12th Ave. S. and north of S. Main St.

Total Site Area	47,462 SF
Site #1 (Seattle Deli) Zone	NC2-65
Height Limit	65'
FAR Max	4.25
Site #2 Zone	MPC-YT
Height Limit	85' / 160' remainder of site
FAR Max	None (Building Height Limits Development)



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM SE)



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM NW)

SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE

Summary


This capacity study looks at the proposed project on Sites 1 & 2. It shows the client's program within the development constraints of the site and initial design concept.

Site Area	47,462 SF
Building Development	
Estimated # of Units	105
Constructed Area (GSF)	270,440 SF
Outdoor Area	26,735 SF
Residential Area	93,410 SF
Night Market	23,535 SF
Asian Market	23,920 SF
Restaurant	12,445 SF
Community Center	21,985 SF
Parking Area	68,410 SF
Parking Capacity	181 Stalls (2 Floors)

- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access





3D MASSING VIEW (FROM SE)



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM NW)


SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE

- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access




3D MASSING VIEW: PARKING LEVEL P2

SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE



3D MASSING VIEW: GROUND LEVEL (INCLUDES PARKING LEVEL P1)


SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE



- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access

3D MASSING VIEW: LEVEL 1

SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE



3D MASSING VIEW: LEVEL 2

SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE



- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access

3D MASSING VIEW OVERALL BUILDING

SITE #1 & 2 - YESLER TERRACE

LITTLE SAIGON PROJECT

SITE #1 & 2 ANALYSIS	PARKING FLOOR		1ST FLOOR (+298)				2ND FLOOR (+318)				3RD - 6TH FLOOR			
	USE	PROGRAM PARKING	CONCEPT	PROGRAM NIGHT MARKET	CONCEPT	PROGRAM ASIAN MARKET	CONCEPT	PROGRAM RESTAURANT	CONCEPT	CULTURAL CENTER	CONCEPT	PROGRAM HOUSING	CONCEPT	
MOBILE KIOSKS			600	600										
FIXED VENDORS			6,000	6,000										
DINING AREA			250	260			2,250	2,250	6,750	6,750				
BAR LOUNGE AREA			240	240			500	560						
KITCHEN			2,400	2,400	1,000	1,000	2,400	2,400	1,000	1,000				
STORAGE SPACE			1,000	1,000	5,000	4,959	400	480	2,000	2,000				
LOBBY			300	300					1,500	870				
OFFICE SPACE			500	500	400	400	200	204	600	612				
LEASEABLE OFFICE									650	650				
PHARMACY			4,000	4,200										
CLINIC			2,000	1,977										
CHILD CARE CENTER									3,500	3,500				
CHILD CARE OUTDOOR AREA														
MEETING ROOMS									2,000	2,000				
MARKET					14,000	14,000								
PERFORMANCE STAGE														
DRESSING ROOM			300	300					250	250				
RESTROOMS			2,200	2,200			2,200	2,200						
OUTDOOR TERRACE			400	NA					2,000	NA				
RESIDENTIAL UNITS											55,000	81,260		
PARKING AREA	55,650	64,355												
TOTAL NET AREA	*55,650 SF AT 350 SF / CAR = 159 CARS	*64,355 SF (181 STALLS = ABOUT 355 SF / STALL)	20,190	19,977	20,400	20,359	7,950	8,094	20,250	17,632	55,000	81,260		
BOH AND CIRCULATION (OR ASSUMED RATIO)		4,055	1.20	3,560	1.05	3,560	1.20	4,352	1.20	4,352	13,750	12,150		
TOTAL AREA	55,650	68,410	24,228	23,537	21,420	23,919	9,540	12,446	24,300	21,984	68,750	93,410		
OUTDOOR AREA	NA	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA	1,303	NA	11,723	NA	13,710		
CONCEPT TOTALS	PARKING TOTAL	68,410	1ST FLOOR TOTAL				47,455	2ND FLOOR TOTAL				47,455	3RD - 6TH FLOOR TOTAL	107,120

RESIDENTIAL UNITS PER FLOOR 27
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS 105


AREAS

SITE #12 - KC SITE

Summary

This project site is located between 12th Ave and 14th Ave, bounded by E Fir Street and Yesler Way.

Total Site Area	75,251 SF
Site (KC Site) Zone	C2-65
Height Limit	65'
FAR Max	4.25



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM SW)



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM NE)


SITE #12 - KC SITE

Summary


This capacity study looks at the proposed project on Site 12, which is owned by King County and is located east of Yesler Terrace. It shows the client's program within the development constraints of the site and an initial design concept.

Site Area	75,251 SF
Building Development	
Estimated # of Units	79 (15 Townhomes)
Constructed Area (GSF)	257,505 SF
Outdoor Area	15,000 SF
Residential Area	94,060 SF
Night Market	23,925 SF
Asian Market	24,315 SF
Restaurant	12,190 SF
Community Center	21,075 SF
Parking	74,440 SF
Parking Capacity	208 Stalls

- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access




3D MASSING VIEW (FROM SW)




3D MASSING VIEW (FROM NE)

SITE #12 - KC SITE



3D MASSING VIEW: PARKING LEVEL P1

SITE #12 - KC SITE




- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access



3D MASSING VIEW: LEVEL 1

SITE #12 - KC SITE




- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access



3D MASSING VIEW: LEVEL 2

SITE #12 - KC SITE



- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access

3D MASSING VIEW OVERALL BUILDING

SITE #12 - KC SITE

LITTLE SAIGON PROJECT

SITE #12 ANALYSIS	PARKING FLOOR		1ST FLOOR (PARTIAL 2ND FLOOR)								2ND - 5TH FLOOR		
	USE	PROGRAM PARKING	CONCEPT	PROGRAM NIGHT MARKET	CONCEPT	PROGRAM ASIAN MARKET	CONCEPT	PROGRAM RESTAURANT	CONCEPT	CULTURAL CENTER	CONCEPT	PROGRAM HOUSING	CONCEPT
MOBILE KIOSKS			600	600									
FIXED VENDORS			6,000	6,000									
DINING AREA			250	250				2,250	2,250	6,750	7,050		
BAR LOUNGE AREA			240	244				500	500				
KITCHEN			2,400	2,000	1,000	680	2,400	2,400	1,000	680			
STORAGE SPACE			1,000	1,000	5,000	5,005	400	390	2,000	2,000			
LOBBY			300	600					1,500				
OFFICE SPACE			500	500	400	400	200	220	600	605			
LEASEABLE OFFICE									650	660			
PHARMACY			4,000	4,000									
CLINIC			2,000	2,000									
CHILD CARE CENTER									3,500	3,600			
CHILD CARE OUTDOOR AREA													
MEETING ROOMS									2,000	2,000			
MARKET					14,000	14,000							
PERFORMANCE STAGE													
DRESSING ROOM			300	295					250	250			
RESTROOMS			2,200	2,200			2,200	2,200					
OUTDOOR TERRACE			400	NA					2,000	NA			
RESIDENTIAL UNITS											55,000	78,400	
PARKING AREA	55,650	74,440											
TOTAL NET AREA	*55,650 SF AT 350 SF / CAR = 159 CARS	*74,440 SF (208 STALLS = ABOUT 358 SF / STALL)	20,190	19,689	20,400	20,085	7,950	7,960	20,250	16,845	55,000	78,400	
BOH AND CIRCULATION (OR ASSUMED RATIO)			1.20	4,232	1.05	4,232	1.20	4,232	1.20	4,232	13,750	8,160	
TOTAL AREA	55,650	74,440	24,228	23,921	21,420	24,317	9,540	12,192	24,300	21,077	68,750	86,560	
OUTDOOR AREA	NA	0	NA		NA		NA	2,500	NA	5,000	NA	7,500	
CONCEPT TOTALS	PARKING TOTAL	74,440	1ST FLOOR TOTAL (PARTIAL 2ND FLOOR)								89,005	3RD - 6TH FLOOR TOTAL	94,060

RESIDENTIAL UNITS PER FLOOR 16
TOWNHOUSE UNITS 15


AREAS

SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY


Summary

This project site is located between 10th Ave S. and 12th Ave S., bounded by S. King St. and S. Jackson St.

Total Site Area	51,000 SF
Site (Acme Poultry Site) Zone	DMR/C-65/65-85
Height Limit	85'
FAR Max	4.5



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM SW)



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM NE)


SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY

Summary


This capacity study looks at the proposed project on Site 3, which is currently the Acme Poultry Site. It shows the client's program within the development constraints of the site and an initial design concept.

Site Area	51,000 SF
Building Development	
Estimated # of Units	105
Constructed Area (GSF)	260,300 SF
Outdoor Area	25,830 SF
Residential Area	100,640 SF
Night Market	25,040 SF
Asian Market	25,580 SF
Restaurant	11,850 SF
Community Center	20,740 SF
Parking	50,620 SF
Parking Capacity	143 Stalls

- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access




3D MASSING VIEW (FROM SE)



3D MASSING VIEW (FROM NW)

SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY




- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access




3D MASSING VIEW PARKING PLAN

SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY



3D MASSING VIEW L1 PLAN

SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY



3D MASSING VIEW L2 PLAN

SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY



- Residential: Multifamily Units
- Residential: Amenity/Lobby
- Asian Market
- Night Market
- Food Service Support
- Back of House
- Office or Commercial/Retail
- Cultural/Civic
- Exterior Open Space
- Parking Garage Access

3D MASSING VIEW OVERALL BUILDING

SITE #3 - ACME POULTRY


LITTLE SAIGON PROJECT

SITE #3 ANALYSIS	PARKING FLOOR		1ST FLOOR				2ND FLOOR				3RD - 6TH FLOOR			
	USE	PROGRAM PARKING	CONCEPT	PROGRAM NIGHT MARKET	CONCEPT	PROGRAM ASIAN MARKET	CONCEPT	PROGRAM RESTAURANT	CONCEPT	CULTURAL CENTER	CONCEPT	PROGRAM HOUSING	CONCEPT	
MOBILE KIOSKS			600	600										
FIXED VENDORS			6,000	6,000										
DINING AREA			250	250			2,250	2,280	6,750	6,800				
BAR LOUNGE AREA			240	250			500	500						
KITCHEN			2,400	1,400	1,000	1,000	2,400	2,360	1,000	1,000				
STORAGE SPACE			1,000	1,000	5,000	4,820	400	400	2,000	2,000				
LOBBY			300						1,500	NA				
OFFICE SPACE			500	500	400	420	200	300	600	750				
LEASEABLE OFFICE									650	750				
PHARMACY			4,000	4,000										
CLINIC			2,000	2,000										
CHILD CARE CENTER									3,500	3,500				
CHILD CARE OUTDOOR AREA									NA					
MEETING ROOMS									2,000	2,000				
MARKET					14,000	13,000								
PERFORMANCE STAGE														
DRESSING ROOM			300	300					250	252				
RESTROOMS			2,200	2,400			2,200	2,320						
OUTDOOR TERRACE			400	NA					2,000	NA				
RESIDENTIAL UNITS											55,000	79,280		
PARKING AREA	55,650	45,550												
TOTAL NET AREA	*55,650 SF AT 350 SF / CAR = 159 CARS	*45,750 SF (143 STALLS = ABOUT 320 SF / STALL)	20,190	18,700	20,400	19,240	7,950	8,160	20,250	17,052	55,000	79,280		
BOH AND CIRCULATION (OR ASSUMED RATIO)		5,070	1.20	6,340	1.05	6,340	1.20	3,689	1.20	3,689	13,750	21,360		
TOTAL AREA	55,650	50,620	24,228	25,040	21,420	25,580	9,540	11,849	24,300	20,741	68,750	100,640		
OUTDOOR AREA	NA	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA	1,803	NA	16,227	NA	7,800		
CONCEPT TOTALS	PARKING TOTAL	50,620	1ST FLOOR TOTAL				50,620	2ND FLOOR TOTAL				50,620	3RD - 6TH FLOOR TOTAL	108,440

RESIDENTIAL UNITS PER FLOOR 27
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS 105

AREAS

OVERALL IMAGES



3D MASSING VIEW ALL SITES

Exhibit C23—Comparative Space Programs for Finalist Sites

	ACME POULTRY		YESLER TERRACE		KING COUNTY ELECTIONS	
	<i>sf</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sf</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sf</i>	<i>notes</i>
Night Market						
Mobile Kiosks	600		600		600	
Fixed Vendors	6,000		6,000		6,000	
Dining Area	250		260		250	
Bar Lounge Area	250		240		244	
Kitchen	1,400		2,400		2,000	
Storage Space	1,000		1,000		1,000	
lobby	-		300		600	
Office Space	500		500		500	
Performance Stage	240		0		0	
Dressing Room	300		300		295	
Restrooms	2,400		2,200		2,200	
BOH / Circulation	6,340		3,560		4,332	
Total Night Market	19,280		17,360		18,021	
Asian Market						
Kitchen	1,000		1,000		680	
Storage Space	4,820		4,959		5,005	
Office Space	420		400		400	
Market	13,000		14,000		14,000	
BOH / Circulation	6,340		3,560		4,232	
Total Asian Market	25,580		23,919		24,317	
Restaurant						
Dining Area	2,280		2,250		2,250	
Bar Lounge Area	500		560		500	
Kitchen	2,360		2,400		2,400	
Storage Space	400		480		390	
Outdoor Space	1,803		1,303		2,500	
Office	300		204		220	
Restrooms	2,320		2,200		2,200	
BOH / Circulation	3,689		4,352		4,232	
Total Restaurant	13,652		13,749		14,692	

	ACME POULTRY		YESLER TERRACE		KING COUNTY ELECTIONS	
	<i>sf</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sf</i>	<i>notes</i>	<i>sf</i>	<i>notes</i>
Cultural Center						
Dining Area	6,800		6,750		7,050	
Kitchen	1,000		1,000		680	
Storage Space	2,000		2,000		2,000	
Lobby	-		870		0	
Office Space	750		612		605	
Leasable Office	750		650		660	
Meeting Rooms	2,000		2,000		2,000	
Outdoor Terrace	16,227		11,723		5,000	
Dressing Room	252		250		250	
BOH / Circulation	3,689		4,352		4,232	
Total Cultural Center	33,468		30,207		22,477	
Pharmacy / Clinic						
Pharmacy/Clinic area	6,000		6,177		6,000	
BOH / Circulation	-	<i>Placeholder</i>				
Total Housing	6,000		6,177		6,000	
Childcare Center						
Childcare Area	3,500		3,500		3,600	
BOH / Circulation	-	<i>Placeholder</i>				
Total Housing	3,500		3,500		3,600	
Housing						
Residential Area	79,280	105 units	81,260	105 units	78,400	79 units
Outdoor Space	7,800		13,710		7,500	
BOH / Circulation	21,360		12,150		8,160	
Total Housing	108,440		107,120		94,060	
Parking						
Parking Area	45,550	143 stalls	64,355	181 stalls	74,440	208 stalls
BOH / Circulation	5,070		4,055		0	
Total Parking	50,620		68,410		74,440	
TOTAL	260,540		270,442		257,607	
TOTAL w/o parking	209,920		202,032		183,167	



December 13, 2013

SCIDpda
Paul Mar
409 Maynard Ave South
Seattle, WA 98144

RE: Landmark project cost study

Paul:

Enclosed is the construction cost study for the Landmark project at the old ACME poultry site. The square foot cost is between \$150 to \$160 per square foot, and includes \$180/sf to buildout the civic level and \$50/sf to buildout the retail level. The wage rate is state residential and the civil buildout is commercial prevailing wage rate.

The documents we used for this study include the block diagram and square foot area provided by GGLO, and a soil study report on a neighboring site. We did not have an environmental report and did not carry cost for any hazmat abatement. Based on the soil report, soil bearing is 6 to 8 feet using conventional footing system. The study assumes excavation and shoring of the site down one level for the parking, and construction of three levels of concrete: parking, retail, and civic. The residential level is constructed with wood framing.

The construction sequence assumes building a mixed use building, finishing the residential level and the retail and civic space as a core and shell. The duration is based on 18 months.

We did not carry certain costs that are traditionally carried by the Owner such as: state sales tax, builders all risk, utility fees, special inspections, design, inflations, contingency, easements, and FFE.

If you have any questions regarding this or any other matter please call 206.228.7757.

Very truly yours,

Marpac Construction LLC

Sai Chaleunphonh
Member

ENCLOSURE

Landmark Project

12/13/2013

	Demolition	50,600 SF	\$	253,000
	Shoring	10,797 SF	\$	896,188
	Earthworks	22,489 CY	\$	764,622
	Site Utilities		\$	100,000
<i>Site work</i>	Storm Detention		\$	80,000
<hr/>				
<i>Building</i>	Site Paving	25,000 SF	\$	325,000
	Landscaping		\$	250,000
	Concrete	177,100 SF	\$	7,969,500
	Gypcrete	81,330 SF	\$	182,993
	Brick	6,720 SF	\$	161,280
	Steel		\$	200,000
	Wood Frame	108,440 SF	\$	2,494,120
	Ext wall skin	44,989 SF	\$	742,325
	Roof	50,600 SF	\$	1,214,400
	Interior Res Finish	105 Unit	\$	3,990,000
	Storefront	20,245 SF	\$	1,012,261
	Elevator	20 Stop	\$	380,000
	Plumbing	105 Unit	\$	1,270,500
	Fire Protection	260,300 SF	\$	468,540
	HVAC Resid	105 Unit	\$	325,500
	Electrical	105 Unit	\$	1,638,000
			\$	24,718,229
	2nd Floor civic buildout	50,620 SF	\$	9,111,600
	1st Floor Retail core	50,620 SF	\$	2,531,000
	GC	18 mo	\$	1,418,400
	Insurance / B&O	1.6%	\$	418,186
	Bond	1%	\$	381,974
	OH&P	2.5%	\$	964,485
			<u>\$</u>	<u>39,543,874</u>

\$ 152 per SF

Exhibit C25--Analysis of 12/16/13 Cost Estimate--Sites #1-2								4/7/2014
item	total	allocation	cultural center	night market	Asian supermarket	restaurant	housing	parking
area(sf)--indoor	221,722		21,984	23,537	23,919	12,446	93,410	68,410
outdoor area(sf)	15,013		11,723	0	0	1,303	13,710	0
total area	236,735		33,707	23,537	23,919	13,749	107,120	68,410
demolition	\$253,000	all	\$36,023	\$25,154	\$25,562	\$14,694	\$114,480	\$73,110
shoring	\$1,211,146	all	\$172,446	\$120,416	\$122,371	\$70,340	\$548,030	\$349,988
earthwork	\$1,033,342	all	\$147,130	\$102,738	\$104,406	\$60,014	\$467,576	\$298,608
site utilities	\$100,000	all	\$14,238	\$9,942	\$10,104	\$5,808	\$45,249	\$28,897
storm detention	\$80,000	all	\$11,391	\$7,954	\$8,083	\$4,646	\$36,199	\$23,118
subtotal sitework	\$2,677,488		\$381,228	\$266,205	\$270,525	\$155,502	\$1,211,534	\$773,721
site paving	\$325,000	all	\$46,274	\$32,313	\$32,837	\$18,875	\$147,059	\$93,916
landscaping	\$250,000	all	\$35,596	\$24,856	\$25,259	\$14,519	\$113,122	\$72,243
concrete	\$8,969,500	all	\$1,134,720	\$792,355	\$805,215	\$462,849	\$3,606,112	\$3,302,969.54
gypcrete	\$169,847	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$169,847	\$0
brick	\$161,280	all	\$22,964	\$16,035	\$16,295	\$9,367	\$72,977	\$46,606
steel	\$200,000	all	\$28,477	\$19,885	\$20,207	\$11,616	\$90,498	\$57,795
wood frame	\$2,314,942	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,314,942	\$0
ext wll skin	\$742,325	all	\$105,694	\$73,804	\$75,002	\$43,112	\$335,894	\$214,512
roof	\$1,214,400	all	\$172,910	\$120,740	\$122,699	\$70,529	\$549,503	\$350,929
interior res finish	\$3,703,358	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,703,358	\$0
storefront	\$1,012,261	all except residential & parking	\$557,475	\$389,275	\$395,593	\$227,393	\$0	\$0
elevator	\$380,000	all	\$54,105	\$37,781	\$38,394	\$22,069	\$171,946	\$109,810
plumbing	\$1,179,227	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,179,227	\$0
fire protection	\$434,880	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$434,880	\$0
HVAC residential	\$302,116	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$302,116	\$0
electrical	\$1,520,325	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,520,325	\$0
subtotal total building	\$22,879,461		\$2,158,215	\$1,507,043	\$1,531,502	\$880,330	\$14,711,806	\$4,248,779
2nd floor buildout	\$9,640,000	cultural center+restaurant	\$6,155,265	\$0	\$0	\$3,484,735	\$0	\$0
1st floor buildout	\$2,460,930	Asian market+night market	\$0	\$1,220,560	\$1,240,370	\$0	\$0	\$0
gc	\$1,418,400	all	\$201,956	\$141,022	\$143,311	\$82,377	\$641,810	\$409,879
insurance/B&O	\$433,066	all	\$61,661	\$43,057	\$43,756	\$25,151	\$195,958	\$125,144
bond	\$395,408	all	\$56,299	\$39,313	\$39,951	\$22,964	\$178,918	\$114,262
OH&P	\$997,934	all	\$142,089	\$99,218	\$100,828	\$57,958	\$451,554	\$288,376
subtotal other	\$15,345,738		\$6,617,270	\$1,543,170	\$1,568,215	\$3,673,186	\$1,468,240	\$937,662
total cost estimate	\$40,902,687		\$9,156,713	\$3,316,418	\$3,370,243	\$4,709,019	\$17,391,580	\$5,960,162
cost per sf (indoor+outdoor)	\$172.78		\$272	\$141	\$141	\$342	\$162	\$87
# units							105	181
cost per unit							\$165,634	\$32,929

Exhibit C26--Analysis of 12/16/13 cost estimate--Site #3

4/7/2014

item	total	allocation	cultural center	night market	Asian supermarket	restaurant	housing	parking
area(sf)--indoor	213,969		20,741	25,280	25,580	11,849	100,640	50,620
outdoor area(sf)	9,603		16,227	0	0	1,803	7,800	0
total area	223,572		36,968	25,280	25,580	13,652	108,440	50,620
demolition	\$253,000	all	\$41,834	\$28,608	\$28,947	\$15,449	\$122,714	\$57,283
shoring	\$896,188	all	\$148,186	\$101,335	\$102,537	\$54,724	\$434,682	\$202,910
earthwork	\$764,622	all	\$126,432	\$86,458	\$87,484	\$46,690	\$370,868	\$173,122
site utilities	\$100,000	all	\$16,535	\$11,307	\$11,442	\$6,106	\$48,503	\$22,641
storm detention	\$80,000	all	\$13,228	\$9,046	\$9,153	\$4,885	\$38,803	\$18,113
subtotal sitework	\$2,093,810		\$346,215	\$236,754	\$239,563	\$127,855	\$1,015,569	\$474,069
site paving	\$325,000	all	\$53,739	\$36,749	\$37,185	\$19,846	\$157,636	\$73,585
landscaping	\$250,000	all	\$41,338	\$28,268	\$28,604	\$15,266	\$121,258	\$56,604
concrete	\$7,969,500	all	\$1,317,770	\$901,137	\$911,831	\$486,642	\$3,865,478	\$1,804,412
gypcrete	\$182,993	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$182,993	\$0
brick	\$161,280	all	\$26,668	\$18,236	\$18,453	\$9,848	\$78,226	\$36,516
steel	\$200,000	all	\$33,070	\$22,615	\$22,883	\$12,213	\$97,007	\$45,283
wood frame	\$2,494,120	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,494,120	\$0
ext wll skin	\$742,325	all	\$122,745	\$83,937	\$84,933	\$45,329	\$360,053	\$168,073
roof	\$1,214,400	all	\$200,803	\$137,316	\$138,946	\$74,155	\$589,025	\$274,958
interior res finish	\$3,990,000	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,990,000	\$0
storefront	\$1,012,261	all except residential & parking	\$580,067	\$396,670	\$401,377	\$214,214	\$0	\$0
elevator	\$380,000	all	\$62,834	\$42,968	\$43,478	\$23,204	\$184,313	\$86,038
plumbing	\$1,270,500	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,270,500	\$0
fire protection	\$468,540	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$468,540	\$0
HVAC residential	\$325,500	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$325,500	\$0
electrical	\$1,638,000	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,638,000	\$0
subtotal total building	\$22,624,419		\$2,439,034	\$1,667,896	\$1,687,689	\$900,716	\$15,822,649	\$2,545,469
2nd floor buildout	\$9,111,600	cultural center+restaurant	\$5,798,825	\$0	\$0	\$3,312,775	\$0	\$0
1st floor buildout	\$2,531,000	Asian market+night market	\$0	\$1,258,035	\$1,272,965	\$0	\$0	\$0
gc	\$1,418,400	all	\$234,535	\$160,383	\$162,286	\$86,612	\$687,972	\$321,147
insurance/B&O	\$418,186	all	\$69,148	\$47,286	\$47,847	\$25,536	\$202,834	\$94,683
bond	\$381,974	all	\$63,160	\$43,191	\$43,704	\$23,325	\$185,270	\$86,485
OH&P	\$964,485	all	\$159,479	\$109,057	\$110,352	\$58,894	\$467,808	\$218,374
subtotal other	\$14,825,645		\$6,325,146	\$1,617,952	\$1,637,153	\$3,507,142	\$1,543,885	\$720,688
total cost estimate	\$39,543,874		\$9,110,395	\$3,522,602	\$3,564,405	\$4,535,713	\$18,382,103	\$3,740,227
cost per sf (indoor+outdoor)	\$176.87		\$246	\$139	\$139	\$332	\$170	\$74
# units							105	145
cost per unit							\$175,068	\$25,795

analyzing Marpac's 12/16/13 cost estimate--Site #12								4/7/2014
item	total	allocation	cultural center	night market	Asian supermarket	restaurant	housing	parking
area(sf)--indoor	242,607		24,021	24,317	12,192	21,077	86,560	74,440
outdoor area(sf)	15,000		0	0	2,500	5,000	7,500	0
total area	257,607		24,021	24,317	14,692	26,077	94,060	74,440
demolition	\$347,255	all	\$32,380	\$32,779	\$19,805	\$35,152	\$126,793	\$100,345
shoring	\$1,230,062	all	\$114,699	\$116,113	\$70,154	\$124,517	\$449,132	\$355,448
earthwork	\$1,048,627	all	\$97,781	\$98,986	\$59,806	\$106,150	\$382,885	\$303,019
site utilities	\$100,000	all	\$9,325	\$9,440	\$5,703	\$10,123	\$36,513	\$28,897
storm detention	\$80,000	all	\$7,460	\$7,552	\$4,563	\$8,098	\$29,210	\$23,117
subtotal sitework	\$2,805,944		\$261,645	\$264,869	\$160,030	\$284,040	\$1,024,534	\$810,826
site paving	\$325,000	all	\$30,305	\$30,679	\$18,536	\$32,899	\$118,667	\$93,914
landscaping	\$250,000	all	\$23,312	\$23,599	\$14,258	\$25,307	\$91,282	\$72,242
concrete	\$8,469,500	all	\$743,129	\$752,287	\$454,521	\$806,735	\$2,909,902	\$2,802,924.92
gypcrete	\$157,391	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$157,391	\$0
brick	\$161,280	all	\$15,039	\$15,224	\$9,198	\$16,326	\$58,888	\$46,605
steel	\$200,000	all	\$18,649	\$18,879	\$11,407	\$20,246	\$73,026	\$57,793
wood frame	\$2,145,181	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,145,181	\$0
ext wll skin	\$742,325	all	\$69,219	\$70,072	\$42,337	\$75,144	\$271,045	\$214,508
roof	\$1,214,400	all	\$113,239	\$114,634	\$69,260	\$122,931	\$443,414	\$350,922
interior res finish	\$3,431,781	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,431,781	\$0
storefront	\$1,012,261	all except residential & parking	\$272,880	\$276,243	\$166,902	\$296,236	\$0	\$0
elevator	\$380,000	all	\$35,434	\$35,870	\$21,672	\$38,467	\$138,749	\$109,808
plumbing	\$1,092,751	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,092,751	\$0
fire protection	\$402,989	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$402,989	\$0
HVAC residential	\$279,961	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$279,961	\$0
electrical	\$1,408,836	residential	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,408,836	\$0
subtotal total building	\$21,673,656		\$1,321,206	\$1,337,487	\$808,091	\$1,434,291	\$13,023,864	\$3,748,716
2nd floor buildout	\$9,315,320	cultural center+restaurant	\$0	\$0	\$3,413,760	\$5,901,560	\$0	\$0
1st floor buildout	\$2,405,300	Asian market+night market	\$1,195,286	\$1,210,014	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
gc	\$1,418,400	all	\$132,261	\$133,891	\$80,895	\$143,582	\$517,900	\$409,871
insurance/B&O	\$416,303	all	\$38,819	\$39,297	\$23,743	\$42,141	\$152,005	\$120,298
bond	\$380,102	all	\$35,443	\$35,880	\$21,678	\$38,477	\$138,787	\$109,837
OH&P	\$959,306	all	\$89,452	\$90,554	\$54,712	\$97,108	\$350,271	\$277,208
subtotal other	\$14,894,731		\$1,491,261	\$1,509,637	\$3,594,788	\$6,222,868	\$1,158,963	\$917,214
total cost estimate	\$39,374,331		\$3,074,112	\$3,111,993	\$4,562,910	\$7,941,199	\$15,207,360	\$5,476,757
cost per sf (indoor+outdoor)	\$152.85		\$128	\$128	\$311	\$305	\$162	\$74
# units							105	208
cost per unit							\$144,832	\$26,331

Little Saigon
Landmark Project

Comparative Massing Study Results

	Site #1-2	Site #3	Site #12
Emerald Market(sf)	25,300	25,300	24,000
SE Asian Grocery(sf)	23,900	25,600	24,300
SE Asian Restaurant(sf)	13,700	13,700	14,700
Vietnamese Cultural Center(sf)	33,700	37,000	26,100
Housing(sf)	107,100 105 units	108,400 105 units	94,100 79 units
Parking(sf)	68,400 181 stalls	50,600 143 stalls	74,400 208 stalls
Total project size(sf)	270,300	260,600	257,600
Construction cost(\$millions)	\$40.9	\$39.5	\$39.4

Little Saigon
Landmark Project

Massing Study Findings

Factor/characteristic	Site #1-2	Site #3	Site #12
Parcel size(square feet)	47,462	51,000	70,000
Project size(square feet)	270,300	260,600	257,600
Component functionality	Sloped terrain affects optimum functionality	Components fit well on two floors	All components fit on single level
Vehicular/pedestrian access	Only access on S. Main St.	Excellent; pedestrian friendly	good access off Yesler
visibility	Very visible from south/east	Very visible from all sides	Very visible from south
parking	181 stall on 2 ug levels	143 stalls on 1 ug level	208 stalls on 1 ug level
Add'l adjacent parking	None to very little	available	None to very little
Housing types	Must be YT replacement	family/work force	Family/work force
Meets FLS vision	Very good	excellent	Very good

Appendix D—Market/Economic Analysis

Exhibit D1—Capital cost analysis

Exhibit D2--Required rental rates

Exhibit D3—Revised space program

Exhibit D4— Analysis of revised cost estimate

Exhibit D5— Analysis of revised cost estimate for night market

Exhibit D6— Analysis of revised cost estimate for cultural center

Exhibit D7—Comparative massing results

Exhibit D8—Revised capital cost analysis

Exhibit D9—Revised rental rate composition

Exhibit D10—Detailed economic analysis—Night Market

Exhibit D11—Detailed economic analysis—Asian supermarket

Exhibit D12—Detailed economic analysis—Restaurant

Exhibit D13—Detailed economic analysis—Cultural Center

Exhibit D14—Detailed economic analysis—Housing, part 1

Exhibit D15—Detailed economic analysis—Housing, part 2

Exhibit D1--Capital Cost Analysis

COSTS					
	Unit Amount	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	TOTAL
Night Market					
Note: Costs input from MarPac estimates dated 12/18/13					
Land	10%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$798,481	51,000 SF
Direct	18,960	SF	\$133	\$2,521,680	\$150 PSF
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$2,521,680	\$630,420	\$7,650,000 Purchase Price
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$2,521,680	\$63,042	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$3,215,142	\$241,136	
Total Night Market				\$4,254,758	
Asian Supermarket					
Land	14%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$1,072,221	
Direct	25,460	SF	\$124	\$3,157,040	
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$3,157,040	\$789,260	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$3,157,040	\$78,926	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$4,025,226	\$301,892	
Total Asian Supermarket				\$5,399,339	
Restaurant					
Land	7%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$499,008	
Direct	11,849	SF	\$364	\$4,313,036	
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$4,313,036	\$1,078,259	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$4,313,036	\$107,826	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$5,499,121	\$412,434	
Total Restaurant				\$6,410,563	
Cultural Center					
Land	9%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$726,087	
Direct	17,241	SF	\$403	\$6,948,123	
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$6,948,123	\$1,737,031	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$6,948,123	\$173,703	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$8,858,857	\$664,414	
Total Cultural Center				\$10,249,358	
Pharmacy / Clinic					
Land	2%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$168,456	
Direct	4,000	SF	\$146	\$584,000	Same as Night Market
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$584,000	\$146,000	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$584,000	\$14,600	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$744,600	\$55,845	
Total Cultural Center				\$968,901	
Childcare Center					
Land	2%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$147,399	
Direct	3,500	SF	\$250	\$875,000	assumed \$/Ft same as cultural center as costs were not broken out
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$875,000	\$218,750	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$875,000	\$21,875	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$1,115,625	\$83,672	
Total Cultural Center				\$1,346,696	
Housing					
Land	55%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$4,238,348	
Direct	100,640	SF	\$171	\$17,209,440	
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$17,209,440	\$4,302,360	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$17,209,440	\$430,236	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$21,942,036	\$1,645,653	
Total Housing				\$27,826,037	
Parking					
Land					
Direct	50,620	SF	\$63	\$3,189,060	
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$3,189,060	\$797,265	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$3,189,060	\$79,727	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$4,066,052	\$304,954	
Total Parking				\$4,371,005	
TOTAL				\$60,826,658	

OPERATING EXPENSES	\$/Month/PSF	\$/Year/PSF			
Night Market	\$0.50	\$6.00	PSF	\$113,760	Annual
Asian Market	\$0.60	\$7.20	PSF	\$183,312	Annual
Restaurant	\$0.50	\$6.00	PSF	\$71,094	Annual
Cultural Center	\$0.45	\$5.40	PSF	\$93,101	Annual
Pharmacy / Clinic	\$0.60	\$7.20	PSF	\$2,400	Annual
Childcare Center	\$0.45	\$5.40	PSF	\$1,575	Annual
Housing	\$0.70	\$8.40	PSF	\$29,400	Annual
Parking	\$0.10	\$1.20	PSF	\$60,744	Annual
				\$555,386	
					Per Square Ft Per Year


Value Analysis	Notes
Summary 2 Revenue	\$3,650,662 total annual rents
Operating Expense	\$555,386
NOI	\$3,095,275 Derived from total annual rent
CapRate	7.00% estimate
Value	\$44,218,218 NOI/CapRate

Exhibit D2--Required Rental Rates

THIS PAGE SYNCs TO THE DATA OUTPUT FROM CHANGING THE RENTAL RATES FOR EACH SITE USE

Little Saigon Night Market - \$/SqFt/Yr										
		Night Market	Asian Supermarke	Restaurant	Cultural Center	Pharmacy / Clinic	Childcare Center	Housing		
NNN Rental Rate	\$/SqFt/Yr	\$ 16.92	\$ 16.92	\$ 35.40	\$ 26.88	\$ 26.88	\$ 16.92	\$ 14.66		
Operating Expense	\$/SqFt/Yr	\$ 6.00	\$ 7.20	\$ 6.00	\$ 5.40	\$ 7.20	\$ 5.40	\$ 8.40		
Parking	\$/SqFt/Yr	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.09	\$ 2.09		
Total		\$ 25.01	\$ 26.21	\$ 43.49	\$ 34.37	\$ 36.17	\$ 24.41	\$ 25.15		

Question: Can we allocate costs from under performing uses to over performing uses?
 Question: What uses can support these figures?
 Question: What uses are synergistic and most critical to the project mix?



Little Saigon Night Market - \$/SqFt/Month										
		Night Market	Asian Supermarke	Restaurant	Cultural Center	Pharmacy / Clinic	Childcare Center	Housing		
NNN Rental Rate	\$/SqFt/Mon	\$ 1.41	\$ 1.41	\$ 2.95	\$ 2.24	\$ 2.24	\$ 1.41	\$ 1.22		
Operating Expense	\$/SqFt/Mon	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.70		
Parking	\$/SqFt/Mon	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17		
Total		\$ 2.08	\$ 2.18	\$ 3.62	\$ 2.86	\$ 3.01	\$ 2.03	\$ 2.10		




Exhibit D3--Revised Space Program

PROJECT SIZE		SF
Night Market		
Mobile Kiosks	600	
Fixed Vendors	6,000	
Dining Area	250	
Bar Lounge Area	250	
Kitchen	1,400	
Storage Space	1,000	
Office Space	500	
Performance Stage	240	
Dressing Room	300	
Restrooms	1,200	half of 2,400 sf should be allocated to Asian market
BOH / Circulation	4,100	at 35% of total NSF, including delivery area
Total Night Market	15,840	
Asian Supermarket		
Kitchen	500	reduced from 1,000 sf
Storage Space	4,820	
Office Space	420	
Market	13,000	
Restrooms	1,200	half of 2,400 sf should be allocated to Asian market
BOH / Circulation	4,000	at 20% of total NSF, including delivery area
Total Asian Supermarket	23,940	
Restaurant		
Dining Area	2,280	
Bar Lounge Area	500	
Kitchen	2,360	
Storage Space	400	
Outdoor Space	1,803	
Office	300	
Restrooms	1,160	half of 2,320 sf should be allocated to Cultural Center
BOH / Circulation	1,992	should be at 20% of total NSF, not 3,689 sf
Total Restaurant	10,795	
Cultural Center		
Dining Area	6,800	
Kitchen	500	reduced from 1,000 sf
Storage Space	1,500	reduced from 2,000 sf
Office Space	750	
Leasable Office	750	
Meeting Rooms	2,000	
Outdoor Terrace	16,273	area to fill out 2nd floor's 46,980 sf footprint
Dressing Room	252	
Restrooms	1,160	half of 2,320 sf should be allocated to Cultural Center
BOH / Circulation	2,700	should be at 20% of total indoor NSF, not 3,680 sf
Total Cultural Center	32,685	
Pharmacy / Clinic		
Pharmacy / Clinic Area	6,000	
BOH / Circulation	1,200	should be at 20% of total NSF, not zero
Total pharmacy/clinic	7,200	first floor footprint is reduced from 50,620 sf to 46,980 sf
Childcare Center		
Childcare Area	3,500	
BOH / Circulation	-	Nothing allocated, placeholder
Total childcare center	3,500	
Housing		
Residential Area	79,280	
Outdoor Space	7,800	
BOH / Circulation	21,360	Nothing allocated, placeholder
Total Housing	108,440	
Parking		
Parking Area	45,550	
BOH / Circulation	5,070	
Total Parking	50,620	
TOTAL	253,020	
TOTAL w/o Parking	202,400	

Exhibit D4--Analysis of Revised Cost Estimate--All Components							3/13/2014
<i>Indoor only sf with revised and reduced areas</i>							
item	total	cultural center	night market	Asian super-market	restaurant	housing	parking
area(sf)--indoor	227,144	23,040	23,940	8,992	19,912	100,640	50,620
outdoor area(sf)	25,876	0	0	1,803	16,273	7,800	0
total area	253,020	23,040	23,940	10,795	36,185	108,440	50,620
demolition	\$253,000	\$25,663	\$26,665	\$10,016	\$22,179	\$112,096	\$56,382
shoring	\$896,188	\$163,221	\$169,597	\$63,702	\$141,062	\$0	\$358,606
earthwork	\$764,622	\$77,558	\$80,588	\$30,269	\$67,029	\$338,779	\$170,399
site utilities	\$100,000	\$10,143	\$10,540	\$3,959	\$8,766	\$44,307	\$22,285
storm detention	\$80,000	\$8,115	\$8,432	\$3,167	\$7,013	\$35,445	\$17,828
site paving	\$325,000	\$42,419	\$44,076	\$16,555	\$36,660	\$185,289	\$0
landscaping	\$250,000	\$32,630	\$33,905	\$12,735	\$28,200	\$142,530	\$0
concrete	\$5,844,300	\$973,350	\$1,011,372	\$379,877	\$841,204	\$500,000	\$2,138,497
gypcrete	\$182,993	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$182,993	\$0
brick	\$161,280	\$79,095	\$82,185	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
steel	\$200,000	\$20,287	\$21,079	\$7,917	\$17,532	\$88,613	\$44,571
wood frame	\$2,494,120	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,494,120	\$0
ext wll skin	\$907,325	\$118,425	\$123,050	\$46,218	\$102,347	\$517,285	\$0
interior res finish	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
storefront	\$506,131	\$153,672	\$159,675	\$59,975	\$132,809	\$0	\$0
electrical	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
hsg TI	\$7,692,540					\$7,692,540	
2nd floor TI beyond s & c	\$4,062,600	\$0	\$0	\$1,573,600	\$2,489,000	\$0	\$0
shell & core only	\$3,718,316	\$1,128,960	\$1,173,060	\$440,608	\$975,688	\$0	\$0
gc	\$1,418,400	\$143,873.21	\$149,493.26	\$56,150.52	\$124,340.42	\$628,446.17	\$316,096.43
insurance/B&O	\$378,725	\$38,415.36	\$39,915.96	\$14,992.66	\$33,199.94	\$167,800.44	\$84,400.42
bond	\$314,512	\$31,902.05	\$33,148.23	\$12,450.66	\$27,570.91	\$139,349.94	\$70,090.36
OH&P	\$803,611	\$81,513.07	\$84,697.17	\$31,812.74	\$70,446.54	\$356,053.61	\$179,088.17
cost per unit						\$135,867	\$26,792
cost per sf w/o TI or s & c	\$76.93	\$94.07	\$94.00	\$93.61	\$90.93	\$65.32	\$75.69
buildout cost per sf		\$49.00	\$49.00	\$224.00	\$174.00	\$76.44	
housing TI details	interior finish	plumbing	fire protection	HVAC	electrical	total TI	
	\$3,990,000	\$1,270,500	\$468,540	\$325,500	\$1,638,000	\$7,692,540	

Exhibit D5--Analysis of Revised Cost Estimate--Night Market

<i>Indoor only sf with revised and reduced areas</i>				3/13/2014
item	total	night market	pharmacy/ clinic	night market w/o clinic
area(sf)--indoor	227,144	23,040	7,200	15,840
outdoor area(sf)	25,876	0	0	0
total area	253,020	23,040	7,200	15,840
demolition	\$253,000	\$25,663	\$8,020	\$17,643
shoring	\$896,188	\$163,221	\$51,007	\$112,215
earthwork	\$764,622	\$77,558	\$24,237	\$53,321
site utilities	\$100,000	\$10,143	\$3,170	\$6,974
storm detention	\$80,000	\$8,115	\$2,536	\$5,579
subtotal sitework	\$2,093,810	\$284,700	\$88,969	\$195,732
site paving	\$325,000	\$42,419	\$13,256	\$29,163
landscaping	\$250,000	\$32,630	\$10,197	\$22,433
concrete	\$5,844,300	\$973,350	\$304,172	\$669,178
gypcrete	\$182,993	\$0	\$0	\$0
brick	\$161,280	\$79,095	\$24,717	\$54,378
steel	\$200,000	\$20,287	\$6,340	\$13,947
wood frame	\$2,494,120	\$0	\$0	\$0
ext wll skin	\$907,325	\$118,425	\$37,008	\$81,417
roof	\$1,214,400	\$123,180.78	\$38,494	\$84,687
storefront	\$506,131	\$153,672	\$48,023	\$105,650
elevator	\$380,000	\$43,846	\$13,702	\$30,144
subtotal total building	\$12,465,549	\$1,586,905	\$495,908	\$1,090,997
hsg ti	\$7,692,540		\$0	\$0
2nd floor ti beyond s & c	\$4,062,600	\$0	\$0	\$0
shell & core only	\$3,718,316	\$1,128,960	\$352,800	\$776,160
gc	\$1,418,400	\$143,873.21	\$44,960	\$98,913
insurance/B&O	\$378,725	\$38,415.36	\$12,005	\$26,411
bond	\$314,512	\$31,902.05	\$9,969	\$21,933
OH&P	\$803,611	\$81,513.07	\$25,473	\$56,040
subtotal other	\$18,388,704	\$1,424,664	\$445,207	\$979,456
total cost estimate	\$32,948,063	\$3,296,269	\$1,030,084	\$2,266,185
cost per sf (indoor only)	\$145.05	\$143.07	\$143.07	\$143.07

Exhibit D6--Analysis of Revised Cost Estimate--Cultural Center				
<i>Indoor only sf with revised and reduced areas</i>				3/13/2014
item	total	cultural center	childcare center	cultural center w/o childcare
area(sf)--indoor	227,144	19,912	3500	16,412
outdoor area(sf)	25,876	16,273	0	16,273
total area	253,020	36,185	3,500	32,685
demolition	\$253,000	\$22,179	\$3,898.41	\$18,280.19
shoring	\$896,188	\$141,062	\$24,794.93	\$116,266.98
site utilities	\$100,000	\$8,766	\$1,540.87	\$7,225.37
storm detention	\$80,000	\$7,013	\$1,232.70	\$5,780.30
subtotal sitework	\$2,093,810	\$246,048	\$43,249	\$202,800
site paving	\$325,000	\$36,660	\$6,443.88	\$30,216.29
landscaping	\$250,000	\$28,200	\$4,956.83	\$23,243.30
concrete	\$5,844,300	\$841,204	\$147,861.33	\$693,342.91
gypcrete	\$182,993	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
brick	\$161,280	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
wood frame	\$2,494,120	\$0	\$0.00	\$0.00
ext wll skin	\$907,325	\$102,347	\$17,989.83	\$84,356.90
plumbing	\$0	\$0		
HVAC residential	\$0	\$0		
electrical	\$0	\$0		
subtotal total building	\$12,465,549	\$1,309,056	\$230,097	\$1,078,959
hsg TI	\$7,692,540			
2nd floor TI beyond s & c	\$4,062,600	\$2,489,000	\$437,500.00	\$2,051,500.00
shell & core only	\$3,718,316	\$975,688	\$171,500.00	\$804,188.00
gc	\$1,418,400	\$124,340.42	\$21,855.74	\$102,484.68
bond	\$314,512	\$27,570.91	\$4,846.23	\$22,724.67
subtotal other	\$18,388,704	\$3,720,246	\$653,920	\$3,066,326
total cost estimate	\$32,948,063	\$5,275,350	\$927,266	\$4,348,084
cost per sf (indoor only)	\$145.05	\$264.93	\$264.93	\$264.93
buildout cost per sf		\$174.00		
housing TI details	interior finish	electrical		
	\$3,990,000	\$1,638,000		

**Little Saigon Landmark Project
Fine Tune Massing on Site #3**

project component	initial massing results(sf)	final massing results(sf)
Emerald market	25,300	23,000
SE Asian grocery	25,600	23,900
SE Asian restaurant	13,700	10,800
Vietnamese Cultural Center	37,000	36,200
Housing units	108,400 105	108,400 105
Parking stalls	50,600 143	50,600 143
total project size	260,600	252,900
construction cost (millions)	\$39.5	\$32.9
project cost(millions)	\$60.3	\$51.1

Exhibit D8--Revised Capital Cost Analysis

COSTS					
	Unit Amount	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	TOTAL
Night Market					
Note: Costs input from Marpac estimates dated 3/13/14					
Land	8%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$598,696	51,000 SF
Direct	15,840	SF	\$143	\$2,266,185	\$150 PSF
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$2,266,185	\$566,546	\$7,650,000 Purchase Price
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$2,266,185	\$56,655	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$2,889,386	\$216,704	
Total Night Market					\$3,704,785
Asian Market					
Land	12%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$904,847	
Direct	23,940	SF	\$137	\$3,286,897	*Indoor only SF for calc
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$3,286,897	\$821,724	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$3,286,897	\$82,172	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$4,190,794	\$314,310	
Total Asian Market					\$5,409,951
Restaurant					
Land	4%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$339,866	
Direct	8,992	SF	\$312	\$2,807,060	*\$/SF calc'd using only Indoor space so only indoor space in column C
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$2,807,060	\$701,765	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$2,807,060	\$70,177	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$3,579,002	\$268,425	
Total Restaurant					\$4,187,293
Cultural Center					
Land	8%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$620,315	
Direct	16,412	SF	\$265	\$4,348,084	*\$/SF calc'd using only Indoor space so only indoor space in column C
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$4,348,084	\$1,087,021	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$4,348,084	\$108,702	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$5,543,807	\$415,786	
Total Cultural Center					\$6,579,908
Pharmacy / Clinic					
Land	4%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$272,134	
Direct	7,200	SF	\$143	\$1,030,084	Same as Night Market
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$1,030,084	\$257,521	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$1,030,084	\$25,752	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$1,313,357	\$98,502	
Total Cultural Center					\$1,683,993
Childcare Center					
Land	2%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$132,288	assumed \$/Ft same as cultural center as costs were not broken out
Direct	3,500	SF	\$265	\$927,266	
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$927,266	\$231,817	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$927,266	\$23,182	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$1,182,265	\$88,670	
Total Cultural Center					\$1,403,222
Housing					
Land	50%	of total	\$7,650,000	\$3,803,834	
Direct	100,640	SF	\$140.33	\$14,122,912	*\$/SF calc'd using only Indoor space so only indoor space in column C
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$14,122,912	\$3,530,728	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$14,122,912	\$353,073	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$18,006,713	\$1,350,503	
Total Housing					\$23,161,050
Parking					
Land					
Direct	50,620	SF	\$71	\$3,612,923	*Indoor only SF for calc
Indirect	25.0%	of direct	\$3,612,923	\$903,231	
Developer Fee	2.5%	of direct	\$3,612,923	\$90,323	
Contingency	7.5%	of total	\$4,606,477	\$345,486	
Total Parking					\$4,951,962
TOTAL					\$51,082,165

OPERATING EXPENSES	\$/Month/PSF	\$/Year/PSF			
Night Market	\$0.50	\$6.00	PSF	\$95,040	Annual
Asian Market	\$0.60	\$7.20	PSF	\$172,368	Annual
Restaurant	\$0.50	\$6.00	PSF	\$64,770	Annual
Cultural Center	\$0.45	\$5.40	PSF	\$176,499	Annual
Pharmacy / Clinic	\$0.60	\$7.20	PSF	\$4,320	Annual
Childcare Center	\$0.45	\$5.40	PSF	\$1,575	Annual
Housing	\$0.70	\$8.40	PSF	\$29,400	Annual
Parking	\$0.10	\$1.20	PSF	\$60,744	Annual
				\$604,716	

Per Square Ft Per Year

Value Analysis		Notes
Summary 2 Revenue	\$3,575,752	total annual rents
Operating Expense	\$604,716	
NOI	\$2,971,036	Derived from total annual rent
CapRate	7.00%	estimate
Value	\$42,443,365	NOI/Caprate


Direct Cost Totals	Costs
Night Market	\$2,266,185
Asian Market	\$3,286,897
Restaurant	\$2,807,060
Cultural Center	\$4,348,084
Pharmacy / Clinic	\$1,030,084
Childcare Center	\$927,266
Housing	\$14,122,912
Parking	\$3,612,923
Total	\$32,401,412

Exhibit D9--Revised Rental Rate Comparison

NIGHT MARKET SUMMARY OUTPUT (\$/SF/Yr) - INPUTS AS OF 04/15/14

DATE: 4/15/2014

Little Saigon Night Market - \$/SqFt/Yr									
	Night Market	Asian Market	Restaurant	Cultural Center	Pharmacy / Clinic	Childcare Center	Housing		
NNN Rental Rate \$/SqFt/Yr	\$ -	\$ 16.37	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.37	\$ 28.06	\$ 15.08		
Mortgage-Rent Equ \$/SqFt/Yr	\$ 16.83	\$ -	\$ 28.35	\$ 15.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
NNN Operating Exp \$/SqFt/Yr	\$ -	\$ 7.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9.00	\$ 5.40	\$ 8.40		
Parking \$/SqFt/Yr	\$ 1.97	\$ 1.97	\$ 1.97	\$ 1.97	\$ 1.97	\$ 1.97	\$ 1.97		
Total	\$ 18.80	\$ 25.54	\$ 30.33	\$ 17.86	\$ 27.35	\$ 35.44	\$ 25.45		



Notes:

1. If provided with operational and performance estimates for individual tenant then mortgage payment per square foot, or "Mortgage-Rent Equivalent" substituted for cost-margin estimate approach.
2. "Mortgage-Rent Equivalent" is what the tenant can afford to pay based on estimated performance of individual use and funds available for hypothetical financing of space.
3. Operations analysis and estimate from SCIDpda arrives at "Mortgage-Rent Equivalent" which includes full expected operational costs and replaces NNN Operating Expense estimate.

All-in Rental Rate Margin on Cost

Little Saigon Night Market - \$/SqFt/Yr										
	Night Market	Asian Market	Restaurant	Cultural Cent	Pharmacy / Clir	Childcare Center	Housing	Parking		Notes
Allocated Cost \$/SqFt/Yr	\$3,704,785	\$5,596,930	\$4,254,268	\$6,579,908	\$1,683,993	\$1,403,222	\$23,357,192	\$5,251,119	\$51,831,418	Total cost including parking
NNN Rental Rate or Equivalent Only	\$ 16.83	\$ 16.37	\$ 28.35	\$ 15.88	\$ 16.37	\$ 28.06	\$ 15.08		\$ 16.41	Weighted Average only NNN rate or Equ
Total Estimated R _i \$/SqFt/Yr	\$ 18.80	\$ 25.54	\$ 30.33	\$ 17.86	\$ 27.35	\$ 35.44	\$ 25.45		\$ 24.72	Weighted Average including parking allo
Square Feet	15,840	23,940	8,992	16,412	7,200	3,500	108,440		184,324	SqFt of Tenant space (not parking)
NNN or Equivalent Margin	7.19%	7.00%	5.99%	3.96%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%		5.84%	
Total Rent Margin	8.04%	10.92%	6.41%	4.45%	11.69%	8.84%	11.82%		8.79%	Margin on tenant space not inclusive of

Exhibit D11--Economic Analysis of Asian Supermarket

total area (sf)	23,940	
annual sales	\$800,000	
cost of goods sold (35%)	\$280,000	
Gross margin	\$520,000	
sales marketing cost	\$13,000	
payroll cost	\$100,000	
payroll burden	\$15,000	
non-labor expenses	\$12,000	
net profit before debt service	\$380,000	
capital cost	\$5,399,339	note: this cost is just for shell and core
owner's equity	\$500,000	note: owner to fund tenant improvements
debt principal	\$4,899,339	
interest rate	0.5%	
months mortgage	360	
monthly debt service	-\$29,374.01	
annual debt service	-\$352,488.15	

Exhibit D12--Economic Analysis of Restaurant	2/24/2014
---	-----------

total area (w/o outdoor)	10,795	sf	
dining room area	2,280	sf	
bar area	500	sf	
outdoor area	1,803	sf	
dining seats	120		
bar seats	20		

monthly pro forma			
	low	high	
lunch sales	3,000	5,000	120-200 per day
dinner sales	3,500	5,000	140-200 per day
bar sales	7,500	12,500	300-500 drinks per day
revenue			
lunch	\$30,000	\$50,000	at \$10 per
dinner	\$56,000	\$80,000	at \$16 per
bar	\$52,500	\$87,500	at \$7 per
total revenue	\$138,500	\$217,500	
cgs-lunch	\$10,500	\$17,500	35% of lunch revenue
cgs-dinner	\$16,800	\$24,000	30% of dinner revenue
cgs-bar	\$13,125	\$21,875	10% of bar revenue
total cgs	\$40,425	\$63,375	
net revenue	\$98,075	\$154,125	to cover staffing utilities, etc.
labor cost	\$48,475	\$76,125	at 35% of revenue
utilities/maint/repair/insur/secur	\$21,590	\$21,590	at \$2 per total sf per month
general and administrative	\$21,590	\$21,590	at \$2 per total sf per month
net income for debt service	\$6,420	\$34,820	
debt service			
principal	\$4,258,861	100% finan	note: this space is fully built out.
interest rate	0.5%		verified \$1.6 MM build out cost.
months mortgage	360		
monthly debt service	(\$25,534.02)		

banquet hall pro forma (annual)			
number of uses	25		
number of diners per use	400		
dining revenue	\$250,000		\$25 per diner charge to user
cgs	\$75,000		at 30% of revenue
labor	\$100,000		at 40% of revenue
net income	\$75,000		
rental cost of room	\$62,500		\$2,500 per use
net to restaurant owner	\$12,500		annually

Exhibit D13--Economic Analysis of Cultural Center				2/24/2014
total indoor area	17,412	sf w/o childcare center		
use	capacity	area (sf)		
performance hall	700-800 seats	6,750		
meeting rooms	4 large (30) or 8 small (12)	2,000		
co working space	6-8 work stations	650		
annual revenue				
		# of uses	rental per use	revenue
performance hall				
	large celebrations	4	\$4,000	\$16,000
	large celebrations	200	\$200	\$40,000
	<i>at 50-100 attendees each, 4 meetings per week or 200 per year</i>			
	banquet	60	\$2,500	\$150,000
	<i>5 banquets per month with 250 to 400 attendees each</i>			
	total performance hall revenue			\$206,000
large meeting rooms--2 rooms	hours per year	3,000	\$75	\$225,000
<i>classes/small group functions--up to 30 people each, 2 uses per room per day at 6 days per week, 2.5 hours each</i>				
small meeting rooms-4 rooms	hours per year	4,800	\$35	\$168,000
<i>small group meetings--8-12 persons each, 2 uses per day per room at 6 days per week, 2 hours each</i>				
co-working space	7 spaces at \$375/space/month	7	\$4,500	\$31,500
	\$375x 12=\$4,500 annual rental per space			
	total cultural center rental revenue			\$630,500
expenses				
	operating costs for total space	17,412	\$5.40	\$94,025
	staffing cost(includes 25% for benefits)			\$231,250
	other general and admin costs(security, etc)			\$50,000
	total expenses			\$375,275
	net income available for debt service			\$255,225
	staffing cost details			
	general manager	\$40,000		
	scheduler/receptionist	\$30,000		
	kitchen manager	\$35,000	do we need a full time person	
	event planner(pt)	\$15,000		
	AV technician(pt)	\$15,000		
	janitor/maintenance tech	\$30,000		
	other	\$20,000		what else do we need?
	total staffing cost	\$185,000		

Exhibit D14--Economic Analysis of Housing (Part 1)

Form 8A--Proposed Rents

RENT CALCULATIONS

Instructions:

*Rent: If the project includes PHA/HUD/USDA subsidy, include only the subsidy payment amount in column H

**Annual Gross Tenant Paid Rental Income will flow into Year 1 "Annual Gross Tenant Paid Rental Income" on the Operating Pro Forma

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
% of Median Income Served	Number of Units or Beds	Unit Size (Number of Bedrooms)	Average Square footage of unit	Tenant - Paid Monthly Rent	Tenant - Paid Utilities	Sum of Tenant - Paid Rent and Utilities (E + F)	PHA / HUD / USDA Subsidy Payment *	Gross Monthly Rent (G + H)	Annual Gross Tenant Paid Rental Income ** (B x E) x 12	Annual Gross Rental Subsidy Income *** (B x H) x 12	Annual Gross Rental Income J+K
30.00%	25	1	500	\$ 481.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 496.00	\$ -	\$ 496.00	\$ 144,300.00	\$ -	\$ 144,300.00
30.00%	24	2	800	\$ 576.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 596.00	\$ -	\$ 596.00	\$ 165,888.00	\$ -	\$ 165,888.00
30.00%	14	3	1200	\$ 653.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 688.00	\$ -	\$ 688.00	\$ 109,704.00	\$ -	\$ 109,704.00
50.00%	16	studio	400	\$ 757.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 772.00		\$ 772.00	\$ 145,344.00		\$ 145,344.00
50.00%	6	1	550	\$ 812.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 827.00		\$ 827.00	\$ 58,464.00		\$ 58,464.00
50.00%	5	2	850	\$ 972.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 992.00		\$ 992.00	\$ 58,320.00		\$ 58,320.00
50.00%	4	3	1200	\$ 1,111.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 1,146.00	\$ -	\$ 1,146.00	\$ 53,328.00	\$ -	\$ 53,328.00
60.00%	10	studio	500	\$ 912.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 927.00	\$ -	\$ 927.00	\$ 109,440.00	\$ -	\$ 109,440.00
60.00%	9	1	550	\$ 978.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 993.00	\$ -	\$ 993.00	\$ 105,624.00	\$ -	\$ 105,624.00
60.00%	12	2	900	\$ 1,171.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 1,191.00	\$ -	\$ 1,191.00	\$ 168,624.00	\$ -	\$ 168,624.00
Common Area Units (Unrestricted Mgr's Units)				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Market Rate Units				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Totals	125								\$ 1,119,036.00	\$ -	\$ 1,119,036.00

**Form 8C
Operating Pro Forma**

REVENUES

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Residential Income								
Annual Gross Tenant Paid Rental Income	Escalator 2.50%	1,119,036	1,147,012	1,175,687	1,205,079	1,235,206	1,266,087	1,297,739
Annual Gross Rental Subsidy Income	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Annual Operating Subsidy Sources	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other: Name of First Other Source	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other: Name of Second Other Source	0.00%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Residential Income	=	1,119,036	1,147,012	1,175,687	1,205,079	1,235,206	1,266,087	1,297,739
Total Annual Service Funding		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Non-Residential Income		1,032,000	1,062,960	1,094,849	1,127,694	1,161,525	1,196,371	1,232,262
TOTAL PROJECT INCOME	=	2,151,036	2,209,972	2,270,536	2,332,774	2,396,731	2,462,457	2,530,001
Annual Residential Vacancy	Annual % 3.00%	-	34,410	35,271	36,152	37,056	37,983	38,932
Annual Non-Residential Vacancy	5.00%	-	57,351	58,784	60,254	61,760	63,304	64,887
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME (EGI)	=	2,151,036	2,118,211	2,176,481	2,236,367	2,297,915	2,361,170	2,426,182

EXPENSES

		Cost Per Unit (Y1)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Operating Expenses-									
Management - On-site	Escalator 3.00%	900	113,400	116,802	120,306	123,915	127,633	131,462	135,406
Management - Off-site	3.00%	500	63,000	64,890	66,837	68,842	70,907	73,034	75,225
Accounting	3.00%	80	10,080	10,382	10,694	11,015	11,345	11,685	12,036
Legal Services	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Insurance	3.00%	300	37,800	38,934	40,102	41,305	42,544	43,821	45,135
Real Estate Taxes	3.00%	400	50,400	51,912	53,469	55,073	56,726	58,427	60,180
Marketing	3.00%	90	11,340	11,680	12,031	12,392	12,763	13,146	13,541
Security	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenance and janitorial	3.00%	800	100,800	103,824	106,939	110,147	113,451	116,855	120,360
Decorating/Turnover	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contract Repairs	3.00%	200	25,200	25,956	26,735	27,537	28,363	29,214	30,090
Landscaping	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pest Control	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fire Safety	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Elevator	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water & Sewer	3.00%	650	81,900	84,357	86,888	89,494	92,179	94,945	97,793
Garbage Removal	3.00%	250	31,500	32,445	33,418	34,421	35,454	36,517	37,613
Electric	3.00%	250	31,500	32,445	33,418	34,421	35,454	36,517	37,613
Oil/Gas/Other	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Telephone	3.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3.00%	350	44,100	45,423	46,786	48,189	49,635	51,124	52,658
Total Residential Operating Expenses			601,020	619,051	637,622	656,751	676,453	696,747	717,649
Replacement Reserve	Escalator 3.00%	380	47,880	49,316	50,796	52,320	53,889	55,506	57,171
Operating Reserve	3.00%	122	15,372	15,833	16,308	16,797	17,301	17,820	18,355
Total Reserves			63,252	65,150	67,104	69,117	71,191	73,326	75,526
Service Expenses	0.00%	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-Residential Expenses	0.00%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES	=		664,272	684,200	704,726	725,868	747,644	770,073	793,176
NET OPERATING INCOME (EGI - Total Expenses)	=		1,486,764	1,434,011	1,471,755	1,510,499	1,550,271	1,591,097	1,633,006

DEBT SERVICE

	Loan Amount	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
HTF	\$ 3,000,000	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244
tax exempt bond	\$ 2,927,171	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655
Lender 5	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-Residential Lender	\$ 15,023,614	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE		1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348
Gross Cash Flow		66,416	13,662	51,407	90,151	129,923	170,749	212,658
Debt Coverage Ratio		1.046760121	1.009619083	1.036192894	1.063471051	1.091472361	1.120216141	1.149722224

**Form 8C
Operating Pro Forma**

REVENUES

	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15
Residential Income								
Annual Gross Tenant Paid Rental Income	1,330,182	1,363,437	1,397,523	1,432,461	1,468,272	1,504,979	1,542,603	1,581,169
Annual Gross Rental Subsidy Income	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Annual Operating Subsidy Sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other: <input type="text" value="Name of First Other Source"/>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other: <input type="text" value="Name of Second Other Source"/>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Residential Income	1,330,182	1,363,437	1,397,523	1,432,461	1,468,272	1,504,979	1,542,603	1,581,169
Total Annual Service Funding	-							
Total Non-Residential Income	1,269,230	1,307,307	1,346,526	1,386,922	1,428,529	1,471,385	1,515,527	1,560,993
TOTAL PROJECT INCOME	2,599,412	2,670,743	2,744,049	2,819,382	2,896,802	2,976,364	3,058,130	3,142,161
Residential Vacancy	39,905	40,903	41,926	42,974	44,048	45,149	46,278	47,435
Non-Residential Vacancy	66,509	68,172	69,876	71,623	73,414	75,249	77,130	79,058
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME (EGI)	2,492,997	2,561,668	2,632,247	2,704,786	2,779,340	2,855,966	2,934,722	3,015,668

EXPENSES

	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15
Operating Expenses-								
Management - On-site	139,468	143,652	147,961	152,400	156,972	161,681	166,532	171,528
Management - Off-site	77,482	79,807	82,201	84,667	87,207	89,823	92,518	95,293
Accounting	12,397	12,769	13,152	13,547	13,953	14,372	14,803	15,247
Legal Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Insurance	46,489	47,884	49,320	50,800	52,324	53,894	55,511	57,176
Real Estate Taxes	61,986	63,845	65,761	67,733	69,765	71,858	74,014	76,235
Marketing	13,947	14,365	14,796	15,240	15,697	16,168	16,653	17,153
Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenance and janitorial	123,971	127,690	131,521	135,467	139,531	143,717	148,028	152,469
Decorating/Turnover	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contract Repairs	30,993	31,923	32,880	33,867	34,883	35,929	37,007	38,117
Landscaping	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pest Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fire Safety	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Elevator	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water & Sewer	100,727	103,748	106,861	110,067	113,369	116,770	120,273	123,881
Garbage Removal	38,741	39,903	41,100	42,333	43,603	44,911	46,259	47,647
Electric	38,741	39,903	41,100	42,333	43,603	44,911	46,259	47,647
Oil/Gas/Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Telephone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	54,237	55,865	57,540	59,267	61,045	62,876	64,762	66,705
Total Residential Operating Expenses	739,179	761,354	784,195	807,721	831,952	856,911	882,618	909,097
Replacement Reserve	58,886	60,653	62,473	64,347	66,277	68,265	70,313	72,423
Operating Reserve	18,906	19,473	20,057	20,659	21,278	21,917	22,574	23,252
Total Reserves	77,792	80,126	82,530	85,005	87,556	90,182	92,888	95,674
Service Expenses	-							
Non-Residential Expenses	-							
TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES	816,971	841,480	866,724	892,726	919,508	947,093	975,506	1,004,771
NET OPERATING INCOME (EGI - Total Expenses)	1,676,027	1,720,189	1,765,522	1,812,060	1,859,832	1,908,873	1,959,216	2,010,897

DEBT SERVICE

	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14	Year 15
HTF	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244	116,244
tax exempt bond	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655	212,655
Lender 5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Non-Residential Lender	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449	1,091,449
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348	1,420,348
Gross Cash Flow	255,678	299,840	345,174	391,711	439,484	488,525	538,868	590,548
Debt Coverage Ratio	1.180010979	1.211103325	1.243020741	1.275785288	1.309419619	1.343946999	1.37939132	1.415777119

Appendix E—Vietnamese Cultural Center Feasibility Study

The Cultural Center Feasibility Study was completed by SCIDpda as part of the Little Saigon Landmark feasibility analysis. The study was funded by the City of Seattle’s Office of Economic Development, the Seattle Housing Authority, and JP Morgan Chase.



Vietnamese Cultural Center Feasibility Study

Little Saigon Landmark Project
Seattle, WA

2013-2014



Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary	2
2.0 Introduction	4
3.0 Location Analysis	9
4.0 Supply Analysis	14
5.0 Demand Analysis	27
6.0 Stakeholder & User Analysis	31

Exhibits

- E1. Little Saigon Action Plan 2020
- E2. Little Saigon Visitors and Residents Survey
- E3. Cultural Center Stakeholder and User Report

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Background

The Vietnamese American Cultural Center is a central component in the Little Saigon Landmark development project proposed for Seattle’s International District. Identified as a priority by local constituents in the Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan (Exhibit E1) and the Community Action Research & Empowerment (CARE) report, a Vietnamese Cultural Center would strengthen the sense of place in Little Saigon, and serve as a social, cultural and economic anchor for the community. This study evaluates the feasibility of creating a VCC based on local supply and demand data, as well as on the lessons learned from cultural centers locally and nationally.

1.2 Key Findings

- *Community Support*

Little Saigon and the Vietnamese American community have long waited for a Vietnamese Cultural Center. From the Little Saigon Visitor and Resident Survey, over three-quarters (78%) believe it will have a positive impact on the neighborhood. Nearly half (49% “very positive impact) hold an intensely positive position of Little Saigon Landmark project.

- *Cultural Center Models from across the US and Puget Sound Region*

There are many successful community and cultural center models across the nation, all serving their own constituency. Because each center assessed in this study was built on the grounds of community needs, there is a very broad range of usage and programming. However, among the 20 centers studied, majority of the centers were built to stand alone, showing that there are very few models out there that have mix-used configuration similar to the Little Saigon Landmark proposal.

Among the local centers, only the Wing Luke Museum, shares the culture and experiences of the Vietnamese American community, but is on a limited scale and scope. Besides filling an unmet need of the Vietnamese community a Vietnamese Cultural Center would also enrich the cultural fabric of the Greater Seattle area.

- *Functional Components*

All of the centers in this study have a large gathering space that can accommodate large events and activities. The ones that are successful at renting out their space on a regular basis, are designed as flexible space that can be transformed into different sized spaces for a variety of functions.

- *Programs & Services*

The Puget Sound Region has a growing Vietnamese American demographic, in addition to the growing potential of Little Saigon with the Yesler Terrace Redevelopment. Being the main focus for the Vietnamese Cultural Center, this demographic includes (but not exclusive to) Vietnamese American families, seniors, youths, small businesses, and community members and groups. Among the existing groups, Vietnamese community organizations lack appropriate space to conduct programming and services to serve the community.

The types of programs and services currently identified as priorities include: senior services, arts and cultural programs, educational & training programs, and culturally-specific community events and celebrations. There are many Vietnamese organizations that conduct these programs but are on such a small scale that there is no potential for growth. With these organizations potentially becoming users, the Vietnamese Cultural Center may be the support they need to grow their programs. In addition, majority of the “cultural” centers assessed in this study, offer similar services but are catered to a specific culture, which are not culturally specific to the Vietnamese community.

- *Budget & Funding*

Of the centers assessed in this study, all but one are owned and operated by an individual organization with a board of directors. The majority of the centers we surveyed depended on grants, rental income, and private contributions as revenue sources. Programs and services take up _% of the expenses, but are typically covered through program fees and individual grants. For the purposes of this feasibility study, it is assumed that Friends of Little Saigon would be the main operating organization for the Vietnamese Cultural Center.

1.3 Recommendations

- It is critical for the VCC to have a strong organization that can actively lead the project from the beginning and potentially be the operator.
- The preferred structure would be to have the current Friends of Little Saigon Board of Directors also become the governing Board for the Cultural Center. This Board would be in charge of overseeing the center and staff that manages the space. The staff would be hired by the Board. Once a manager or director of the Cultural Center is identified, the responsibility of day-to-day operations of the center falls to the manager/director.
- The VCC will need a gathering/performance hall that is flexible and equipped with amenities needed for most performance and event needs. This is also the same for the meeting room spaces.
- Rental income will be a critical source of income that the VCC will need to prioritize.
- Lessons from how childcare centers interact with cultural/community centers as tenants and social service providers will be important to consider in determining the feasibility of its inclusion within the Little Saigon Landmark project.
- Develop partnerships with existing organization already offering services that can serve the Vietnamese American community.
- Friends of Little Saigon will need to do additional outreach and engagement on the specific types of programs and how they will be run in order determine a sustainable business plan for the center.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility of a Vietnamese Cultural Center, as part of the Little Saigon Landmark project. This study looks at examples of local and national cultural center models in different communities. Specifically, it looks at functional components, types of programs and services, and operational and management structures. The Vietnamese Cultural Center is an important anchor component in the Landmark project, because the Cultural Center is identified as a high-priority need by local constituents. The study will help to address the feasibility of a Cultural Center in this neighborhood.

2.2 History and Background

Seattle's Little Saigon neighborhood is located in the Chinatown International District just east of I-5. It is mainly a small business district with approximately 125 businesses, most of which are in the food or service sector. About 70% of the businesses are owned by Vietnamese who came to the area as refugees starting in 1975. The neighborhood has about 110 residential units, of which about half are market-rate condos and the other half affordable housing.

The area was essentially comprised of vacant buildings during the 1960s and 1970s. It became known as "Little Saigon" in the early 1980s when mom-and-pop shops began sprouting up as the Vietnamese refugees settled into their newly adopted country.

Currently, Little Saigon is a vibrant and vital social, cultural, and economic hub for the Vietnamese community in the Puget Sound area. There are approximately 55,000 people of Vietnamese-descent living in King County according to the 2010 U.S. Census.

External Challenges Facing Little Saigon

Little Saigon's proximity to Downtown Seattle coupled with being a low-rise area makes it an especially attractive neighborhood for developers. Combine this with a recent major rezone of the South Downtown area (of which Little Saigon is a part of), the construction of the First Hill Streetcar line that passes through the neighborhood, and the impending major rezone of the Seattle Housing Authority's 30-acre Yesler Terrace property, Little Saigon is facing several displacement forces of tsunami intensity:

- 1) Livable South Downtown Rezoning (2011): Changed the neighborhood's mostly Industrial Commercial (IC) zoning to Downtown Mixed-Use (DMC/R) and allowed building height to go up to 160' if certain criteria were met.

- 2) First Hill Streetcar (under construction): Connects the International District light rail station to the future Capitol Hill station and passing through First Hill.
- 3) Yesler Terrace Rezoning Proposal (2012): Would increase residential density from 561 up to 5,000 units. Would add up to one million square feet of office space. Would add up to 180,000 square feet of retail. Would allow up to 13 high rise towers to go as high as 300’.

Internal Challenges Facing the Little Saigon Community

Facing all of these impending changes is a community that does not have any civic institutions capable of advocating and engaging on the community’s behalf. The small businesses are pinned to their shops and restaurants in a constant battle to stay alive with thin profit margins, fierce competition, and rising costs. The community-based nonprofits lack the capacity to address issues beyond the parameters of their programs. The religious institutions are fiercely independent and generally don’t involve themselves in neighborhood matters. The broader Vietnamese community is fragmented and has a weak tradition of community collaboration and partnership.

2.3 Defining the Community

Little Saigon is the social, economic, and cultural hub of the Vietnamese community in the Puget Sound region. In the 30 years since the first group of Vietnamese businesses took root in this area, Little Saigon has become a vibrant and vital part of the Vietnamese community as well as the International District.

Prior to the arrival of the first wave of Vietnamese refugees fleeing oppression after the Fall of Saigon, the area directly east of Interstate-5 was a largely abandoned and unproductive neighborhood full of blight and crime.

Today, Little Saigon businesses and institutions serve over 40,000 Vietnamese-Americans from all over the Puget Sound region. There are about 100 businesses in the neighborhood, most of which are Vietnamese-owned. The neighborhood is bounded by I-5 to the west, Rainier and Boren to the east, Yesler Terrace to the north, and Dearborn to the south. Just outside these boundaries lie the Vietnam Buddhist Temple and the Vietnamese Catholic Church, two major religious institutions in the community.

The enterprising refugees who first set up shop in the area and turned it into a vibrant business district laid down a solid foundation. The neighborhood is now ready for the next stage in the evolution of Little Saigon. The richness of Vietnamese culture and tradition mixed with the dynamism of contemporary American culture is ready to be showcased and experienced.

Imagine a Vietnamese cultural center showcasing the best of Vietnamese-American culture. Imagine a social hub for people of all background who are interested in Vietnamese culture and

history. Imagine a neighborhood that is a perfect blend of social, cultural, and recreational experiences.


Friends of Little Saigon (FLS) was created to bring just such a vision to life. Their mission is to preserve and enhance Little Saigon’s cultural, economic and historic vitality.

2.4 Friends of Little Saigon

In 2010 an ad hoc group of concerned and committed community stakeholders came together to work on the development of a park space in Little Saigon, and in January 2011, these stakeholders expanded their scope and became incorporated as a community-based, non-profit known as Friends of Little Saigon (FLS). Composed of individuals, community groups, and small businesses, FLS has a vision of Little Saigon being the hub of the Vietnamese American community where all families and businesses are thriving.

Through support from the Puget Sound Regional Council’s Growing Transit Communities grant, FLS conducted an organizational development process that resulted with a 3-year Strategic Plan. In this plan, FLS established three main goals:

1. Promote the economic development and vitality of Little Saigon.
2. Strengthen the cultural awareness of and sensitivity to Little Saigon.
3. Enhance the capacity of FLS to harness community involvement for the improvement of Little Saigon



In 2012, FLS organized the community in creating a long-range neighborhood plan, with the following overview:

The Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan is a road map that will help guide the community capacity building process while also addressing external displacement factors. Using a project-based approach, it aims to rally the community around tangible projects with strong community support. Key elements of the plan’s overall strategy are:

- Build civic momentum starting with a core group of passionate community stakeholders
- Focus that civic passion on a visionary project that aligns with community needs
- Develop a trusted and sustainable organization designed to harness community involvement for the improvement of Little Saigon
- Maximize collaboration and partnerships to leverage limited resources

The Little Saigon Landmark was a direct outgrowth of the elevated action items from the Little Saigon Action Plan and visioning process. This project encapsulates many of the main recommendations into a single tangible mixed-use development that can more effectively focus limited community resources. The Little Saigon Landmark development aims to be the social, cultural, and economic hub of the Vietnamese American community in the Greater Seattle Area.

2.5 SCIDpda’s role in the neighborhood

SCIDpda plays a fundamental role in advocating for the preservation and development of the Little Saigon neighborhood. For the past 3 years, SCIDpda has helped to foster community leadership, capacity building for the Friends of Little Saigon, and built relationships and partnerships with local organizations and institutions.

SCIDpda has also been serving as the fiscal sponsor for the Friends of Little Saigon. This role helps support FLS in the development of their organization and implementation of projects in Little Saigon. With full-time staff dedicated to Little Saigon, SCIDpda has a direct hand in mobilizing the community around issues that affect the neighborhood. SCIDpda has built strong relationships within the community to advocate on its behalf but has also helped increase investment from local government and institutions to support the future growth of Little Saigon.

As a key partner in the Landmark project, SCIDpda has been directed as the consultant overlooking the multiple components.

2.6 Methodology

The research method used to assess the feasibility of a Vietnamese Cultural Center was a combination of qualitative responses and quantitative data collection. The centers chosen to be part of the study are dependent on specific factors: geographic location and structural concept similar to the proposed Vietnamese Cultural Center, and the center’s willingness to participate. Some of the tools used were:

- Little Saigon Customer & Visitor Survey (August – September 2013) (Exhibit E2)
- Interviews with local centers (September – October 2013)
- Community stakeholders/users report conducted by the Vietnamese Friendship Association (September – November 2013) (Exhibit E3)

- National cultural/community models survey conducted by the Seattle University Educational Doctorate Candidates (January – May 2013)




2.7 Funding acknowledgment

Research reported in this feasibility study was supported by the City of Seattle’s Office of Economic Development, the Seattle Housing Authority, and JP Morgan Chase. Additional in-kind support from the following organizations and institutions made this study possible: Vietnamese Friendship Association, Seattle University Educational Leadership program, 4Culture, the City of Seattle’s departments and offices of Arts, Housing, Planning and Development, and Neighborhoods.

Disclaimer: The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the City of Seattle’s Office of Economic Development.

3.0 Location Analysis

3.1 Demographics



From the 2010 Census Data, the Vietnamese population in King County is 43,746 people. This represents 2.3% of the county’s total population, which is 1,931,249 people. See Figures 1-2 for more detailed information.

Figure 1. Data from Little Saigon Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix F)

	ID	%	LS	%	Study Area	%
Population	2135	100	268	100	27197	100
Households	1268	100	82	100	12306	100
Average household size	1.7		1.9		1.8	
Housing units	1353	100	89	100	13938	100
Rental	1221	96	75	91	9673	79
Ownership	47	4	7	9	2633	21
Race (alone or in any combination)						
White	395	19	63	24	12978	48
Black/African American	167	8	44	16	5539	20
American Indian/Alaska Native	43	2	16	6	749	3
Asian	1559	73	142	53	7601	28
Native Hawaii/Other Pacific	22	1	1	0+4	267	1
Islander	49	2	12		1663	6
Other						
Age						
Under 18	204	10	19	7	3007	11
65 years and over	630	30	85	32	3585	13
Income						
Median household income	Income data not available at block level				\$13,667 – \$58,229	
Mean household income					\$30,677 – \$73,845	

Figure 2. Regional Vietnamese Community & King County

	Vietnamese Community	King County
Household size	3.4 people	2.4 people
Family households	3.8 people (78%)	3 people (59%)
Families with children	48%	30%
Single householders	17%	31%
Seniors living alone	16%	30%
Median household income	\$58,638	\$70,567
English proficiency – speaks English “less than very well”	53%	11%
Homeownership rate	63%	60%

3.2 Current Residents and Visitors

According to the Little Saigon Resident & Visitors survey conducted in early fall 2013, about a quarter (26%) of the people surveyed live or work in Little Saigon, while two thirds (68%) were visitors. See Exhibit E2 for the survey.

- 3.2.1 Despite not having a live/work connection to Little Saigon, about half (51%) of visitors come to the neighborhood at least weekly and another fifth (19%) visit 2-3 times per month. These visitors are largely coming from surrounding areas (First Hill, ID, CD).
- 3.2.2 Majority of visitors and residents/employees are coming to Little Saigon for grocery shopping (51% mention as a reason) and dining (51%), followed by errands, cultural attractions, retail shopping and connecting to transit (18-23% each)
- 3.2.3 Two-thirds (66%) of visitors stay in Little Saigon for two hours or less, though very few (3%) report parking but not staying. About a quarter (26%) stay for 3 hours or longer.

3.3 Employment

This section drawn from the Little Saigon Housing Needs Assessment (2013)—Appendix F

The Chinatown/ID has 4,061 total jobs as reported in 2011—more jobs than residents.¹ The vast majority of local jobs are low-wage, with 80 percent paying less than \$40,000 per year (Fig. 11). This amount is only 65% of area median income (AMI) for a one-person household and less than 50% of AMI for a family of four.² Over 30 percent pay \$15,000 or less per year—below 30% of AMI for any family size.

The census tracts around Little Saigon report nearly 48,000 jobs—close to ten percent of all jobs in Seattle (Fig. 3). These reflect a high concentration of hospitals and educational institutions around First Hill and Capitol Hill, and are much higher-paying. Over 60 percent pay more than \$40,000 per year, compared to just 12 percent that pay less than \$15,000 annually.

Figure 3.

Annual Wages	Percent of Jobs		
	Chinatown ID	Little Saigon Study Area	Seattle
\$15,000 or less	32%	12%	21%
\$15,001 to \$39,996	48%	24%	27%
\$39,997 or more	20%	63%	52%

The Livable South Downtown Final Environmental Impact Statement produced in 2008 noted a potential increase of close to 16,000 jobs in the South Downtown area (Pioneer Square, the stadium area, and the ID, and south of Dearborn) by 2030, for a total employment capacity of nearly 33,000 jobs in South Downtown.³ Little Saigon is projected to hold 8,200 to 8,300 jobs.

¹ [Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics database, http://lehd.did.census.gov](http://lehd.did.census.gov).

² These are AMIs from 2011, the same year as the jobs data.

³ *Livable South Downtown Planning Study*, 3-119.


The concentration of jobs in the neighborhood and surrounding areas should generate a consistent demand for housing.⁴

3.4 Transportation

Little Saigon is easily accessible by public transportation and has major roadways that connect to other major neighborhoods; Downtown, First Hill/Capitol Hill, Central District, and Rainier Valley. With the construction of the First Hill Streetcar, the connection between the neighborhoods along South Jackson Street will potentially bring in more visitors to Little Saigon. In addition to public transit, there are a number of parking lots that are used to capacity – majority are visitors outside of nearby neighborhoods.

According to the Little Saigon Visitor & Residents survey, about two-thirds (65%) of visitors and residents agree that they can easily travel to Little Saigon by transit, including 43% who “strongly agree”. A fifth of visitors and residents (21%) have some issues with parking availability. Fewer (12%) have issues with parking time limits.

Figure 4. Parking locations in Little Saigon




⁴ SCIDpda Little Saigon Housing Study

3.5 Educational infrastructure

There are two major educational institutions located north of Little Saigon, Bailey Gatzert Elementary and Seattle University.

According to the SUYI⁵ plan, the Bailey Gatzert neighborhood is defined by the following geographic boundaries in Figure 5.

Figure 5.



There are approximately 17,500 residents that live within the Bailey Gatzert neighborhood. Of these residents, it is estimated that 35% live at or below the poverty threshold as defined by the United States government, 55% are members of racial-ethnic minority groups or mixed race, and 10%, or 1,750, are youth under the age of 18 years. In addition, a growing number of Asian and African immigrants and refugees have recently settled in the neighborhood. Many of these populations do not speak English as their primary language.

Bailey Gatzert has an enrollment of 324 students. In 2009, 42% of Gatzert students were African American, 25% Latino, 22% Asian, 9% Caucasian, and 2% American Indian. Nearly 60% of the children attending Bailey Gatzert were English Language Learners (Bailey Gatzert Annual Report, 2009).

Another half a mile away is Seattle University, with 7,484 students: 4,589 undergraduates and 2,895 graduate and professional students, with enrollment remaining steady in recent years.⁶

⁵ Seattle University Youth Initiative Plan 2012-2015 Action Plan

⁶ Seattle University Fact File, Student enrollment profiles and Students by country

Students of Asian Ethnicity are ranked as the second highest total number of students enrolled. Non-resident students from Vietnam also rank as the third highest total number of students enrolled in the 2012-2013 academic year.

Both of these institutions house a high percentage of students of Asian ethnicity and immigrant backgrounds that may have a need for specific resources, such as youth and educational programs and services, which Little Saigon and the programs from the Vietnamese Cultural Center can potentially provide.

3.6 Land Use

Zoning in the Little Saigon area was recently changed from commercial, industrial commercial, and neighborhood commercial zoning with 65' height limits to Downtown Mixed Residential/Commercial (DMR/C) zoning, which provides for downtown mixed commercial/residential uses with 85' or 150' height limits. This zoning classification allows high residential density with pedestrian-oriented retail and service uses at the street level.

Under the new zoning, the residential capacity is approximately 3,900 units. This is a very significant increase from the area's current housing supply and development type.

Figure 6. Yesler Terrace and Little Saigon




4.0 Supply Analysis

4.1 Local and regional social/cultural/community centers

Interviews were conducted with nine cultural centers in the South Seattle area. These organizations were chosen based on relevance of their location, demographics they serve and the services or program in relation to the Landmark proposal. The goal was to get a wide range of centers that offered unique services to the community. The centers include:

1. Filipino Community of Seattle
2. Inscape Arts and Cultural Center
3. Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington
4. Jefferson Community Center
5. Nisei Veterans Hall
6. Rainier Valley Cultural Center
7. TAF's Bethaday Community Center
8. Washington Hall
9. Wing Luke Asian Museum



Filipino Community of Seattle



The Filipino Community of Seattle (FCS) was founded in 1935 by a group of students. In 1965 the organization bought a bowling alley located at 5740 Martin Luther King Jr. Way and converted it into a community center. The FCS community center is two floors. The first floor includes a ballroom, commercial kitchen, and two meeting rooms. The second floor consists of classrooms and meeting rooms.

Fees for Service			
Service	Member	Non-member	Public/Private
Membership Fee	Regular:\$25, \$250 (lifetime) Seniors & students: \$10, \$100(lifetime) Family (husband/ wife/kids under 23) \$50 Nonprofit: \$100		
Family Academy – Filipino Language & Culture Class	\$35 per child, \$50 for 2 children, \$20 each additional child	\$40 per child, \$55 for 2, \$20 each additional	
Board Room- capacity 30			\$100
Room 201- capacity 50			\$75
Room 202 – capacity 50			\$75
Meeting Room- capacity 25			\$45
Art Room- capacity 40			\$45
Multipurpose Room- capacity 40			\$45
Booking fee			\$25
Staffing			\$25/hr. outside reg. hours

Inscape Arts and Cultural Center

Inscape Arts and Cultural Center opened in 2010 after the former government building was sold to private developers. The development offers affordable studio spaces and occasional one-time event space to artists. The building is 3 stories consisting of 105 studio spaces. They range from 100 to 3,000 square feet. At the time of the interview, the building was fully rented out with 175 local artists as the tenants.



Fees for Service	
Service	General Public
Studio Rental	\$1.10 to \$1.85 per square foot

Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington



Members of the Japanese community saw a need for a language school in Seattle. In 1913, the language school was built. The organization expanded by creating the Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington (JCCCW) as oversight to the language school and other programs. JCCCW is made up of three buildings: The administrative offices, the language school, and exhibit and meeting spaces.

Fees for Service		
Service	Member	Non-member
Membership Fee	\$35 Individual Membership (One individual age 18+) \$25 Senior Membership (One individual age 62+) \$40 Senior Couple Membership (Two individuals age 62+) \$20 Student Membership (One individual age 18-25) \$75 Family Membership (Four members, children 17 and under) \$150 Non-Profit Membership (Two membership cards) \$250 Sustaining Membership (Two individuals age 18+) \$250 Supporting Business Membership (Two membership cards) \$500 Patron Membership (Two individuals age 18+ plus 2 guest passes to JCCCW special events) \$500 Corporate Membership (Four membership cards) \$1,000 Tsuru Circle Membership (Two individuals age 18+ plus 4 guest passes to JCCCW special events) \$1,000 Premier Corporate Membership (Six membership cards)	
Seattle Japanese Language School	Adults: \$135 Youth: \$195 for one student, \$380 for two students, and \$555 for three students	\$40 per child, \$55 for 2, \$20 each additional
Japanese Summer Program	\$200	\$250
Matinee Eiga Sundays	\$3 Suggested Donation	\$5 Suggested Donation
Karate	New student: \$50 Existing students: \$100	
Project Community! Youth Leadership Program	\$25	

Jefferson Community Center

The Jefferson Community Center opened in 1972. It is a part of the City of Seattle's Parks and Recreation Department. In 2004 the community center was remodeled and they added a gym, entry area, toilets and gym storage, basketball court, small parking lot, site lighting and landscaping.



Fees for Service		
Service	Public	Private
Gymnasium	\$10/hr.	\$110/hr.
Patio	\$48/hr.	
Meeting & Art Rooms	\$35/hr.	
Damage Deposit	\$250-1000	
Booking fee	\$25	
Staffing fee	\$25/hr./staff (outside reg. hrs.)	
Adult Gym Drop-in	\$3 per session	
Seniors Gym Drop-in	\$2 per session	
Indoor sports league	\$25/hr.	
Academic course/preparedness	\$75-\$90	
Career/Job Finding	\$77-\$240	
Computer Training	\$22-67	
Languages	\$5-105	
Arts: Visual/Crafts	\$60-200	
After school enrichment	\$60-70	
Dance lessons	\$10-60	
Music lessons	\$35-75	

Nisei Veterans Hall



The center was created after World War II as a veterans' social organization for Japanese Americans excluded from mainstream vet organizations. The first floor of the NVC has a gym, meeting rooms, ceremonial space, and museum. The basement has a social gathering hall with a commercial kitchen. Adjacent to the parking lot is a memorial wall where families can purchase bricks to honor Japanese veterans.

Fees for Service		
Service	Public/Nonprofit	Private
Entire facility	\$105-115/hr.	
Gymnasium		
Meeting room		
Commercial kitchen	\$60-70/hr.	
Damage Deposit	\$200	

Rainier Valley Cultural Center

Rainier Valley Cultural Center (RVCC) was established in 1995 and is a branch of SEED Seattle. SEED works to provide economic development in south Seattle through the arts and housing. RVCC works to provide art and theater to the youth of Columbia City. The center consists of two floors. The first floor houses the center's theater with fixed seating. The basement has one event room, commercial kitchen, and offices for the theater's staff.



Fees for Service	
Service	General Public
Auditorium Events	\$100/hr
Auditorium Rehearsals	\$25/hr-Does not include access to the stage, lighting or sound equipment
Entire Facility	\$150/hr

Fees for Service (con't)	
Sound and Lighting Equipment	Price varies by item requested
Event Room	\$40/hr or \$50/hr with commercial kitchen
Rental Deposit	25% at time of contract to secure rental date
Damage Deposit	\$300
Arts Gumbo	Adults-\$15, Seniors & Students-\$10, Children-\$5
JazzEd	Intro Ensemble- \$800, Middle School Ensembles-\$850, High School and New Works Ensembles-\$900, 12 Week Combo Workshop-\$550

TAF's Bethadaya Community Learning Space



The Technology Access Foundation (TAF) was founded to provide technology education to students of color in preparation for college. Their center, called TAF's Bethadaya Community Learning Space, was completed in October of 2012; it was a \$14 million project in collaboration with King County. They aim to provide technology education and access to diverse and low-income students. The building is made up of three floors. The ground level is a multipurpose room with open space for 200 people and a catering kitchen. The first floor consists of office space and conference rooms. The second floor is dedicated to their programs with two large classrooms that can be divided in half to make four.

Fees for Service	
Service	Costs
TAF Academy - 6th-12th grade STEM-focused partner school	-
Summer camp	\$300 per session (one week) \$100 deposit \$50 extended care
STEM – After school academic enrichment	\$30 annual snack & supplies -
STEM Institute – professional development & teacher-leadership program	\$800
Consulting – STEM based education	-
AV equipment Rental	Projector-\$20, Laptop-\$25, Smart Board-\$15
Multi-purpose Room	\$65/hr. Minimum rental time is 4 hours
Kitchen	\$100 flat fee
Learning Labs	\$35/hr or 4 labs for \$100/hr. Minimum rental time is 2 hours
Board Room	\$25/hr
Small Conference Room	\$20/hr
Project Space	\$25/hr

Washington Hall

Washington Hall was built in 1908. Historic Seattle acquired the building in 2009 and renovations have been underway since 2010. The process has cost around \$6.5 million dollars and is still in progress. Washington Hall contains theater space and an event room.



Fees for Service		
Service	Public	Private
Main Hall	<p>\$500 full day/night (8hrs.)</p> <p>Class: \$20/hour Rehearsal: \$12/hour</p>	<p>Fridays: \$500 for 8 hours, includes setup and breakdown time Saturdays: \$900 for 8 hours, includes setup and breakdown time</p> <p>Sunday-Thursday: \$400 for 8 hours (after 1pm only), includes setup and breakdown time</p> <p>Time exceeding 8 hours: \$50/hour</p> <p>Class: \$20/hour Rehearsal: \$12/hour</p>
Lodge Room	<p>\$250 full day/night (8 hrs.)</p> <p>Meeting (non-ticketed): \$12 for up to 25 people, \$20 per hour for 26-75, \$30 per hour for 76-100, event rate for 101+</p> <p>Lodge Room rates when bundled with Main Hall rental - Lodge Room used for staging, NOT open to public: \$100 - Lodge Room OPEN to public: \$150</p> <p>Class: \$20/hour Rehearsal: \$12/hour</p>	<p>Fridays: \$250 for 6 hours, includes setup and breakdown time</p> <p>Saturdays: \$450 for 8 hours, includes setup and breakdown time</p> <p>Sunday-Thursday: \$200 for 6 hours (after 4pm only), includes setup and breakdown time</p> <p>Time exceeding 8 hours: \$30/hour 8am-midnight</p> <p>Class: \$20/hour Rehearsal: \$12/hour</p> <p>Lodge Room rates when bundled with Main Hall rental - Lodge Room used for staging, NOT open to guests: \$100 - Open to guests: \$150</p>

Fees for Service (con't)		
Kitchen	Food prep: \$100 Staging, no food: negotiable	Food prep: \$100 Staging: \$25
Whole Building Package = Main Hall + Lodge Room + Kitchen		Saturdays: \$1500 for 12 hours, includes setup and breakdown time Fridays: \$800 for 12 hours, includes setup and breakdown time Sunday-Thursday: \$500 for 8 hours (after 4pm only), includes setup and breakdown time
Staffing	House manager: \$18/hour for duration of rental before 12am \$36.00/hour after midnight (load-out must be completed by 2 am – no exceptions) Technical manager: \$100 for first 2 hours on event day \$25/hour each additional hour until midnight, \$50/hour midnight-2am	House manager: \$18/hour for duration of rental before 12am \$36.00/hour after midnight (load-out must be completed by 2 am – no exceptions) Technical manager: \$100 for first 2 hours on event day \$25/hour each additional hour until midnight, \$50/hour midnight-2am
Parking	Parking lot reservation: \$50 – After 6pm and weekends	Parking lot reservation: \$50 – After 6pm and weekends
Security deposit	Main Hall \$300 Lodge Room \$200 Main Hall & Lodge Room \$500 Food & Alcohol (additional) \$150 Multiple days \$100 per date	Main Hall \$300 Lodge Room \$200 Main Hall & Lodge Room \$500 Food & Alcohol (additional) \$150 Multiple days \$100 per date
Equipment	Basic grid lighting in Main Hall (for performance/event rentals only): no charge Public address sound in Main Hall (for performance/event rentals only): no charge Setup for microphones and speakers: \$25 Setup for projection screen: \$25	

Wing Luke Asian Museum



The Wing Luke Asian Museum has been in existence for over 40 years and is now recognized nationally for their innovation in education and community building. In 2008, they moved to their current location in the East Kong Yick Building. The site acquisition and building renovation totaled over \$24 million. The museum’s exhibits display aspects of Asian American history, art and culture. They offer public programs such as films, music events, speakers and book signing. The museum consists of 10 to 12 exhibition spaces, 2 large gathering spaces, a theatre with fixed seating, and a retail store.

Fees for Service				
Service	Member	Non-member	General	Non-Profit
Membership	Individual Member \$45 Friends Member \$65 Family Member \$75 Patron Member \$125 Benefactor \$250			
YouthCAN	-			
Summer Camp	\$200	\$250		
Microsoft Board & Community Conference Room			\$200/2 hrs., \$100 for each additional hour	\$150/2 hrs., \$75 for each additional hour
Tateuchi Story Theatre			\$300/3 hrs., \$100 for each additional hour	\$225/3 hrs., \$130 for each additional hour
Ping & Ruby Chow & Family Gathering Space & Learning Studio			\$80/2 hrs., \$40 for each additional hour	\$60/2 hrs., \$30 for each additional hour
Wing Luke Asian Museum Board of Trustees Community Hall			\$525/3 hrs., \$175 for each additional hour	\$395/3 hrs., \$130 for each additional hour
The Hugh and Jane Ferguson Foundation Welcome Hall			\$300/3 hrs., \$100 for each additional hour	\$225/3 hrs., \$75 for each additional hour
A/V System (1 microphone, projector, screen, DVD, VCR and laptop hookup)			\$50	
Set-Up			\$50	
Break-Down/Clean-Up			\$50	
WLAM A/V Assistance		\$25/hr.		

Functional components

About half of the centers included in this study were designed and constructed with specific functional components in mind. For example, the Nisei Veterans Hall wanted to build a space where they could display and honor the history of WWII Japanese American Veterans, therefore an exhibition space was included. Functions of the other half of the centers are predetermined by the existing structure of the building during purchase. For example, historic buildings such as the Inscape Arts and Cultural Center and Washington Hall, are bounded by historical preservation regulations which sets parameters on the type and scope of renovations that can done to the facilities. However, one concept that all the centers shared was the need for flexible space. This flexible space is described as an event space, which is most commonly constructed to be a large open space that can used for a variety of small and large events.

In addition to having a large event space, each center provides a number of smaller rooms for meetings, classes, and other activities. Because these rooms offer opportunity for a variety of activities, the size and capacities also vary. Many of the rooms offer basic amenities as part of the

rental cost, and for additional revenue, some centers also offered services such as IT, event planning, equipment rentals, etc.

Figure 7. Total Size and Capacity


Cultural Center	Total Square Footage	Total Capacity	Parking	Primary Demographic	Notes
LS Landmark Proposal	22,020 sq. ft.	450-900	Parking garage	Vietnamese	Total capacity for performance hall – banquet vs. seating alone
Filipino Community Center	22,269 sq. ft.	635	Parking Lot (20+ spaces)	Filipino and Southeast Asian	Total square footage is taken from all available rental space.
Inscape Arts	77,000 sq. ft.	175	Parking Lot (40 spaces)	Artists of diverse backgrounds	Total capacity is based on number of tenants currently leasing.
Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington	18,500 sq. ft.	440	Street parking	Japanese	Total capacity is taken from all available rental space.
Jefferson Community Center	16,173 sq. ft.	530	Parking Lot (26 spaces)	Chinese, Vietnamese, and White	Estimated from remodel plans (2004). Total capacity is taken from all available rental space, does not include kitchen.
Nisei Veterans Hall	Not Provided	-	Parking Lot (30 spaces)	Japanese war veterans and their descendants	-
Rainier Valley Cultural Center	Not Provided	378	Parking Lot (15 spaces)	Youth, Mexican, Somalian, Korean	Total capacity is of theater and event space.
TAF’s Bethaday Community Learning Space	22,500 sq. ft.	416	Parking Lot (35 spaces)	Children of color K-12, low-income	-
Washington Hall	25,000 sq. ft.	349	Parking Lot (20+ spaces)	50% White, 50% mixed	Total capacity does not include kitchen space.
Wing Luke Museum	60,000 sq. ft.	500	Street parking	37% Asian American, 50% White, rest is mixed	-

Programs and Services

Each cultural center offers a wide range of programs to serve their constituents. The top three types of programs and services offered are (not including rental services):

1. Arts programs
2. Youth programs
3. Cultural programs

Figures 8-9.



Center	Arts	Youth	Culture
Filipino Community Center		Filipino Language & Culture Class	
Inscape Arts	Studio Rental for local artists		Studio Rental for local artists
Japanese Cultural and Community Center of Washington	Japanese Language school Matinee Eiga Sundays Karate	Summer Camp Project community youth Leadership program	Japanese Language school Matinee Eiga Sundays Karate
Jefferson Community Center	Visual arts & crafts workshops Dance and Music lessons	After school enrichment	Language courses
Nisei Veterans Hall			WWII Nisei Veterans Exhibition
Rainier Valley Cultural Center		Arts Gumbo JazzED	
TAF's Bethaday Community Learning Space		TAF Academy Summer camp STEM afterschool academic enrichment	

Washington Hall	Partnership with: 206 Zulu Hidmo Voices Rising
Wing Luke Museum	Exhibitions YouthCAN Summer Camp


Out of all the programs, the top 3 programs identified are also the programs that overlap with each other the most. For example, the Wing Luke Museum and the Japanese Cultural & Community Center’s youth program offers both arts and cultural activities in their summer camp. This shows that centers can efficiently offer one program that meets multiple needs of the community.

Many of the centers in this study when interviewed about services, included facility rentals as a program or service. It is not included as a top program above because all of the centers in this study offer this service and has reported that facility rentals are essential to bringing in extra income. Some centers even report that rentals make up the majority of their revenue, but when asked about priorities for the center, most say they rank their community programs (youth programs, classes, events, etc.) higher than rental services.

Operating costs

The annual operating budgets of the various centers studied range between \$500,000 and \$2,000,000 (Fig. 10). This variation is based on size and staffing capacity of the center, which is also dependent on the types of programs and services offered. For some centers, the program expenses are the bulk of the center’s expenses, an average of over 60% are programmatic expenses.

Figure 10.



Annual operating costs for 2011-2-12 from the Washington's Secretary of State and The Seattle Foundation.

Revenue

The total revenue earned from the centers range from \$50,000 to more than \$2,000,000. The large range is due to the fact that each center operates very differently. An important factor to this are the types of programs and services offered, which pay for themselves through grants and/or fees. The centers on the higher end of the revenue and expenses scale, like TAF and Rainier Valley, depend solely on programs and services operated in-house, meaning higher program expenses but higher return on profit. Other centers, like the Filipino CC and Washington Hall, work with different groups and organizations to collaborate on programs and/or offer rental space for the organization to run those programs in their space. This strategy lowers operational costs for the center and potentially becomes straight income for the center.

Figure 11. Operations and management


Cultural Center	Board of Directors	Number of Staff
LS Landmark	7	general manager, receptionist, janitor, maintenance technician, kitchen manager
Filipino Community of Seattle	5	5 part time staff including rental manager and administrative assistant.

Inscape Arts	-	One building manager
Japanese Cultural and Community Center of WA	6	5 fte, 8 staff run the cultural center. 7 teachers, 1 principal (school staff are part time). Also has a student internship program which gives the center 6 to 12 interns a quarter
Jefferson Community Center	5-15	5 City staff – manage facilities. Associated Recreation Council (ARC) funded instructors – 1 or 2 per class/program
Nisei Veterans Hall	8	One janitor, use to have a part time bookkeeper. The organization is ran mostly by volunteers
Rainier Valley CC	9	1 center manager and a part time technical manager
TAF's Bethaday Learning Space	9	11 full time staff. The full time staff is split into educational, operational and fundraising departments. Part time: volunteer coordinator, accountant, after-school teachers and tutors.
Washington Hall	5	1 - ¾ time paid staff, 1 - on-site caretaker, works for rent and additional 10 hrs. for wages, 1 - Tech manager – consultant, Volunteers: admin focused, event, outreach, fundraising, projects to fix building
Wing Luke Museum	25	26 fte. 45 part time: staff includes tours, front desk, and marketplace. There are 3 departments: program department, development and marketing (grant waiting, donors and database), and finance and admin operations.

4.2 National social/cultural/community centers

Through the Seattle University's Community Based Research program, Educational Doctorate candidates conducted a research project on the assessment of community and cultural center models throughout the nation. During the quarter-long program, they conducted research and interviews with 11 centers located in 9 different cities (Fig. 12).

Figure 12.



1. La Peña Cultural Center (Berkeley, CA)
2. Southeast Asian Community Center (San Francisco, CA)
3. World Beat Center (San Diego, CA)
4. Eden Center (Falls Church, VA)
5. Shrine of the Black Madonna: Bookstore and Cultural Center (Atlanta, GA)
6. Multicultural Center of Sioux Falls (Sioux Falls, SD)
7. National Hispanic Cultural Center (Albuquerque, NM)
8. Youngstown Cultural Arts Center (Seattle, WA)
9. Duwamish Tribe Longhouse (Seattle, WA)
10. Swedish Cultural Center (Seattle, WA)
11. Asia Pacific Cultural Center (Tacoma, WA)

Early in the students' research, they discovered that even with hundreds of community/cultural centers, there is no one clear definition of what a cultural center is and that there is no one model because they grow out of the need of the community. Some of the other major emerging themes they saw were:


- "Cultural Center" has many meanings and is different for each center and community
- Networking is very important –you need to be able to know the right people to gain the right support

- Intra-relations between Racial and Ethnic groups – with each center, groups have to be open to working together; be inclusive to all community members
- Thriving centers are developed in conjunction with housing and/or retail
- Increasing reliance on local/federal grants and funding – which are contingent availability of these funding sources, not good for long-term sustainability of the center or its programs

Functional components

The top 5 uses of cultural center around the nation are for community events (100%), Education & training (78%), other (78%), meetings (70%), and conferences (55%).


Figure 13.



Programs and services

The top 5 programs/services offered are other (78%), Youth programs (55%), Social services (55%), Health initiatives (39%), and adult education (39%).

Figure 14.



Because programs and services varied across many center, the ‘other’ category is very high due to the fact that these services are offered according to the specific need of that community, these services set each center apart from another, offering a niche service. Some of those niche services include interpretation and translation services, alternative school, library, tea ceremonies, cooking classes, etc.

Annual budget/revenue

About 50% of the centers they surveyed fell between \$500,000 and \$900,000, of which majority are funded through local and federal government grants, in addition to rental and program revenue, corporate sponsorships and donations.

Figure 15.

Fees for Service			
Cultural Center	Programs Offered	Rental Options	Fee Range
La Peña Cultural Center (Berkeley, CA)	Choir, Children’s music class, Dance Classes (Afro-Peruvian, blues, West African, and Afro Puerto-Rican), Latin jazz orchestra, children percussion and dance	Theater, lounge, community room. Also offers equipment rental: Sound and lightning, Technicians, projector, VHS & DVD player, CD player, Box Office Services.	Programs: \$6 to \$50 Rental Fees: Rates are split into Non-profit and for profit events. \$25 to \$800 Equipment rental: \$15 to \$150 Cleaning fee: \$15 per hour

Fees for Service (con't)			
Cultural Center	Programs Offered	Rental Options	Fee Range
Southeast Asian Community Center (San Francisco, CA)	Small business assistance/loan programs, interpreters, immigration services, citizenship program, food bank for families, Senior programs, phone assistance center, and advocacy.	N/A	Program fees not provided
World Beat Center (San Diego, CA)	Classes: African studies, dancing classes, meditation class, drumming class and health education Programs: Ethno botanical gardening, disabled program, community health and education, media arts program, children program	Public or private events. Center only rents to events that have a fundraising purpose and social benefit. Can accommodate up to 1,200 people. Equipment Rental: sound system, backline (band gear), dressing rooms, projection set up, tables, chairs, full service bar and catering at an additional cost.	Program and rental fees not provided
Eden Center (Falls Church, VA)	No programs – commercial center	N/A	N/A
Shrine of the Black Madonna: Bookstore and Cultural Center (Atlanta, GA)	Events: Kids Story Telling Time, Wordlife Wednesdays (spoken word, poets and storytellers), Book Club	Chapel, gallery and bookstore	Free to \$5 Rental fees not provided
Multicultural Center of Sioux Falls (Sioux Falls, SD)	Youth programs: After school middle school program, Froggy reads, Native reads, Native youth club, Defense/karate classes, CARE camp. Adult programs: Drivers education, English classes, Spanish classes, Educational presentations, events, Immigration legal services, interpreting and translating services and training	The Coliseum of Sioux Falls (floor space and balcony seating). Also offers canopy, flag and flag stand rentals.	Youth programs are free, Adult programs: free to \$130. Rental fees not provided. Canopies- \$25 per day. \$2 per flag per day, \$10 per stand per day. \$100 deposit required for flag and flag stand.

Fees for Service (con't)			
Cultural Center	Programs Offered	Rental Options	Fee Range
National Hispanic Cultural Center (Albuquerque, NM)	Visual arts, performing arts, media arts, history and literacy arts, education, Instituto Cervantes, Spanish resource center and exhibits.	Rentals: outdoor plazas, patios, conference, meeting and banquet rooms (over 17 different room options). On site catering available.	Admission: Free to \$3 Rentals: \$60 to \$900
Youngstown Cultural Arts Center (Seattle, WA)	Programs: arts education Services: affordable space for artists and community arts, and technical expertise in the performing arts	Theater, Movement Studio, Recording Studio, Media Lab, South Classroom, Kitchen, and Dressing Rooms	Program fees not provided Rentals: \$12 to \$90. Split into Standard and Registered 501c3 rates
Duwamish Tribe Longhouse (Seattle, WA)	Art Gallery and Exhibit	Conference room, Commercial Kitchen, and Gallery	Admission is Free. Rentals: \$65 to \$800. Rates are split into member and nonmember
Swedish Cultural Center (Seattle, WA)	Singing class, dance class, Scandinavian film showings, Viking history, and Swedish language class	Stockholm Hall, Vasa Room, Viking Room, Library, 3 Crowns Room, Crown Room Lounge	Program Fees: \$5 to \$95 Rentals:\$75 to \$1,500
Asia Pacific Cultural Center (Tacoma, WA)	Taste of Asian, Summer Camp, Tea Experience	Auditorium, Full kitchen, Rose Garden/Gazebo	Programs: \$20 to \$100 Rental rates not provided

5.0 Demand Analysis

5.1 Existing Vietnamese American Organizations

In partnership with the Vietnamese Friendship Association, there were 18 individual interviews and 5 focus groups conducted to assess community reactions and input to the proposed Vietnamese Cultural Center (see Stakeholder and User Report, Exhibit E3). Among those interviewed were community groups and associations, community development directors, business owners, childcare providers, seniors, and youth. Majority of the responses to the development of a Cultural Center were positive and show an interest in becoming a potential user.

Key Findings:

1. Cultural Center needs to have flexible space, particularly for special events
2. Important to have at least 200 spaces of parking for the multiple components
3. Essential to have professional, in-house staff to assist with services
4. Concerns about Little Saigon being part of Chinatown, political histories still present
5. Community groups are currently renting spaces from restaurants and high schools because they are most affordable but have poor services, states that hotels have the perfect amenities and services but are too expensive
6. More research needs to be done on Childcare of existing programs, in addition to the new redevelopment and housing in surrounding areas, i.e. Yesler Terrace
7. Crucial to have interest from Childcare provider before determining if it should be included in the center

5.2 Programs and Activities Assessment

The variety of programs and activities the cultural center will offer is contingent on two major criteria, resources available and community needs. The Friends of Little Saigon created a preliminary vision of the types of programs and activities that they would like to have in the center. This vision was based on the Little Saigon Visioning Process in 2012 and the Vietnamese Friendship Association's Community Action Research & Empowerment project from 2011-2012.

Based on stakeholder feedback from the Little Saigon Visioning process, the following fundamental priorities were identified:



From the visioning process, the board of FLS ranked in priority their own vision for the cultural center. The board members then conducted a survey asking for further community input at the VFA’s community gathering and at Celebrate Little Saigon. The survey asked to rank in order of priority the types of programs and activities the community would like to see in the cultural center. The scale is based on 1 ‘being highest’ to 10 ‘being lowest’.

In addition to the outreach FLS has conducted, the Little Saigon Visitors & Residents survey also revealed that visitors and residents strongly support the Landmark mixed-use development – over three-quarters (78%) believe it will have a positive impact on the neighborhood and nearly half (49% “very positive impact) hold an intensely positive position of Landmark project.

All of the priorities listed above were also included in this survey and tested very favorable among visitors and residents. At least three-fifths (61-73% ‘4’ or ‘5’) believe each of the items “should be included” as a part of the development.

Figure 16: Program and activities priority ranking

Program/Activity	FLS	VFA Gathering	Celebrate Little Saigon	LS Visitors & Residents	Mean	Ave. Rank
Community gathering space & festivals	2	1	1	1	1.25	1
Vietnamese arts, cultural and history exhibitions	5	7	3	2	4.25	2
Vietnamese language school	3	3	8	9	5.75	6
Bilingual Childcare program	1	8	9	7	6.25	8

Program/Activity	FLS	VFA Gathering	Celebrate Little Saigon	LS Visitors & Residents	Mean	Ave. Rank
Social/health services	10	5	4	3	5.50	5
Classes/workshops	8	2	2	5	4.25	3
Senior Services	4	6	7	4	5.25	4
Small business assistance program	6	9	10	10	8.75	10
Job-finding program	7	4	6	6	5.75	7
Office spaces for community nonprofits	9	10	5	8	8.00	9

Figure 17. Vietnamese Community Organizations & Programs

Organization	Programs	Events
Vietnamese Friendship Association	After School Saturday English Summer Science Academy Job Training Cultural Navigator Hoa Mai Preschool	World Cafe Tet Celebration Various community gatherings, like CARE, but these are more on an as needed basis
Vietnamese American Community of Seattle & Sno-King County		Community gathering and forums
Tet In Seattle		Annual Tet New Year Event
Helping Link	Afterschool program Adult Computer classes Vietnamese Language classes	
Vietnamese Senior Association	Senior meal program, traditional dance	

Key Findings:

The 20 cultural and community centers assessed in this study share many overlapping themes. These include youth, arts, and cultural programs, as well as rental services. However, the sustaining factor for all the centers are the variety of specialized programs they offers that make them stand apart from one another. Based on the needs of the Seattle region’s Little Saigon and Vietnamese community, there are opportunities and gaps that the Vietnamese Cultural Center can potentially fill.

The community ranked its priorities as:

1. Community gathering space & festivals
2. Vietnamese arts, cultural, & history exhibitions
3. Classes and/or workshops
4. Senior services
5. Social & health services

Some of the key opportunities for programs and services in the Vietnamese Cultural Center are bringing the community together, preserving and celebrating Vietnamese arts and culture, and providing social services for the diverse Vietnamese population in Seattle.

5.3 Functional components of proposed Vietnamese Cultural Center

The vision of a Vietnamese Cultural Center is derived directly from the Little Saigon visioning process and the Action Plan 2020, both of which were completed in 2012 (see Exhibit E1). The components illustrated below are drawn by connecting community needs to community assets. Many of the cultural center components are flexible and/or multipurpose functions that can accommodate the changing types of programs and activities envisioned in the cultural center.

Gathering/performance hall

Large flexible hall for hosting festivals, banquets, performances, and other events. In addition to being a shared space with the restaurant on rental basis. This hall will accommodate up to 800 people in theater-style seating or 500 people at tables. A performance stage and room dividers will accommodate two concurrent uses.

Coworking/rental office space

This space is an open-floor concept for individuals to rent out as an office/workstation on a short-term lease. It will be equipped with desks and chairs, power, and Wi-Fi. There may be additional costs for other services (IT, printing, etc.).

Management offices

Private offices for center management staff; manager, scheduler/receptionist, and maintenance.

Classroom and meeting space

Flexible space for small or large group meetings. Each room may have a divider to accommodate groups of various sizes.

Commercial kitchen

Full commercial kitchen with all permitted equipment needed for full-service use. Can be used for caterers to prepare food for events in the cultural center but can also be used for the restaurant to prepare food for banquet events.

Exhibition/lobby space

This space serves as the entrance and lobby space into the cultural center. It includes a reception desk, exhibition/art display space, informational brochures and resources.

Childcare Center

6 Stakeholder & User Analysis

6.1 Defining Community Stakeholders

Throughout the community visioning and Landmark project process, a stakeholder has been defined as a person who has a stake in the community. Stakeholders can also vary on different levels, such as being a business owner versus a resident or consumer. But the most important factor is the level of engagement and impact they have on the project, potentially becoming users of the cultural center.

Some of the specific stakeholder categories that we've engaged and/or want to engage with in this process are:

- Organizations/groups
- Business owners
- Community members
- Residents
- City departments
- Funders

In addition to the traditional stakeholders, there are also groups that are just as important to engage such as patrons, tourists, schools, etc. As the center begins development, these users are important in the growth and vibrancy of the cultural center.

Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan: Years 1 & 2

Quang H. Nguyen, IDEA Space



- 1.0 Executive Summary, Page 2
- 2.0 Little Saigon Background & Context, Page 2
- 2.1 External Challenges Facing the Little Saigon Community, Page 3
- 2.2 Internal Community Challenges, Page 3
- 3.0 Community Engagement Strategy, Page 3
- 3.1 Actions: Intensive Community Engagement, Page 4
- 4.0 Assessing Community Vision for Little Saigon, Page 4
- 4.1 Key Action Items Forged into Little Saigon Landmark Vision, Page 4
- 5.0 Key Accomplishments in 2012, Page 5
- 6.0 Strategy for 2013, Page 5
- 6.1 Actions: Strengthen Friends of Little Saigon, Page 6
- 6.2 Actions: Continue to Engage and Build Community, Page 6
- 6.3 Actions: Maximize Collaboration and Partnerships, Page 6
- 7.0 Goals for 2014 and Beyond, Page 6
- 8.0 Key Stakeholders, Page 7
- 9.0 Key Resources, Page 7


1.0 Executive Summary

Seattle's Little Saigon neighborhood faces strong displacement forces due to its proximity to Downtown, a regional transportation hub, and recent major land-use changes allowing for significant density increase. The neighborhood is a social, cultural, and economic hub for the Vietnamese community in the Great Seattle Area. However, there are major internal community challenges preventing effective response to external displacement forces. Those internal challenges include lack of a community-based institution capable of advocating, engaging, and taking action on the community's behalf.

The Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan is a road map that will help guide the community capacity building process while also addressing external displacement factors. Using a project-based approach, it aims to rally the community around tangible projects with strong community support. Key elements of the plan's overall strategy are:

- Build civic momentum starting with a core group of passionate community stakeholders
- Focus that civic passion on a visionary project that aligns with community needs
- Develop a trusted and sustainable organization designed to harness community involvement for the improvement of Little Saigon
- Maximize collaboration and partnerships to leverage limited resources

2.0 Little Saigon Background & Context



Seattle's Little Saigon neighborhood is located in the International District just east of Chinatown. This neighborhood is primarily a small business district with approximately 125 businesses, most of which are mom-and-pop restaurants, markets, hair salons, delis, and other food/retail/service sector businesses. About 65-70% of the businesses are owned by Vietnamese who came to the area as refugees beginning in 1975. The neighborhood has a little over 100 residential units, about half of which are market-rate condos and the other half, low-income rental units.

The area between I-5 and Rainier Ave comprised mostly of vacant buildings during the 70's. It became known as "Little Saigon" in the early 80's when mom-and-pop shops began sprouting up around the intersection of 12th and Jackson as the Vietnamese refugees settled into their newly adopted country.

Currently, Little Saigon is a vibrant and vital social, cultural, and economic hub for the Vietnamese community in the Puget Sound area. There are approximately 55,000 people of Vietnamese-decent living in King County according to the 2010 U.S. Census.

2.1 External Challenges Facing the Little Saigon Community

Little Saigon's proximity to Downtown Seattle coupled with being a low-rise area makes it an especially attractive neighborhood for development. Adding fuel to the fire is the future First Hill Streetcar and recent major land-use changes of the South Downtown area as well as of SHA's 30-acre Yesler Terrace property. Little Saigon is facing economic forces that would likely uproot and displace this community if nothing is done.

2.2 Internal Community Challenges

These major changes to the area will unleash economic forces on a community that does not have any civic institutions capable of advocating, engaging, and taking action on the community's behalf. Business owners are pinned to their shops and restaurants in a constant battle to stay afloat. They are saddled with thin profit margins, fierce competition, rising costs, and sluggish demand due to a weak economy.

Associations and organizations in the Vietnamese community lack the capacity to address issues beyond the bounds of their programs. The religious institutions are fiercely independent and generally don't involve themselves in neighborhood matters. The broader Vietnamese community is fragmented and has a weak tradition of community collaboration and partnership.

3.0 Community Engagement Strategy 2012

Given the internal and external challenges, IDEA Space staff in partnership with Friends of Little Saigon (FLS), developed a Community Engagement Plan which incorporated the following elements:

- Educate stakeholders on issues impacting Little Saigon and broader Vietnamese community
- Assess community stakeholders' vision for Little Saigon
- Recruit a core group of passionate stakeholders to prioritize and advocate for a common vision
- Develop community stakeholders' capacity to advocate and engage in civic process
- Meet with elected officials and other decision-makers to advocate for specific deliverables

3.1 Actions: Intensive Community Engagement

The Community Engagement Plan was implemented between December of 2011 and September of 2012. It included the following major meetings and events:

- 2 large community gatherings to educate stakeholders on Little Saigon issues and to solicit feedback on how they would improve the social, cultural, and economic fabric of Little Saigon
- 4 Friends of Little Saigon “core group” meeting where feedback from the community gatherings were discussed and prioritized
- Monthly meetings of FLS members to discuss civic engagement strategies and tactics
- 9 meetings with Seattle Councilmembers to discuss community issues and vision
- 2 City Council public hearings on Yesler Terrace rezoning where over 40 stakeholders attended

Through this engagement process, Friends of Little Saigon and IDEA Space were able to generate strong civic momentum which in turn strengthened FLS’s position as a credible entity for the community to rally around.

4.0 Assessing Community Vision for Little Saigon

Based on stakeholder feedback from two large community gatherings and four smaller “core group” meetings to prioritize the feedbacks, the following recommendations were elevated as action items:

CULTURAL

- Build Vietnamese Cultural Center
- Develop Little Saigon into center for Vietnamese-American arts, history and culture
- Preserve the stories and history of the Vietnamese refugee experience
- Share Vietnamese culture with broader community through regular events

SOCIAL

- Build affordable family and senior housing
- Increase community-based organizational capacity
- Advocate for medium-rise density to preserve neighborhood feel
- Advocate for more direct transit connections with major Vietnamese-American population centers
- Develop open space and parks

ECONOMIC

- Build affordable commercial space
- Business assistance and access to financing
- Develop centralized parking structure
- Create more opportunities for micro-enterprises
- Limit building heights to 65’ commercial/85’ residential

4.1 Key Action Items Forged into Little Saigon Landmark Vision

The Little Saigon Landmark project is a direct outgrowth of the elevated action items from the community visioning process. This project encapsulates many of the main recommendations into a single tangible mixed-use development that can more effectively focus limited community resources. The Little Saigon Landmark development aims to be the social, cultural, and economic hub of the Vietnamese-American community in the Greater Seattle Area.

The concept solidified into its current form as IDEA Space staff connected the dots between community priorities and key stakeholders with resources who are aligned with these priorities. The proposal has three main components:

- Vietnamese Cultural Center
- Destination Cultural Retail/Commercial
- Affordable Housing

The **Vietnamese Cultural Center** will be a multifunctional social and cultural gathering place. At approximately 10,000 to 15,000 square feet, the Center will include a large gathering/performance hall, exhibition space, office space for community nonprofits, and classrooms.

The **commercial/retail space** will be the largest component of the development at approximately 40,000 to 50,000 square feet. The centerpiece will be the *Emerald Market*, a 20,000 square foot indoor Southeast Asian-style market housing kiosk and booth vendors. The market will be activated by approximately 35 to 50 vendors offering a range of culinary as well as retail products. Also incorporated into the commercial/retail component will be:

- Banquet-size restaurant capable of seating 400-500 people
- Asian supermarket
- Bar/lounge
- Asian bakery

The Little Saigon Landmark development intends to be a cultural and retail destination for the Vietnamese-American community as well as all Seattleites who enjoy a great cultural experience.

Affordable housing will also be an integral part of this development at 75+ units with many 2 and 3-bedroom units catering to families.

5.0 Key Accomplishments in 2012

- Elevated Friends of Little Saigon as a credible and effective advocate for Little Saigon
- Friends of Little Saigon was successful in winning the unanimous approval for City Council Resolution #31403 calling for City support for the Little Saigon Landmark project
- Through community organizing and engagement, FLS successfully persuade the City to allocate \$40,000 to go toward LS Landmark feasibility study
- Through FLS advocacy efforts, SHA agreed to participate in the feasibility study and was able to leveraged a \$100,000 grant from JP Morgan Chase Foundation for this purpose

6.0 Strategy for 2013

In order to build on the accomplishments of 2012, our strategy for 2013 must adjust to address the growing complexities as well as the growing opportunities of this project. The following strategy will guide actions taken in 2013:

- Strengthen Friends of Little Saigon's organizational infrastructure
- Continue to develop FLS into a trusted and sustainable organization designed to harness community involvement for the improvement of Little Saigon
- Continue to engage and build community through the Little Saigon Landmark project
- Maximize collaboration opportunities and partnerships to leverage limited resources

6.1 Actions: Strengthen Friends of Little Saigon

As the Little Saigon Landmark project gains momentum and becomes more complex, it becomes even more crucial that the community, through FLS, be firmly in the driver's seat of this process. IDEA Space staff have lined up consultant resources to support this strategy. The main actions are:

- Institute clearly defined board roles and responsibilities, by-laws, organizational and board structure
- Target and recruit passionate and qualified community stakeholders for FLS membership and board
- Implement board training to ensure effective board governance
- Develop a strategic plan that addresses long term FLS sustainability and relevancy issues
- Develop and submit application to IRS for 501(c)(3) status

6.2 Actions: Continue to Engage and Build Community

Capitalize on the visibility and credibility garnered through advocacy efforts during 2012 by expanding FLS's reach in the community and developing opportunities for more community engagement. Main actions:

- Create and implement communications plan for FLS
- Develop multiple touch points for community stakeholder to engage in Landmark project and other Little Saigon improvement projects
- Continue to solicit community feedback on Action Items

6.3 Actions: Maximize Collaboration and Partnerships

Target and reach out to potential resource partners with aligning interests. Main actions:

- Define and clarify roles and responsibilities between all key stakeholders for the Little Saigon Landmark feasibility study
- Continue to build bridges to groups/organizations in the Vietnamese community as well as groups/organizations outside the Vietnamese community
- Partner with Seattle Department of Planning for Little Saigon Neighborhood Planning process
- Continue to reach out and engage with local, state, and federal decision-makers
- Partner with resource providers such as Seattle University and University of Washington on community capacity building projects

7.0 Goals for 2014 and Beyond

The Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan will evolve as social, cultural, economic, and political factors shape the civic landscape over time. However, the overarching goals of **community capacity building**, **civic engagement**, and **neighborhood cultural preservation improvement** should remain fairly constant.

Projected goals for 2014:

- Assemble financing package for the Little Saigon Landmark development
- Develop business technical assistance support structure for landmark retail tenants
- Continue expanding community involvement and membership to FLS
- Leverage community involvement to other Little Saigon improvement projects
- Add staff capacity for Friends of Little Saigon

8.0 Key Stakeholders

There are many stakeholders in this process but the main one is Friends of Little Saigon. Formed about two years ago by community members who wanted to work together to improve the neighborhood and preserve its unique cultural flavor. Members are made up of small business owners, community activists, and professionals who share a love for Little Saigon and its symbolic meaning to the Vietnamese community. Other organizations and entities directly involved in this project are:

Organization	Role(s)	Key Individual(s)
Friends of Little Saigon	Initiator, community activist & advocate	Tam Nguyen, Theresa Reyna, My Linh Ngo, Yen Lam, Thach Nguyen
Emerald Market Partners	Commercial/retail investors	Tam Nguyen, Yen Lam, Thach Nguyen
SCIDpda/IDEA Space	Consultant, project management, fiscal agent for FLS	Maiko Winkler-Chin, Paul Mar, Quang H. Nguyen, Quynh Pham
Seattle City Council	Project supporter	CM O'Brien and CM Licata
Seattle Office of Economic Development	Lead City agency for feasibility study	TBD
Seattle Housing Authority	Potential landlord and partner	Andrew Lofton, Al Levine, Anne Fiske-Zuniga

9.0 Key Resources

Effective leveraging of resources from key partners aligned with the aims of the plan is crucial to its success. As this process evolves, FLS and the Little Saigon community will actively reach out to other resource partners to ensure that critical actions have the means to be implemented. The following are current resource partners:

Partner	Resource(s)	Task(s)	Implementation Timeframe
Friends of Little Saigon	Community volunteers	Community building	Jan 2009 – Future
SCIDpda, IDEA Space	Staff	Feasibility study, community building	Jan 2008 – Future
JP Morgan Chase Foundation	Funding	Supports community capacity building	Jan 2012 – Dec 2013
PSRC/Growing Transit Communities	Funding, peer support group	Supports community engagement process	Nov 2011 – Dec 2013
City of Seattle OED	Funding	Supports feasibility study	Jan 2013 – Dec 2013
City of Seattle DPD/DON/SDOT	Staff	Neighborhood planning	Starts Spring 2013
Seattle Housing Authority	Staff, funding (from JP Morgan)	Feasibility study	Jan 2013 – Dec 2013
Seattle University	Staff, PhD candidates	Research, consulting on org development	Nov 2012 – June 2013



MARKET
& OPINION
RESEARCH
SERVICES

720 Third Ave.
Suite 1110
Seattle, WA 98104
206.652.2454

436 14th Street
Suite 820
Oakland, CA 94612
510.844.0680

4041 North High Street
Suite 300M
Columbus, OH 43214
614.268.1660

2415 SE 38th Ave.
Portland, OR 97214
206.204.8040

EMCresearch.com

2013 Little Saigon Visitors & Residents Survey

City of Seattle & SCIDpda

DRAFT REPORT
October 2013

Purpose:

To understand who is visiting Little Saigon and why, and to better understand visitor priorities and interests for future development in the neighborhood.

Objectives:

- Understand how and how often visitors come to Little Saigon and how they get there, including their travel modes, length and frequency of visit.
- Get a general sense of the types of parking drivers and carpoolers use, and where they park when visiting Little Saigon.
- Gauge the primary reasons people visit Little Saigon and which types of offerings visitors would like to see.
- Test visitors' perceptions about a variety of aspects of Little Saigon, including ease of accessing the district via transit, parking time limits and availability, shopping/dining offering mix, and safety.
- Understand visitors' impressions and interest in the Landmark development and their priorities for its use.
- See how these objectives vary between people who live or work in Little Saigon and visitors.

- ▶ A total of 346 interviews were completed in Little Saigon
- ▶ Interviewing took place from September 13th to September 26th, 2013
- ▶ The questionnaire was a single page (front & back), letter-sized, self-administered handout. SCIDpda volunteers were on site for each shift to distribute and collect surveys
- ▶ Interviewing was conducted between 9 am and 4 pm over several week days and weekends
- ▶ Surveys were printed in English, Vietnamese, and Chinese
- ▶ Interviewing took place in several locations throughout Little Saigon including 12th + Jackson, Ding How Plaza, S Main & 12th St, Boren/14th S & S Jackson, and 10th S & S Jackson


Due to rounding, some percentages may not add up to exactly 100%

Visitation Profile




- About a quarter (26%) of people surveyed live or work in Little Saigon. Two thirds (68%) were visitors.
- Despite not having a live/work connection to Little Saigon, about half (51%) of visitors come to the neighborhood at least weekly and another fifth (19%) visit 2-3 times per month. These visitors are largely coming from surrounding areas (First Hill, ID, CD).
- A majority of visitors and residents/employees are coming to Little Saigon for grocery shopping (51% mention as a reason) and dining (51%), followed by errands, cultural attractions, retail shopping and connecting to transit (18-23% each).
- Two-thirds (66%) of visitors stay in Little Saigon for two hours or less, though very few (3%) report parking but not staying. About a quarter (26%) stay for 3 hours or longer.

Q1. Which describes you best?




Q2. Which describes how often you visit Little Saigon?




Visit Frequency - Neighborhood Connection

Q2. Which describes how often you visit Little Saigon?



Length of Today's Visit - Overall


Q3. How long will your visit to Little Saigon be today?



Length of Today's Visit – by Subgroup




Q3. How long will your visit to Little Saigon be today?



Typical Reasons for Visiting - Overall

*Q10. If you have been here before... Which activities do you usually do while visiting Little Saigon?
(Multi-Response)*


All Visitors and Residents



Typical Reasons for Visiting – by Neighborhood Connection

Q10. If you have been here before... Which activities do you usually do while visiting Little Saigon?

■ Live/Work in LS (n=91) ■ Visitors only (n=255)




Getting to Little Saigon




- Nearly half of Little Saigon’s residents and visitors (43-45%) travel Little Saigon at least in part by bus. A quarter (24-26%) drive alone or carpool.
- Residents/Employees (37%) are predictably more likely to walk to Little Saigon than Visit-only respondents (25% walked or biked). However, other access modes vary little between the two groups.
- Most visitors (80%+) who drive or carpool to LS park for free. Nearly half of drivers/carpoolers (47%) report parking on the street and just under a third (39%) who parked in a lot or garage.
- Nearly two-thirds (65%) of visitors and residents agree that they can easily travel to Little Saigon by transit, including 43% who “strongly agree.”
- A fifth of visitors and residents (21%) have some issues with parking availability. Fewer (12%) have issues with parking time limits.

Q4. How did you get to this area today? (Multi-Response)




Q5. If you drove or carpooled (n=85)... What type of parking did you use today? (Multi-Response)



Parking Locations


Q6. What are the nearest cross-streets, or the closest landmark or business to where you parked today? (Excludes No Answer; n=54)



Location	%	n
12th and Jackson	48%	26
Jackson st (other)	11%	6
12th & King St / King St (unspecified)	15%	8
12th Ave & Main / Main St (unspecified)	9%	5
10th and Jackson	4%	2
Viet-Wah	2%	1
Ding How	2%	1
12 th & S. Weller	2%	1
Other	7%	4

Parking & Transit Access Ratings - Overall

Q7. Please indicate if you Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, or Strongly Disagree with each statement




Parking Issues – by Subgroup

Percent of subgroups that **Somewhat or Strongly Disagree** to one or both of the following statements:

Parking is easy for me to find in Little Saigon

Parking time limits in this area give me enough time to do what I need to

(n=85)




Safety & Amenities



- One in four respondents have some concerns with safety in Little Saigon.
- Those most concerned include women (30%), residents/employees (30%), Asians (28%) and people age 25-44 (26%).
- Overall, a strong majority (59%) of visitors and residents agree that Little Saigon has most of what they need for shopping and entertainment.
- When prompted for top-of-mind improvement suggestions, a majority of visitors and residents (59%) had no suggestions to give.
- No particular improvement suggestion was very widely offered, indicating that visitors don't see any major deficiencies in Little Saigon's amenity mix. More drug stores/grocery (9% mentioned) and more entertainment/night life (8%) were the most common suggestions.


Amenity & Safety Ratings - Overall

Q7. Please indicate if you Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, or Strongly Disagree with each statement



Safety Concerns – by Subgroup Ranking


Percent of Subgroups that **Somewhat or Strongly Disagree** with the following statement: **I feel safe walking around Little Saigon (n=72)**



Improvements - Overall

Q8. What are some things that you would like to see in Little Saigon that are currently not available?
(i.e. types of shops, restaurants, services, activities, events etc.)


All Visitors and Residents



Improvements – by Neighborhood Connection



Q8. What are some things that you would like to see in Little Saigon that are currently not available? (i.e. types of shops, restaurants, services, activities, events etc.)




Landmark Development



- Visitors and residents strongly support the Landmark mixed-use development – over three-quarters (78%) believe it will have a positive impact on the neighborhood. Nearly half (49% “Very positive impact”) hold an intensely positive opinion of Landmark.
- Residents/employees are more intensely favorable about the development (56% “Very positive impact”) than visitors (47%), However, the same percentage (78%) of both groups believe the project will have at least a somewhat positive impact on the neighborhood.
- All of the priorities tested very favorably among visitors and residents. At least three-fifths (61%-73% ‘4’ or ‘5’) believe each of the items “should be included” as part of the development.
- A strong majority of visitors and residents ‘definitely’ want to see community gatherings/festivals (60% ‘5 – Definitely should include’ rating), Vietnamese arts/cultural/history exhibitions (59%), senior services (57%), arts and music performances (57%), social/health services (57%) and classes/workshops (56%).

- Overall, just under a fifth (17%) of visitors and residents are “Very interested” in the new apartments at the development. Another third are “Somewhat interested”.
- The demographic subgroups who express the most interest are Asians (57% “Very or Somewhat interested”), <25 year olds (55%); men (53%) and Other non-white ethnicity (53%) visitors/residents.
- Of those who express interest, preferences are split between apartment sizes (46% studio/1BR; 40% 2BR). A strong majority (60%) prefer to rent instead of own (23%).


Q11. There is a proposal for a new mixed-use development called The Little Saigon Landmark that will include a Vietnamese cultural/community center, and new apartments. This center would provide space for social and cultural programs serving youths, families and seniors. What kind of impact do you think this would have on Little Saigon?



Landmark Impact – by Neighborhood Connection




Q11. What kind of impact do you think this would have on Little Saigon?



Landmark Impact – by Subgroup


*Percent of subgroups that indicate agree the Landmark development would have a **very positive impact***



Landmark Priorities - Overall




Q12. If this development is built, what would you like to see included? Please rate each using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is 'Definitely should NOT be included' and 5 is 'Definitely SHOULD be included.'



Landmark Priorities – Among LS Residents/Employees




Q12. If this development is built, what would you like to see included? Please rate each using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is 'Definitely should NOT be included' and 5 is 'Definitely SHOULD be included.'



Landmark Priorities – Among Visitors


Q12. If this development is built, what would you like to see included? Please rate each using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is 'Definitely should NOT be included' and 5 is 'Definitely SHOULD be included.'



Interest in Apartments - Overall


Q13. How interested would you be in living in one of the new apartments that would be part of this development?

All Visitors and Residents




Interest in Apartments – by Neighborhood Connection

Q13. How interested would you be in living in one of the new apartments that would be part of this development?



Interest in Apartments – by Subgroup



Percent of subgroups that indicate they would be **very or somewhat interested** in a new apartment
(n=164)



Apartment Preferences

Q14. *If you said very/somewhat interested, what size would you want?*

Q15. *If you said very/somewhat interested, would you prefer to rent or own?*




Demographic Profile



Demographics - Overall




Q10. If you have been here before... Which activities do you usually do while visiting Little Saigon?



Demographics – Residents/Employees




Q10. If you have been here before... Which activities do you usually do while visiting Little Saigon?
(n=91)



Demographics – Visitors



Q10. If you have been here before... Which activities do you usually do while visiting Little Saigon?
(n=255)



CULTURAL CENTER STAKEHOLDER AND USER REPORT

Executive Summary

Background: Between September and November 2013, 18 individual interviews and 5 focus groups were conducted to assess community reactions and input to the proposed Vietnamese Cultural Center component of the Little Saigon Landmark Project.

Highlights, Results and Recommendations:

Banquet Hall: A large banquet hall that can fit either 350-400 or 200-300 people. Supporting rooms with moving walls for coats, volunteers, a green room for speakers and a lockable storage room for auction items or other supplies that need to be housed overnight.

Meeting Rooms: Flexible meeting rooms (i.e., wall dividers) that can be used for meetings, workshops and conferencing.

Reception: Needs to have a reception area that feeds into main banquet hall. Large enough to fit all guests standing.

Food: Have flexibility of bringing in own catering or choose from a list of preferred vendors.

Parking: 400 people, need at least 200 spots.

Kitchen: A full kitchen that is large enough for servers to come in and out. One that can also be used for community gatherings, including food and overnight storage.

Audio/video: At least two projector screens for 400 people. Needs to have good in-house audio/video equipment with professional staff to provide services and support throughout event. Meeting rooms need to be fully equipped with presentation and conference equipment.

Professional in-house staff: Professional and well-trained staff to provide in-house, day-of support. Also provide support for rentals and event planning.

Child Care: Current centers around the ID have difficulty filling up their spots. This will change during the Yesler redevelopment, which will eliminate centers during the process. Overall, pursue child care in this area but find an operating partner early on who has “staying power,” aligns with cultural values. Give partner time to develop awareness and community ties.

Location: The majority of respondents support the proposed location of the Vietnamese Cultural Center. There is some concern that Little Saigon is actually a part of Chinatown, and would prefer to have the Landmark Project in the Rainier Valley.

Outreach and Methodology

Outreach

A priority outreach list was created by VFA, SCIDpda and FLS that included key community leaders, organizations that primarily focus on the API community, and local community groups. Snowball sampling, where interviewees are asked for referrals and connections, was also used to expand the outreach.

Methodology

Individual 1:1 interviews: 18 individual interviews were conducted.

Focus group: 5 focus groups completed, ranging from 2-10 people. Individuals who were not able to attend a focus group were interviewed individually instead.

Interviewees and focus groups were presented with a summary and history of the Friends of Little Saigon and the Landmark Project. Interviewees and focus groups were then asked six questions, each following the same order.

1. Do you see any areas of alignment because the vision and mission of Friends of Little Saigon and your own organization?
2. What types of events/meetings does your organization currently host?
3. What are some challenges you've experienced with the current availability of event/meeting space?
4. How much do those types of spaces cost you, for a typical event?
5. If you were to design your own event/meeting space, what things would it include?
6. Would you pay as much, or more, to "rent" this new space as you currently do?

Interviews and focus groups related to child care in the International Districts were asked to conduct a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) Analysis.

Timeline

Interviews and focus groups were conducted between September and December 2013.

Fundraising and benefit dinners

Description: These events are generally hosted by non-profit organizations and happen 1-2 times a year, depending on the size of the organization. Most benefit dinners happen in the Fall and Spring.

Number of people served:

- Small: 150 people (e.g., Vietnamese-American Bar Association)
- Average: 300-400 (e.g., KinOn, VFA)
- Large: 450+ up to 1000 requires use of downtown hotels (e.g., ReWA, Plymouth, InterIM, ACRS)

Challenges and Opportunities:

- **Space:** Not enough large community spaces. Need a venue near the ID that can accommodate 350-400. A few people think 200-300 is the sweet spot. Too large (450+) and you're competing with hotels. Too small and you're competing with community centers (100-200).
- **Reception:** Current venues have a small reception space which causes a bottleneck of people. Needs to have a reception area that feeds into main banquet hall. Large enough to fit all guests standing.
- **Food:** Some places offer "Asian" food but it's not authentic. Other places don't allow you to select own caterers. Would like to have flexibility of bringing in own catering, or at least choose from a list of preferred vendors.
- **Parking:** In downtown hotels it costs \$10. In community spaces, there's not enough parking. Banquet style restaurants (e.g., Jumbo, Tea Palace) usually have enough, free parking, but poor food and service. For 400 people, need at least 200 spots.
- **Kitchen:** No kitchen or dishwasher for food prep and cleaning poses a challenge when hosting events. Need a full kitchen that is large enough for servers to come in and out, and to store food, possibly overnight.
- **Audio/video:** Disappointing in community spaces. Hotels do the best job but also cost the most. Need good in-house audio/video equipment with professional staff to provide services and support throughout event. At least 2 projector screens for 400 people.
- **Room layout:** Can be awkward in spaces that have pillars and poles obstructing views. Hotels have nice layouts and provide large, open areas. Stage needs to be visible from everywhere in the room. With space behind for performers to enter/exit.
- **Flexible spaces:** Moving walls and extra rooms for coats, volunteers, a green room for speakers and a lockable storage room for auction items or other supplies that need to be housed overnight.
- **Professional, in-house staff:** Most restaurants and community centers do not have professional staff to provide support. Organizations are often left on their own but don't have the experience to manage AV. Hotels provide the best services but also the most expensive. Need to have professional and well-trained staff to provide in-house, day-of support.

Currently paying about:

- Asian restaurants with food \$5,000-10,000 per event, or about \$25-35 a head.
- Community centers cost about \$15,000, but you need to piecemeal everything since it's not full-service.
- A downtown hotel luncheon costs about \$13,000. At dinners, it's about \$65 per head.
- \$3000 for a large venue, no food.

Community gatherings

Description: These events are generally hosted by non-profit organizations and community groups. They happen a few times throughout the year and include events cultural events (e.g., Tet, Fall of Saigon), community gatherings and community-building events.

Number of people served:

- Low end, 50-70
- Average 100-150 people

Challenges and Opportunities:

- Costs prices out community groups who rely on donations and members. Would like to have a non-profit vs. private rate.
- Would like to host events in the ID, but few spaces. Asian Resource Center is one of the few, but limited parking makes it difficult for attendance and a gymnasium changes the feel of the event.
- Vietnamese community groups often host events at restaurants, but it lacks a "community feel."
- Potential issues if using a church/temple as gathering space.
- Would like to have a flag pole with the Vietnamese and American flag.

Currently paying about:

- \$500 per event at community center. Most places you have to clean yourself.
- Or about \$100-200 per hour.

Small group meetings and workshops

Description: These happen often throughout the year. Examples include workshops about healthcare or planning meetings for Seafair.

Number of people served: 10-40 people

Challenges and Opportunities:

- Few affordable spaces to host workshops in the ID.

- Community groups have limited funds and are always looking for low-cost and free options. Reluctant to pay a lot, otherwise they will meet a restaurant instead.
- Hard to find an affordable meeting room in the evenings. Libraries are closed, as are other places.
- Needs to have flexible rooms with wall dividers.
- Projectors and screens for presentations and white boards.

Currently paying about:

- Most small community groups try to find free spaces.
- Medium to large non-profits have their own meeting rooms.
- \$25-50 an hour for meetings.

Community programs

These are potential programs that can be housed in the new cultural center. However, these discussions and conversations were cursory and surface level, and require more in-depth research and assessment to make an informed decision.

Senior Programs

Currently well established at Garfield Community Center, ReWA and ACRS. Serves up to 100 people, but there is a desire to expand services.

Challenges:

- Lack of access to a full kitchen where they can store food and supplies.
- Needs easy access to public transportation for most seniors
- Safety is important. At Garfield they have monthly police outreach meetings.

Opportunities:

- Well-established groups that want to expand their services, which may include a computer room, gym with equipment
- Ideal space would fit about 150 people.
- Want to have multiple rooms, each serving a distinct purpose, such as meeting room, activity room, kitchen

Child Care / Preschool

Challenges:

- Not enough current density to fill a center
- Look carefully at Yesler’s redevelopment plan and number of actual units projected.
- Yesler redevelopment may eliminate child care during the process. Some current child care is definitely going away because of redevelopment. How much is the question.

- Current care in the area includes Denise Louie, Harborview and Yesler programs. InterIm also doing child care with El Centro de la Raza.

Opportunities:

- Folks want child care where they live and work.
- Have a center close to the eastside of Rainier Ave.
- Evening shift for small businesses
- Location in the ID is likely to feel important to the City.
- Growing interest in bilingual programs.
- Strong trend in families looking for center-based care
- Need to identify operator before construction/planning of space.
- Universal pre-K is being discussed in Seattle, but a concern that the dollar amount might make it not happen.
- Will be compelling to for-profit centers, especially if there is a dual-language component. They do not have a record of serving low-income populations and offer low-balling rates.

Individual Interviews

Person/Contact	Affiliation	Purpose	Lead
1. MyLinh Ngo + Kiet Ly	SnoKing	Events, meetings	Quynh-An
2. Minh Duc	Helping Link	Offices, events	James
3. Vu Le	VFA	Offices, events	James
4. Trong Pham	Vietnamese Seafair	Offices, events, meetings	Quynh-An
5. Kim Lundgreen	Vietnamese Senior Association	Programming	Quynh-An
6. Viet Hai	Huong Viet Performing Arts Group	Offices, events	Quynh-An
7. Kim Pham	Nguoi Viet Tay Bac	Offices	Quynh-An
8. Tri Pham	Nguoi Viet Ngay Nay	Offices	Quynh-An
9. Ghi Dang	Vietnamese Community Activity Center	Events, meetings	Quynh-An
10. Binh Nguyen	President, Vietnamese American Bar Association of Washington	Events, meetings	James
11. Someone from language school			
Focus Groups			
Type of Focus Group	Stakeholders	Purpose	
1. Development Directors / E.D.s	VFA, ACRS, ICHS, PDA, InterIM, WAPI, CISC, Helping Link, JAAC, International Examiner, ReWA	Events	James
2. Vietnamese language schools / groups (Vietnamese-speaking)	Ask Anh Tam...he will arrange one for us. SnoKing,	Events, meetings	Quynh-An
3. Child Care Providers	Denise Louie, Sound Child Care, Child Care Resources, HSD Step Ahead	Child CARE	James
4. Vietnamese Community Groups (English-speaking)	UW VSA, SU VSA, Miss Viet WA, TIS, e.g. Hoi H. O., Vietnam Scholarship Foundation?	Events, meetings	Quynh-An
5. Non-profit organizations, City departments	HSD, Civil Rights, Immigrant Affairs..., Puget Sound Sage, ,	Meetings	James
6. Vietnamese Pharmacist/Dental/Medial	Vietnam Health Clinic?, Nguyen Pharmacy (they have 2 locations- Little Saigon & on Rainier)	Event	Quynh-An

Questions: This is the general arc of the questions. Beginning with what they currently use space for. Success and challenges. And how they would envision a new space that meets their needs.

Will be slightly altered depending on events, meetings, workshops etc.


- What types of event/meeting does your organization currently host? When? How often? Where? How many attend? Who attends? Or who do they serve?
- What are some challenges you've experienced with the current availability of event/meeting space?
- How much do those types of spaces cost you, for a typical event?
- If you were to design your own event/meeting space, what things would it include?
 - What makes a successful event/meeting? Space, amenities, location, etc...How large of a space?
- Would you pay as much, or more, to "rent" this new space as you currently do?

In the case of child care providers, the questions will be radically different, as we need to assess child care needs in the area.

Appendix F—Little Saigon Housing Needs Assessment

In the past five years or so, stakeholders from various groups have developed plans in response to planning changes that nearly guarantee that Little Saigon will change drastically in the relatively near future. These plans cover broad topics, but nearly all address housing as a part of Little Saigon's future. Strengthening the residential base is seen as a way to create new advocates for the neighborhood, build a larger customer base for local businesses, provide housing for nearby workers and families, add market-rate housing to the International District while expanding affordable housing choices, and offer new homeownership opportunities to Seattle residents.

The following housing needs assessment was funded by Enterprise Community Partners and JP Morgan Chase and completed by SCIDpda in November 2013.



LITTLE SAIGON HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Produced by the Seattle Chinatown International District
Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda)

*with support from Enterprise Community Partners
and JP Morgan Chase*

October 30, 2013

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Little Saigon Context	1
1.2 Defining the Community	4
1.3 Previous Studies.....	5
1.4 About SCIDpda	7
1.5 Acknowledgments.....	8
2. COMMUNITY VISION	9
2.1 Housing in Little Saigon	9
3. HOUSING NEEDS	12
3.1 Population Characteristics.....	12
3.2 Housing Needs and Preferences	16
3.3 Other Factors	17
3.4 Population Trends	19
4. HOUSING SUPPLY AND CAPACITY	25
4.1 Little Saigon	25
4.2 Study Area	25
4.3 Rainier Valley	29
4.4 Neighborhood Capacity.....	31
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
5.1 Housing Needs vs. Supply.....	32
5.2 Incentives and Policy Tools.....	33
5.3 Major Stakeholders	35
5.4 Remaining Questions	36

1. INTRODUCTION


This report provides information on housing needs in the Little Saigon area of Seattle’s International District. It is intended to inform community stakeholders and developers who are interested in investing in the area and in opportunities for future development.

The housing needs assessment was prompted by several major changes and new opportunities in Little Saigon. New zoning has increased height limits in the area and encourages mixed-use development, virtually ensuring that future development will dramatically change what Little Saigon looks like and what happens there. In the near future, a new streetcar line and an area plan from the Department of Planning and Development will bring added attention to the area. Finally, the Friends of Little Saigon group is evaluating the feasibility of a mixed-use cultural, commercial, and housing development in response to the Vietnamese community’s longstanding desire for a cultural “landmark” project. While this report is much broader than a single development, it lays the groundwork for a project that aims to strategically meet several community needs and set the precedent for quality future development.

1.1 Little Saigon Context


Little Saigon is a 12-block area within the Chinatown International District (Fig. 1). It is bounded by I-5 on the west, S Main Street on the north, Rainier Avenue S on the east, and S Dearborn Street on the south. It currently holds primarily commercial and light industrial uses in low-rise buildings (10’ to 30’ tall) with surface parking lots. Some housing, mixed-use developments, nonprofit organizations, and religious organizations are located throughout the area.

Figure 1. Little Saigon



Source: Google Maps, modified

Figure 2. Walking distances from Little Saigon



Source: Little Saigon Public Realm Design Study, Atelier Dreiseitl, 2008

1.1.a History

The Little Saigon area developed as a mixed-use community with Chinese and Japanese residents in the 1910s. Small shops, houses and apartments, light industrial buildings, and a Gospel Tabernacle lined Jackson and Main streets east of 10th Avenue S. The blocks between Jackson and Dearborn streets were much more open, with clusters of single-family dwellings, boarding houses, stores, and industrial auto garages interspersed with undeveloped land. A Chinese Mission on King east of 12th appears to have been the only community organization headquartered south of Jackson.

From the 1920s through the 1960s, Jackson Street became the hub of a vibrant jazz community. The Black & Tan Club at 12th and Jackson was Seattle's premier jazz club, hosting internationally renowned musicians such as Duke Ellington, Ray Charles, and Charlie Parker.¹ It closed in 1966.

In 1942, the forced internment of Japanese Americans left many homes and businesses empty. Around that time, the small-scale, mixed-use development that had characterized the area shifted. By the 1950s, the land south of Jackson had filled in with more development, largely industrial. Auto shops, machine shops, glove and vinegar factories, and storage facilities stood alongside older houses and small stores. The earlier Chinese Mission had been converted to a store, but the Chinese Baptist church on King and the Buddhist church on Weller (both still extant) had been constructed. Bailey Gatzert School was located on 12th between Weller and Lane. Light industrial buildings—including a Goodwill Industries salvage facility and factories that made envelopes, sausages, macaroni, and donuts—clustered near the intersection of Dearborn and Rainier Ave. And there was still undeveloped land, both isolated lots and where terrain was too steep to build, as around Dearborn and 12th.

¹ "Seattle Music Map: An Insider's Guide to Seattle's Music History," City of Seattle, www.seattle.gov/music/map/Jazz.htm.

In subsequent decades, much of this land gradually filled in with newer commercial and industrial buildings, even as the construction of I-5 in the 1960s severed the area from the historic Chinatown and Japantown cores. With the influx of refugees from Vietnam in the 1970s and 1980s, the area became a commercial center for the growing Vietnamese community. Business owners were initially drawn by rents that were less expensive than in the Chinatown core, as well as proximity to two major Vietnamese worship centers and the Yesler Terrace housing development, which was home to a significant number of Southeast Asians. More and more Vietnamese businesses began establishing themselves along Jackson and King streets, with a concentration at the intersection of Jackson and 12th.

1.1.b Present

Little Saigon remains a hub of activity for Vietnamese businesses, including grocery and herb stores, restaurants, personal services, and small office uses. Approximately 70 percent of businesses are owned by Vietnamese Americans. This is reflected by a regional customer base that comes to the area on weekends to shop and eat, attend religious services, and socialize.

In contrast to Chinatown and Japantown west of I-5, which are densely developed mixed-use areas, Little Saigon is a low-density area that primarily holds commercial and light industrial uses. Fewer than 100 housing units exist in the area. These are split between market-rate condominiums and affordable rental apartments, with a few single-family houses along King Street east of 12th Ave S.

1.1.c Future

The area has recently received attention as part of the Livable South Downtown land use planning process, the First Hill streetcar, and the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, with another area plan in the pipeline. The Livable South Downtown Plan changed the zoning in Little Saigon from commercial, industrial commercial, and neighborhood commercial zoning with a 65' height limit to downtown mixed commercial/residential that allows buildings up to 85' and, on larger lots, 150' (Figs. 3-4). This rezone opened the door for intensive mixed-use development very unlike the low-rise commercial and industrial buildings that currently stand.

Figures 3-4. Little Saigon today, looking east on Jackson (L); same area, with development matching new zoning (R)



Source: Google Earth, 2013



Source: Final EIS, City of Seattle, 2008

The First Hill Streetcar currently under construction will make the neighborhood more accessible to First Hill and Capitol Hill. An embedded track is now being laid, and cars will run to and from these areas at 10-minute intervals. A ridership of at least 3,000 people per day is expected.

Immediately north of the neighborhood, the Seattle Housing Authority is moving forward with plans to redevelop the 30-acre Yesler Terrace housing development from an affordable, low-rise 561-unit community to a mixed-income community with 4,000 to 6,000 units. This shift is projected to occur over 20 to 30 years. Meanwhile, the Department of Planning and Development will soon begin developing an Action Plan for Little Saigon that will focus on placemaking-oriented streetscape improvements.

This housing needs assessment responds to these significant changes in context, as well as the opportunity for a larger residential base in Little Saigon. The area is located in a prime position for transit-oriented development: a half-mile from a major regional transit hub, with easy access to over 50 bus lines, light rail, Amtrak and commuter trains, and—within the next year—the First Hill streetcar. The recent upzoning projects a demand and opportunity for much denser development that adds residents to the current mix of small businesses.

Affordable commercial space is a significant concern as the area develops. Most of the Vietnamese businesses that make up the backbone of Little Saigon’s cultural identity rely on inexpensive rent to survive. Though this is not explicitly a housing issue, affordable commercial space is a priority for stakeholders in thinking about future mixed-used development. Additionally, continuing access to affordable commercial space means that business owners who prefer to live close to their shops or offices may consider Little Saigon as a viable place to live as well as work.

1.2 Defining the Community

Today, there are many stakeholders in Little Saigon. Though the residential population is very small—fewer than 300 people—Little Saigon is home to roughly 125 diverse small businesses, along with a number of institutions and organizations. The businesses offer Vietnamese and Chinese food (fresh and prepared), household goods, and personal services within a small but dense area.

Varied nonprofit organizations and housing providers also have a stake in the long-term vitality of the area. The Nisei Veterans Committee is headquartered on King Street, next to a historic apartment building owned and managed by Historic Seattle. Leschi House, another residential property, is owned and managed by the Seattle Housing Authority on S Weller, and the Seattle Indian Health Board serves 6,500 to 7,000 clients each year just across 12th Ave S. Several churches and Buddhist temples are located throughout the neighborhood, along with nonprofit organizations like Helping Link, the Asian Resource Center, and a food bank run by the Asian Counseling and Referral Service. The Friends of Little Saigon community group was established in early 2009 to preserve and strengthen the area’s unique character. Additionally, two longstanding community development organizations, the Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda) and Inter*Im, include Little Saigon in their service areas.

Other stakeholders are not based in the neighborhood, but still have strong ties. Thousands of Vietnamese American families come to Little Saigon from around the region every week to shop for groceries, eat at restaurants, socialize, or attend church or temple. These stakeholders are harder to define and consequently more difficult to engage, but they are vital to the cultural identity and vitality of the area. They also comprise a group of potential residents for future housing developments: people who are familiar with Little Saigon and have ties to the area, but currently live elsewhere.

1.3 Previous Studies

This section reviews previous plans and studies for Little Saigon, with a focus on how they address housing.

1.3.a Livable South Downtown Plan

The Livable South Downtown Plan was produced in 2009 to encourage and guide investment in neighborhoods south of downtown: the Chinatown International District, Pioneer Square, the stadium district, and south of Dearborn.² It set forth a vision for new land use, more jobs, and more residents, and introduced new zoning to facilitate those uses.

The plan noted that Little Saigon would likely see significant changes in the future, due to its central location and accessibility. It noted that the retention and strengthening of local small businesses and creation of a park were community priorities, and pointed to parallel efforts to address economic development, create a cultural community center, and create design guidelines.

The Livable South Downtown plan itself focused on land use and zoning changes. These laid the groundwork for the development of higher mixed-use buildings in Little Saigon, with the dual goals of retaining small and medium businesses and adding residents.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) produced to accompany the Livable South Downtown Plan provided figures associated with the new zoning. By its estimation, Little Saigon has a capacity of 3,900 residential units and will add nearly 1,700 residential units by 2030.³ The EIS also estimated an increase of close to 16,000 jobs in the South Downtown area by 2030, for a total employment capacity of nearly 33,000 jobs. Under these projections, Little Saigon is anticipated to hold 8,200 to 8,300 jobs.

1.3.b CARE Project

The CARE Project was initiated in 2009 by the Vietnamese Friendship Association (VFA), a nonprofit that serves the Vietnamese community around the region. The project engages youth and elders to assess strengths and challenges within the Vietnamese community. It includes multiple phases: a community needs assessment, the

² *Livable South Downtown Planning Study*, City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development (December 2009), http://wayback.archive-it.org/3241/20130513173937/http://seattle.gov/DPD/cms/groups/pan/@pan/@plan/@proj/documents/web_informational/dpdp018365.pdf.



³ *Livable South Downtown Planning Study: Final Environmental Impact Statement*, City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development (May 2008), 3-116, 3-119.

development of a community plan, and implementation (in progress). Phase I, the community needs assessment, is most relevant to this study. A survey undertaken between August and October 2010 received 309 individual responses. The survey was administered online through SurveyMonkey.com and in person at churches, temples, and community events. It asked a range of questions about community needs, including housing, transportation, concern around social issues, and demographics.

Respondent demographics generally reflect the broader Vietnamese community in family size and income, though with a lower homeownership rate (44 percent compared to 63 percent countywide). The proportion of respondents with children appears to be much higher than that of the countywide Vietnamese population (76 percent compared to 48.3 percent countywide). It is possible that this resulted from double-counting households with children if more than one person from each household responded to the survey.

Most respondents' current housing situations were stable, though a majority indicated a medium or high degree of concern. Half of renters used housing assistance to rent a home or apartment (Figs. 5-6).

Figures 5-6. CARE Project survey results



Survey responses indicated strong support of social services, including housing programs, senior assisted-living services, and childcare services. One other result worth noting is around transportation. More than 90 percent of respondents lived more than 2 miles from work, school, shopping, errands, and religious events. This is reflected in a heavy dependence on cars: 61 percent drove “practically every day.”

Several conclusions can be drawn from the CARE Project survey data. Affordable family housing is needed. In particular, housing close to jobs, shops, schools, and religious/community institutions could provide families with opportunities they do not currently have. Given the family demographics of respondents and the King County Vietnamese community, childcare and assisted-living services could add value to housing developments.

1.3.c Community Plans

See Section 2.1.a for a discussion of community plans.

1.4 About SCIDpda

The Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda) was founded by community activists nearly 40 years ago. Its mission is to preserve, promote, and develop the Chinatown International District (comprised of Chinatown, Japantown and Little Saigon) as a vibrant community and unique ethnic neighborhood.

SCIDpda has been recognized locally and nationally for its innovation in four program areas:

- *Property management* of affordable housing serving more than 700 residents and commercial/retail space totaling over 200,000 square feet.
- *Culturally responsive senior services*, including Legacy House (offering adult day programs and assisted living) and our Senior Meal Program (providing seniors with access to hot meals and nutrition/health services).
- *Economic development*, including real estate development, public realm enhancements, marketing, and business support.
- *Neighborhood involvement*, focusing on empowering local residents and business owners to become involved in ongoing community improvement projects.

SCIDpda has a long history of catalyzing neighborhood revitalization initiatives. In particular, it has extensive experience in serving as a convener and facilitator of community processes. Over its 38-year history, SCIDpda has leveraged over \$65 million in resources through its various programs.

SCIDpda has been intensively working to build capacity in Little Saigon for the past three years. This includes organizing local businesses around safety and sanitation, providing technical assistance to business owners, assisting property owners in identifying and evaluating development options for their properties, and participating in planning processes. SCIDpda staff members also work with Friends of Little Saigon to build the capacity of the organization.

1.5 Acknowledgments

This study would not have been possible without the help of many partners. Obi Amobi, a graduate student at the University of Washington’s Master of Urban Planning program, played a key role in gathering demographic data and developing population projections, first as a volunteer and then as an intern. Mike Stanger from A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), jointly working with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), helped to define the study’s scope of work and provided helpful feedback on the report draft. He also assisted with population projection methodologies, as did Matt Hoffman from Heartland, LLC. Tim Parham from the PSRC and Laurie Olson from the City of Seattle’s Office of Housing provided data on existing and pipeline housing developments. Other staff from the PSRC—Carol Naito and Mark Simonson—offered specific guidance on population projections. Staff at Historic Seattle, Leschi House, and the Pacific Rim Center assisted with distribution of resident surveys. All help was much appreciated.

This study was funded with grants from Enterprise Community Partners and JP Morgan Chase.

2. COMMUNITY VISION

Little Saigon matters to many people. As discussed in the introduction, the area is home to dozens of small businesses that attract thousands of families from around the region. It also holds diverse organizations and institutions that serve the Vietnamese and larger Asian communities, Seattle’s Native American population, Japanese American veterans, and others. Given the number and diverse scale of stakeholders, it is nearly impossible to articulate a vision for Little Saigon without an extensive community process—and even then, consensus would not be guaranteed.

This section seeks to begin answering the questions, *What is the community vision for Little Saigon, and how can housing help to realize it?* Though it does not provide definitive answers, it identifies common goals from past plans and factors that can contribute to further development of a vision for the area.

2.1 Housing in Little Saigon

In the past five years or so, stakeholders from various groups have developed plans in response to planning changes that nearly guarantee that Little Saigon will change drastically in the relatively near future. These plans cover broad topics, but nearly all address housing as a part of Little Saigon’s future. Strengthening the residential base is seen as a way to create new advocates for the neighborhood, build a larger customer base for local businesses, provide housing for nearby workers and families, add market-rate housing to the International District while expanding affordable housing choices, and offer new homeownership opportunities to Seattle residents.

Here are some points from the plans:

- Balanced mix of affordable housing, apartments, and high-end condos for both renters and homeowners (1/3 low-income, 1/3 moderate-income, 1/3 market-rate) (Vision 2030)
- Housing for individuals (including seniors), couples and families; downtown and hospital workers; longstanding community members and newer immigrants (Vision 2030, Little Saigon 2020)
- Medium-rise density (Little Saigon 2020)
- Little Saigon Landmark to fulfill various community goals, including 75+ units of affordable housing, with 2- and 3-bedroom units for families (Little Saigon 2020)
- Mixed-use neighborhood (Vision 2030, Open Space Master Plan)
- Increase ID housing capacity by as much as 10,000 units and 25,000 people (Vision 2030)

2.1.a Community plans

- The *Little Saigon 2020 Action Plan* resulted from a community planning process led by the Friends of Little Saigon in 2011-12. It had two primary goals: 1) to guide capacity building in the Little Saigon community, and 2) to address external development pressure that might lead to displacement.
- *Vision 2030* was developed in 2006 as a community response to the preliminary recommendations of the *Livable South Downtown* study.
- The CARE Project, as discussed in Section 1.3.

- The Chinatown, Japantown, Little Saigon: International District Urban Design Streetscape and Open Space Master Plan is an urban design plan for streetscapes and other public open spaces produced in 2004. It was driven by a Community Advisory Board and completed by Interlm and Nakano Associates.
- The Little Saigon Public Realm Design Study was produced by Atelier Dreiseitl in 2008. The study focused on reworking the public realm to make it more sustainable and pedestrian-friendly. It was initiated by the Vietnamese American Economic Development Association (VAEDA) and involved public design charrettes.

2.1.b Little Saigon resident survey

As part of this study, SCIDpda conducted a survey of Little Saigon residents to better understand current assets and challenges from residents' perspectives. The survey asked why people choose to live in Little Saigon, what they like and dislike about living in the area, and what they would like to see in the future. It also collected basic demographic information, though a small sample size made demographic analysis infeasible.

Most respondents highlighted Little Saigon's location and accessibility to transportation and other places both as reasons they chose to live in the area and continuing benefits as a resident. Diversity (of people and businesses) and the low cost of housing were also cited. Specific places that were mentioned as highly accessible from Little Saigon include downtown, the waterfront, workplaces, grocery stores and restaurants, the sports stadiums, and highways.

Respondents also described a number of challenges around living in the area. Almost every respondent highlighted public safety and cleanliness as major concerns. Other challenges that were identified include a lack of parking and playgrounds, homeless encampments, construction activity, noise from I-5, run-down buildings and shops, and a lack of diverse shops and eateries.

When asked what additional services, amenities, and events they would like to see in the area, most respondents wanted to see a greater variety of stores and restaurants (e.g., a coffee shop, chain grocery store, and western food restaurants). They suggested police walking and biking patrols and emergency call boxes to create a safer environment. Some respondents felt that more convenient community services such as walk-in medical clinics and activity centers would enhance quality of life. Others named more frequent community festivals and a monthly night market as activities that would benefit residents and draw additional people into the neighborhood. Other answers included traffic measures such as reduced vehicle speeds and better-marked street crossings, parklets with benches on major streets, and removal of warehouse and store boxes from sidewalks.

This survey was distinct from a resident/visitor intercept survey conducted jointly by SCIDpda and the Department of Planning and Development, which primarily captured visitor perspectives. See Section 2.4.c for information on the intercept survey. None of the resident survey respondents also took the intercept survey.

2.1.c Little Saigon Landmark

The Little Saigon Landmark is a proposed mixed-use development that includes a Vietnamese cultural center, a night market with many small vendors, a restaurant, a grocery store, and housing. The Friends of Little Saigon

group is driving the project, which is seen as a potential catalyst and standard-setter for future mixed-use developments in Little Saigon.

The Friends of Little Saigon has commissioned SCIDpda and other consultants to prepare a project feasibility study, which is anticipated to be completed in early 2014. The feasibility study process has included a community intercept survey (see Section 2.4.c), research on other cultural centers around the U.S., and evaluation of the economic feasibility of the commercial components. The results of this study will inform the housing component of the Landmark project.

3. HOUSING NEEDS

This section answers a series of questions around housing in Little Saigon. Who lives there now? Who might want to live there, now or in the future? And what type of housing do those populations need and want?

It discusses current and future housing needs in Little Saigon based on demographic and household characteristics of two study populations:

- Residents of Little Saigon and surrounding areas
- The Vietnamese population in King County

The focus on the Vietnamese population grows out of two assumptions that underlie this study: (1) that a larger residential base can make Little Saigon a stronger and more resilient economic area, and (2) that one role of future development should be the preservation and enhancement of the area's cultural heritage. Assessing the housing needs of the Vietnamese population will inform potential new developments that seek to strengthen this cultural heritage by serving Vietnamese residents, among others.

This section begins with an overview of each study population's household characteristics. It then examines how the study populations have changed over the last decade and projects population growth in the future.

The bulk of data discussed in this section was gathered from the decennial Census (1990-2010) and American Community Survey 2011 estimates.

3.1 Population Characteristics


3.1.a Little Saigon

In 2010, Little Saigon was home to approximately 270 people living in 82 households. Slightly over half were Asian American. The population was considerably older than Seattle as a whole, with half of all households headed by someone over 65 years old. One quarter of all households were occupied by a senior living alone. The number of Vietnamese Americans is unavailable at this geography.

3.1.b Study Area


A larger study area was defined to capture more information and enable somewhat more reliable population projections. Because the most detailed racial and ethnic data is obtainable at the census tract level, the study area was defined as the seven census tracts that intersect with or are immediately adjacent to the Chinatown International District (Fig. 7). Though information for tracts with fewer than 100 Vietnamese residents is not obtainable from the Census, available data provides a snapshot of typical household types and characteristics for the overall Vietnamese population.

Figure 7. Census tracts in Little Saigon study area



In 2010, 27,197 people lived in the study area in roughly 12,300 households. Just over 4 percent are of Vietnamese descent. Households are slightly smaller than average and predominantly renters. Nearly a quarter of residents in the study area, comprising half of all households, live alone. Only 10 percent of households have children under 18, and 21 percent are headed by people 65 years or older. Households are primarily low-income, with a median income less than half that of the city; over 30 percent receive public assistance. One quarter of residents are not proficient in English (Fig. 8).


Figure 8. Population characteristics in the Study Area and Seattle (2010)



2.1.c Vietnamese population in King County

In 2010, 43,746 people of Vietnamese descent lived in King County in 12,347 households. This group comprised 2.3 percent of King County’s total population. When compared to the entire population of King County, the Vietnamese community has a significantly larger proportion of family households, along with larger household and family sizes and fewer single-person households (Fig. 9). Median household income is substantially lower than in King County as a whole, though median income among Vietnamese households did increase by 43 percent between 2000 and 2010.

Figure 9. Population characteristics in the countywide Vietnamese community and King County (2010)



Two-thirds of Vietnamese households own their homes. Homeowner households are notably larger than renter households. Half of Vietnamese renter households are cost-burdened, meaning that they spend more than 30 percent of income on housing costs; 20 percent of renter households are severely cost-burdened, spending

more than half of income on rent. As median rent increased between 2000 and 2010, the proportion of cost-burdened and severely cost-burdened households also rose (Fig. 10).

Figure 10. Housing characteristics of Vietnamese households in King County (2010)

	2000	2010	% Change
Homeowner households	49%	63%	29%
Average household size	4.2	3.6	--
Median home value	\$193,600	\$375,000	94%
Mortgage holders that spend more than 30% of income on housing costs	35%	47%	34%
Renter households	52%	37%	-29%
Average household size	3.0	2.6	--
Median rent	\$574	\$822	43%
Households that pay more than 30% of income for rent	37%	47%	27%

Some additional cultural data is also relevant. In 2010, 64 percent of King County’s Vietnamese population was foreign-born. However, the community is relatively well established, with only 20 percent of residents entering the U.S. after 2000. Four out of every five Vietnamese persons speak Vietnamese at home. More than half of these speak English “less than very well.”

3.2 Housing Needs and Preferences

This section addresses housing needs and preferences based on two datasets: information from the 2010 Census and an intercept survey of residents and visitors to Little Saigon conducted in fall 2013.

3.2.a Census

As discussed in Section 3.1, Census data was collected for two groups: one geographically based in the seven tracts including and surrounding Little Saigon; and one ethnically based, King County’s Vietnamese population.

The population in the Little Saigon study area has some defining characteristics:

- Small household and family sizes
- Many single-person households
- A very high proportion of renters
- Low-income households
- Many foreign-born residents

Tract-level information on King County’s Vietnamese population highlights a number of characteristics that differ notably from the Little Saigon study area:

- A high proportion of family households with relatively large households that include children under 18 and seniors over 65
- Relatively few single-person households

- A low proportion of seniors living independently
- Household incomes below King County’s area median income, but increasing
- High proportion of homeowners
- Renter households that spend a high proportion of income on rent
- High proportion of foreign-born community members
- Limited English proficiency in half the Vietnamese population

3.2.b Intercept survey

In fall 2013, the Department of Planning and Development and SCIDpda jointly conducted an intercept survey in Little Saigon. The survey sought to assess parking needs and gauge interest in various components of the Little Saigon Landmark project, including a potential housing development. However, the housing questions yielded broader information about who is interested in living in Little Saigon, and what types of development would meet their needs. The survey received 339 responses.

Only 17 percent of survey respondents lived in the study area. The majority of responses (70 percent) were from visitors or customers, with an additional 10 percent from local employees or business owners. This population of existing customers is an important demographic to understand when thinking about future housing developments, as they already have ties to the area. Over half of respondents visit the area at least once per week. (Further study of local employees and business owners will occur in early 2014.)

Nearly half of respondents said that they would be very interested or somewhat interested in living in an apartment in a new mixed-use development in Little Saigon. Most of the affirmative responses live or would prefer to live in small households: approximately half indicated that they would prefer a studio or one-bedroom apartment, 40 percent would prefer a two-bedroom apartment, and the remainder (11 percent) would prefer three or more bedrooms. Interested respondents strongly preferred renting (61 percent) to owning (24 percent); 14 percent indicated no preference.

3.3 Other Factors

Several other factors may influence demand for housing in Little Saigon: local employment, nearby educational institutions, and a major new mixed-use development on the Yesler Terrace site.

3.3.a Employment

The Chinatown International District is a job-rich area, with 4,061 total jobs in 2011—more jobs than residents.⁴ However, the vast majority of local jobs are low-wage, with 80 percent paying less than \$40,000 per year (Fig. 11). This amount is only 65% of area median income (AMI) for a one-person household and less than 50% of AMI for a family of four.⁵ Over 30 percent pay \$15,000 or less per year—below 30% of AMI for any family size.

⁴ Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics database, <http://lehd.did.census.gov>.

⁵ These are AMIs from 2011, the same year as the jobs data.

The census tracts around Little Saigon have a significant number of jobs as well, with nearly 48,000 jobs—close to ten percent of all jobs in Seattle. These reflect a high concentration of hospitals and educational institutions around First Hill and Capitol Hill, and are much higher-paying. Over 60 percent pay more than \$40,000 per year, compared to just 12 percent that pay less than \$15,000 annually.

Figure 11.

Annual Wages	Percent of Jobs		
	Chinatown ID	Little Saigon Study Area	Seattle
\$15,000 or less	32%	12%	21%
\$15,001 to \$39,996	48%	24%	27%
\$39,997 or more	20%	63%	52%

The Livable South Downtown Final Environmental Impact Statement produced in 2008 noted a potential increase of close to 16,000 jobs in the South Downtown area (Pioneer Square, the stadium area, and the ID, and south of Dearborn) by 2030, for a total employment capacity of nearly 33,000 jobs in South Downtown.⁶ Little Saigon is projected to hold 8,200 to 8,300 jobs. The concentration of jobs in the neighborhood and surrounding areas should generate a consistent demand for housing. Given the low wage rates of jobs in the International District, affordable housing is especially important; however, higher wages in nearby areas means that housing for a mix of incomes will likely find demand.

3.3.b Educational institutions

The Pacific Tower (PacMed Building) sits at the north end of Beacon Hill, just over the Jose Rizal Bridge from Little Saigon. The Washington State Department of Commerce plans to open a Community Health College and Innovation Center in 13 floors of the building.⁷ Seattle Central Community College will operate health training programs on up to six floors as part of the project. Other community and health care nonprofits are expected to lease space in the building.

Little Saigon is located less than half a mile from the Pacific Tower. It also connects the building and a high concentration of hospitals on First Hill, and is located on the way to Seattle Central’s main campus. It is not clear how an influx of new students and professionals will impact Little Saigon: this depends on the number of international students, who are more likely to live close to campus; how much time students will spend at the new campus; and whether students will do practical work in First Hill hospitals.

On the other side, Seattle University sits about half a mile north of Little Saigon. The university counts 7,484 students: 4,589 undergraduates and 2,895 graduate and professional students, with enrollment remaining steady in recent years. Freshmen and sophomores are guaranteed on-campus housing. It is anticipated that nearby Capitol Hill and the Central Area may be more attractive neighborhoods for students, but housing

⁶ *Livable South Downtown Planning Study*, 3-119.

⁷ “Letter of Intent for Pacific Tower signed with Washington State Department of Commerce,” Pacific Hospital Preservation and Development Authority, August 13, 2013, www.phpda.org/about-the-phpda/press-room/letter-of-intent-for-pacific-tower-signed-with-washington-state-department.

developments in Little Saigon may attract some students who want to live close to campus. Affordable developments may also draw some students.

3.3.c Yesler Terrace development

Yesler Terrace abuts Little Saigon to the north of S Jackson Street. The 561-unit development was completed in 1941 as the first racially integrated public housing project in the U.S. Today, it is slated for a \$290 million redevelopment over the next 25 to 30 years with a mix of market-rate and affordable housing units. The completed project will include between 1,200 and 3,200 market-rate units and 1,801 affordable units serving households from 30% AMI to 80% AMI.

The threefold increase in the number of affordable units is a sizeable change for the area, but it is not expected to meet demand. Additionally, the lengthy timeframe for redevelopment means that the increase will happen over time and not flood the market.

A 2012 market analysis estimated that Central Seattle—Denny Triangle, South Lake Union, Belltown, Pioneer Square, First Hill, Capitol Hill, and the Central District—would grow by approximately 28,000 households between 2012 and 2032.⁸ This figure includes 4,800 workforce households earning between \$30,000 and \$60,000 per year; 7,000 mid-rise renters earning between \$60,000 and \$90,000 per year; and 8,500 high-rise renters earning more than \$90,000 per year. The analysis assumed that Yesler Terrace would capture 13 percent of structural demand, or net new demand, amounting to approximately 2,000 households by 2032. Turnover demand, or households moving within Central Seattle, is estimated to add 1,626 households to Yesler Terrace.

3.4 Population Trends

Making population projections is not a straightforward exercise. Birth, death, and migration data are not available at the scale of Little Saigon, and projections are rarely done for individual ethnic groups due to inconsistent patterns of regional migration. For this study, population projections for the Vietnamese community were made using three models:

- 1) Countywide proportional change, in which Vietnamese community growth is based on the assumption that the Vietnamese community will account for the same proportion of King County’s population in the future.
- 2) Citywide proportional change, which bases proportional growth on the city of Seattle.
- 3) Straight-line method, which assumes that historical growth rates will continue.

Population projections for the total population of the study area were based on the straight-line method. However, these projections are made less certain by the large changes in zoning and transportation and the other factors discussed in Section 3.3. These will substantially impact the area and almost guarantee that the nature of future local development will be very different than what it has been to date. Thus, growth in area households may be higher due to multiple major projects in the area.

⁸ “Memorandum to Anne Fiske Zuniga and Al Levine, Seattle Housing Authority,” from Chris Fiori and Matt Hoffman, Heartland LLC (March 23, 2012), 14-15.

3.4.a Little Saigon

Population projections were not made for Little Saigon due to the small number of households. However, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) produced by the City of Seattle to accompany the Livable South Downtown Plan estimates that Little Saigon itself will add nearly 1,700 residential units by 2030.⁹


3.4.b Study Area

Assuming that the area around Little Saigon continues to grow at a similar rate as in the past, it is projected to add 2,274 residents in 4,333 (smaller) households by 2020, and an additional 2,559 residents in 6,789 households by 2030 (Figs. 12-13).¹⁰

However, other factors—primarily zoning changes and the Yesler Terrace redevelopment—may mean that these assumptions are too low. If the Final EIS is correct (see above), substantial growth in Little Saigon will lead to a larger number of households in the overall study area.


Population growth projections for the Vietnamese community within the study area vary depending on the model used. Under the straight-line projection model, a recent decrease in Vietnamese residents results in projections of fewer Vietnamese residents in the future, with the population dropping to 830 residents in 318 households by 2030. The proportional-change model yields more positive results, with the Vietnamese community accounting for 489 new residents in 122 additional households by 2020 and 309 residents in 118 households by 2030.

Figures 12-13.



⁹ *Livable South Downtown Planning Study: Final Environmental Impact Statement*, City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development (May 2008), 3-116.


¹⁰ The growth in households outstrips the resident growth, which is in line with recent trends. This reflects the formation of smaller households among new and current residents.



3.4.c Vietnamese population in King County

The Vietnamese community is a small but rapidly growing part of King County’s population. In 2010, the county held 43,746 Vietnamese residents in 12,347 households. This community comprised 2.3 percent of the county’s total population, up from 1.7 percent in 2000. The growth in the last decade—13,858 persons—translates to a population increase of 46.3 percent. Over the same decade, white, Black, and Hispanic racial groups in King County increased by -0.2 percent, 30.8 percent, and 81 percent, respectively (Fig. 11).


Figure 14. Population change, 2000-10



The projected growth in the county’s Vietnamese community varies depending on the projection model used (Figs. 15-16). Both proportional-change models project an increase of 9,543 Vietnamese residents in 489 households by 2020 and an additional 12,642 residents in 3,509 households by 2030, with the total Vietnamese community reaching nearly 66,000 residents by 2030 (see blue lines in figures below).

The straight-line method reflects Vietnamese community growth rates that historically outstrip countywide growth. These result in much higher projections: 25,084 new residents in 6,756 households by 2020 and 51,375 additional residents in 14,258 households by 2030 (green lines in figures below). By 2030, the total population is projected to reach 120,205 people—nearly double the projection of the proportional growth model.

Figures 15-16.




3.4.d Vietnamese population in Seattle


Like King County, Seattle experienced more modest growth in the Vietnamese population between 2000 and 2010, with an increase of 15 percent compared to the city’s overall growth of 8 percent. At 14,987 persons, the Vietnamese population accounted for 2.5 percent of the city’s total population in 2010. The distribution of Vietnamese communities within the city has remained fairly consistent, with the highest concentrations observed in the central and southeast regions, particularly in the Rainier Valley and adjacent areas (Figs. 17-18).¹¹

¹¹ Tracts 104.01, 104.02, 110.01, 110.02 111.01, and 117.

Growth rates for Seattle’s Vietnamese population also vary depending on the projection model, though slower growth rates within the city mean that the difference is less dramatic. The population is anticipated to reach between 17,393 and 20,746 total people by 2020, an addition of 495 to 1,475 new households since 2010. By 2030, the projections range from 20,397 to 24,412 total people in an additional 878 to 1,590 new households.

Figures 17-18.





3.4.d Vietnamese population in the Rainier Valley

The Rainier Valley contained 28 percent of Seattle’s Vietnamese population in 2010: 4,256 people. If growth rates continue in a similar manner, the Rainier Valley will likely continue to absorb much of the Vietnamese community’s population growth within the city in years to come. The area is projected to reach between 4,688 and 7,300 people by 2020 and between 6,482 and 14,568 by 2030.

4. HOUSING SUPPLY AND CAPACITY

This section examines existing and planned multifamily housing developments in and around Little Saigon and the Rainier Valley, as well as the housing capacity of Little Saigon under new zoning regulations. Multifamily developments were selected as a comparable development type based on the new zoning for Little Saigon.

For the purposes of this study, housing comparables were defined as residential or mixed-use properties with 30 or more units, with a focus on 50+-unit developments. Developments were gathered based on in-house knowledge and from the Seattle Housing Authority and the Puget Sound Regional Council. Those developments that met the criteria (1) in Little Saigon, (2) within the study area around Little Saigon, and (3) in the Rainier Valley were examined. The Rainier Valley houses the largest concentration of Vietnamese residents in King County.

4.1 Little Saigon

4.1.a Existing housing

Little Saigon itself has a very small housing supply. The 2010 Census counted approximately 270 people living in the neighborhood. Rentals dominated the housing stock, with nearly 92 percent of households renting their homes. Just seven households owned their homes. A handful of older single-family houses are clustered on King Street east of 12th, along with the historic Victorian Row apartments. The only comparable developments in Little Saigon for the purposes of this project are Pacific Rim, a mixed-use development with 50 market-rate condominiums, and Leschi House, a 34-unit senior housing development currently planned for expansion.

4.1.b Planned housing

The Seattle Housing Authority is also planning a renovation of Leschi House that will add 69 units for low-income seniors. The Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) is also planning a project in Little Saigon at 12th and Jackson.

4.2 Study Area


4.2.a Existing housing

Little Saigon and surrounding areas hold a diverse supply of rental housing in multifamily properties and single-family houses (Fig. 19). Housing options are predominantly rental: 79 percent of households rented their dwelling in 2010. As noted, this report focuses on mid-sized to large-scale rental properties. Fifty-five comparable properties were identified for this report.

To the north, First Hill holds mid-scale rental housing with one or two units, as well as two large SHA developments: Jefferson Terrace (299 units) and the soon-to-be-redeveloped Yesler Terrace (561 units). To the west, the rest of the Chinatown International District is dominated by rental housing: primarily SROs, studios, and 1-bedroom units in historic mixed-used buildings, with a limited amount of newer family housing. These units are generally affordable, some because of funding obligation and many simply by location. To the south, Beacon Hill holds single-family houses and smaller apartment complexes. SHA owns one exception, the 108-unit

income. Yesler Terrace, Domingo Viernes Apartments, and The Jefferson all include 2- and 3-bedroom apartments; however, all other income-restricted buildings contain only SROs, studios, and 1-bedroom units. Three quarters of the comparable buildings are owned by nonprofit organizations or the Seattle Housing Authority.

Figure 20.




However, local households are still stretched for affordable options. In 2011, the median rent in the area was \$763—a 65 percent increase from the \$463 median rent in 2000. This increase is reflected in how households allocate their income: Half of all renter households spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Owner-occupied housing units appear to be somewhat more affordable, but the costs are still high compared to household income, with four out of ten homeowner households spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs.

4.2.b Planned housing

As mentioned earlier, the Yesler Terrace redevelopment will add between 3,000 and 5,000 housing units adjacent to Little Saigon over the next 30 years. This will be a significant change. Additional developments include affordable housing constructed by El Centro on Beacon Hill, two developments on Capitol Hill by Capitol Hill Housing, and a project in the Central District by LIHI. Not including Yesler Terrace, these developments will add just over 600 housing units to Little Saigon and surrounding neighborhoods, with most designated for households in the 30 to 60% AMI range (Fig. 21).

Figure 21.



4.3 Rainier Valley

4.3.a Existing housing

Housing options in the Rainier Valley are a mix of rental and for-sale housing. Forty percent of households rented their dwelling in 2010: just below Seattle's homeownership rate of 48 percent. As noted, this report focuses on mid-sized to large-scale rental properties. Sixteen comparable properties with 3,200 units were identified for this report.

The comparable developments are clustered along the two primary thoroughfares of the Rainier Valley, Rainier Avenue and Martin Luther King, Jr. Way. Most buildings were constructed in the late 1990s to the mid-2000s, with few exceptions. Sizes vary widely, from 30 units to the nearly 1,500 units in the Seattle Housing Authority's NewHolly project, with most comparable developments holding between 80 and 150 units (Fig. 22).

Figure 22.



Only three developments include a sizeable proportion of market-rate units, though three additional properties provide housing available to 80% of AMI (workforce housing). Six of the properties focus on seniors and/or special needs populations; these comprise nearly 20 percent of all comparable housing units that were identified. The majority of the properties were developed by one of three entities: SouthEast Effective Development (SEED), the Retirement Housing Foundation, and SHA.

4.3.b Planned housing

Two pipeline developments were identified in the Rainier Valley, though this list is not complete. Both are anticipated to be completed by the end of 2013, and will add a total of 130 units affordable to households earning 30 to 60% of AMI. One development, Rainier Court IV, is intended for seniors, with 1- and 2-bedroom units. The other development, the Impact Family Village, is intended for families and includes 12 3-bedroom units.

4.4 Neighborhood Capacity

Zoning in the Little Saigon area was recently changed from commercial, industrial commercial, and neighborhood commercial zoning with 65' height limits to Downtown Mixed Residential/Commercial (DMR/C) zoning, which provides for downtown mixed commercial/residential uses with 85' or 150' height limits. This zoning classification allows high residential density with pedestrian-oriented retail and service uses at the street level.

Under the new zoning, the residential capacity is approximately 3,900 units.¹² This is a very significant increase from the area's current housing supply and development type.

¹² *Final EIS, City of Seattle (May 2008), 3-119.*

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Housing Needs vs. Supply

This section estimates the type and quantity of housing that is and will be needed in Little Saigon in the future. These types of projections are always difficult, but the significant developments, plans, and projects that are currently happening in and planned for Little Saigon and adjacent areas make them even less straightforward.

5.1.a Little Saigon and surrounding study area

In the coming decades, Little Saigon and the surrounding study area will grow significantly. The study area is expected to add 11,122 households by 2030. By the same year, 1,700 additional households are anticipated to be located within Little Saigon alone: a twentyfold increase from its current count of 82 households. Based on zoning, Little Saigon's projected overall capacity is 3,900 households. Housing developments in the pipeline (not including the Yesler Terrace redevelopment, which falls outside the boundaries of Little Saigon) will add 135 units—not nearly enough to meet this need. Some recommendations can be made based on current demographics, though those will almost certainly shift with such a large influx of new residents.

If population growth does bring residents with similar characteristics, the population could benefit from affordable studios and one-bedroom units for individuals and couples. Conversely, the county's Vietnamese community could benefit from affordable family housing that accommodates relatively large, multi-generational households and is located close to shops, jobs, cultural organizations, and transportation. For both groups, for-sale housing—from affordable to market-rate—and affordable rental housing would meet community needs. Housing that includes some embedded social services or is located nearby service centers may be useful for residents who do not speak English fluently.

When asked what additional services, amenities, and events they would like to see in the area, residents' responses were closely tied to the challenges they perceived. Most respondents wanted to see a greater variety of stores and restaurants (e.g., a coffee shop, chain grocery store, and western food restaurants). Respondents suggested police walking and biking patrols and emergency call boxes to create a safer environment. Some respondents felt that more convenient community services such as walk-in medical clinics and activity centers would enhance quality of life. Others named more frequent community festivals and a monthly night market as activities that would benefit residents and draw additional people into the neighborhood.

Future development and plans should build on existing strengths of the area and address challenges as identified by current residents. Location and accessibility are primary reasons that residents choose to live in Little Saigon. However, walkability could be improved with maintenance and cleaning of the public realm, increased police presence to enhance the perception of safety, and traffic calming/pedestrian crossing measures. In addition to the retention and support of existing small businesses—identified by multiple community and City plans as key priorities for the area—providing space for other businesses and community services could create a neighborhood environment that met more of residents' needs. Finally, developing spaces for cultural activities such as community festivals and a night market could benefit both residents and business owners.

Recommendations:

- 1,500 new units by 2030, including both rental and for-sale units to expand options for current and future residents
- A mix of affordable, workforce, and market-rate units to accommodate current low-income residents, low-income workers in the Chinatown ID and higher-income workers in surrounding areas, and new residents
- A balance of smaller units for individuals and seniors, as well as family units to accommodate families with children under 18
- Housing linked to social services to assist residents with limited English proficiency

5.1.b Vietnamese population

As King County’s Vietnamese population continues to increase, it is anticipated that growth will continue to be concentrated in the Rainier Valley. However, the strong core of Vietnamese businesses and cultural institutions, the Vietnamese cultural center in the proposed Little Saigon Landmark project, and the rezoning of the Little Saigon area present an opportunity for a Vietnamese residential community to establish and grow in Little Saigon.

The Vietnamese community in Seattle is projected to grow by between 495 and 1,475 households by 2020 and an additional 878 to 1,590 households by 2030. In comparison, the Vietnamese community in all of King County—which has historically grown at faster rates—is projected to add between 489 and 6,756 households by 2020, with an additional 3,509 to 14,258 households by 2030. Little Saigon’s ability to capture a portion of that growth in the city and/or the county depends on the size and types of housing that are developed in the area, rental vs. for-sale housing, affordability levels, and targeted marketing.

Recommendations based on Vietnamese community:

- 3BR+ family units
- A mix of affordable and workforce housing
- Both rental and for-sale options, with more for-sale units
- Housing linked to social services to assist recent immigrants and residents with limited English proficiency

5.2 Incentives and Policy Tools

5.2.a Existing tools

This subsection asks what incentives and policy tools exist to support the housing envisioned in this report. The following list is not intended to be comprehensive.

Incentive/tool	Purpose	Benefit	Who offers it
New Markets Tax Credits	Encourage private investment in business and real estate in low-income communities	39% income tax credit; can be claimed over 7 years	Federal/IRS
Low-Income Housing Tax	Encourage private investment	Annual income tax credit of 9%	Federal/IRS

Credits	in affordable rental housing	or 4% (where tax-exempt bond financing is used) for eligible costs associated with income-qualified units; can be claimed over 10 years	
Residential Bonus Program	Integrate affordable housing into new residential developments, or generate money to fund new affordable housing	Residential floor area above the base height limit	City/Office of Housing
Transferable Development Rights Potential (TDP)	Concentrate density in appropriate areas while preserving lower-density areas with historic or natural character	Residential floor area above the base height limit or floor area ratio (FAR) allowed by zoning	City/Office of Housing
Multifamily Tax Exemption Program	Integrate affordable workforce housing into new rental or for-sale housing projects and rehabilitations	Developer receives property tax exemption on residential improvements for 12 years in exchange for including 20% affordable units for 65-85% AMI (rental) or 100-120% AMI (for sale)	City/Office of Housing
Housing Trust Fund	Assist local governments, housing authorities, and nonprofit organizations in providing affordable housing up to 80% AMI	Maximum award per project is \$3 million. Awards are recoverable grants, amortized loans, or deferred loans. Loan interest rates are 0-3%.	State/City administrators
Multifamily NOFA	Assist nonprofit and private developers in acquiring, rehabilitating, and/or constructing affordable rental housing for low-income households (up to 80% AMI, with emphasis on <30% AMI). Property must be used for low-income housing for at least 50 years or the entire loan term, whichever is longer	50-year loans to help fund developments. Without LIHTC: 1% interest rate for nonprofit-sponsored projects; 3% for private for-profit-sponsored projects. With LIHTC: 1-3% case-by-case.	City/Office of Housing
On-Site Bonus Housing	Integrate affordable housing into market-rate residential or mixed-use developments.	For height limits 85' and below, developers can gain residential floor area above the base height limit or floor area ratio (FAR) allowed by zoning. Number of affordable units (for 80% AMI) based on a formula. If height limit is higher than 85', developer can choose to pay a fee-in-lieu for extra FAR.	City/Office of Housing
BUILT SMART	Reduce building's energy usage by incorporating energy-efficient measures	Financial incentives based on energy saved or square footage, plus technical guidance and	Seattle City Light

	into building design, construction, and operation	marketing tools. Additional incentives may be available for affordable housing developments.	
Multifamily New Construction Energy-Efficiency Program	Reduce buildings' energy usage by incorporating energy-efficient fixtures and appliances	Financial incentives for water-saving fixtures and efficient natural-gas appliances, plus technical information	Puget Sound Energy

5.2.b Additional tools

Still other policies, incentives, and tools that could help to realize a balanced, thriving Little Saigon are not yet in place.

Potential incentive/tool	Purpose	Benefit	Who would offer it
Density bonus	Encourage developers to include affordable housing and other public amenities in developments. Recommended by Livable South Downtown plan.	Floor area above the base height limit of 65' (up to 85')	City
Inclusionary zoning	Ensure that new housing developments include housing for a mix of incomes. Developers may alternatively pay into a fund for affordable housing.	Public benefit: Affordable housing integrated into market-rate developments	City
Cultural development bonus	Encourage developers to include cultural and educational uses in developments	Increased height for new developments	City
Commercial land trust	Preserve affordable commercial space for small businesses in areas where commercial rents are rising or anticipated to rise	Public benefit: Preserve and strengthen the cultural character of Little Saigon	City; land trust; business consortium

5.3 Major Stakeholders

The Friends of Little Saigon (FLS) is the primary group working to advocate for Little Saigon. Formed in 2009, its mission is “to preserve and enhance Little Saigon’s cultural, economic, and historic vitality.” It sees the area as a mixed-use hub of the regional Vietnamese American community. To this end, it is working with the SCIDpda to evaluate the feasibility of the Little Saigon Landmark project as a standard-setting development that would include a Vietnamese cultural center, night market, Asian supermarket, housing, and other uses.

There are a number of other potential partners and collaborators in Little Saigon. Some of these are property owners, such as the following agencies and organizations:

- The **Robert Chinn Foundation** owns the Asian Resource Center, a community facility that includes a gymnasium and meeting rooms.
- The **Chong Wa Benevolent Association** holds properties in the Little Saigon area.
- **Historic Seattle** owns and operates Victorian Row Apartments, a 14-unit building that serves low-income households.
- The **Nisei Veterans Committee** owns and operates a Memorial Hall for events and gatherings.
- The **Seattle Housing Authority** operates Yesler Terrace (to be redeveloped) and Leschi House.
- The **Seattle Indian Health Board** is a social service and primary health care organization located in Little Saigon.
- Other **property owners** who hold one or more parcels in the area, including individuals and religious communities.

Some organizations do not own property in Little Saigon, but are tied to the area through location and/or mission:

- The **Asian Counseling and Referral Service (ACRS)** operates a food bank in the area.
- The **Chinatown International District Business Improvement Association (CIDBIA)**, which works on neighborhood marketing, community events, and public safety. The BIA currently focuses on the Chinatown/Japantown core but would consider expansion of its assessment area to Little Saigon if invited by local stakeholders.
- **Helping Link** is a nonprofit that works to help Vietnamese immigrants transition to the U.S. It offers ESL programs, homework tutoring, and a youth leadership program; and is located in Little Saigon.
- **InterIm Community Development Association** works to promote, revitalize, and advocate for the Chinatown ID and the broader API community in the Puget Sound region.
- **International Community Health Services (ICHS)** is a nonprofit community health center that serves King County's Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities, as well as other underserved communities. ICHS was founded in the International District and currently has four locations around the county.
- **SCIDpda** has worked to build community capacity in Little Saigon for several years, and plans to continue working closely with community partners such as Friends of Little Saigon to explore the feasibility of the Little Saigon Landmark mixed-use project. It will also continue to explore ways to maintain commercial affordability, such as commercial land trusts.
- The **Wing Luke Asian Museum** tells the story of Asian Americans in the U.S. through multiple community-oriented lenses. It is located on the eastern edge of the historic Chinatown core, close to Little Saigon.

5.4 Remaining Questions

This report has laid the groundwork for thinking about future housing needs and supply in Little Saigon. However, given the potential for major change in the area, significant questions and challenges remain.

- *Land assembly.* The Little Saigon area holds relatively small parcels owned by different individuals. How can small property owners be engaged in thinking about and contributing to larger-scale development?
- *Local businesses.* Little Saigon is defined by the presence of diverse small businesses, which may be displaced by future development. How can small businesses be supported and retained through the development process, both for individual parcels and the neighborhood? How can affordable commercial space be created so that businesses can afford to stay in the neighborhood?
- *Vietnamese residents.* As discussed in this study, one purpose of residential development in Little Saigon is to strengthen the residential base of local advocates and customers. What type of marketing and attraction can help attract potential Vietnamese residents? What factors will make individuals and families want to live in Little Saigon, as opposed to commuting from the Rainier Valley or other parts of Seattle/King County?
- *Walkability.* One of Little Saigon’s potential strengths over other areas of King County is walkability. The area is compact, with sidewalks throughout the area and excellent access to shops, jobs, cultural institutions, and public transportation. However, it is not a pleasant place to walk. There are no street trees, benches, public art, and other streetscaping improvements, which means that the area’s inherent walkability does not feel like an obvious asset. How can future planning projects and developments increase the feeling of walkability?
- *Neighborhood character.* Little Saigon’s built landscape is currently a mix of utilitarian buildings that do not reflect local culture. How can future planning projects and developments define a distinctive neighborhood character that reflects the local culture, businesses, and residents?
- *Affordability.* Little Saigon’s current residential base is very small, and largely consists of designated affordable housing in Victorian Row and Leschi House. Gentrification in the traditional sense—displacement of existing residents by new higher-income residents—is extremely unlikely to occur. However, it is not easy to ensure that new development accommodates a range of incomes, particularly given the varying demographics and incomes of potential residents, from very low-income households that currently live in the area to higher-income employees of nearby institutions and downtown firms.