St. Mark's Episcopal Cathedral
2030 Plan/Report

Table of Contents

Dean's Introduction to the Plan

In my nearly five years here at Saint Mark's Cathedral, our focus has necessarily been about casting strategic visions over the short term—in three year iterative cycles—with emphases on invigorating ministries, parish development, securing financial stability, and embracing our cathedral role in the diocese and broader community. This is good work, rewarding in so many ways, and it will most certainly continue.

More recently, we've begun tackling some of the deferred maintenance issues on our buildings, which remain a rich resource for our mission but are showing their age. In addition to the $10 million preservation project on the cathedral now underway, we've devoted nearly half a million dollars to address deferred maintenance on our infrastructure since 2015. Even still, the list of deferred maintenance projects is long for the buildings on our campus, which were all built more than a half century ago. There is a sense of pride and accomplishment in undertaking this work, but it also has prompted us to consider how we might approach these projects more strategically, with an eye cast down range, to consider how our mission and ministry might be best supported on this uniquely situated campus.

With that in mind, a committee was formed by direction of the vestry, to explore potential trajectories between where we are and where we want to be by the year 2030. Campus planning is a critical element of that work, as you will see in this report, as is integration of the campus assets—buildings and grounds—so that we might optimally use them for ministry. There is much to do in this regard, and a template is needed to guide us. Hence, the proposed 2030 Plan herein.

I am grateful for all who have contributed to this work, or will in the coming months and years as we strive to accomplish the objectives set forth here. I am grateful for the generosity of those who steward this parish, this cathedral, this campus, and all the ministries that flow in and from here. I am grateful for the vestry whose visionary leadership has informed this work plan, and I am grateful for the 2030 Vision Committee members and our consultants for their dedicated engagement in this time, and for our esteemed chair, Maria Coldwell, for shepherding us in the process. And above all, I am grateful to God who has called us into community in this time, in this place to serve faithfully. I am,

Your Brother in Christ,

The Very Reverend Steven L. Thomason
Dean and Rector

Chair's Introduction to the Plan

The 2030 Planning Group met monthly from May 2016-June 2017. Members included Canon for Operations and Chair Maria Coldwell, Dean Steve Thomason, Chancellor John Hoerster, Senior Warden Lynne Markova, Junior Wardens Cara Peterson and Walter Stuteville, Canon Musician Michael Kleinschmidt, Canon for Youth and Young Adult Ministries Malcolm McLaurin, Vestry members Christopher Breunig and Alice Reid, Facilities Committee member Mary Baldwin Kennedy, and former Master Planning Project Manager Nancy Pearson.

Members of the 2030 Planning Group started their work with a SWOT analysis of St. Mark's Cathedral and some demographic research from the Mission Insite database provided by the Diocese of Olympia. An online parish survey was created (also available as hard copy) and circulated in June to gather input from parish members; about 40 responses were received. Reports were presented by the Dean, the Canon Musician, and the Canon for Youth and Young Adult Ministries, on ministry priorities for the future. Reports were also presented by the Chancellor, the former Master Planning Project Manager, and guest presenter (and former member of the Master Planning task force) Gerry Johnson concerning St. Mark's campus and facilities. Three professional reports were then commissioned: a Property Condition Assessment of the St. Nicholas Building and Leffler House from the firm of Marx/Okubo, a Site Development Study from Spectrum Development Solutions, and a traffic/parking study from Transpogroup. These reports were reviewed and discussed by the 2030 Group.

The current 2030 Plan takes the form of a Report; it gathers together and summarizes many of the reports heard by the 2030 Group throughout 2016. Based on the reports, the 2030 Group makes certain recommendations for St. Mark's Cathedral over the next 13 years, and presents a prioritized list of major facilities projects to be undertaken during that time period.

This Plan/Report was presented to the Vestry for approval in June 2017.

--Maria Coldwell, Canon for Operations

Executive Summary

Brief History of Campus Planning at St. Mark's

Saint Mark's Cathedral has long desired a Master Plan to guide its campus and facilities development. In the late 1980s, a long-range planning committee prepared "A Site Plan for St. Mark's: Master Plan Alternatives." The vision laid out in this 1989 document led to the "Century II: A Cathedral for the Northwest" plan of 1990, which envisioned building a new center for ministry in the south parking lot, with a cloister and courtyard connecting it to the cathedral. While the Century II campaign raised enough money to complete the West Wall project (finished in 1997), the new building never materialized. Instead, with the help of a generous partner, the St. Mark's Properties LLC purchased the St. Nicholas building to the north of the cathedral in 2003. Since that date, the focus of campus development has been on how best to utilize St. Nicholas as a future parish life and ministry center for the cathedral, as well as on "finishing" the cathedral itself (with both exterior and interior renovations). In 2005-2006, a Master Planning Task Force was convened, charged with developing "a comprehensive master plan to complete the Cathedral campus." Maria Barrientos (Barrientos LLC) produced a Long Range Facilities Program Plan for the cathedral in spring 2006, based on Cathedral staff input, but the Task Force never finalized its review of this plan. With the departure of Dean Taylor in 2008 and the major recession of 2008-2012, the plan was never completed or implemented. Shortly after the arrival of Dean Thomason in fall 2012, concrete chunks began falling from the north and south walls of the cathedral, and it became imperative and urgent to complete exterior renovations to the cathedral nave. A 3-year capital campaign from 2014-17 has raised over $8 million to date to complete a $10 million construction project in 2017. Cladding the exterior walls in stone, replacing the windows, and adding an elevator to improve accessibility are the main components of the current project; upgrades to the systems and interior of the nave remain to be undertaken in the future.

Need for 2030 Plan

The need still exists to create a mid-range plan for the whole campus, including the cathedral itself, the St. Nicholas property, Leffler House, and the grounds. Times have changed since 2006, and the expansive vision proposed to the Master Planning Task Force at that time (adding over 50,000 square feet to the current structures) no longer seems feasible. But the campus currently is underutilized as an urban center for ministry; Dean Thomason has urged that we maximize the use of the campus to further the Cathedral's mission. The current 2030 Plan is a relatively modest and intentionally pragmatic guide to campus development over the next 13 years at the cathedral.

Mission and Ministry Priorities

The 2030 Planning Group decided at the beginning of its process that any plan for the St. Mark's campus should be Mission and Ministry driven. St. Mark's is a house of prayer for all people, where worship is a central priority; St. Mark's is also the cathedral for the Diocese of Olympia and a gathering space for the broader community. These statements from the Mission underline the primacy of the cathedral nave among our campus structures. But St. Mark's is also a welcoming and inclusive community that places special emphasis on social and environmental justice, and we have an ongoing need for flexible meeting spaces of all sizes, and increasingly for temporary housing for certain ministries. We also aspire to

continue building on our identity as a Green Cathedral. Through a parish survey, staff reports, and discussions, we developed a list of ministry priorities through 2030 (see page 9). St. Mark's ministry priorities include 1) Expanding and developing ministries both for younger people (children, youth, young adults) and for seniors; 2) Focusing the social justice ministries, with special attention to services for the homeless, refugees and immigrants, and living into "Renewing Our Covenant: A Statement of Commitment and Action;" 3) Expanding the faith formation ministry and our communications efforts to better serve the broader community; 4) Expanding diocese-wide activities; 5) Expanding the activities of the music program, especially the choir school; 6) Increasing attendance and membership at St. Mark's; 7) Increasing emphasis on stewardship, including planned giving and major gifts; 8) Finishing the Nave construction projects; 9) Addressing deferred maintenance needs at the St. Nicholas Building and Leffler House; and 10) Preparing St. Nicholas for use as a parish life and ministry center.

Criteria for making decisions

The 2030 Planning Group realized the need to establish criteria for making decisions about future campus planning and construction projects. The guidelines we developed:

- Decisions should advance the cathedral's Mission and Ministry Priorities
- Projects should integrate rather than further fragment the campus
- Stewardship of current buildings should take priority over acquiring or constructing new buildings
- Given limited resources, the cathedral building itself should take first priority and the St. Nicholas Building second priority over other campus structures
- We should try to retain all current property (not sell it off), and be open to acquiring any contiguous property that becomes available
- We must be always mindful of parking considerations
- We must be always mindful of sustainability and accessibility

Reports and Results

At the beginning of the planning process, the 2030 Group did a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis, and some demographic research, using the Mission Insite database provided by the Diocese of Olympia. Weaknesses and threats that stood out in the SWOT analysis include our aging physical plant, with many deferred maintenance issues; the shallowness of St. Mark's financial resources; and the threat of earthquakes in this region. Data reviewed from Mission Insite revealed that within a 5-mile radius of St. Mark's Cathedral, 46% of the households are 1-person households. Only 20% of area households have 3 or more people in them. While the number of children in the Seattle schools is growing, within a 5-mile radius of St. Mark's, the community consists largely of single adults (many of them young adults or seniors); married couples or partners (some younger adults, some "empty-nesters"); and a relatively small number of families with children. This suggests that while we are prioritizing programs for children and youth, demographics are against us in our efforts to expand in this area, although special "magnet" projects (like the choir school) may thrive. Another data point is that household incomes within a 5-mile radius average well over $100,000, and are increasing rapidly. While we desire to serve the poor and homeless in Seattle, few of them live in

close proximity to the cathedral. Good bus service compensates somewhat for this, and we continue to house about 30 women per night, five nights a week, in our Noel House overflow shelter. Proposals to create more housing for the homeless on campus are currently under consideration. Also, as a result of "renewing our covenant," St. Mark's is now a sanctuary hub for undocumented immigrants, and we continue our commitment to support refugees.

It became clear to the 2030 Group that while we had substantial deferred maintenance on the St. Mark's campus, we were not sure exactly what problems needed to be addressed most urgently, nor did we have good cost estimates. We therefore decided to engage the firm of Marx/Okubo to do a thorough property assessment of the St. Nicholas building and Leffler House, to determine exactly what would need to be done to those structures over the next 10-15 years and what it might cost. Also, because the current capital campaign for the nave is "maxing out" our fundraising resources, we wanted to investigate possible alternative revenue streams for St. Mark's. It was suggested by former master-planning task force member Gerry Johnson, along with Dean Thomason and others, that our campus is underutilized. Our nave construction project managers, Spectrum Development Solutions, told us that it should be possible to find development partners to build new housing structures in the south parking lot area, which might give us a new and perhaps substantial revenue stream (rental income), while also addressing St. Mark's interest in exploring the possibility of providing low income or "workforce" housing on the campus. We therefore hired Spectrum Development Solutions to produce a site assessment report, focused on partnering with a developer to build housing structures in the south parking lot area and perhaps in the Leffler House/Carriage House area. Another area of concern on the campus is traffic and pedestrian circulation, and the use of the parking lots. Transpogroup, which had done a traffic study about 3 years ago in connection with the nave construction project, was hired to do a new study focused on maximizing parking opportunities (another potential revenue source for the cathedral) and improving both pedestrian and vehicle circulation on the campus.

The results of these various commissioned reports seriously challenged us and changed our thinking on priorities for the campus over the next 13 years. The Marx/Okubo report revealed that to continue using the St. Nicholas Building and Leffler House will require at least $3 million of deferred maintenance projects which will need to be completed over the next 10-15 years. The most expensive among these are a new roof for the St. Nicholas Building and seismic retrofitting of the "unreinforced masonry" structure of the original portion of the St. Nicholas Building (projects conservatively estimated to cost at least $2.5 million). A new boiler/HVAC system and recommended ADA accommodations for St. Nicholas are also needed, along with some major maintenance projects at Leffler House.

The Spectrum Development report showed that while it would certainly be feasible for St. Mark's to partner with a developer on the construction of housing units in the south parking lot area, the projected revenue stream would only be $100,000-$200,000/year at best. The "workforce housing" that was recommended would create small studio apartments at rental rates that still seemed very high, and St. Mark's would in effect lose control over a large portion of our campus. Issues with any potential development partner and issues with tenants might make life on the St. Mark's campus difficult. St. Mark's would also lose parking spaces. Upon consideration, neither the 2030 Group nor the Vestry felt

that the relatively small revenue stream projected was sufficient to justify the inconvenience and loss of control over the south parking lot area that would result from this potential construction.

Mike Swenson of the Transpogroup did a traffic circulation and parking study for St. Mark's in May 2017. Four preliminary designs were submitted, and we quickly focused in on Alternative A, the top recommendation from Transpogroup. This design proposes that we close off the driveway in front of the cathedral with bollards, using it for pedestrians only except in emergencies or special circumstances. The current entry and exit driveways to the cathedral campus would both be made available for 2-way traffic. This would, in effect, create two separate parking lots: the north lot (used to a great extent by the tenants of the St. Nicholas building, but also by St. Mark's parishioners, primarily on Sundays or for special events); and the south lot, used primarily by St. Mark's. The narrow road behind the cathedral would still be available for one-way traffic from the north to the south lot, but we would discourage its usage. A semi-circular drop-off area would be created at the southeast corner of the cathedral, with easy access to the new wheelchair ramp. By restriping the south parking lot, we would go from 110 to 127 stalls; wheelchair parking spaces would be relocated to a certain extent, so that some would be near the new elevator annex, some near the Bloedel Hall entrance, and some near the nave wheelchair ramp. The new layout includes a number of landscaped islands, for small shrubs and plantings. Besides making the front driveway for pedestrians only, the design suggests adding a sidewalk for pedestrians that would run close to the south driveway entrance/exit to Tenth Ave. E. and along the east side of the south parking lot, up to the pedestrian only driveway and entrance to the nave. The Transpogroup study also includes recommendations for establishing paid parking in the south lot on weekdays (for use by the St. Nicholas building tenants).

Top Priority Projects and Recommendations of the 2030 Group

After much discussion and review of reports, the 2030 Group makes the following recommendations for St. Mark's over the next 13 years. Most of these top priority projects are facilities projects and depend upon raising substantial amounts of money from various funding sources before they can be undertaken. A possible timeline for approaching these projects is found on page 11.

However, two project priorities stand out as being mission/ministry driven, and not requiring a huge amount of revenue to move ahead. These projects might be undertaken in the near future, as desired by the Vestry.

- **Create temporary housing on St. Mark's campus for those in need (undocumented immigrants needing sanctuary; newly arrived refugees; the homeless).** Potential sites include the basement of Leffler House; the Leffler House yard area (for "tiny houses"); and possibly the basement of St. Nicholas Building as a more permanent homeless shelter for Noel House (this would require considerably more revenue).
  Recommended funding sources: LIHI partnership; Noel House partnership; grants; special gifts.

- **Expand the Choir School and/or create an After-School Music Program**. Utilize the mezzanine rooms (current Sunday School rooms) in the St. Nicholas Building on weekdays, and Skinner Auditorium as needed.
  Recommended funding sources: ongoing major gifts program and special gifts.

The top priority facilities projects are listed below. While these are listed in order of importance, it is not expected that the cathedral would need to finish each project in order before moving onto the next. It is recommended, in fact, that we move ahead with parts of each of these projects as funding becomes available, or as urgent need requires. With each of these projects, consideration shall be given to opportunities for environmental sustainability and renewable energy.

- **Renovation of the cathedral nave.** This continues to be the top priority for St. Mark's Cathedral. The current 2017 construction project includes cladding of the exterior walls in stone, replacing the windows, and adding an elevator. However, over the next 10-15 years, we need to continue making improvements, primarily to the interior and building systems of the nave. We need to install a new high-efficiency boiler/HVAC system (including consideration of renewable energy potential) with radiant floor heating (preliminarily estimated to cost $2-3 million) as well as new wainscoting, cathedral chairs, and other interior upgrades.
  Recommended funding sources: 1) an ongoing major gifts program and a planned giving initiative, to be undertaken jointly by the cathedral and the Cathedral Foundation of the Diocese of Olympia; 2) another capital campaign in 7-10 years, if major and planned gifts do not generate enough revenue to complete these upgrades; and 3) carbon reduction incentives and grants.

- **The St. Nicholas Building must be repaired** to ensure the safety of the occupants as well as the structural integrity of the building. Assuming that the original part of the St. Nicholas Building is preserved without significant design changes, this means at least $3 million of repairs to the roof, installation of high-efficiency boiler/HVAC, seismic retrofitting, and ADA accommodations.
  Recommended funding sources: Ongoing rental income from tenants, the St. Nicholas reserve fund, diocesan funds, gifts from St. Nicholas School alumnae, grants are all possible sources.

- **Develop the St. Nicholas property as a Ministry center/Parish life center for St. Mark's Cathedral**, including offices, meeting rooms, etc.
  Recommended funding sources: Another capital campaign will likely be required, and another parish-focused, broad-based campaign may not be feasible for about 7-10 years.

- **Address deferred maintenance needs at Leffler House**, including the "solarium," the front stairs and decks, and the roof.
  Recommended funding sources: Leffler repairs can perhaps be done from operating funds or special gifts over the next few years.

- **Improve the parking lots and grounds**, including traffic circulation patterns. Consider eco-friendly pavement, as well as gardens and plantings. There is a serious desire for a memorial garden on campus; there is also a desire to make more use of the beautiful views from the top of the greenbelt area.
  Recommended funding sources: Current capital campaign may allow some work on this; operating budget; ongoing major gifts program; paid parking revenue.

- **Build a new narthex or create another "social gathering area,"** possibly in a new structure that would connect the north wall of the cathedral with St. Nicholas. In all probability, neither of these projects will be feasible before 2030.
  Recommended funding source: part of the capital campaign in about 7-10 years.

Mission/Vision of Saint Mark's Episcopal Cathedral

Saint Mark's Cathedral strives to be:

- A house of prayer for all people, where we worship God and proclaim the reconciling Gospel of Jesus Christ
- A loving, welcoming, inclusive community that nurtures faith, encourages service, and integrates social and environmental justice into our lives
- A sacred gathering place for the Diocese of Olympia and the broader community in times of crisis, sorrow, and celebration

Major Ministry Priorities for 2030

The 2030 Planning Group surveyed the members of St. Mark's Parish in June 2016 to get input regarding ministry priorities for the future; staff leaders were also asked to outline their priorities. The following list emerged:

- Expand and develop ministries for younger people: children/youth/young adults (including Choir School, Youth Ministry, Seattle Service Corps, 20s & 30s group)
- Deepen and expand the ministry of the Choir School; maintain the robust musical leadership of the Cathedral Choir; and develop broader support for Saint Mark's Music Series
- Focus the justice ministries, with special attention to those that provide social services (homelessness, hunger, mental health, refugee services, etc.)
- Continue to live into, integrate, and, as needed, revisit the St. Mark's "Renewing Our Covenant: A Statement of Commitment and Action"
- Expand ministries for seniors/elders and "older singles"
- Develop the faith formation ministries to better serve the broader community (including the development of a speakers' series)
- Increase attendance and membership at St. Mark's
- Increase emphasis on stewardship, including planned giving and major gifts; increase the number of pledging households within the parish
- Increase diocese-wide cathedral activities
- Expand communications/publicity to the broader community for St. Mark's activities
- Finish the Nave construction projects, including the interior; address deferred maintenance needs at St. Nicholas building and Leffler House
- Prepare St. Nicholas for use as a Cathedral parish life and ministry center

Criteria/Guidelines for Decisions about Future Campus Planning

- Decisions should advance the cathedral's Mission and Ministry Priorities
- Projects should integrate rather than further fragment the campus
- Stewardship of current buildings should take priority over acquiring or constructing new buildings
- Given limited resources, the cathedral building itself should take first priority and the St. Nicholas building should take second priority over other campus structures
- We should try to retain all current property (not sell it off), and be open to acquiring any contiguous property that becomes available
- Be always mindful of parking considerations
- Be always mindful of sustainability and accessibility

List of Top Ten Projects for Which St. Mark's Would Like Funding in the Next 10-20 Years

- Upgrades to the Cathedral Nave (wainscoting, cathedral chairs, new floor (with labyrinth?), boiler, etc.)
- Repairs to St. Nicholas Building (such as seismic protections; roof; boiler; and ADA accessibility)
- Improvements to Leffler House (roof, front porch/decks, solarium, ADA accessibility, etc.)
- Improved parking lots/traffic circulation/plantings
- Establish a memorial garden on the campus; utilize the views (bench area of greenbelt)
- Dedicated space for Noel House or other homeless shelter/housing
- Enhance the music program (develop choir school, community music school?)
- Utilize the St. Nicholas property as a parish life and ministry center for St. Mark's
- Create an expanded Narthex as a social gathering space
- Connect the north wall of the cathedral with St. Nicholas, possibly by building a structure that would include a social gathering space, a mid-sized auditorium, etc.

Prioritized List of Major Facilities and Deferred Maintenance Projects

2017	Finish current nave construction project to clad exterior of cathedral in stone, replace windows, add elevator, etc.
2017	Rebuild "solarium" at Leffler House ($50,000) Clean roofs of Carriage House/Leffler House ($1,000)
2018-19	Replace boiler at St. Nicholas building; install individual radiator thermostats or zone heating ($100,000?) Conduct seismic assessment of St. Nicholas ($60,000) and plan for future use of St. Nicholas as a parish life and ministry center; results of this plan may affect the list of St. Nicholas projects below Repave/reconfigure parking lot and driveways at St. Mark's ($100,000) Replace existing deck and stairs on north side of Leffler House ($30,000)
2020-2023	New roof and gutters for St. Nicholas Building (at least $500,000) Finish the interior of the cathedral: new wainscoting, cathedral chairs, etc. ($1 million) Replace boiler in the Cathedral; install radiant floor heating ($2-3 million)
2023-2030 (and beyond If necessary)	Do seismic and other system upgrades to St. Nicholas building ($2 million?) Address accessibility issues at St. Nicholas building ($1-2 million?) Renovate St. Nicholas Building to accommodate St. Mark's uses: office space, Noel House in basement, etc. Investigate the feasibility of building a connecting structure between the cathedral and the St. Nicholas building and/or create a new Narthex

St. Mark's Cathedral
SWOT Analysis—May 2, 2016

Strengths

Music program
Compline ministry, and its online accessibility
Inclusivity
Strong theological focus
Diversity, including age diversity
Justice ministries
Strong, new staff/leadership
Collaborative leadership
Passionate lay leaders
Space and location and parking
Incredible visibility/visual prominence in the city
Strong financial support, especially for capital campaign
Transparency—clear policies and procedures
Important spiritual center for the city/community
We are rebuilding, with more families and youth
Strong relationship with Bishop and Diocese

Weaknesses

Buildings are "falling apart" (an aging physical plant, with much deferred maintenance)
Legacy of dysfunctional communication
Lack of coherent master plan
Too much going on: not enough FOCUS
We over-think things
Still too many "silos;" lack of coordination between ministries
Stuck in old models of success and failure; patting ourselves on the back for past achievements
Financial depth not strong; relatively small pledge base

Opportunities

Educate and inspire all members about the importance of stewardship
New ways of communicating/reaching out to younger people
Many new people moving to Seattle, Capitol Hill
The prevailing "unchurched" population
Differently formatted services with diverse musical styles
Bridge the gap between the Sunday morning and Sunday evening attendees
Space that's big enough for events of all kinds, in a central location
Complete the campus as we want to
Diversify our income sources

Threats

Earthquakes, natural disasters
Financial shallowness of resources
We're an inner-city church, an "endangered species"
Land use restrictions
Limited resources for additional capital campaigns
If staff should leave, it would be a setback

Mission Insite Data for 5-mile radius of St. Mark's Cathedral, Seattle
May 2016

Population:
2015 population: 450,015
Projected 2025 population: 524,422

Age:
2015 median age: 36; 2025 median age: 41

Growing Demographic Segments:
School age population (5-17) is expected to increase by 7.9% over the next 10 years; population over the age of 65 is expected to increase 4% over the next 10 years.

Households:
46% are single-person households
14% are "non family" households (unrelated people living together)
40% are "family" households; over half of these are 2-person households
(Households by number of people in them:
46% are one-person; 33% are 2-persons; 10% are 3-persons; 11% are more than 3-persons)

Ethnicity: 72% white; 11% Asian-American; 6% black; 6% Hispanic; 5% Pacific Islander/Native American/other

Average household income: $103,534; expected to continue increasing over next 10 years

Educational attainment (adults over 25): 27% graduate or professional degrees; 38% college degrees; 22% associate degrees or "some college;" 9% high school grads; 4.5% less than high school

Employment (over age 16): 70% employed; 3% unemployed; 27% "not in work force"
Of those who are employed, 80% are "white collar;" 20% are "blue collar"

Mosaic Groups:
36% are "Young City Solos/Urban Edge" (young, up and coming singles living big city lifestyles)
Religious perspective: Spiritual truth is buried beneath an avalanche of religious hypocrisy.
17% are "Singles and Starters" (young, multi-ethnic singles in city centers)
Religious perspective: Looking for Heroes of Faith
14% are "Power Elite" (wealthiest households in the US, living in exclusive neighborhoods)
Religious perspective: Divine Right
12% are "Thriving Boomers/full pockets, empty nests" (older, upper middle class)
Religious perspective: Reasonable religion, from a privileged perspective, for a better world
12% are "Booming with Confidence/silver sophisticates" (mature upscale couples and singles)
Religious perspective: It's the right thing to do.

Parish Survey Results: Facilities Usage Needs/Desires for 2030

The 2030 Planning Group surveyed the members of St. Mark's Parish in June 2016 to get input regarding facilities usage ideas for the future; staff leaders were also asked to outline their priorities. The following list emerged:

St. Nicholas Building

- Move St. Mark's offices to St. Nicholas Building
- Rent office/storage space in St. Nicholas Building to other non-profits and/or to Diocese
- A school in St. Nicholas Building—Choir School? Episcopal Middle School?
- A homeless shelter in the basement of St. Nicholas Building
- A coffee shop in St. Nicholas Building
- Skinner Auditorium as a multi-purpose auditorium—theater, banquet facility, gym, conference center (available for rentals as well as St. Mark's use)

Leffler House/Carriage House

- Continue to use Leffler House as housing for Seattle Service Corps, meetings, and Shop
- Expand residential uses of Leffler House/Carriage House/grounds to include sanctuary and/or homeless housing

Cathedral Grounds

- Build a labyrinth on the grounds
- Create a memorial garden (for ashes)
- Improve the lawns and expand the gardens (and bees) on the grounds
- Improve the parking lot; create better entrances/exits/traffic pattern; consider a parking garage as part of any new structure on the grounds

General Concerns

- Improve accessibility to all buildings
- Reduce our carbon footprint and be ever mindful of sustainability

MEMORANDUM

TO: **Saint Mark's 2030 Planning Group Members and Advisers**

FROM: **John Hoerster, Chancellor**

DATE: **June 16, 2017**

RE: **Land Use Issues for St. Mark's 2030 Plan**

A. Land Use Status and History

1. The campus of Saint Mark's, including the Cathedral and St. Nicholas buildings, is located in a single-family residential zone with a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size ("SF 5000"). "Religious facilities" are classified as an institutional use that may be permitted in a single-family zone as an administrative conditional use. As an administrative conditional use, the Cathedral must for most projects undergo land use review by City staff that will result in approval if the project meets applicable standards for institutions in a single-family zone and will operate subject to conditions imposed by the City to mitigate adverse impacts of the project. The standards that apply to a religious institution in a single-family zone include (a) maximum lot coverage for all principal and accessory structures of 35%, (b) maximum height of 35 feet (if pitched roof), (c) setbacks from the front property line of at least 20 feet and from side property lines of at least 5 feet, (d) minimum separation between any two institutions of at least 600 feet – the "institutional dispersion" rule, (e) parking requirements – at least one parking space for each 80 square feet of auditoriums and public assembly rooms, and (f) a transportation plan, including traffic impacts. SMC 23.44.

2. In 1996 the Cathedral was granted an administrative conditional use permit for the west wall project, along with a variance to exceed the maximum height of 35 feet for an institutional structure and a variance to expand a nonconforming structure as to height. The project was determined to be exempt from the 600-foot institutional dispersion requirement. During the public comment period on the project application, there were a few letters submitted by neighbors, but in general the project raised little interest. The almost contemporaneous application for an administrative conditional use permit for the Richard Hugo House across the street raised considerable neighborhood opposition, mainly on the grounds of too many institutions, too much traffic, and too little parking in the neighborhood. Similarly, in 2000, Cornish's proposal to develop the property it then owned on Tenth Avenue to the south of Saint Mark's campus generated strong neighborhood opposition. Neither proposal went forward.

3. The St. Nicholas property currently is owned by St. Mark's Properties LLC. The original St. Nicholas building and site are designated as a landmark under the City Landmarks Preservation Ordinance. The designation ordinance imposes controls and provides incentives, including that a certificate of approval must be obtained from the Landmarks Preservation Board for alteration of any portion or aspect of either the exterior of the original structure or the site, except for in-kind maintenance or repair of the protected features. Incentives include City

discretion to allow exceptions from the land use code in certain circumstances to permit uses not otherwise permitted and to modify certain standards otherwise applicable. Section C below includes a discussion of whether the landmark status is enforceable.

4. In 2003 the City of Seattle approved an administrative conditional use of the St. Nicholas building to allow administrative offices, a fine arts school, a private elementary school, and a child care center in a landmark structure in a single family zone. No comment letters were received during the official public comment period. The City referenced that the new uses of St. Nicholas did not meet the 600-foot institutional dispersion requirement and thus would not be permitted in a single family residential zone. However, the City allowed the proposed use because the St. Nicholas building is an historic landmark structure and it would be financially infeasible to convert the existing space into a permitted use, such as a single family residence. A condition was placed on the project in order to mitigate the potential for spill-over parking into the neighborhood during peak hours. This condition was met by a shared parking agreement with the Cathedral. The dispersion requirement should not apply if ownership of St. Nicholas shifts to Saint Mark's Cathedral Parish and the property is used in furtherance of the Cathedral's religious purposes.

5. In 2015, in connection with the Cathedral's Living Stones construction project, the City informed Olson Kundig that its design for improvements to the Cathedral would require a variance from Seattle's land use code because the planned improvements exceeded the 30' height limit of the single family zone. The law firm of Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson provided an attorney/client privileged communication in February 2015 which discussed the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act ("RLUIPA") [1] in detail and concluded that the City probably would be in violation of RLUIPA if it required the Cathedral to limit the height of improvements to 30' or undergo a variance to request additional height when the Code allows additions to existing public schools in single family zones to be built to the height of the structure that Olson Kundig had designed. In addition to RLUIPA and as discussed in Section C below, certain land use restrictions may not be enforceable against Saint Mark's under the U.S. and Washington State Constitutions if they coercively burden the Cathedral's free exercise of religion.

---

[1] RLUIPA is a federal law that generally prohibits state and municipal governments from enacting or enforcing land use laws that have a disproportionate impact on religious practices. RLUIPA specifically prohibits governments from treating religious institutions on less than equal terms with a secular institution. *See* 42 U.S.C. Section 2000cc. Treating a religious institution on less than equal terms includes imposing different development standards, like height, on the separate institutions when the institutions cannot be distinguished on the basis of accepted zoning criteria. Saint Mark's may also have arguments under RLUIPA and Washington's Constitution that it is entitled to protection from government regulations that would impose a substantial burden on the exercise of religion. *See* Wash. Const. Art. 1 Section 11; 42 U.S.C. 2000cc(a). Under these laws, a government impermissibly burdens religious exercise if the coercive effect of an enactment, like a land use law, substantially burdens a party in the practice of religion. For example, might Saint Mark's be able to successfully contend that locating its Noel House program in the St. Nicholas building or providing housing on the campus is essential to Saint Mark's ministry?

B. Land Use Issues and Approaches Regarding Potential New Development South of Cathedral Building

This section discusses the applicability of land use laws to a possible major construction project south of the Cathedral building. Presumably, such an expansion would be located on the current parking area and would include decked or underground parking. While this section does not directly take RLUIPA and free exercise of religion concerns into account, this will certainly be a part of the analysis in considering specific expansion possibilities, especially if the type of proposed expansion is allowed by other institutional users.

Expansion of institutional uses in single-family residential zones is contemplated and provided for in the City of Seattle land use code. Institutional expansions are generally allowed but must meet development standards and procedural requirements. Applicable procedural requirements for an administrative conditional use include a notice of application, a SEPA determination, a public comment period, and a permit decision by the City staff that usually includes development and operational conditions.[2] The notice of application and SEPA determination are posted on the property and mailed to property owners and residents within 300 feet of the property. SMC 23.76.012.B.4.

The major development standards as they would apply to an expansion on the site include the following:

- **Lot size, lot coverage, and setbacks.** Since Saint Mark's apparently meets these standards currently, the only issue is whether the expansion would affect this compliance. While lot size and setbacks do not appear to be a problem, the maximum lot coverage for principal and accessory structures of 35 percent could become an issue if the greenbelt areas are not included as part of Saint Mark's property for purposes of development standards. If this standard could not be met, a variance from the standard would probably be required.[3]

- **Maximum height.** Saint Mark's already exceeds the maximum height of 35 feet and therefore would probably require a height variance and a variance to expand a nonconforming structure as to height for any expansion project.

---

[2] An administrative conditional use permit is a Type II land use decision that is made by the Department of Design, Construction and Land Use ("DCLU") and that is appealable to the Hearing Examiner. SMC 23.76.004.A.

[3] A variance is a separate permit (Type II decision) that allows a departure from applicable standards if the following criteria can be demonstrated:

1. Because of unusual conditions on the site not created by the owner, strict application of standards would deprive the property of rights and privileges enjoyed by other properties;
2. Variance request does not exceed the minimum necessary to afford relief or constitute a grant of special privilege for this property relative to others;
3. Granting the variance will be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity;
4. Literal application of code standards would cause undue hardship or practical difficulties; and
5. Requested variance is consistent with the spirit of the land use code, policies, and comprehensive plan.

SMC 23.40.020.C.

- **Institutional dispersion.** The lot line of any expanding institution in a residential zone must be located at least 600 feet from the lot line of any other institution. In recent previous permits, Saint Mark's has been exempted from this requirement, but a major expansion could trigger this standard if another institution is located adjacent to the north. If so, a variance from this standard would probably be required.

- **Parking.** The parking requirement for religious institutions is at least one parking space for each 80 square feet of auditoria and public assembly rooms. To the extent that a proposed expansion will result in greater than that floor area of public space, additional parking spaces will be required. However, as part of the expansion, the on-site parking would probably be reconfigured into a structure, which would necessitate a new parking plan for Saint Mark's in any event.

- **Transportation plan.** A transportation plan will probably be required, including traffic generated, accessibility and circulation, events and hours, existing congestion, parking and parking overflow, and mitigation of impacts. The City could require issues of noise, lighting, exhausts, and screening to be addressed in this plan.

- **Critical areas.** Because virtually all sloped areas (i.e., greenbelt and ravine) on the Saint Mark's site are designated as critical areas by the City, all development is normally prohibited on the slopes. In addition, the City usually requires a 15-foot undeveloped buffer area from the top of a steep slope. [4] Therefore, no development on or near the sloped areas would probably be permitted.[5]

In addition, noise and visual impacts are considered for expanding institutions and could result in landscaping or screening requirements for a parking structure or building façade. The application for a conditional use permit will require submittal of a site plan, building plans, SEPA environmental checklist, drainage plan, landscape plan, and transportation plan, including parking.[6] The application should also include requests for any variances that will be required and should include a statement of how the criteria for each variance are met in the proposal. SMC 23.40.020.C. A notice of application will be posted and mailed to neighboring residents, with a 14-day period for public comments. The comment period may be extended by another 14 days if a request to do so is received by the City during the original 14-day period. SMC 23.76.012.D. City staff may hold a public meeting on the application if staff determines that the project has broad public significance or if 50 or more people file written requests for a meeting. SMC 23.76.015. Depending on public comments, the City could require additional analyses or

---

[4] The City reserves some discretion to allow development on steep slope critical areas and buffers, based primarily on the practicability of the proposal to locate elsewhere on the property. SMC 25.09.180.A. Where such development is allowed, the City requires geotechnical studies and engineered building techniques.

[5] Per Spectrum Development, a review of the Seattle Municipal Code indicates that the Cathedral's current capital project qualifies for an Environmentally Critical Area (ECA) exemption because, even though an area of the Cathedral property has a steep slope and slide area (which CPL, our civil engineers for the project, have mapped), the project work does not encroach on this area. Depending on where future improvements would be located, ECA could come into play.

[6] Other submittals will also be required, including property title, legal description, and encumbrances, if any, a statement on landmark structures on site or adjacent, and various maps. SMC 23.76.010.D.

documentation for the project. The City decision on the administrative conditional use must be based on (1) whether the proposal meets the applicable development standards, and (2) whether the proposal will be "materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property in the zone or vicinity." SMC 23.44.018.C. The City decision on any required variances must be based on whether the proposal satisfies the five variance criteria. SMC 23.40.020.C. The City may impose requirements or conditions to mitigate adverse impacts of the proposal for the protection of the public welfare or other properties in the zone or vicinity.[7]

All documents will be available to the public for comments on the application. Based on the Hugo House and Cornish experiences in the past, any proposed expansion through construction on site may be received negatively in the surrounding neighborhood. The expansion could be perceived as a net increase in institutional activity within the neighborhood, causing additional traffic, parking overflow, and noise impacts, particularly as a result of activities and events at Saint Mark's. Neighborhood opposition could lead to numerous public comments filed with the City and to requests for additional time and a public meeting on the proposal. Even if the expansion proposal meets all development standards, the opposition could argue that the proposal is detrimental to the public welfare and injurious to property in the vicinity, or, if variances are required, that the variance criteria have not been met.

Ultimately, a proposed Saint Mark's expansion on site would probably be approved and permitted if it were in furtherance of the Cathedral's mission as a religious institution or if the purpose of the expansion met a City-perceived need and did not elicit strong neighborhood opposition . While an outright permit denial is possible, the City is more likely to rely on mitigation to address the identified impacts of the project or the public opposition or both. Mitigation could take the form of permit conditions on design, construction, or operation, or a re-design of the project to reduce impacts, possibly including a smaller expansion. The major effect of such analysis and mitigation would be to increase the cost of the project and extend the construction schedule, but operational restrictions may also be imposed to mitigate potential impacts.

The City's decision or the SEPA determination may be appealed to the City Hearing Examiner by "any person significantly affected by or interested in the permit" within 14 days after the notice of decision is published. SMC 23.76.022.C; 25.05.680.A. Such an administrative appeal could almost certainly be filed by a neighbor opposing the expansion proposal for almost any reason who had submitted a comment letter. The appeal would increase the cost and time for the project and could result in additional requirements or conditions or even in an invalidation of the City decision.

C. Land Use Issues and Approaches Regarding St. Nicholas Building

It is likely that future use of St. Nicholas for current and comparable purposes will be allowed, especially if there is no substantial expansion involved and there is no significant increase in

[7] The City is authorized to impose conditions to mitigate impacts of an administrative conditional use either under its zoning authority to permit conditional uses and variances or under its SEPA authority to mitigate impacts that would otherwise be significant adverse environmental impacts, and thereby issue a mitigated determination of non-significance ("DNS"). SMC 23.44.018.D; 23.40.020.E; 25.05.350.A.

traffic. Other uses that would likely be viewed as permitted uses that are accessory to the Cathedral's religious institutional use include pre-school, counseling center, women's shelter, performance facility, coffee shop, and artist/scholar lodging. On the other hand, for example, if a portion of the building were proposed for condominium units, it might be necessary to independently demonstrate that use's consistency with the compatibility, impracticality, and impact tests. A certificate of approval from the Landmarks Preservation Board may be required if the current owner, St. Mark's Properties LLC, alters the exterior façade of the original building or otherwise alters the site, particularly the setback area fronting on Tenth Avenue East. [8]

[8] There are three Washington Supreme Court cases (*First Covenant*, *First United Methodist Church*, and *Munns v. Martin*) holding that a landmark designation coercively burdens a church's free exercise of religion and thus is unenforceable, including two holding that the Seattle Landmark Preservation ordinance cannot be enforced against the churches involved in those cases. In a separate attorney/client privileged communication, I have provided to Saint Mark's an analysis of the circumstances under which the landmark designation would not be enforceable against the Cathedral.

Spectrum Development Solutions Campus Development Study Summary—December 2016

Spectrum Development Solutions was engaged by Saint Mark's Cathedral to review the campus for potential future redevelopment opportunities with the goal of helping to both create short and long term revenue streams for Saint Mark's. Spectrum engaged Office for the City, an architectural planning firm, to help support the study through a detailed zoning analysis and capacity study. This work focused primarily on the feasibility of developing in the southwest parking lot area as well as along 10th Avenue. Although many capacity studies are explored in the attached Exhibit A many of the development concepts are not viable from a financing or constructability perspective. Rather, the intent was to study a broad array of options and narrow down to the recommended approach consisting of selling a portion of the land along 10th Avenue for short term revenue coupled with creating a long term passive revenue stream through the redevelopment of land near the cathedral.

Due to its current occupancy by tenants, the St. Nicholas Building was excluded from this study. However, Spectrum has compiled a conceptual master campus cashflow analysis including all buildings and potential future revenue streams to help provide a long-term campus financial picture for Saint Mark's.

The work of Spectrum is also intended to both leverage and compliment the comprehensive Land Use Issues Memorandum issued by John Hoerster for the Saint Mark's 2030 Plan.

The specific contracted scope of work included the following:

- Work with sub-consultant to review both existing zoning and potential rezone opportunities, site conditions, and development opportunities;
- Generate development options for consideration with project delivery method and potential income generation;
- Develop concept programs and massing studies for contemplated development opportunities;
- Perform development cost and financial feasibility analyses for each contemplated development option;
- Submit final report to Client with development options containing massing studies, development program possibilities, delivery methods, financial analyses with focus on potential revenue for Client.
- Meet with Client to present report findings and discuss next steps

Redevelopment Options - 10th Avenue

The land along 10th Avenue, including and north of Leffler House, is zoned SF 5000. Although the land abuts the LR3 zone, due to the ECA buffer and steep slope challenges we believe it would be very difficult and cost prohibitive to develop multistory housing in this location even if Saint Mark's or an outside developer were successful achieving a Contract Rezone to LR3.

The current zoning dictates the following:

- Single Family housing is permitted as of now.
- Lots required to be 5,000 sf each.

- Each lot limited to one single family dwelling unit + one attached or detached accessory dwelling unit.
- Structures on newly created lots will be subject to 20' front yard setbacks.

For the purposes of this study we have assumed that Saint Mark's would create five lots that could be sold as developable land to a residential developer. After researching land values and comps in the neighborhood we have assumed a relatively conservative value of $400,000 per lot which would yield approximately $2,000,000 to Saint Mark's upon sale. The proceeds from this sale could be used in a variety of ways for other campus uses.

Redevelopment Options – Saint Mark's South/West Campus

Spectrum's work with Office for the City focused on analyzing the potential development capacity of the south and west portions of the campus. As noted previously, the soil conditions and proximity to the ECA steep slope areas complicate the viability of development in this area. Additionally, for the purposes of this study, we have assumed a successful rezone effort to increase the zoning capacity from SF 5000 to LR3 which would match the adjacent zoning to the south. We believe an LR3 rezone would be palatable with both the City and the neighborhood in that the actual height of the zone would only increase 5' and, if located towards the southwest corner of the site, the project would have little visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

In any redevelopment scenario, parking will need to be addressed both with respect to maintaining the existing parking for the Cathedral as well as providing some level of parking for the new development. Many of the scenarios provided in the capacity study appear to have too great an impact on overall site circulation as well as parking capacity for the campus.

Aside from selling the single family lots on 10th Avenue, we have focused on a rental building approach which allows for greater long term control by Saint Mark's. If land or a building is sold directly south or adjacent to the Cathedral it would compromise long term control for Saint Marks. There are effectively two approaches for Saint Mark's to take with respect to redevelopment: 1. Joint Venture with outside developer; 2. Long Term Ground Lease to outside developer.

There are pros and cons to each approach. The long-term ground lease can appear less complicated and easier; however, given the location of the project on the campus, if something went wrong with the developer or the project, Saint Mark's would be in a difficult situation. A joint venture with an outside developer would allow for greater control in some respects but would require a trusted partner.

In either scenario Saint Mark's would need to contribute their land to the project. For simplicity, we have assumed a land value rate as follows:

Size of Development Site	11,900 SF
Land Value	$2,975,000

Some additional highlights comparing the two delivery models are as follows:

Delivery Model	Structure	Advantages	Disadvantages
Joint Venture	• Saint Mark's contributes land to development with outside developer • Saint Mark's land contribution is treated as equity in the project • Saint Mark's retains ownership of asset with developer and controls • No property management is needed by Saint Mark's – that is handled by property manager/developer	• Allows for better annual cash flow to Saint Mark's • More affordability to renters: (65%-120% of Area Median Income (AMI) - households earning between $40,000 and $80,000 per year) • Better return on land to Saint Mark's than ground lease	• Need to find right development partner • Exact cashflow projection not certain until it is stabilized
Ground Lease	• Long term ground lease with outside developer (70 – 100 year lease) • Privately financed • No participation in development by Saint Mark's	• Creates long term cash flow to Saint Mark's • Private market delivery • Improvements on land revert back to Saint Mark's upon expiration of ground lease	• Loss of control with land and development on campus • Long time horizon before land and improvements come back to Saint Mark's • Risk of developer default • Likely more expensive apartments • More difficult to finance

Development Program

In the financial comparison of the two delivery methods below, Spectrum focused on developing a 45-unit apartment project with a mix of Studios, 1 Bedrooms, or 2 Bedroom units, comparing the two delivery methods from a conceptual standpoint. Spectrum also explored the viability of creating a true workforce housing project with Small Efficiency Dwelling Units (SEDU) featuring 82 units at approximately 400 square feet per unit and rents of $1400/month (affordable to individuals making approximately $55,000 per year). There is very strong demand for this product in the market given the affordability challenges in the greater Seattle area. Additionally, from a marketing perspective, we believe this unit type would be favorably viewed given the somewhat remote location of the building on the southwest corner of the campus. In other words, in our opinion, it would be hard to make family-size housing work in this location.

Saint Mark's Cathedral
Site Development Study

Land Sq Ft:	11,912		
Gross Bldg Sq. Ft.:	34,000		
CONCEPTUAL			
	Joint Venture with Developer		**Ground Lease to Developer**
Type:	**Small Efficiency Dwelling Unit**	**Mixed Unit**	**Mixed Unit**
Total Units	82	45	45
Average Unit Size	400 sf	650 sf	650 sf
Unit Mix			
Studios	82	15	15
One Bedrooms	-	19	19
Two Bedrooms	-	11	11
Rents		**Rent ($)**	
Studios	1,400	1,028 - 1,500	1,028 - 1,700
One Bedrooms	-	1,355 - 1,700	1,355 - 2,000
Two Bedrooms	-	1,727 - 2,400	1,727 - 2,800
Area Median Income Target		**AMI %**	
Studios	87%	65%-95%	65% - 107%
One Bedrooms	-	75%-94%	75% - 111%
Two Bedrooms	-	85%-118%	85% - 124%
Project Costs			
Land Contribution/ Ground Lease	2,975,000	2,975,000	650,000
Hard Costs	11,390,000	8,790,000	8,790,000
Softs Costs	4,970,000	3,760,000	3,760,000
Total Project Costs	**19,335,000**	**15,525,000**	**13,200,000**
$ Per Unit	240,000	350,000	290,000
Sources of Funds			
Land Contribution	2,980,000	2,980,000	-
Construction Loan	12,920,000	7,390,000	8,060,000
Cash Equity	3,435,000	5,155,000	5,140,000
Total Sources	**19,335,000**	**15,525,000**	**13,200,000**
Proceeds from Ground Lease (Years 1-5)	-	-	$ 650,000
Avg Annual Cash Flow to Saint Mark's	**$175K - $250K**	**$100K - $150K**	**$100K - $130K**
Estimated Annual Return on Land**	**6% - 8%**	**3% - 5%**	**4% - 6%**

**All development options require contract rezone to LR3 per OFC Study*

*** All numbers and assumptions are purely conceptial & subject to market change/fluctuation*

Marx Okubo Property Condition Assessment for St. Nicholas Building and Leffler House—Summary

INTRODUCTION

Marx|Okubo Associates, Inc. (Marx|Okubo) has completed a Property Condition Assessment of the Saint Nicholas Building and Leffler House, located in Seattle, Washington, for the Canon for Operations at St. Mark's Cathedral. This survey consists of a review of the physical conditions; architectural, structural, mechanical, and electrical components accessible or visible during the site visit; and the quality of construction.

The purpose of this project review is for Marx|Okubo and its consultants to provide an overview for Client, and it is in no way implied that every aspect of the project has been reviewed. The sole purpose of this report is to observe the major aspects of the property and evaluate their condition. Limited construction drawings were made available to Marx|Okubo and were used as reference material and as a basis for takeoffs. These drawings were not reviewed for content. No field test results or inspection records from the construction were available for our review. The use of this report is limited to the client to whom it is addressed.

Opinions of probable costs are based upon quantity take-offs and a unit pricing method to arrive at line item totals. Unit prices are based upon historical data compiled by this office and in no way imply that bids were received from trade subcontractors. No bid documents or corrective drawings were produced.

It is not the intent of this office to assume any part of the design responsibility, but rather to report our findings to the client to whom this report is addressed.

The scope of this review is to provide a general overview of building components, as well as related ADA and code requirements. It should be noted that a detailed compliance survey related to ADA, building codes, and zoning issues was not performed.

SITE OBSERVATION

The project observation was conducted by a Marx|Okubo team comprised of Allan Thunder, AIA, Vice President; Keith Moore, PE, SE, Senior Associate; Steven Yi, PE, Associate; Dustin Casper, Project Coordinator and Bryan Kai, Project Coordinator. The site observation took place on September 19, 2016, and the walk-through incorporated a review of site improvements, building structural components as observable, building shell components, fire and life safety systems, plumbing, HVAC, electrical systems, and interior spaces, as well as a cursory review of accessibility requirements for the disabled.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The subject property is located in the Capitol Hill neighborhood, east of downtown Seattle. The two buildings, St. Nicholas Building and Leffler House, are subsidiary to St. Mark's Cathedral. The St. Nicholas building was originally constructed in 1925, with a west wing addition in 1954. No official records

indicate the original construction date of the Leffler House. The three-story St. Nicholas building is currently occupied by a private elementary school for Kindergarten through 8th grade (Bright Water School), and an adult art academy (Gage Academy of Art). The Leffler House is also three stories and is currently in use for housing residences associated with St. Mark's Cathedral, with a gift shop on Level 1, and a detached carriage house for educational use. The north, east, and south adjacent properties are single-family housing. The majority of the west side adjacent to the St. Mark's Cathedral is a moderate to steep greenbelt. The project appears to be in fair condition for its age and use.

The St. Nicholas building and the Leffler House are separated on the property by St. Mark's Cathedral and shared parking lot. There are three access points along the east side of the property. Limited parking is associated with the St. Nicholas building's site boundary; however, shared parking is noted on drawings within St. Mark's Cathedral's surface parking area. In addition to the shared parking area at St. Marks' Cathedral, six designated parking stalls are provided for the Leffler House. Landscaping within the site, along the building perimeter, and within parking area islands generally consists of deciduous trees, evergreen shrubs, and groundcover. Natural vegetation was also noted along the west site perimeter at the St. Mark's Cathedral's greenbelt. The site is fully developed with building, paving, and landscaped areas. The site generally slopes downward from north to south, with a moderate slope from the center of the site downward to the west. Damaged and spalled areas of asphalt were observed at paved areas adjacent to the St. Nicholas building and the Leffler House. It is recommended that damaged areas be patched and repaired, along with the routine maintenance of repair cracks, seal coating, and restriping of the parking areas.

The project is supported by concrete stepped footing foundation systems. Typical roof and floor framing utilizes wood-framed construction. The lateral load-resisting system for the original structure at the St. Nicholas building consists of unreinforced masonry (URM) walls. At the addition to the St. Nicholas building lateral forces are resisted by reinforced masonry walls. The Leffler House utilizes plywood sheathed and gypsum wallboard sheathed shear walls to resist lateral forces. The structures appear to be in fair to good overall condition, consistent with their type of construction, age, and current use.

The buildings are anticipated to have average seismic performance (with approximately equal damage) when compared to buildings of similar age and retrofitted construction under similar ground motions. It is our opinion that the structures should generally maintain their vertical load-carrying capacity during a 475-year return period seismic hazard event. However, localized damage and even partial collapse should be anticipated at the St. Nicholas building. The estimated losses were determined per a Level 1 study according to ASTM E2026-07, "Standard Guide for Seismic Risk Assessment of Buildings". The composite Scenario Expected Loss estimated for the buildings is 23%, and the composite Scenario Upper Loss is 38%.

The City of Seattle is presently considering an ordinance for the mandatory seismic retrofit of existing URM structures. As presently written, this ordinance would require all URM buildings to be evaluated and retrofitted to meet the life-safety guidelines of ASCE 31-03 Seismic Evaluation of Existing Buildings and ASCE 41-06 Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings, the current standards adopted by the City.

The original St. Nicholas building would be categorized as an URM structure and thus, would require evaluation and may require further seismic enhancements. As noted in our evaluation of the lateral systems for the structure, in Section VI below, there are a number of features of the original St. Nicholas building which do not appear to satisfy the current guidelines of the City of Seattle. Specifically, it is anticipated that the following may be required to meet the requirements of the ordinance: 1) provisions for an adequate load path for the transfer of in-plane shear stress from the roof and floor diaphragms to the URM walls; 2) provisions for continuous cross ties between diaphragm chords at the roof and floor framing; 3) independent secondary support for vertical loads for beams, girders, and trusses supported by the URM walls; and 4) wall anchors from the roof diaphragm of the addition to the original building URM walls.

As an educational facility, the St. Nicholas Building would be classified as a High-Risk URM building by the proposed ordinance. The timeline for implementing a seismic retrofit for the building as the ordinance is presently written would be ten years, if a retrofit is required. The first step would be an assessment phase which would involve a more detailed evaluation of the structure, material testing of the existing URM walls, and at least one meeting with the City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development to establish the extent of any seismic upgrade. This phase would need to be completed within the first five years after the implementation of the ordinance. The actual construction could occur during the last five years of the timeline. Whereas the City may not require structural modifications to address each of the items noted above, additional items identified by a more detailed evaluation and testing may be required.

For capital planning purposes, it is recommended that a budget be established to complete the assessment phase during the next five years and that the implementation of a seismic retrofit of the St. Nicholas building be anticipated during the following five years. It is recommended that the construction cost to implement any required structural modifications be prepared by a contractor during the assessment phase as the construction cost is significantly impacted by the means and methods of construction along with the impact to the construction cost by existing architectural finishes and conflicts with existing mechanical, electrical, and plumbing.

The St. Nicholas building pitched roofs and dormers are gabled construction consisting of asphalt composite shingles over board sheathing. Typical slope appears to be approximately 15:12. Drainage is via prefinished aluminum or copper gutters and downspouts. Secondary flat roofs consist of a black built-up membrane of unknown number of plies and substrate material. It was noted by property management that replacement of the building's roof systems is currently being bid by one or more contractors. Based on Marx|Okubo's review it is recommended that replacement or overlay of the secondary, or flat, roof systems be performed at the same time as the main roof. The roofing system above the northeast arcade shows signs of failure (efflorescence of brick and water-damaged soffit) and replacement is recommended by Year 1. Several downspouts were observed leaking or missing. All downspouts and conductor heads should be inspected, repaired or replaced as part of the roof replacement project. The main roofing at the Leffler House appeared in fair condition, and replacement of the deteriorated wood roof deck is recommended. The roof of the carriage house had a significant amount of debris and, if left unaddressed, may result in leaks into the building. Cleaning and inspection

of the roof is recommended immediately with replacement likely required late in the term. Provide flashing caps at end of trellis beams to extend life of material and structure.

The St. Nicholas building facades are generally brick, with the exception of a stucco system applied at select locations on the north wing gable end walls and dormers and one small area of wall infill on the south elevation of the west wing where an exterior insulated foam system (EIFS) is installed. Brick patterns vary in style, with cast stone masonry pillars and archways located at select windows on Level 1 and at the arcade on the northeast corner of the building. Cleaning and coating of stucco using an elastomeric paint to bridge cracking is recommended early in the term. Many of the wood windows at both buildings have various levels of paint and wood deterioration. An annual allowance should be carried to repair or replace the windows as needed. Similarly, several of the exterior wooden doors at the St. Nicholas building should be replaced with hollow metal doors and frames due to existing damage. The existing roof and gutter systems of the St. Nicholas building is causing damage to the painted wood trim at the roof perimeter as well as the arcade soffit. Following, or in conjunction with roof replacement, repairs, and repainting of the trim and soffit should be performed. The Leffler House and carriage house are clad with painted cedar shingle lap siding and wood trim. A solarium on the southwest corner of the Leffler House has been leaking with visible damage on the soffit below. Reconstruction of the solarium should be considered early in the term.

Building interior walls and ceilings generally consist of textured and painted gypsum wallboard sheathing, painted wood or resilient base trim. Several locations of the interior ceiling were of exposed structure. Floor finishes vary; however, generally consist of commercial-grade carpet, hardwood floors, and resilient sheet flooring. No significant issues were noted or reported.

The St. Nicholas building is heated by a combination of hot water and steam radiators, hot water duct heaters, and air handling units with hot water coils. The hot water radiators are located in the stairwells, corridors, and generally in each of the classrooms. The two AHUs are installed on the roof of the building. An air handling unit is located in the attic but appears to not be in operation. According to the management staff, the units provide only heating to the building and no cooling. Heating hot water and steam is supplied to the building by a natural gas boiler with an input capacity of 2,396-MBH. Some of the office spaces in the St. Nicholas building are cooled by split systems with the indoor fan coil units installed in the spaces they serve. The common areas of the Leffler House are heated by a natural gas furnace located in the basement mechanical room. The bedrooms are heated by electric baseboard radiators. Residents have installed packaged terminal air conditioning in the windows for cooling in the bedrooms. The living quarters on the top level is cooled by a ductless split system of unknown capacity. The carriage house is heated by a natural gas furnace with an input capacity of 88MBH.

The HVAC equipment in the buildings is generally in good condition with no major issues observed or reported by the management staff. With an expected useful life of 25 to 30 years, replacement of the natural gas boiler and the vacuum return pump serving the St. Nicholas building is anticipated during the term. It is recommended that a reserve be established for future replacement of the heating radiators located throughout the St. Nicholas building. No costs are anticipated for the Leffler House and carriage house.

The buildings are provided with separate domestic water services. The Leffler House and carriage house appear to share a single service. No backflow preventers were observed on the water services. Domestic hot water is produced in the St. Nicholas building by a natural gas water heater with an 80-gallon storage capacity. The Leffler House has a 50-gallon natural gas water heater located in the basement mechanical room. The water heater serving the carriage house is a 50-gallon electric water heater. The water heaters in the St. Nicholas building and Leffler House are provided with two seismic straps while the water heater in the carriage house has only one strap. Generally, the piping systems in each of the buildings appear to be in fair to good condition with no major issues observed or reported by the management staff. It is recommended that a reserve be established for future repairs and replacement of piping in the buildings. Based on an expected useful life of 15 years, replacement of the water heaters is anticipated during the term. An additional seismic strap needs to be installed on the water heater in the carriage house. Installation of automatic seismic shutoff valves on the natural gas services is recommended.

The 120/208-volt electrical service to the St. Nicholas building is provided from an underground utility transformer vault to a 1,200-amp main switchboard. The Leffler House and carriage house are provided with 120/208-volt gutter style electrical services from pole-mounted transformers. Capacities provided to both building are unknown. The electrical systems generally appear to be in good condition with sufficient capacities for current use.

Based on the age of the buildings, it is recommended that infrared scans be performed on the electrical equipment in each of the buildings. Maintenance of the main switchboard in the St. Nicholas building is also recommended as a preventative maintenance tool.

The St. Nicholas building is provided with a central fire alarm system monitored by an addressable fire alarm control panel (FACP). The FACP monitors all manual pull stations, smoke detectors, and fire sprinkler tamper and flow switches in the building. Speaker/strobe devices activate upon initiation of the fire alarm system. The FACP is monitored offsite. The Leffler House and carriage house are not provided with fire alarm systems. Smoke and carbon monoxide alarms were observed in the Leffler House.

The St. Nicholas building is partially protected by a wet pipe fire sprinkler system with a 2-1/2" riser designed for 0.10 gallons per minute per square foot over 920 square feet. Fire sprinkler coverage was observed in the stairwells, corridors, and some of the classrooms. The Leffler House and carriage house are not provided with fire sprinkler systems.

The fire alarm and fire sprinkler systems in the St. Nicholas Building appear to be in good condition. The FACP was recently replaced in August 2016. Annual inspection of the fire sprinkler system appears to be past due based on the inspection form provided by the management staff. No modifications to the fire sprinkler system are anticipated during the term with the exception of a future tenant renovation in the St. Nicholas building which may require additional coverage to be provided.

Although the project predates the implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, accessible features are required as readily achievable and as renovations occur. The following are accessibility

concerns observed during Marx|Okubo's site visit, and are considered subject to readily achievable barrier removable standards: Accessible parking at the St. Nicholas building was non-compliant, no accessible parking stall was associated with the Leffler House, an accessible restroom was not provided for wheel chair use within the common areas of the St. Nicholas building, handrails at select stair locations of the St. Nicholas building and Leffler House were not provided where necessary, and the path of travel from public right-of-way to the Leffler House gift shop was not accessible.

ST. NICHOLAS BUILDING
AND LEFFLER HOUSE
Seattle, Washington

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE AND OPINION OF PROBABLE COSTS

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
SITE						
1	Patch and repair spalled and damaged areas of parking asphalt.		1,500			Damaged asphalt was observed at associated parking areas, adjacent to the St. Nicholas building and the Leffler House.
2	Repair, seal, and restripe associated parking areas to the St. Nicholas building and Leffler House .		3,600		3,600	Repair cracks in asphalt, apply seal coat, and restripe. Anticipated in Year 2, and on a five- to seven-year cycle thereafter. Includes restriping of pedestrian surface-marked pathways at doorway access on the south and east sides of St. Nicholas building.
	Site - Subtotal	**$0**	**$5,100**	**$0**	**$3,600**	
STRUCTURE						
3	Conduct a seismic assessment of the St. Nicholas building including material testing and meeting with the City of Seattle to establish the extent of any modifications to the structure, if any. Assessment to include development of a construction budget by a contractor.		60,000			The assessment phase would be the next step in establishing required upgrades to the structure imposed by the proposed URM ordinance.
4	Seismic retrofit of the St. Nicholas building to meet the requirements of the proposed City of Seattle URM ordinance.				1,620,000	A more detailed budget would be established as part of the assessment phase.
5	Tuckpoint cracks in the unreinforced masonry walls of the St. Nicholas building.		9,600			
6	Replace existing deck and stairs on the north side of the Leffler House. In the short term, replace deck boards with insect damage and dry rot.		2,900	29,300		
7	Provide seismic anchorage for older building service equipment.		10,000			
	Structure - Subtotal	**$0**	**$82,500**	**$29,300**	**$1,620,000**	

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
	ENVELOPE AND EXTERIOR					
8	St. Nicholas: Replace shingles at main roof system. Scope includes: removal and disposal of existing roofing; installation of new multi-laminate asphalt composition shingles over new "breathable" roof deck protection (shingle underlayment), and replacement of existing flashings where necessary.		204,000			No cost estimate is provided as it is Marx|Okubo's understanding that separate bids for full roof replacement are being solicited from roofing contractors.
9	St. Nicholas: Replace built-up roofing system at secondary roof locations, with a TPO overlay system. Include walking mats at mechanical system access locations.		15,000			Roofs were observed through exterior windows from interiors, and extent of condition is unknown. Based on limited visual observation, it is recommended secondary roofs be replaced at time of main roofing. No cost estimate is provided as it is Marx|Okubo's understanding that separate bids for full roof replacement are being solicited from roofing contractors.
10	St. Nicholas: Replace damaged roof area to the arcade on the south elevation of the northeast wing.		15,000			Based on visual evidence to underside of roof at soffit paneling and surrounding brick columns. Further investigation may be required for potential damage of roof framing. No cost estimate is provided as it is Marx|Okubo's understanding that separate bids for full roof replacement are being solicited from roofing contractors.

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
ENVELOPE AND EXTERIOR *(cont.)*						
11	St. Nicholas: Replace damaged downspouts or install new where missing.		2,000			Scope should include inspection of conductor heads where evidence of leaks are noted. Work should be performed in conjunction with roof replacement. No cost estimate is provided as it is Marx|Okubo's understanding that separate bids for full roof replacement are being solicited from roofing contractors.
12	St. Nicholas: Clean stucco via low-pressure water+TSP and repaint using an elastomeric coating in areas along building facades. Repair cracking where necessary.		18,300			Stucco appeared in fair condition, with exception of cracking in locations associated with structural facade deformations noted in the 'Structural' section. Repainting is recommended in Year 3, and on a 10-year cycle thereafter.
13	St. Nicholas: Remove existing grout plaster at damaged wall base on northwest corner of building.		3,500			Damaged concrete grout plaster was observed at the exterior wall base.
14	St. Nicholas: Repair and/or replace wood-framed windows on as needed basis.		9,000	9,000	12,000	Cost provided is an annual allowance. Multiple wood-framed windows were observed with poor paint coatings and various degrees of wood deterioration. Several windows were observed with painted metal brackets providing support at operable window units. Scope should also include painted plywood infill paneis associated with window openings.

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
	ENVELOPE AND EXTERIOR *(cont.)*					
15	St. Nicholas: Remove and replace exterior wooden doors with hollow metal doors.		2,000			Several exterior wooden doors providing access to the west courtyard/play area, showed signs of water damage. New doors should be fitted with insulated glass relites in lieu of existing single pane glass.
16	St. Nicholas: Repair and repaint wood fascia at perimeter of roof.		7,900			Cost is an allowance based on visual observation from at grade and assumes minor wood repair and assumes work is concurrent with roof replacement utilizing perimeter scaffolding provided by roofing contractor.
17	St. Nicholas: Repair wood trim and soffit associated with the arcade on the south elevation of the northeast wing; repaint.		2,500			Cost assumes minor wood replacement.
18	Carriage House: Clean roof and inspect. Replace roof with new multi-laminate shingle roof late in term.	700			7,200	Roof observed from at grade. Based on visual observations, severe build-up of moss and debris is damaging roof and potentially leading to leaks.
19	Leffler House: Remove and re-construct solarium (a.k.a. 'Reading Room' per drawings) associated to the gift shop, located on the southwest corner of the house.	35,000				Cost includes; demolition of existing water damaged structure, and rebuild of new wood frame structure including walls, roof, flooring, windows, and renovation of interior walls associated to the structure. Note soft costs (design) not included.
20	Leffler House: Replace deteriorated wood decking at roof deck located on the second floor, west elevation.		3,000			Further investigation may be required for roofing material below deck (roofing and gift shop interiors below were not accessible during Marx|Okubo site visit).

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
ENVELOPE AND EXTERIOR *(cont.)*						
21	Leffler House/Carriage House: Repaint exterior siding, including reseal of exterior wall openings and penetrations.		10,000			Cost includes difficulty of access along the west elevation of both buildings. Painting recommended in Year 3, and on a seven-year cycle thereafter.
22	Leffler House/Carriage House: Repair wood-framed windows on as needed basis.		4,000	2,000	4,000	Cost provided is a bi-annual allowance. Several wood framed windows were observed with poor paint coatings and various degrees of wood deterioration.
23	Carriage House: Provide galvanized aluminum flashing caps over trellis beam ends.		600			Roofing provided over trellis, is allowing continuous water run-off on to beam ends, which is reducing the life of the wood beam. Color coated galvanized aluminum flashing recommended.
	Envelope and Exterior - Subtotal	**$35,700**	**$296,800**	**$11,000**	**$23,200**	
INTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS						
	No significant issues were noted or reported.					
	Interior Improvements - Subtotal	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL						
24	St. Nicholas: Replacement of the natural gas boiler.			35,000		Based on an expected useful life of 30 years, replacement of the boiler is anticipated during the term.
25	St. Nicholas: Reserve for replacement of heating radiators in the classrooms, stairwells, and corridors.		4,000	8,000	8,000	Based on an expected useful life of 25 years, replacement of radiators is anticipated throughout the term.
26	St. Nicholas: Replace the condensate vacuum pump.			7,500		Based on an expected useful life of 30 years, replacement of the pump is anticipated during the term.
27	St. Nicholas: Replace the natural gas domestic water heater.			2,500		Based on an expected useful life of 15 years, replacement of the water heaters is anticipated.
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL *(cont.)*						

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
28	Leffler House: Replace the natural gas domestic water heater.		2,000			Based on an expected useful life of 15 years, replacement of the water heaters is anticipated.
29	Carriage House: Replace the electric gas domestic water heater.				500	Based on an expected useful life of 15 years, replacement of the water heaters is anticipated.
30	Reserve for repairs and/or replacement of piping in all three buildings.		12,000	12,000	16,000	Based on the age of the buildings, it is recommended that a reserve be established for future repairs and/or replacement of piping within each of the buildings.
31	Perform infrared scans on electrical equipment in all buildings.		5,000			Based on the age of the buildings, it is recommended that infrared scans be performed as a preventative maintenance tool.
32	St. Nicholas: Perform five-year maintenance of the main switchboards.		5,000			Based on the age of the buildings, it is recommended that five year maintenance be performed on the main switchboard.
33	St. Nicholas: Install automatic seismic shutoff valve on the natural gas service.		500			Although not required by code, installation of the seismic shutoff valve is recommended.
34	Leffler House: Install automatic seismic shutoff valve on the natural gas service.		500			Although not required by code, installation of the seismic shutoff valve is recommended.
	Mechanical/Electrical - Subtotal	**$0**	**$29,000**	**$65,000**	**$24,500**	
	BUILDING EQUIPMENT					
	No significant issues were noted or reported.					
	Building Equipment - Subtotal	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	

ST. NICHOLAS BUILDING
AND LEFFLER HOUSE
Seattle, Washington

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
CODE REVIEW						
35	St. Nicholas: (Advisory) Install safety glazing (2 locations) or install safety protection screen at window openings.	*Advisory*				On Level 2, south corridor (blue), near the southeast entrance, two windows are located above the art academy offices, and within a hazardous location along the walking pathway.
36	St. Nicholas: Adjust guardwall to 42" minimum height along perimeter of accessible balcony at the gymnasium area. Additionally structurally improve the guardwall gate.	5,000				The guardwall was measured at 34" above the balcony floor which is below the minimum allowable. It appears the area is accessible to the public. The gate located within the guardwall, did not meet structural requirements for safety.
37	Leffler House: (Advisory) Improve safety and constructability of exterior stairs on south side of house.	2,500				The stairs provided on the south side of the house were of slippery surface and considered a life/safety hazard along a path of travel.
38	St. Nicholas: Perform annual inspection of the fire sprinkler system.	1,000				The annual inspection appears to be past due based on the inspection form provided by the management staff.
39	Carriage House: Install additional seismic strap on the domestic water heater.	100				Two seismic straps are required to be installed on the water heater. One strap is missing.
	Code Review - Subtotal	**$8,600**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
	DISABLED ACCESSIBILITY					
	Subject to Readily Achievable Barrier Removal Standards					
40	ADA Advisory: St. Nicholas: Rearrange existing (non-compliant) accessible parking stalls (2), to include a loading access aisle for each stall, and one stall to be designated as van-accessible. This includes signage to be re-mounted at regulation height.					$1,500 Advisory Currently the two accessible parking stalls, on the south side of the St. Nicholas Building, do not contain a loading access aisle for each stall. No signage for van-accessible was provided. And signs appeared to be located below the 60" minimum mounting height.
41	ADA Advisory: St. Nicholas: Relocate accessible parking stall, or provide accessible path of travel from existing parallel accessible parking stall to building accessible access point. This includes signage to be re-mounted at regulation height.					$1,000 Advisory Non-compliant stall located on the east side of St. Nicholas Building. leading pedestrians to an accessible entrance.
42	ADA Advisory: St. Nicholas: Provide an accessible restroom, on the ground floor.					$8,000 Advisory During Marx|Okubo's limited review, it appeared that no accessible restroom/water closet was provided within the common access areas along a wheelchair accessible path.
43	ADA Advisory: St. Nicholas: Provide handrails on both sides of interior stairway along path of travel.					$1,000 Interior stairway is located adjacent to the wheelchair lift and gymnasium.
44	ADA Advisory: Leffler House: Provide, at minimum, one designated accessible stall associated to the Leffler House. Accessible stall shall be van-accessible, with a compliant path of travel from stall to building entry.					$500 Advisory No accessible stall was included with the six designated stalls for the Leffler House, not providing an accessible stall near the building entry.

	Description	Immediate	Years 1-3	Years 4-6	Years 7-10	Comments
	DISABLED ACCESSIBILITY *(cont.)*					
	Subject to Readily Achievable Barrier Removal Standards *(cont.)*					
45	ADA Advisory: Leffler House: Provide accessible path of travel from public right-of-way to Leffler House Gift Shop. This includes adjustment of ramp slope, handrails provided both sides of ramp, and the gift shop door threshold exceeds maximum height restriction.					$5,000 Advisory The access ramp in front of the gift shop appears to exceed a maximum slope of 10%, and does not contain handrails on both sides of the ramp. The gift shop access door threshold exceeds the 1/2" height limit. New ramp may need to be provided.
46	ADA Advisory: Leffler House: Provide handrails on both sides of each set of stairs at Leffler House northeast access.					$1,000 Advisory
	Disabled Accessibility - Subtotal	**$0**				
	TOTAL	**$44,300**	**$413,400**	**$105,300**	**$1,671,300**	**Note: Advisory cost items are not included in totals.**