



**MEETING NOTES
CENTRAL WATERFRONT COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING #6 March 10, 2011
3:30 — 5:00 PM Room 4080, Seattle Municipal Tower**

Meeting Attendees

Committee Members

- Charley Royer, Co-Chair
- Maggie Walker, Co-Chair
- Patrick Gordon
- Carol Binder
- Mark Reddington
- David Frieboth
- John Nesholm
- Bob Davidson

Other Central Waterfront Committee Members

- None

City Staff & Consultants

- Hannah McIntosh
- Steve Pearce
- Nathan Torgelson
- Marshall Foster
- Norm Schwab
- Peter Hahn
- Ken Johnsen
- Jennifer Wieland
- Erin Presentin-Taylor

Other

- None
-

Minutes/Subcommittee Updates

- **Long Term Stewardship Co-Chairs noted that:**
 - The Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee members met for the first time on March 7th, 2011; the group is starting off by looking at various models of successful projects relevant to the Waterfront.
 - It will be important to remember that the Subcommittee needs to think not just operations and maintenance after the design, but also about programming and uses for activating the area. **Design Oversight Subcommittee Co-Chair agreed that much of the Long Term Stewardship work would need to inform the design elements so the waterfront ultimately sustains itself.*

- **Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that:**
 - Our last meeting focused on transportation and transportation issues—there are many competing projects that will absorb all of the available money in the Transportation Benefits District (TBD).
 - A relevant piece of the transportation discussion is the Streetcar issue, particularly the Waterfront Streetcar versus First Avenue Streetcar.
 - This probably needs to be reviewed in a venue that pulls the Executive Committee leadership in as part of the discussion because it affects the Waterfront.
 - The other issue is the issue of timing, which seems critical; we have several questions surrounding this topic, such as:
 - Are we putting something on the ballot in August and, if so, what will the cost be? The figure of \$235 million is out there now, but we know that was a placeholder and probably no longer valid.
 - At what point can we know what number goes on ballot? Our understanding is that the Seawall will be paid for with money from the Army Corps of Engineers and some other source of public funding. If the maximum we can get from the Corps is 65 percent, and they agree on the preferred alternative, but it suggests that, if the public builds the Central Part, that's probably a lot more than 35 percent—and it might be most expensive.
 - Will we end up paying more than we have to? We need to maximize money from the federal government and minimize the number for the voters—but we also need to have the right number so that we're not designing to a number to get the best possible result. If we don't get the Seawall right, we won't get the Waterfront right.
 - We've asked for a detailed presentation from the Seawall team during our next Subcommittee meeting on March 22nd, 2011 in order to further understand this issue.

- **Design Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that:**
 - The Design Subcommittee has had a few meetings since the Executive Committee last met; the most urgent issue right now is integrating the design work from the Seawall.
 - There are some critical deadlines coming up soon regarding recommendations to Council and options to be carried forward in the environmental process.
 - One of the challenges for our Subcommittee is that the Seawall team has been working ahead of us; we're in the process of trying to schedule an additional meeting for more briefing background.
 - After our last meeting, which was primarily about the Seawall, we developed a series of questions we think are important for us to understand before the Council briefing.
 - In particular, we really have to integrate allocating the amount of money to working the right way decisions made each right time—I introduce that as an issue we all need to look out for.
 - We appreciate the effort that both teams are putting into reviewing what they've been doing for a long time.

- **Outreach Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that:**
 - Our subcommittee is pretty energized; we had a great event at the aquarium with more than 1,000 people attending.
 - People commented they would have liked to sit, rather than stand; but, at the same time, it was great being in the packed room—I'm not sure it would have been quite as exciting if everyone were seated.
 - Right now, we're addressing what's next: there's an event in May and a summer event.
 - For the summer event, we're looking at what the proper venue is, the proper level of engagement and how we get people to the Waterfront.

- This will be congruent with where jcfo wants to take the design process—including a usefulness that pulls in locals in addition to visitors.
- We recognize that we need a useful urban environment that people want to be a part of; one that is very dynamic—and expressing that vision in outreach is key.
- Coordination with the Seawall project is very important to us, but it seems the Waterfront project needs to lead in terms of public relations.
- We'll have a report in our Subcommittee meeting tomorrow about Seawall coordination; it sounds like steps are being taken to coordinate and we appreciate that work.
- We'll have a discussion about the resources for the outreach program, including making sure we have the right folks in the right place.
- In terms of advisors, we're working on defining what that means and what the criteria are for bringing folks in.
- We want people who can advise us how we make this a dynamic place, then plug that into design—so it all gels together.
- The Outreach Subcommittee is so important because, if we're not successful and don't continue to make progress it will be so much harder to engage and get resources.

Subcommittee Advisors / Participation of Arts and Music Commission

- **City Staff noted that:**
 - People from the Arts and Music Commission have been expressing interest in the Waterfront project and, in particular, they're interested in what's happening in the Outreach Subcommittee.

Finalize Revised CWC Guidelines

*Committee reviewed and referenced documents including: *Central Waterfront Committee Guidelines (Revised March 3rd, 2011)*; *Central Waterfront Committee Staffing and Operations Plan*

- **City Staff noted that:**
 - We updated the Central Waterfront Committee Guidelines, mainly from a staffing and Subcommittee emphasis, including Subcommittee Chairs to run and set agendas for meeting.
 - We also revised the guidelines to emphasize the role of C. Royer and M. Walker as spokespeople surrounding the Waterfront.
 - With regard to media queries, N. Quick (Fearey Group) and R. Sheridan (SDOT) are our points of contact; ultimately we'd like to direct all media questions to C. Royer and M. Walker as much as possible. *Committee members noted hearing City Staff on KUOW the Conversation Weekday and Committee Co-Chairs on Ross Reynolds.
 - We checked-in with W. Barnett, Exec. Dir. Seattle Ethics & Elections Commission; he confirmed we're in good shape but we thought it would be smart to do new disclosure statements given the new Charter.
 - Our hope is to send the new CWC Guidelines out in advance of the April meeting and send the new disclosure along with it.
 - We also met about role of Commission members; they decide which meetings to attend although they are not full Committee members—instead playing ex-officio liaison roles to their Commissions *Committee Co-Chair clarified further that *Commission members can provide feedback but not as a member during the flow of Committee or Subcommittee discussion.*

- **Committee Members asked:**
 - How should commission members participate in Subcommittee meetings? They're representing the perspective of their Committee—are they relevant to coordinating but not there to interact as an individual Committee member? **City Staff noted that is a good way to frame the situation; with attendance growing, at the beginning of the meetings it would be good to start by introductions: who is in room, why and what their roles are.*
 - What's the difference between advisors and commissioners? **Committee members noted that the Design Oversight Subcommittee advisors participate like Committee members because they offer valuable perspectives to enrich the conversation; for commissioners they advocate finding a way for them to be offered a chance to comment, but not sitting in on discussion with the Subcommittee* **Committee members agreed that we need to be deliberate about saying that the Subcommittee members/advisors will have discussion and Co-Chairs will ask for input afterwards; it's also important to request that, when asked to comment, attendees explain what their role is and Co-Chairs are responsible for summarizing the action and takeaway.*

Waterfront Seattle Public Outreach Strategy

**Committee reviewed and referenced documents including: Central Waterfront Committee Public Engagement Strategy (Revised March 3rd, 2011)*

- **City Staff noted that:**
 - As we review, note that this is a draft document and one of the key first milestones in the charter: the public engagement strategy.
 - The main thing to be clear about is the coordination with the Seawall and the importance of integrating with the Seawall public engagement strategy.
 - The big idea is to step back and look at everything through construction—and what we are doing during each outreach phase, including:
 - *Phase I* – establishing positive project identity and getting momentum around design process; expanding the simple idea of reconnecting to the water and increasing the foundation of public knowledge; and, integrating the Seawall and Waterfront projects. The Outreach Subcommittee is helping us expand on outcomes and measures for success
 - *Phase 1a* — in particular, this will be focused on broadening public awareness. We had a strong following with social media and email lists and we now have a big email list to utilize in future events.
 - *Phase II* – this will be a challenging phase to ensure the design stays top-of-mind with the public; we'll be building major aspects of the waterfront, but the majority of work doesn't happen until the viaduct comes down. We'll have to build and maintain project excitement and implement broad-based public engagement to see how concept translates into detail, and funding will be a big part of that phase—it will also be important to look at how we keep waterfront activities and business viable during construction.
 - We have more than 1200 responses to the “What Makes a Waterfront Great?” question and we hope that coming out of May there's some strong public support for the big moves. **Committee Co-Chair noted that two big events occur early on in this schedule: City Council Elections (2011) and Mayor's Race (2013); it will be important to think about messaging and what we need to do/not do during sensitive periods of time. That is also why it's important over the next several years to have many things happening at the Waterfront, such as art flowing*

down to the waterfront and a festival or music—what matters in the end is not just that the space works but what happens in it. *City Staff noted that the summer event should be a positive step toward that. *Consultants noted that navy ships and tugboat race promotions would be great events to focus upon. *Committee members noted it also might be worth considering a DSA Out to Lunch event at the Waterfront or talk to Sounders about extending the parade; the Downtown Seattle Association has also expressed interest in operations and maintenance issues. *City Staff noted that the Committee members have relationships, which is the strength of the group—this Committee can touch many different organizations. *Committee members noted that if we bring in historical elements, nostalgia, into the excitement, that seems to have real possibilities.

- This fall and early next year, we'll need to get in front of elected officials to get formal recognition of how we go forward; we also need to show design approach at this time.
- In particular, JCFO will go through 3—4 design iterations; we need something to say we've got direction and the big step is focusing on that in the Fall. *Committee members asked whether this needs to be approved in an open City Council meeting? *City Staff noted that it's not something to say what the waterfront will look like, but something formal—a resolution at the key stages which involves a presentation. *Committee Co-Chairs asked if there will be any discussion about staffing and outreach? *City Staff noted that we're negotiating and looking at resources to carry everything off, including City resources; the summer event will require effort from many places and we won't be able to do it with just consultants. *City Staff noted that formal action from Council is important because of the length of time we're dealing with (2012—2016); we'll get a lot of visibility and interest with that which is powerful; we'll need to make sure what comes out is enduring so it will set stage we can follow for a long time.

- **Committee Members noted that:**

- There are many venues such as rotaries, social clubs, CDRT, City Club all of which are hungry for information about the Waterfront—it's also very important to build support at that level.

Seawall Alternatives Definition: Review Timeline and Opportunities for CWC Input

- **Seawall Team Members noted that:**

- There was a Stakeholder meeting on March 3rd, 2011 and the Stakeholder team now has two alternatives—these are rough dimensions to help people understand the constructability issues.
- We're obtaining greater understanding about the alternatives and which alternatives will have the least and greatest impacts; what's always difficult to articulate is where the flexibility is at and how much.
- The next Stakeholder meeting is March 22nd and we'll have further discussion about what's included in each of the alternatives and where the flexibility is.
- The Full Committee meeting is on April 12th and an Executive Committee meeting will take place that day, as well; at that time, the Seawall team will talk through this with the all Committee members.
- We have tentative plans to go to City Council toward the middle or end of April, on either April 18th or 25th, 2011
- We're in the process of developing new range of cost estimates; we also want to be clear that when we talk about alternatives and bookends, we don't mean we must chose one of two; there are many options.
- We fully expect the outcome to be continued coordination and collaboration, and it will likely look different than either alternative. *Committee members asked how the Seawall team

*finances this in a ballot measure? It seems like there needs to be a public number that embraces whatever you might do. We know May 24th is the last day they have to put this on the ballot. *Seawall team noted that it's doing everything possible to be sensitive about different issues but still making sure Council members and the Mayor have everything they need to make decisions. *City Staff noted that the situation is dynamic and fluid, and there's no certainty that there will be an August ballot measure. *City Staff noted that the Seawall team still needs to identify the bookends for the preferred alternatives by April and that will still go on—this will include cost estimates. *Committee members asked if there is a critical date in which funding of the Seawall has to happen? *City Staff noted that Seawall and Waterfront are both funded through the end of 2012 for design; we want construction for the Seawall to start in 2013 so there needs to be a funding mechanism in place sometime in 2012 to achieve that—it could be part of the budget process of 2012. *Seawall Staff noted that we'll talk more about this with the Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee—when we talk about 65 percent, that's the entire reach of Washington to Broad Streets, not just phase 1.*

Suggestions for Waterfront Activities and Uses

- **City Staff noted that:**
 - Some community members have been pushing for the resurrection of the Waterfront Streetcar and scheduling meetings with Councilmembers. **Committee members noted that it's important to think about who the Streetcar will be serving—commuters, tourists and ridership issues. *Consultants noted that there are numerous Waterfront Streetcar advocates but the team is trying to underscore the process to them. *City Staff noted that the City will be taking on these questions and developing a framework strategy around mobility and access for the Waterfront—the issue of how you get to the water. It's also being thought of in the context of the master transit plan: how are we moving people in the City and the region. The First Avenue corridor potentially has high ridership; Waterfront Streetcar is more of a slow people mover system and the team will acknowledge the two different types of functions. The mobility work will happen with the framework plan; it's a good opportunity to look at how you get the Streetcar to the Stadium and add value in terms of planning for that area—the link could be the Waterfront or First Avenue.*
 - We understand this has to go through the Waterfront process—it's not a stand-alone end of that. Would it be beneficial to reach out to the audiences advocating for specific activities and uses on the Waterfront to educate them about the framework that the CWC will be shepherding along, and let them know that, at the right moment, we'll bring specific thoughts about how we achieve these goals and processes? Does the Committee want to shape where that goes at some level? **Committee members noted this is probably one of a series of inquiries—is there a way these should be typically handled—brought to this Committee? *Committee Co-Chairs noted that the CWC has asked for ideas, and community members will give them to us—it's important to underscore the process we're going through, and let them know we'll keep them posted on what's happening.*
- **Committee Members noted that:**
 - Concern has been raised that tailoring the piers toward outdoor music events is the wrong idea since they're only usable two months out of the year. I've tried to explain that it's not the plan for things to come together in pieces; it's important that we don't tie the designer's hands.

**Committee members noted that it would be good to have a stock answer as simple as, “we’ve got a parking lot for all of this input—it will go into the mix but it’s not going to move now.”*

**Consultants noted that you can tell those who ask that “we did a survey—that ideas came out as part of that; we do have a process but we are keeping track—it will take time”*

**Committee Co-Chairs noted that it can also become political at any time—it’s important to underscore to everyone that this is a process, and it’s important to respect that process—if we get enough pet projects laid on, we’ll have an interesting Waterfront. If we do our job right, people will focus on the big picture—we need to manage; part of our job is to constantly say this.*

**Committee members suggested possibly sending e-mail out to the Full Committee to be aware of these issues so they’re not blindsided by inquiries.*

**City Staff asked whether someone on the Committee should track the issue? This discussion will move forward and if we don’t recognize others opinions and legitimate perspectives, it can otherwise get away.*

**Committee Co-Chairs noted we should tell Council how much we understand their difficulties—and stress not making commitments outside of the process.*

**Committee members noted this stresses the importance of the Executive Committee—many of these issues cut across the entire spectrum.*

**Committee Co-Chairs suggested declaring a Seattle History Day at the Waterfront including a focus on Maritime.*

**City Staff noted that it’s important to try and get event opportunities when we can do something about the noise from the viaduct and Surface Street—it’s a whole different experience and could resonate with people.*