



**MEETING NOTES
CENTRAL WATERFRONT
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING #13 October 20th, 2011
12:00 — 1:30 PM Room #4080, Seattle Municipal Tower**

Meeting Attendees

Committee Members & Advisors

- Charley Royer, Co-Chair
- Maggie Walker, Co-Chair
- Patrick Gordon
- Mark Reddington
- Carol Binder
- Gerry Johnson
- John Nesholm
- Ed Medeiros

Other Central Waterfront Committee Members

- Peter Hahn

City Staff & Consultants

- Steve Pearce
 - Marshall Foster
 - Bob Chandler
 - Jennifer Wieland
 - Goran Sparrman
 - Norm Schwab
 - Ken Johnsen
 - Erin Tam
-

Subcommittee Reports

*Committee reviewed and referenced documents including: *Design Oversight Committee/City Management Team – Joint Feedback to September 22nd, 2011 Meeting with Design Team.*

Update on Summer 2012 Event Plan

- **Outreach Subcommittee Co-Chairs:**
 - Early cost estimates for the summer 2012 event exceeded \$500,000, so the Subcommittee is instead proposing we provide a Waterfront events venue for music, arts or food festivals throughout the year.
 - The idea is that, by utilizing this approach, we could share in costs, generate more buzz and momentum, create a deeper interest and minimize the demand on City resources.
 - **City Staff:**
 - This approach seems to animate the space while making us stage-setters instead of producers; it also associates the project with arts and culture in a way that could be sustainable over time.
-

- The City’s special events committee and those who run the “Summer Streets” program have expertise that we might be able utilize; we could also try to package the permitting.
- **Executive Committee Co-Chairs & Members:**
 - Perhaps the Parks Department could oversee this? We should develop specific criteria for participation and make this as simple and centralized as possible.

Design Oversight Subcommittee Comments to jcfo

- **Design Oversight Subcommittee Co-Chairs:**
 - Our Subcommittee has scheduled meetings every other week through the end of the year and we’ve generated sketch ideas about different issues from a design perspective.
 - We’re trying to find a way to share what we’re doing with everyone else in a deeper, more detailed and meaningful way and this kind of input will continue on a regular basis.
- **Executive Committee Co-Chairs & Members:**
 - This is a useful method for communicating to various audiences; could we also show how it connects back to the principles? We may need to update City Council before the October 27th presentation.
 - That the Seattle Aquarium and Pike Place Market are increasingly engaged and have their own architects is important; it seems the whole concept plan needs a provision of housing.
 - What is the schedule for partnership resolution? Will we have all of the issues resolved before the third design iteration? We may need a work plan to get these issues resolved.
- **City Staff:**
 - We have City Council briefings scheduled in December with key City staff from DPD, SDOT and DPD and a few co-chairs; we could also participate in a Monday morning briefing before then.
- **Consultants:**
 - We’re aiming for May or June to resolve partnership issues; given early cost work we may decide that a couple of opportunities are for later on.

ACTION: City Staff to coordinate participation in City Council’s Monday Morning Briefing.

Long Term Stewardship, Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee Updates

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Co-Chairs:**
 - Our Subcommittee is continuing to review operating costs, including those of local parks departments; it’s important to remember our limitations surrounding independent earned revenue potential.
- **Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee Co-Chairs:**
 - Our Subcommittee did not meet this month, but we had informal discussions; critical items include: design as it relates to our Subcommittee; where we are with partnerships; the schedule as it relates to partnership resolution; the work plan to achieve partnership resolution; and overwater coverage.
 - It’s also important to emphasize the interrelatedness of design and funding; sources and uses should be revisited in conjunction with the evolution of the schedule of all project elements.
- **City Staff:**
 - We’re currently amending the master shoreline program, which includes a set of recalculations and we’re setting up a mechanism to be able to transfer overwater coverage.

Review Project Timeline & Approach to Strategic Plan

*Committee reviewed and referenced documents including: *Waterfront Example Schedule*.

Timeline

- **City Staff:**
 - In terms of timing:
 - In September 2013 we want to start building the seawall, which will be in three phases;
 - Construction will last through the end of 2015 and opening day for the new tunnel is 2015 or 2016;
 - In 2016 the viaduct comes down and the road must be ready; any fold structure should go in then.
 - We have just barely enough time to do this starting in September 2013:
 - In June 2013 there will be a bid on the seawall construction and we will need money for a bid;
 - If some funding is a levy or bond, we're looking at a potential vote in late 2012 or early 2013;
 - By March 2012 we should have enough design to start discussing phasing plan and funding strategy;
 - By June 2012 we should have phasing cost ideas and enough of a project we can sell to fund.

Project Funding, Non-Profit Entity

- **Executive Committee Members & Co-Chairs:**
 - We need to think about what we'll do between March 2012 and sometime in 2013 to create a funding package driven by phasing—there are elements of uncertain application or amount:
 - Local Improvement District (LID);
 - One or more voter-approved levies or bonds;
 - Partnership leveraging;
 - Philanthropy (which overlaps with the three);
 - The conversation with the Army Corps of Engineers.
 - Specific questions include:
 - What if the total project amount is significantly higher than what we can achieve through an LID?
 - Will we get the remainder through partnerships and philanthropy?
 - When do we have the necessary specifics to present? People will ask what they'll get in return.
 - How do we ask property owners to approve elements that depend upon a public voter?
 - What is the message, what do people respond to and how do we sell this? That's critical.
 - Does everything go away if the seawall fails?
 - If the assumption is that we go to a vote for a levy or bond on the seawall, we need to be clear about the total funding need before we ask voters for anything.
 - If the assumption is that the vote is for one project, the LID should go first; we will not have the opportunity to go back to voters on anything else for a number of years.
 - It seems we need to accelerate the LID planning, including property owner research—if the project is defined broadly enough, money can be spent on the seawall.
 - We need to preserve and develop unfunded opportunities without allocation to a particular use for as long as possible; we also need to determine feasibility for philanthropy as a potential revenue stream.
 - A third party moving some of this forward is critical and it needs to be launched quickly: a non-profit with committed people on the board sends a strong message and we need an instrument to raise and spend money; later we'll be working to build a huge swell of support.
- **City Staff:**
 - There are two related but distinct elements:
 - Resolving to the right design with a good level of confidence and momentum built;
 - Forming partnerships around management opportunities.

- There are several unknowns we need to define regardless of vote timing: the level of funding the Committee recommends, strategy for the public vote and LID.
- While everything can't all be done in the first phase, people will need a level of comfort that we have something real and tangible that happens at the end of the first phase.
- The viaduct demolition is part of the LID and the other primary value is additional improvements; legally, the LID can include various pieces funded by a variety of people.
- The intent is that by June 2013 we'll have enough design to identify value to property owners and form an LID, then you can go back and pay yourself back; that is important financially.
- Fundraising feasibility should be an element to the strategic plan; the question will be how we line things up, as philanthropy and public support need to be in parallel.