MEETING NOTES
CENTRAL WATERFRONT
LONG TERM STEWARDSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING #1 March 7th, 2011
3:30 — 4:30 PM Room 4080, Seattle Municipal Tower

Meeting Attendees

Subcommittee Members

- Carol Binder, Co-Chair
- Bob Davidson, Co-Chair
- Rollin Fatland
- Gary Glant
- Bob Donegan
- Patrick Gordon

Other Central Waterfront Committee Members

- None

City Staff & Consultants

- Hannah McIntosh
- Nathan Torgelson
- Steve Pearce
- Marshall Foster
- David Conway
- Ken Johnsen

Other

- Kate Joncas

<u>Committee Kick-Off</u>

*Subcommittee referenced documents including: *Central Waterfront Committee Resolution, Attachment1, Section F*

PURPOSE

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that**:
    - The Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee will be charged with overseeing the long-term programming of the waterfront's operations and maintenance.
    - The Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee will look at various items surrounding the Waterfront Seattle project, including:

        - What it becomes in the future; how it's going to operate; how it's going to pay for itself; and, how it will pay for operations and maintenance over its lifetime.
    - There will need to be quite a bit of integration with the other Subcommittees, particularly the Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee and the Design Oversight Subcommittee
    - The Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee should be engaged with, or at least listening intently to conversations that these Subcommittees are having. **Design Oversight Co-Chair noted that the Design & Oversight Subcommittee has not yet developed the Waterfront Seattle "program," and, in the future, the design team will be asking questions about the Waterfront's functions such as what the CWC wants to happen there, who will be involved with it, what benefits they want to bring to the Waterfront, etc.—and this direction could come in large part from the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee. *City Staff noted that one important thing the team has learned in reviewing projects that have failed is that they did not integrate the maintenance and operations (M&O) discussion enough into the design process.*
    - Members of the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee are encouraged to attend the Finance & Partnerships and Design Oversight Subcommittee meetings whenever they can.

CHARTER LANGUAGE

- **City Staff noted that**:
    - The Central Waterfront Committee Charter was unanimously passed by City Council on January 31st, 2011; pages 8-9 of Attachment 1 refer to the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee.

<u>Subcommittee Scope of Work</u>

*Subcommittee referenced documents including: *DRAFT Work Plan Central Waterfront Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee*

WORK PLAN REVIEW

- **City Staff noted that**:
    - The DRAFT Work Plan includes the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee's Scope of Work and a Draft Timeline including Project Design and Budget Milestones.
    - It is important to note that this document is an evolving draft; if something is missing or if the timing seems off anywhere, the plan can be revised collaboratively with the Subcommittee's input.
    - With regard to the Scope of Work for the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee, it seems to fit into two phases:
        - Understanding the projects and initial background leading up to the Strategic Plan, in which the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee will be charged with making recommendations.
        - Getting into details of cost estimates and making finance recommendations; the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee will be charged with coming to a shared series of recommendations along with the Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee on overall financing.
    - The Project Design and Budget Milestones are tentative, but seem to be topics that this Subcommittee should address.
    - One thing the Subcommittee should keep in mind is that it needs to stay flexible as the design process unfolds and, in the 2nd or 3rd iteration, things should be much more clear.

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Co-Chairs asked**:
    - When will the Full Committee come up with the Strategic Plan? **City Staff noted that this will likely happen by early next year, and they hope to have some sense of how M&O will fit into that. *Co-Chairs noted that, in a year, the Subcommittee will know conceptually what*

the design looks like, as well as various options for partnership, financing and ownership—and that is when they will look at options for operations and maintenance planning.

Committee Business

MEETING SUMMARY APPROVAL/POSTING PROCESS

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that**:
  - In order to make the minutes public as quickly as possible after the meeting, the Co-Chairs will approve the initial drafts and then they will be posted online.
  - After that time, Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee members can make any suggested edits to be implemented within.

ADVISORS

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that**:
  - Other CWC Subcommittees have been asking people with relevant expertise to join their Subcommittee meetings, when appropriate, as Advisors.
  - Subcommittee members should think about useful advisors who might be asked to join the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee.

ACTION: Subcommittee members to consider potential advisors to the Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee.

Peer Project Analysis

*Subcommittee referenced documents including: *DRAFT Waterfront Seattle Peer Public Space Project Analysis*

- **City Staff (D. Conway/SDOT) noted that**:
  - A Peer Public Space Project Analysis has been developed featuring a variety of peer projects, including capitol costs as well as operations and maintenance costs.
  - The projects within include:
    - Highline (*NYC*);
    - Millennium Park (*Chicago*);
    - Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy Greenway Conservancy (*Boston*);
    - Bryant Park (*NYC*);
    - Embarcadero (*San Francisco*);
    - Allegheny Riverfront Park (*Pittsburgh*);
    - Fresh Kills Park (*NYC*);
    - Brooklyn Bridge Park (*NYC*);
    - Hudson River Park (*NYC*);
    - Pioneer Courthouse Square (*Portland*).
  - Discovery Green in Houston will also be added to the list; this is a successful public-private partnership.
  - HR&A Advisors, an economic development, real estate and public policy consultant, is on the CWC consultant team.
  - Candace Damon, Partner at HR&A, will be coming to Seattle this spring and will supplement the matrix further, as she worked on a lot of these projects as a consultant.
  - The Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee will likely hold a joint meeting with the Finance & Partnerships Subcommittee when C. Damon comes in town.

- The matrix is based on initial internet research; the City has not yet talked to any state or local officials and will wait for input from C. Damon before doing so.
- With some of these projects, there is still thinking happening about how to fund the gaps—City Staff will keep tabs on that progress and update the matrix as appropriate.
- When reviewing specific projects, comments were as follows:
  - ALLGEHENY RIVERFRONT PARK | **City Staff noted that it was difficult to get information for this project. *Subcommittee members noted they could help facilitate connections to those responsible for this project. *City Staff noted that this project was selected because it is a major street located along a waterfront; it's not a big tourist attraction but makes the best of a complicated project.*
  - BROOKLYN BRIDGE PARK | **City Staff noted there was legislation or an MOU that required this project to be self-sufficient with M&O and they've just allowed their consultant to move forward with analyzing. *Subcommittee members noted that it looks like there will be a lot of housing revenue contributing to this.*
  - HUDSON RIVER PARK | *This project is pretty much done—it receives $15 million per year from a variety of different sources. *Consultants noted they have a connection to the Executive Director; the Subcommittee might consider bringing her out to weigh in on this project.*
  - PIONEER SQUARE COURTHOUSE | **City Staff noted the City of Portland is still involved with this project , although they have in-kind donations through a not-for-profit that takes over the majority of the M&O and it is pretty straightforward. *Other attendees noted more than 300 events are held per year at this site and they also have public restrooms.*
  - ROSE FITZGERALD KENNEDY GREENWAY |**Subcommittee members noted that the West side is fully developed and it's a lot bigger and longer than what we're doing—they have some commitments they can't meet such as planting trees; the State was supposed to contribute 50 percent for this. *City Chairs noted that there was a decision made early in the design process in which they'd originally looked at splitting the space to be half passive and half active in order to generate revenue; the decision was ultimately made to be 100 percent passive and that ultimately hurt the greenway.*
  - MILLENIUM PARK | **Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that the Millennium Park Project in Chicago has an annual operating budget of $13 million dollars. *Subcommittee members noted that they've done a brilliant job of marketing this project as a tourist destination for almost everyone visiting from Chicago. *City Staff noted they counted on parking revenue but the parking garage use fell short. *Other attendees noted that offering elements of the park for "adoption" could help with M&O.*
  - HIGHLINE | **Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that it looks like, for the Highline, the New York City Parks Department still owns the property, and that a lot of maintenance comes from a non-profit/friends organization. *City Staff noted that New York Parks & Recreation Department only supports specific pieces of the project and Friends of Highline supports everything else; there are a lot of commonalities with Seattle Waterfront and the Highline—it is highly maintained and sees a lot of wear and tear; they also have incredible programming on their blog, including contests. *Subcommittee members noted that it would be interesting to get a sense of the demographics and characteristic of these neighborhoods, such as the number of businesses per block that serve residential or office communities and what was there before and after the project—we can't underestimate the importance of the existing environment all along, rather than taking a "build something and they will come" approach.*

- BRYANT PARK | **Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that Bryant Park is restoration of an existing park; their operating costs are around $7 million per year, and a private non-profit manages this. *City Staff noted this is a business improvement area where assessments are collected from adjacent property owners to help finance operations. *Other attendees noted that this one would be a good project to research further; one has the most impressive public restroom in the country—they are safe, clean, staffed and beautifully designed; a percentage of restaurant sales also go back to the park and they have impressive measures for success.*
- EMBARCADERO | **Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that the Embarcadero seems active in some places and not very active in others. *Subcommittee members noted that one influence on success would be the placement of the street in the space. *City Staff noted that the Embarcadero speaks to the importance of activity generators; they've tied it into AT&T Ballpark, the extension of the F line, the Streetcar and the Ferry building and, until that all happened, it was still kind of a sleepy part of the City—they dramatically limited parking and put a huge emphasis on transit use so folks use the streetcar or walk. *Subcommittee members noted that this seems like a good analogous project to Waterfront Seattle with business retail in the ferry terminal building and public places and thoroughfare in other parts.*

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Members noted that**:
  - In terms of expanding the matrix, it would be helpful to know the cost per acre to maintain, annual attendance and number of events per year, which will be directly proportional to operating costs like garbage, cleaning, security and maintenance **City Staff noted that this is an excellent point, but trying to get comparable consistent data can sometimes be a challenge.*
  - Can HRA measure demographics of the existing site? **Subcommittee members noted that the Waterfront currently receives 2.5 to 3 million visitors per year—including 800,000 visitors at the Aquarium, 300,000 on the Royal Argosy and 600,000 at Ivar's. In the summer, the average distance traveled to the Waterfront is 504 miles; in the winter, the average distance traveled is six miles. *City Staff noted that it wouldn't be difficult to measure residential density within one quarter of a mile and look at potential activity in each of these cases. *Subcommittee members also noted that the Victoria Clipper books more hotel rooms than anyone in the Puget Sound: 350,000 per year—and the more data we have with that in mind, the better we'll be at designing programs that work. *City Staff noted that each space will be different—the Highline is drawing their population from a dense neighborhood around the park and the Millennium is drawing on a regional scale; we need to appreciate that kind of information as we move forward—each of these examples is comparable but in some they're all different.*
  - It's important to look at traffic and understand where visitors come from. **Subcommittee members noted the broader attendance draw is a valid area of focus; the immediate neighborhood draw is a transformative question because the neighborhood will not have been allowed to develop in terms of residential within one quarter of a mile. *City Staff noted that it seems like the group is talking about market analysis and it would be useful to think about how to bring some of those approaches to bear; although the demographics might very well change over time.*
  - Members suggested that City Staff should consider adding Vancouver Stanley Park; Portland Parks experience; all the Los Angeles Piers up to Malibu that have ben re-developed; Seaport Village in San Diego; and Sterns Wharf in Santa Barbara—wherever we see similar models we should get as much information as we can and see where they've made mistakes. **Subcommittee Members asked whether the matrix is missing anything else, such*

*as the San Antonio Riverwalk or Denver Platt River? *City Staff noted that from the original round of peer city review included examples in briefing book. *Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted they can send that document around to Subcommittee members.*

ACTION: Share peer city review examples included in CWC briefing book with Subcommittee members.

Next Steps

- **Long Term Stewardship Subcommittee Co-Chairs noted that**:
  - Our next steps are to have people from the Seattle Parks Department come and talk to us about Lake Union Parks, some other parks and the difficulties some parks are having.
  - We'll talk about Pike Place Market, too—if it's successful, it generates it's own revenue for operations and maintenance. It is a business entity as much as it is a public entity.
  - If Mondays are generally good for everyone, we can consider holding meetings then. **Subcommittee members agreed. *Other attendees noted there are lots of great folks around the Country to learn from in future meetings—the group may think about having someone Skype in from New York, for example since we can't afford to fly everyone out.*

- **City Staff noted that**:
  - In the next meeting, we could have Robb Courtney, Seattle Parks Division Director, come and talk about relevant topics such as security, M&O, park rangers and labor issues issues.
  - Victoria Schoneburg, head of the Center City Unit within Seattle Parks, could also come.