



**MEETING NOTES
CENTRAL WATERFRONT COMMITTEE
OUTREACH SUBCOMMITTEE**

**MEETING #3 February 11, 2011
8:00 — 9:30 AM Room 1600, Seattle Municipal Tower**

Meeting Attendees

Subcommittee Members

- Dave Friebboth, Co-Chair
- Ed Medeiros, Co-Chair
- Mahlon Clements
- James Kelly
- Jan O'Connor

City Staff & Consultants

- Marshall Foster
 - Steve Pearce
 - Hannah McIntosh
 - Paul Elliot
 - My Tam Nguyen
 - Jennifer Wieland
 - Ken Johnsen
 - Natalie Quick
 - Erin Taylor
-

Update on February 17th Event & Partners

- **Consultants noted that:**
 - The team has purposefully asked for RSVPs from the community to get a sense of how many people are interested and as of yesterday there were more than 500 RSVPs to the event.
 - The event will likely be at capacity; the initial thinking was that there would be 250 seats but given the strong response it's necessary to move to a standing format now.
 - For overflow, there's a mezzanine up above and a tide pool in the back where the program can be shown; the team is also looking at additional screens to display around the aquarium.
 - After evaluating other alternatives, the team confirmed that the aquarium space is still the best option; there will also be a tent outside for overflow and possibly heaters.
 - Having a large number of attendees is an exciting message surrounding the first event; the team is exploring all options to make sure everyone has a good experience.
 - There will be activity stations providing opportunities for participants to weigh in on places, uses and what's important to them surrounding the Waterfront.
 - There will also be a few different video stations where people can be videotaped talking about what they think makes a great Waterfront.

- There will be a Q&A with the Corner team following the presentation in the Mezzanine; there will be Waterfront project and Seawall information.
 - So far the team has received more than 600 responses to the eight survey questions about Waterfront design that were featured on the website.
 - Volunteers will be walking around handing out surveys and there will also be surveys at the stations; we hope to have more than 1,000 surveys completed by the end of the event.
 - We will encourage sign-ins and business card drop offs at the door; that way we will know if this is all just design community attendees or beyond.
 - Next week we'll be distributing our last HTML e-mail invitation to 2,000 people and will also issue via social media sites.
 - We have almost 25 partner groups; the hope is that through social media and partners we're getting out to a broader base.
 - The hope is also that the community gets really excited about the Waterfront after this event; if you've been around Seattle a lot you see this is a big deal.
- **City Staff noted that:**
 - We've had overwhelming response that is far beyond what we expected; it will be a crowded house but we don't want to dissuade people from coming.
 - One thing we've done with the electronic surveys is adding the ability to track a respondents' zip code; this provides a quick dashboard level look at how broad the community response is.
 - In terms of metrics, the team can also see where an RSVP is linked from—i.e. which partner site distributed e-vite.
 - If Subcommittee members know people that will be coming to the event, please encourage them to RSVP; it's very easy to do on the website.
 - **Subcommittee Members noted that:**
 - Subcommittee members asked if the consultant team is planning to alert any more people to attend the event. **Consultants noted that they are continuing outreach& sending reminder e-mails.*

Update on Media / Social Media

- **Consultants noted that:**
 - The team is conducting 1:1 briefings on Friday, Feb. 11th from 11:00 a.m.—5:00 p.m. with M. Foster, S. Pearce, K. Johnsen, M. Walker/C. Royer (rotating) and the jco team (via phone)
 - Interviews will be taking place with publications including the *Seattle Times*, *Puget Sound Business Journal*, *Crosscut* and *Daily Journal of Commerce*.
 - The media strategy is to make sure that reporters have a very thorough overview of all dimensions of the project so they can be better informed for any resulting stories.
 - As a project team it will also be helpful to get a sense of what questions they have and where they might be confused.
 - The team is aiming for well-rounded interest and through the next week expects continuing coverage in print, radio, television and online media outlets.
 - The team also expects to have great media at the event and Seattle Channel will be streaming live from the event.
- **Subcommittee Members noted that:**
 - It would be great to have broadcast coverage beginning 24 hours before the event, such as within radio outlets. **Consultants noted that broadcast outlets will likely cover it.*

- What are the parameters for measuring success? **Consultants noted that measurements include building awareness and building excitement around the project as well as educating people (whether it be public or media) and the team is on track to meet those metrics *City Staff noted that the high level set of goals will continue to be refined and also include establishing positive momentum citywide around the process and bringing people to Waterfront through a foundation of project knowledge, goals and opportunity that will directly move the ball forward.*
- It sounds like you've already exceeded expectations in terms of numbers; in our heads we thought 400 attendees would be great. **Consultants noted that for public events of this type that is a very large number of attendees.*

Media Protocols

**Subcommittee referenced documents including: DRAFT Media Protocol for Central Waterfront Committee; DRAFT Messaging Map*

- **Consultants noted that:**
 - As a lot of Committee members have great relationships with the press, the team has been talking about establishing a protocol for how to deal with media.
 - The protocols are geared toward making sure that everyone is protected so Committee members don't inadvertently say something that hurts instead of helps the project.
 - It is important for Committee members to remember that M. Walker and C. Royer, as Committee co-chairs, are the only ones that can officially speak for the project.
 - If Committee members do end up fielding calls from reporters, they must be very clear that they're speaking not on behalf of the project but as an individual.
 - If Committee members get media inquiries, please let N. Quick (The Fearey Group) or R. Sheridan (SDOT) know ; they'll then give the Committee member a quick call to discuss before an interview.
 - This is requested because the team may be working on a story and the Committee member could say something that doesn't help the direction they're trying to go.
 - Committee members should remember they are not obligated to take a reporter call or respond to a question at that very moment.
 - The team has also created a messaging matrix: three broad messages at the top and under that supporting messages that go deeper into each areas.
 - There is also a new suite of press kit materials that have been developed leading up to the media briefings; they can be helpful to use in conversation and/or externally.
- **Subcommittee Members noted that:**
 - Why aren't we following a protocol that we are not responding as individuals—it's simply M. Walker or C. Royer speaking? **Consultants noted that we're at least allowing conversations because some people have great press relationships.*
 - Some Subcommittee members expressed preference for a more restrictive protocol in which designated spokespeople only provide interviews to reduce the risk of negative comments.
 - Other Subcommittee members noted they think it is unreasonable to ask Committee members not to comment at all given their existing press relationships.
 - Some Subcommittee members noted that it's very important to identify what the Committee wants out of this project so they can support the design team and where they're at.
 - Subcommittee members also noted that it should be less of a matter of getting permission to speak, per say, and instead making sure that "the right hand knows what the left hand is doing."

- Some Subcommittee members noted that it seems more important that they have a vision of how design is moving forward so it's less likely that comments are detrimental or taken out of context. **City Staff noted that comments should indeed tie back to where they're taking the initiative and every interview is an opportunity to get the message out there.*
- Some Subcommittee members suggested saying, "I can't speak officially—if you want to speak officially talk to M. Walker or C. Royer—if you want my opinion I'll be glad to discuss it with you." **Consultants noted that while certain Committee members talk to media often and are comfortable with it; some very rarely talk to reporters and it's possible to run into problems without some discipline and protocol.*
- Subcommittee members emphasized that it's important to be careful what you say in order to keep any comments from being taken out of context.

ACTION: The Fearey Group (T. Paulk) to distribute press kit materials to Full Committee members for reference.

Review Outreach Priorities for February / March

**Subcommittee referenced documents including: Central Waterfront Scope of Work for Public Involvement & Communication—October 2010 through May 2011*

- **Consultants noted that:**
 - After the event, the team will conduct a de-briefing about how everything went and what the team thought.
 - The second event will be taking place in May; it will be a good time to collectively look at pros, cons, lessons learned, opportunities, etc.
- **City Staff noted that:**
 - The event in May will be when the jcfo team presents their first real design ideas and a first iteration of the design theme; many people will likely be interested in participating.
 - The team will shift their attention to that event by the next meeting; we anticipate there will be reams of public comments which we'll want to summarize in a powerful way.
 - We already have 600 plus respondents online, in addition to surveys we expect to receive after the event; our thought is that it will feed the direction we take for May.
- **Subcommittee Members noted that:**
 - If the May event happens in the daytime, it might be worth considering the Maritime Festival; there is a lot going on in the waterfront during that event (i.e. tugboat races).
 - Is it a bigger budget for the May event? Is it a bigger event? It sounds like it is. **City Staff noted that we're putting a lot of effort into the first event right now but may need a bigger venue in May; perhaps paying for Bell Harbor (the aquarium was at no cost). It's hard to say what costs will be but there is nothing indicating significantly higher costs.*
 - So no budget? **Consultants noted that right now there is a budget but we're spending a lot on this event; after the event, they'll have to settle back, take in what we learned, how much rental and staff time, gather ourselves and balance it out; the second event is in the scope of work.*

Seawall Update

*Subcommittee referenced documents including: *Elliott Bay Seawall Public Engagement Summary February 11, 2011(PowerPoint)*; *Public Involvement Draft Plan*

- **Seawall Team noted that:**
 - Planning lead J. Wieland walked through the Elliott Bay Seawall Public Engagement Summary, referencing:
 - Project Goals; Preliminary Project Schedule; Environmental Impact Statement; Seawall Team Working in Parallel with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Central Waterfront Team & Public; Project Approach-Public Engagement; Outreach Activities; Walking Tour Sept 2010; Business Survey Highlights; Jan. 19—Feb. 8 Comment Period; Conversations in the Community.

- **City Staff noted that:**
 - There was good turnout at the Seawall Open House in January; this helped set the stage for the February event.

- **Subcommittee members noted that:**
 - It seems important that the public knows they can have an impact and change the location of the Seawall, but we assume you also need to get support: how much money is needed and do we know about funding; what is the funding plan? **Seawall Staff noted that they're funded through design in 2012; there's a significant gap to construction and the Mayor is working on that.*
 - Will there be a proposed measure? **Seawall Staff noted that there's been conversation; that's happening but the timing is currently unknown *City Staff noted that decisions will be made in the April/May timeframe; the group will have many meetings including a Stakeholder Group meeting where we'll articulate how the bigger decision is informing the Seawall decision; if they do reach a point where a decision about a proposition for the Seawall comes up things may get more complicated in terms of outreach; there could be a point where the group will continue to move forward but there could be new expectations and rules.*
 - What are the options for paying? **Seawall Staff noted that it's a priority for the Council and Mayor to determine this; the team has a partnership with the Army Corps of Engineers but needs to advance the first phase which is the most critical for construction; advancing and maintaining a partnership with the Army Corps means that the City must self-perform (fund) the first phase and the Army Corps would then fund the second phase (at up to 65% of the total cost of the Corps' federally preferred plan); the Mayor and Council are committed to working on this.*
 - It seems like people would be interested to know that; do you introduce that idea within your outreach? **Seawall Staff noted that they say they're funded through design; the Army Corps offers opportunities but they're not yet determined.*
 - Is there a high likelihood for a local component? It seems important to communicate that. **City Staff noted that we could say analysis indicates that, but it will have to be voter approved.*
 - There is real difference in overall general ways to fund and organize alternative means of funding; we know the Seawall has to be paid for in part by City because we separate it from the viaduct and it seems like people should know that.
 - It seems important to be very up-front; that funding has been identified through design to accommodate the timeline and at some point there will need to be voter approved funding.

- *Seawall Staff noted that ‘s a message we can start to work on a little more; the Subcommittee has a good point about being proactive in referencing that.*
- It seems important to also say that we know this has to be done; it’s not an optional activity. **Seawall Staff noted they agree and the majority of folks feel that way.*
 - It seems absolutely critical to integrate the two in order to get the Seawall funded—and it has to be about the possibilities of waterfront; not just rebar and concrete.
 - The Seawall presentation looks thorough, but the whole purpose for doing public engagement doesn’t seem to pop out enough—presumably it’s to get advice?
 - There is concern that the public will continue not to distinguish the Waterfront and Seawall planning and it’s important that the teams think that through.
 - Members feel that they are not hearing enough about how the Seawall outreach project is going to be integrated with the Central Waterfront project. **Seawall Staff noted they’d like to start working on this with the Subcommittee now.*
 - It seems like the Seawall is getting into design elements (stairway, beach) and it is not integrated with what the Waterfront team is doing; it seems like a comprehensive plan is still missing.
 - If our strategy is Seawall separately and that’s marching orders maybe that’s a flawed strategy. **City Staff noted that the intent of the open house was to talk about the location of the wall, what might be possible with locations, examples of what can be done and the open house was carefully crafted so it was talking about the possibility of different wall locations, then feeding into discussions about what the public realm should be* **Seawall Staff noted that part of their challenge is helping people understand where the wall can be located (either in place or pulled inland); ; part of this conversation is communicating what can be accomplished with different wall locations.*
 - Subcommittee members suggested that the Outreach Subcommittee is not about the project details; it is about the message.
 - The focus should be on how it’s being coordinated and whether we are reaching the right people; it should not be discussing details of the events.
 - It seems more important to talk about how messages are being coordinated; bringing the teams together in how we present to the public in coordinating and integrating concepts.
 - People can understand the concept of a large project with components and why we are dealing with this component first.
 - Subcommittee members asked why the projects were originally split? **City Staff noted that they were split in part because of the relationship with the Army Corps of Engineers—there’s a logical sequencing issue; if you don’t get the Seawall done before the Viaduct is torn down you’ve pushed everything out two to three years and if you get projects tied together from an environmental standpoint it could take a very long time to reach completion* **City Staff also noted that every major project a city does has different elements; they work together and are integrated it’s natural to have two teams like this.*
 - Some Subcommittee members advocated for everyone to use one project and one team; otherwise we risk stranding the Seawall and never having the waterfront. **Seawall Staff noted that for environmental reasons we’re in a delicate position; this is not one project, and so we can’t talk about it as one project.*
 - What is the Corner team’s preferred alternative? **Consultants noted the main objective is flexibility; they can use alternatives and still have a clean palette; there will also continue to be flexibility with the Seawall.*
 - Subcommittee members noted that they think it’s important when talking about the Seawall to first talk about the overarching project; then talk about urgency of why we’re moving

- forward with the Seawall first because of public safety component as it is a serious issue that could cause major destruction if it isn't dealt with.
- The overarching message seems to be that the details of strategies and how you actually carry out the work is not as important to the public as where you're going; we need to work a little harder to create a single concept of where we're going and how they all fit together.
 - The Subcommittee would like the Seawall Staff and Consultants to come back with an overarching message that can be used going forward so they can see effort to bring the projects together in the public eye and not to continue presenting as two separate projects. **City Staff suggested that they get back with the Outreach Subcommittee at the next meeting with more specifics in terms of how they're getting beyond coordinating to integrating messages; they'll outline how the teams are working together and messaging things—everything from the main meeting to summer events; and get back to how we are making certain outreach programs integrated*
 - Could we also have a paragraph that discusses the scheduling, financing and role of the Army Corps of Engineers in short summary? **City Staff noted they're planning that as a significant item for the next Full Committee meeting in April.*

ACTION: City Staff to revise the Public Engagement Plan and develop more specific guidelines regarding Waterfront/Seawall integration (including measures of success) in next Outreach Subcommittee meeting.

Confirm Next Meeting & Adjourn

- **City Staff noted that:**
 - Several people would like to be advisors to the Outreach Subcommittee, such as Dave Meinert (Music) and James KEBLAS (Arts & Culture) and they have contacted the City to express their interest
 - It would be great to hear proposals or thoughts from the Subcommittee in terms of who should be on the advisor list; in particular, advisors who are interested in outreach summer engagement.
 - Advisors don't need to participate in every meeting and attendance will be determined by focus; some might be broad experts for specific meetings; others might be longer-term participants.
 - It will be good to find members of groups that aren't just focused downtown or cultural; further afield organizations should be considered, as well.
- **Consultants noted that:**
 - If Subcommittee members have ideas, please share them with N. Quick and the City will do the same so there is a strong lists of potential advisors.
- **Subcommittee Members noted that:**
 - Some Subcommittee members have not been attending meetings; it's important for those Subcommittee members to understand that attending meetings is important.
 - Co-Chair E. Medieros will check-in with inactive Subcommittee members to determine where they stand.
 - Adding people with event experience or someone connected to the Maritime Festival would be helpful in terms of Subcommittee advisors.

ACTION: Provide contact information for non-attending Subcommittee members to co-chairs (T. Paulk). Create list of target advisors to Subcommittee (City Staff, Consultants, Subcommittee members).