



Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary (DRAFT)

October 13, 2016

6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Sound Transit - Ruth Fisher Boardroom

Welcome and Follow-up from the September 15 Meeting:

Susan Hayman, facilitator, welcomed members of the One Center City Advisory Group and led a round of introductions. Susan reviewed the meeting agenda and materials with Advisory Group members and provided attendees with a reminder of the Advisory Group's purpose. She also briefly reviewed the ground rules for the Advisory Group process.

Eric Tweit, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) One Center City Project Manager, directed members' attention to two resource lists (one for Citywide Policies and Studies and one for Neighborhood Plans and Studies) included within the provided member binders. Eric explained that the partner agencies (City of Seattle, Downtown Seattle Association, Sound Transit, and King County) will plan to highlight relevant resources and materials in advance of future Advisory Group meetings, and that additional items may be integrated into resource lists as the Group's work evolves in the coming year.

Advisory Group members provided the following opening thoughts:

Comment: There is currently no One Center City project website. An online presence is important for alerting the public to the important conversations that Advisory Group members and partner agencies are having. It is important that members of the community can learn more about the project and upcoming Advisory Group meetings.

Response: *The project partners agree that a website is a very important tool for informing members of the public about the One Center City effort. The website is currently in development, and the project team plans to share additional information about the website with the Advisory Group members at the November Advisory Group meeting and launch the site shortly thereafter.*

Comment: It would be beneficial if the Advisory Group was provided with a list of organizations and affiliations represented by members.

Response: *The project team will work to compile this information, get appropriate approvals from members, and distribute this information at a future meeting.*

Susan closed the Welcome and Follow-up portion by inviting members to highlight any potential edits to the meeting summary from the Advisory Group's September meeting. As no members noted any clarifications, Susan noted that the meeting summary would be considered final.

Advisory Group Charter Review and Discussion:

Susan requested that members review the Advisory Group draft charter and identify any opportunities to enhance the draft language to better reflect member's understanding of the Advisory Group process and outcomes. Susan walked members through each section of the draft charter.

Members highlighted the following questions and opportunities regarding the Advisory Group's draft charter:

Comment: The draft charter's **Purpose** section identifies that the Group will work together to create a 20-year vision. In addition, this section should also note that the Group will work together to identify near-term and interim actions.

Comment: Within the **Purpose** section, it may be helpful to add emphasis that the Group will work to identify mobility solutions that are accessible, equitable, and safe. These three tenets should be noted as a key focus of any potential vision or solution that Group members identify.

Comment: In the **Roles and Responsibilities** section, the partner agencies should commit to distributing relevant information and other materials in alternate formats to aid in accessibility.

Question: Many Advisory Group charters include anticipated deliverables, measures of success, and other key performance indicators. This is not made clear in the draft Advisory Group charter. Would it be helpful to discuss and include this information before finalizing the document?

Response: *The partner agencies will need to further consider these aspects of the Advisory Group's work. Current plans call for the agencies' One Center City recommendations to include a summary of Advisory Group input.*

Question: How will Advisory Group feedback be presented alongside the agencies' One Center City recommendations and key interim products?

Response: *Partner agencies will summarize Advisory Group perspectives and report on how this feedback was or was not incorporated. The Roles and Responsibilities section of the draft charter could be updated to more clearly note this role that Advisory Group members will play in shaping these products.*

Comment: It would be helpful if Advisory Group members had the ability to communicate with one another outside of meetings.

Comment: In the *Meeting Ground Rules* section, the Advisory Group draft charter could be updated with language that encourages a “step up/stand back” approach to ensure that everyone has space to speak up and provide their thoughts and ideas during meetings.

Susan thanked members for their review. In addition to draft charter updates identified by the Advisory Group, she asked members if they would agree to potentially update their draft charter with language that would allow for the formation of *ad hoc* Groups and allow for Group meeting times to be extended (up to three hours), as needed. Members agreed to these revisions.

Susan also noted that the strength of the Advisory Group comes from the perspectives that individual members bring to the process. She noted that members should reach out to the facilitation team if they are no longer able to participate in the meetings so that a replacement may be appointed, if needed.

Identified updates to the Advisory Group’s draft charter will be incorporated and sent out with other materials in advance of the November Advisory Group meeting, where members will be asked to formally adopt the charter.

One Center City Scope and Deliverables:

Tom Brennan, Nelson/Nygaard, walked Advisory Group members through the Key Products document.

Tom reminded members that the One Center City project is working to set a 20-year vision for the Center City area, but he also highlighted that the partner agencies will consider near-term projects that may help to facilitate the long-term vision. Tom said that the Advisory Group would begin to focus on this near-term work in the coming meetings. He highlighted the closure of Convention Place Station and the opening of East Link and Northgate Link as considerations that Group could keep in mind as they think of near-term opportunities. Tom noted that the project partners would work to develop a list of potential near-term solutions in early 2017.

Tom noted that conversations with the public, both in-person and online, would occur throughout the One Center City process.

Members highlighted the following questions and opportunities regarding the Advisory Group’s key products:

Question: Is the Advisory Group producing any products independent of the partner agencies, or is the role of the Group primarily to react to products produced by the partner agencies?

Response: *Advisory Group members will assist the agencies in reviewing and shaping products. Currently, the partner agencies do not expect Advisory Group members to produce their own standalone products.*

Comment: Advisory Group members could potentially play a role in developing a set of guiding principles, values, and performance measures that supplement those developed by the partner agencies.

Question: With regard to the near-term recommendations—could these potentially be acted upon by partner agencies before the final One Center City report comes out in late 2017?

Response: *Yes, that is the idea. Partner agencies are conceptualizing near-term recommendations as projects that could be implemented quickly and that could potentially help to facilitate implementation of the 20-year vision.*

Question: When looking at designing a long-term vision, have the partner agencies considered what Seattle may look like in 20 years? Will today's Center City neighborhoods be the same in 20 years, or is there the potential that the Center City area will expand or migrate? Designing a long-term plan and only considering the current landscape presents challenges.

Response: *Land use is a key component of the partner agency's assumptions. The Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan will help to guide the One Center City efforts. The Comprehensive Plan considers what the Center City may look like in 20 years, and the project team is taking these assumptions into account.*

Opportunities and Challenges:

Susan separated Advisory Group members into six breakout Groups and provided them with three discussion questions (noted below). Members shared their perspectives with one another, took notes, and highlighted key ideas that arose during conversation. Following the breakout Groups, Susan invited members to share key points from their discussion with meeting attendees.

1. What are the biggest opportunities for Center City in light of growth?
 - Congestion pricing, where tolls are levied during certain peak hours to reduce congestion
 - Incorporating the Yesler Terrace community in Center City mobility planning
 - Planning according to a set of values and priorities developed with community input
 - Integrating transportation modes to streamline mobility
 - Community interest in transportation planning

2. What are the biggest challenges for Center City, and/or that could arise without a 20-year vision?
 - Obstacles to accessible and equitable mobility (e.g., orientation of curb ramps, lack of tree grates, physical obstacles, no accessible pedestrian signals)
 - The existing single-use designs of many Center City neighborhoods
 - Involving younger generations in long-term mobility planning
 - Coordinating with cities outside Seattle
3. Knowing your communities/constituents, what are indicators of a successful One Center City Plan?
 - Well-integrated transportation modes and public spaces
 - A significant decrease in the number of single-occupancy vehicles on the roads in Center City neighborhoods
 - Accessible, safe transportation for all
 - Supporting populations that are the most vulnerable

In addition, members noted that that breakout Group discussion prompted the following ideas that they would be interested in exploring further at upcoming Advisory Group meetings:

- In Seattle, streets that support heavy bus traffic (e.g., 3rd Avenue) do not support robust retail. Is there a body of research that could help us understand this phenomenon? Learning more about potential cause and effect may allow the partner agencies and the Advisory Group to come up with strategies to improve the public realm on these streets in the future.
- There are 15,000 construction workers coming into the Center City area every day. Incentivizing transit, carpooling, or other strategies for this segment of workers could help to remove cars from congested Center City streets.
- The area in SODO near the Starbucks headquarters should also be considered part of the Center City. There is a huge employment base in that part of the City and it is very close to downtown.

Observer thoughts:

One observer provided comment, saying that much of the breakout Group discussion applied focus to livability and public space in the Center City, rather than on single-occupancy vehicles and parking. The observer noted that they appreciated that the Advisory Group was approaching Center City mobility planning from this perspective.

Wrap-up and Next Steps:

Meghan Shepard, SDOT, thanked Group members for their attendance, participation, and discussion. She noted that the next Advisory Group meeting would be held on November 10, 2016, in Seattle City Hall's Bertha Knight Landes Room, followed by a meeting on December 8, 2016, also in the Bertha Knight Landes Room.

Meghan noted that materials for the upcoming Advisory Group meetings would be sent to members at least one week in advance.

Identified Action Items:

1. Project team members will update the draft Advisory Group charter with identified changes.
 - Highlight the Group's role in shaping near-term actions
 - Include a note that the Group should focus on accessible, equitable, and safe solutions
 - Note that partner agencies will work to provide accessible materials to Advisory Group members and the community
 - Update member roles and responsibilities to more clearly note the role that Advisory Group members will play in shaping products
 - Add language that would allow the formation of ad hoc Groups, as needed
 - Add language that would allow for longer meetings (up to three hours), as needed

Attendees:

Advisory Group Members:

- Monty Anderson
- Thatcher Bailey
- Derrick Belgarde
- Michael Davis
- Deanna Dawson (phone)
- Jim Erickson
- Brian Ferris
- Erin Goodman
- Tom Graff
- Brie Gyncild
- Staci Haber (phone)
- Holly Houser
- Jared Jonson
- Jeff Keever
- Elizabeth Kiker
- Carl Leighty
- Peggy Martinez
- Anders McConachie (phone)
- Cary Moon
- John Pehrson
- Rico Quirindongo
- Hester Serebrin
- Leslie Smith
- Monica Smith
- Reese (Marissa) Tanimura
- Jessa Timmer (phone)
- David Wiggins

Observers:

- Ron Judd
- Cathy Tuttle

Project Staff:

City of Seattle

- Sam Assefa, OPCD
- Gary Johnson, OPCD
- Tracy Krawczyk, SDOT
- Scott Kubly, SDOT
- Candida Lorenzana, SDOT
- Chisaki Muraki-Valdovinos, SDOT
- Kevin Shively, Mayor's Office
- Meghan Shepard, SDOT
- Eric Tweit, SDOT
- Diane Wiatr, SDOT

Sound Transit:

- Mike Harbour
- Juan Higuera
- Wesley King

Downtown Seattle Association:

- Don Blakeney
- Jacqueline Gruber
- Jon Scholes

King County DOT:

- Frank Abe
- Kim Becklund
- Victor Obeso

Other Project Staff:

- Tom Brennan, Nelson/Nygaard
- Tyler Cohen, EnviroIssues
- Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
- Justin McCaffree, EnviroIssues
- Erin Tam, EnviroIssues
- Brett Watson, EnviroIssues