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**Commission Business (9:00 – 9:30 am)**

The following items were discussed:

1. Briefing on projects to be reviewed today.
2. Approval of Minutes for March 21, 2024 and May 2, 2024

**Project review – Downtown Seattle Association digital kiosk program (9:30 am - Noon)**

Project Description

The Downtown Seattle Association (DSA), in conjunction with IKE Smart Cities and Orange Barrel Media (IKE/OBM), have developed a pilot project to install up to 50 digital kiosks in downtown Seattle and various Business Improvement Areas (BIA) in Seattle. The project requires the approval of a Substantial Structure Term Permit (SMC 15.65), which is approved by the City Council. The Commission received an update on the proposal following the initial presentation on April 4, 2024. The focus of the presentation highlighted 6 issues:

* SDOT, Seamless Seattle, and Office of the Waterfront Updates
* Public Outreach Update
* Business Plan
* Term Permit Conditions, and Operations & Maintenance
* Location Analysis and Criteria
* Public Benefits

The following people were presenters:

1. Mark Brands, SiteWorkshop
2. Jessica Burton, OBM
3. Clay Collett, IKE
4. Jon Scholes, Downtown Seattle Association (DSA)
5. Natalie Quick, Natalie Quick Consulting
6. Andrew Myerberg, Chief Innovation Office, Mayor’s Office
7. Marnie Heffron, Heffron Transportation
8. Seth Geiser, DSA
9. Corey Favor, IKE (attended virtually)
10. Currecia Gamble, IKE (attended virtually)
11. Deputy Chief Reba Gonzales, SFD
12. Interim Chief Amy Smith, CARE
13. Deputy Chief Dan Nelson, SPD

The following people were present:

1. Kevin VanMeter, SiteWorkshop
2. Matt Beaulieu, SDOT (attended virtually)
3. Ruri Yampolsky, Office of the Waterfront
4. Ryan Durkan, HCMP
5. Rachel Mazur, HCMP
6. Sung Yang, Pacific Public Affairs
7. Bobbie Nickel, Visit Seattle – provided public comment
8. Davonte Bell, CARE
9. Beverly Barnett, SDOT (provided comment on SDOT work)
10. Amy Gray, SDOT (provided comment on SDOT work)
11. Alyse Nelson, SDOT
12. Gabriel Seo, SDOT
13. Josh Gawne, SDOT
14. Jackson Keenan-Koch (attended virtually)
15. Lisk Whitson (attended virtually)
16. Jasmine Marwaha, Council Central Staff
17. Jeanette Dubois, SDOT
18. Emily Burns (attended virtually)
19. Ellen Sollod, Sollod Design – provided public comment in person and will provide written comment
20. Ryan Packer, The Urbanist (attended virtually)
21. Paula Rees – provided public comment
22. Tom Becker

Following the presentation, the Commission deliberated using the 6 elements detailed in the presentation. The commission expressed their thanks for the quality of the presentation and the information provided.

They raised two overarching concerns about the proposal:

1. Is the public benefit enough to allow the imposition of advertising in the right of way?
2. Has there been enough public input, has the public had a sufficient opportunity to comment on the proposal, and has the comment indicated that there is support for the proposal that is quantifiable and transparent.

Commissioners also made the following comments and recommendations:

1. It is unclear that the public safety presentation team has a complete understanding about the capabilities and limitations of the kiosks, as a tool that they are seeking to assist with their efforts.
2. Concern that the amount of kiosk images that will be made available to the public (1 out of 8 images; 25% of the annual allotment) is not sufficient, given the implications that the program will have on the right of way. In addition, concern was expressed that the slides that are made available to the public will be displayed at times that are less than optimal (nights, weekends, etc.) to be of value to the public.
3. Overall, more information on the public safety element of the project is needed.
4. Concern about the precedent being established by allowing a private entity to pursue this project within the right of way, and how it may open the door to additional requests from other digital media companies.
5. More information is needed about the tools that will be used by City staff to guide installation of an individual kiosk, including any template, handbook, or other similar tool to be used by decision-makers.
6. More information about the public benefit package and the overall value created by the individual elements.
7. Make sure that the content of the aesthetic study considers the impact on trees, the minimum amount of lighting needed to reduce impacts on public’s use of the right of way, lighting impact on abutting uses, and the overall composition of the right of way because of the addition of the kiosks.
8. What views are being blocked by the kiosks that negatively impacts the goal of an active and safe streetscape.
9. An interim reporting period within the initial 15-year term to evaluate the program that includes an assessment of the strength of the program and the goals it is achieving.
10. The ability to have a more public version of the kiosk program, one driven by public information that is supported by the public and not a program driven by advertising revenues.
11. Concern that the role that this system plays in wayfinding – not sure if its needed given Seamless Seattle and other similar programs.
12. It is unclear why the city of Seattle would need 4 different solutions to solve the wayfinding problem in Seattle. If this is truly a wayfinding and information amenity, then why is the number one app a “selfie” app? In addition, if the number one need is wayfinding, then that would suggest the need for better signage in the city and not a kiosk.
13. Equity concerns raised about the imbalance of the public safety advantage in only some neighborhoods.