



## Summary Minutes – DRAFT

### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome
- II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?
- III. Construction Funding
- IV. Viewpoint Review
- V. Environmental Justice

### Attendees

---

#### Design Advisory Group

- ✓ Dan Burke
- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ John Coney
- ✓ Bob Derry
- Erin Fletcher
- ✓ Eric Fahlman
- Grant Griffin
- ✓ Bob Holmstrom
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- ✓ Doug Lorentzen
- Jose Montaña
- ✓ Mike Smith
- David Spiker
- Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)
- ✓ Janis Traven (alternate)

#### Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein A|U
- Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Richard Butler, Shapiro
- ✓ Hadley Greene, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Katharine Hough, HNTB
- ✓ Steve Johnson, Johnson Archts
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- ✓ Anthony Katsaros, Shapiro
- ✓ Teresa Platt, City of Seattle
- Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- ✓ Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ DAG Contact Information
- ✓ DAG #9 Summary Minutes
- ✓ Alignment Alternatives
- ✓ All Magnolia Bridges—PM Peak Hour Two-Way Traffic
- ✓ 'Listening to You' Public Involvement Summary Board
- ✓ Public Involvement Summary, Fall 2002—Winter 2003
- ✓ The EIS Process: Discipline Reports
- ✓ Speakers Bureau Meetings: Fall/Winter 2003

## I. Welcome

---

### ***Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues***

Brad Hoff welcomed the group and pointed out the new DAG contact information included in the meeting handouts. Calling members' attention to the September 10 DAG minutes, Brad asked if there were any amendments or changes to the minutes. No issues were raised and the group approved the minutes. Brad asked the group if it would be helpful to have a traffic calming 101 workshop at the next meeting. After asking clarifying questions, the group said that it would be helpful.

Brad ran through the agenda for the meeting, explaining that the project team was responding to issues that the DAG had expressed interest in at the last meeting.

### **Discussion:**

**Kenworthy:** Are there any issues on the agenda where you will be asking the group for a decision?

**Hoff:** We think of the DAG as a sounding board, where the team will ask DAG members for feedback.

**Kenworthy:** In the future, if there is a question that will be posed to the group. It would be helpful to have it listed on the agenda to give advance warning if a decision will be required.

**Conclusion:** With no further questions or comments, Brad introduced Kirk Jones to provide an overview of recent project activity.

## II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?

---

### ***Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager***

Kirk Jones related that the consultants have been finalizing and refining the alternatives that are being studied in the EIS. He explained that they have been working on discipline reports and called the groups' attention to the handout summarizing what is being covered in each discipline report. Kirk said that all discipline reports have been turned into city staff for comment, and that comments should be returned by next week. He mentioned that the Environmental Justice and Visual Quality reports would be covered in more detail later in the meeting, as the team would like feedback in these areas from the DAG. He noted that FHWA has held up approval on some projects because the project's environmental justice conclusions were not adequately documented. The City is coordinating who is commenting on each report to make sure that the City is not giving conflicting directions in their comments and so there are no holes in the analysis. The next round of discipline reports, which the City considers to be final drafts, will go through one more round of review prior to being given to WSDOT for review and comment.

Kirk explained that the discipline report handout would be available at the open house on November 20<sup>th</sup>. He asked the group to return comments to Brad or himself within a week so materials can be finalized for the open house. Kirk ran through the Fall 2003 Speakers Bureau schedule. In addition to community groups, the team has also met with the Port's North Bay team to continue the process of working together as both projects develop. Kirk announced the upcoming Port Transportation Forum on November 6, which will look at both active projects, and projects that are on the drawing board. The Magnolia Bridge Project will have a table at the forum. Kirk announced that the team had recently sent out 9,000 newsletters to the Magnolia and Queen Anne neighborhoods and had placed newsletters at libraries and other public locations. The newsletters update the public on what alternatives are being studied in the EIS and invite them to a November 20 public open house.

### Discussion:

**Kenworthy:** Some months ago, I had recommended that the impact on the maritime cluster economy be studied in the EIS. I do not see that listed here. I only see a listing for discipline report based on census data. At the last meeting I noted that Professor Sommers at the University of Washington had completed a study of the maritime cluster economy. It is important to point out that the City is funding Professor Sommers' work on nine critical sectors of this cluster economy. It is important because parts of the cluster economy combine to create a sum greater than their parts. Professor Sommers is amazed at the impact that these smaller cluster economies have on the greater economy.

**Jones:** That issue is addressed in the socioeconomic discipline report.

**Kenworthy:** Then please add that to the description on the handout to better reflect what will be studied in that particular report.

**Hoff:** The discipline report handout is intended to be a layperson's guide to what is being studied in the Draft EIS. Feedback from the group will be helpful as we develop materials for the public open house.

**Coney:** Is bicycle/pedestrian mobility included in these reports?

**Jones:** Yes, in the Traffic and Transportation report.

**Burke:** Will the discipline reports be available for the DAG to see before they are released to the public?

**Jones:** If DAG members are interested in a particular topic we can arrange to have a presentation on that topic. The reports have to be sent to WSDOT for comment before they can be released to the public. They will also be referenced in the Draft EIS

In response to requests for more information about what the new bridge will look like, Kirk said the team had developed profiles of the three bridge alternatives. He showed the profile for Alternative D with ramps, which shows how the bridge will look from the south side. The group took some time to look at the profile and ask clarifying questions.

When they reconvened, members offered the following suggestions:

- Show pedestrian walkways clearly; it is not clear that pedestrian accommodations are included in this profile.
- The colors are helpful because they are bright and contrasting.
- Post PDFs of the profiles on the website so DAG members and the public can download them.

The following discussion concerned the Alternative D profile:

**Coney:** I perceive that there is no pedestrian/bike facility at the 15<sup>th</sup> Ave over-crossing connecting Elliott Ave with the Garfield intersection. Indeed, the Galer Flyover currently does not have much of a pedestrian/bike facility on it. How can there be no pedestrian/bike facility on a federally funded project?

**Jones:** The project will use pedestrian actuated signals at Galer and Garfield to provide a way for pedestrians to cross 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W.

**Coney:** One of the failures of the Galer Flyover is the lack of pedestrian/bike facilities. They were never included in the initial project and now we are reaping the problems. I would propose to repair the Flyover for pedestrians and bikes, as well as vehicles, as part of the bridge replacement project.

**Conclusion:** Kirk said that the team would post the profile on the website so that DAG members may share it with their constituents. With no further discussion, Kirk moved on to a discussion of construction funding.

### III. Construction Funding

---

#### ***Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager***

Kirk explained that securing construction funding for the project would be limited by four major factors. The first is the fact that there is no load limit constraint on the bridge and that this project is not related to a major safety concern, which limits the types of funds that the project is eligible for. The second is whether growth will create a need for the new bridge because of lack of capacity on the existing bridges. Kirk pointed out that the team does not anticipate much growth related to the Magnolia community, although there will be significant growth in Interbay. The primary driver for this project is the need to tie into 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a corridor that is experiencing growth and increased congestion. Kirk went on to explain that the main structural problem with the bridge is

seismic safety, particularly with the foundations, which have not been upgraded. One catastrophic event could potentially put the bridge on the ground. Unfortunately, Kirk said, this is one area that is not a high priority when it comes to funding, as bringing bridges up to current load limits generally has priority. Another limiting factor is that the bridge is not on the state highway system, and is not part of the primary regional transportation network.

Funding options for the project include the Federal Bridge Replacement Fund that usually goes to structurally unsound bridges. However, the Magnolia Bridge Project would take most of the money in that fund, meaning other projects would not get as much, or any, money. Another option is to lobby for direct grants, like the one which is funding the project through the environmental review process. The City plans to pursue this avenue vigorously. Kirk said state funds are also a possibility, and could come from freight mobility funds, as this project will help ease freight congestion. Kirk said that these are the general funding mechanisms available for this project.

Other funding sources include putting together a bond fund made up of a package of projects and putting it in front of Seattle City voters. Creating a local improvement district (LID) is another possibility. Kirk pointed out that the existing bridge was built with money from a LID back in the 1930s. The question is whether the Magnolia community would be willing to fund a LID. The City is also looking at local funding partners such as BNSF, the Port of Seattle, and others that stand to benefit from a new bridge.

#### Discussion:

**Fahlman:** What are the City's predictions? What are the odds that the project will be funded?

**Jones:** Funding through direct federal grants will be looked at vigorously, although how much money we get is up in the air. A bond issue is also a possibility. Under the bridge replacement fund are the seismic funds that this bridge could qualify for, although using them would wipe out funds for other projects. In part because of the difficulty in funding the project, the City decided that Dravus Street is the critical route for emergency access to Magnolia. It has spent money in recent years to bring that route up to seismic code. Overall, it will not be an easy task to get funding for this project.

**Kenworthy:** Does SDOT prioritize major structural projects annually?

**Jones:** Yes, as part of the capital improvement project list.

**Kenworthy:** What priority is the City giving to the Alaskan Way Viaduct compared to the Magnolia Bridge?

**Jones:** The Magnolia Bridge is probably 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> behind the Alaskan Way Viaduct, the Monorail, the Fremont Bridge, and a couple other projects.

**Conclusion:** Kirk concluded by saying that he intended to offer a summary of how funding is looked at and how the project will be competing for funds. He emphasized that this project is not as high priority as other regional and City projects. He introduced Steve Johnson to review the viewpoints that are being considered in the Draft EIS.

## IV. Viewpoint Review

---

Steve Johnson described what is being studied in the Visual Quality discipline report, saying that he would cover two primary topics: 1) what the process is, and 2) what the team will study and look at in the Draft EIS. Steve is working with Lesley Bain, of Weinstein A|U, to prepare the Visual Quality discipline report. Their methodology is to describe the visual resource, the type of environment (i.e., a valley between two hills), the roadside character (defined by FHWA), and critical areas in the environment that are important to the community such as parks, the Magnolia bluffs, the Olmstead connection, Queen Anne Hill, and others. Steve said that the study area includes Queen Anne Hill and other areas that have views of the bridge, including views from the ferries in Elliott Bay. User groups that are being considered include drivers, neighbors, park users and others who are especially sensitive to the view from and of the bridge, especially bikers and pedestrians who are moving slowly, and ferry riders who look at the view for long periods of time.

After identifying the view opportunities, Steve explained that the team's analysis process includes taking photos, constructing a 3D rendering (computer model) of each bridge alternative and then merging the renderings with the photos to see what the bridge will potentially look like. Each of these views is scored using explicit FHWA criteria for visual impact assessment. The project must address vividness, intactness, and unity. Vividness addresses what characteristics make a scene memorable. For instance, a view of Mount Rainier would score high in the vividness category. Intactness includes how much of the view is in one piece, and the criteria differ for urban and rural areas. The last criterion is unity. Steve explained that they then take the scores in each area, which range from 1-10, and divide by three. Steve said that he and Lesley would try to make this analysis process transparent by using matrix scoring.

Steve then explained that another component of the scoring is the experience of someone crossing the bridge. Duration and speed adds to enjoyment of the view and because of this pedestrians score higher, even though there are more drivers. Steve explained that the challenge is how to weigh those different experiences to assign an overall score.

Steve walked the group through photos of the viewpoints that are being analyzed and asked for feedback on what views are important and suggestions for others that should be studied. He said that they started with 23 viewpoints and are now looking at 10. Their objective is to find areas where lots of people will see and experience the view. Photos of

the following viewpoints were shown and provided to the group. For each picture, Steve explained why the particular view was chosen:

1. The view from the Galer Flyover.
2. The view from the north end of the Pier 89/90 waterway where the Elliott Bay bike path moves from a water environment to a land environment. This is a gateway point to the project area.
3. A view from West Dravus looking south.
4. The view from where the bike trail turns down from 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue. This is where vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians all share the view.
5. The view from Queen Anne at the 8<sup>th</sup> and West Lee overlook. This viewpoint angles southwest and is probably the most important Queen Anne view from a public park. It is also a spot where people go to enjoy the view and watch it for extended periods of time.
6. The view from West Marina Place just west of Smith Cove Park. Both marina and restaurant traffic and people within Smith Cove Park all share this view.
7. The view from the Magnolia Bridge looking southeast. This view includes the city skyline and Mount Rainier. Steve pointed out that because this view will be hard to model, as it is looking from the prospective bridge, it would be described narratively.
8. The view from Magnolia Bridge looking northeast towards Queen Anne Hill.
9. The view from the middle of Magnolia Bridge taken from the driver's perspective.
10. The view of the bridge from the Bainbridge and Bremerton ferries. It is a distant view, but must be recorded and analyzed.

### Discussion:

**Kenworthy:** Is there a way to take the photos in better light to show the distinction between the bridge and the land below?

**Johnson:** We will try to get a better photo, perhaps in the morning when the light is better.

**Kenworthy:** In terms of cognitive theory, there is a lot of significance of change in the environment. Where you will see the most change in these viewpoints is when you look for the boats to see whether there is one or three tied up at the pier. There is a rhythm to what boats are there, and whether they are out to sea or at the dock. It is important to note things that residents notice as they cross the bridge (Mount Rainier, the boats, etc) if we want federal help and funding. We need to tell a vivid story of what the view is from the bridge for someone sitting in Washington D.C.

**Conclusion:** Brad asked Steve how he would like DAG members to submit comments. Steve said written comments would be helpful, including suggestions for what to include in the photos of the views, and if there are any views that

should be added. Steve stressed the need to do this promptly so they can move on to modeling and keep the project on schedule.

## V. Environmental Justice

---

Anthony Katsaros explained what the environmental justice process for the project is, and what is included in the discipline report. He asked the group for feedback on the team's environmental justice analysis and gave some background on what the environmental justice analysis must include according to federal regulations. Anthony explained that any project receiving federal funds must conduct an environmental justice analysis that takes into consideration highly disproportionate or adverse impacts on minorities and low-income communities. Individuals with limited English proficiency are also considered through the environmental justice analysis. Federal guidelines provide a threshold for what percentages within the community must be considered. Anthony explained that the team's analysis started with demographic analysis (school records, census data, etc...) and now they need to conduct community outreach to seek out individuals that could be classified as part of an environmental justice population.

Anthony explained that the environmental analysis for the discipline reports also included looking at the project's impact on social conditions, which includes community cohesion and the impact on gathering places such as churches, community centers, and day care facilities. For this project, they are primarily looking at the area within approximately 1/4-mile of the bridge. Anthony asked the group if they knew of groups that represent minority or ethnic populations within the project area, or of important social gathering places that the team should look at.

**Jones:** When we met with FHWA on environmental justice we learned that there is a threshold for minority groups of 5%. If a population is above that, the project must take action to reach that particular group by providing materials in other languages and making other efforts to reach out.

**Katsaros:** Census data has identified a Hispanic population over 5% for the area, which triggers us to look to see if they have limited English proficiency, or need other targeted public involvement efforts.

**Jones:** We must also take into account the workforce in the fish processing plants below the bridge. They have a high percentage of Hispanic and Asian employees and we need to look at how the bridge will impact their job and how they get to work.

**Kenworthy:** I would like to point out that all the DAG members present are middle aged and white. We should ask Jose for contacts within the Hispanic community.

**Traven:** The school's free lunch program can be accessed on the Seattle Public Schools website. It will give information about the schools in Magnolia and Queen Anne.



**Kenworthy:** **CityTeam**, right at the end of the bridge, is a shelter that serves homeless youth and perhaps non-English speaking populations.

**Conclusion:** In conclusion, Anthony explained that this is an ongoing process, and he encouraged the group to bring their ideas to the team's attention at any time during the EIS process.

## VI. Public Comment

---

Brad opened the floor for public comments.

**Member of Public** As somebody working with a group to make Magnolia's streets safer, I am concerned that if people slowed down or stopped to look at the view from the bluff, they would get run over. We are on a campaign to get the speed limit reduced from the bridge to the village. It would help if the traffic criteria for that area that has been generated for this project could be shared with other departments in the City.

**Jones:** Tell me who you are working with at the City, and I can be sure they get the information.

**Conclusion:** Brad asked members to e-mail or phone viewpoint suggestions soon. He said the next meeting will most likely be in January and that DAG members will be contacted in mid-December to confirm when the meeting will be.