



Summary Minutes

Agenda

- I. Welcome
- II. Port's Master Planning Process
- III. What's happened since our last meeting?
- IV. Adjourn

Attendees

Design Advisory Group

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

Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein A|U
- Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Richard Butler, Shapiro
- ✓ Chelsea Galano, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Katharine Hough, HNTB
- Steve Johnson, Johnson Architects
- ✓ 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
- ✓ Project Goals
- ✓ Key Community Impacts
- ✓ October 2004 Newsletter, Issue 3
- ✓ DAG #14 Summary Minutes

I. Welcome

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues

Brad welcomed the group and introduced the packet of information distributed, which included the agenda, two green handouts describing the project goals and the impacts of each alternative, the new newsletter, and summary minutes from the last DAG meeting. Brad welcomed Janis Traven and thanked her for taking over Bob Holmstrom's position.

Brad asked if there were any corrections to the DAG 14 meeting minutes. Kirk explained the last meeting was spent looking at variations of Alternate C. A week later various criteria were applied to the six variations of Alternate C. John Coney questioned what Option 6 was. Kirk explained Option 6, which was selected as the Alternative C alignment. He said for all options, except for Option 6, the bridge touchdown from the railroad crossing is on the west side of the Trident building. With this clarification, the meeting minutes were approved.

Brad described the public outreach that took place throughout the summer. In July, the project team visited the Seattle Design Commission, set up a booth on two different Saturdays at the Magnolia Farmer's Market, as well as attended a Transportation Committee Meeting. In August and September, the team again staffed a booth at the Magnolia Summer Fest and two Farmer's Markets. During the course of the summer, the project team talked with more than 200 people about the project. These events are important avenues for reaching different audiences. Although the project team talked to several new residents that had not heard of the project, they also heard many of the same questions, such as when will construction start, and has the City decided on an alternative. Overall people appeared to have strong reactions one way or another about Alternative C. This fall brings more outreach opportunities. On October 15th the project team will be addressing workers at City Ice and Trident. The presentation will be translated into Spanish and Vietnamese. There is also another Open House scheduled for October 26th at Blaine Elementary. The purpose of this is to inform community members that Alternative C is back on the table, update them on information from the EIS discipline reports, and layout the new schedule.

II. Port's Master Planning Process

Dan Burke, Port of Seattle

Dan began by informing the group that the Port spent the summer bringing their new consultant team up to speed. He noted that on October 19th from 10:00am –12:00am the Northbay Team will brief the Port Commission on the project to date. This meeting will be held at Pier 69. No decisions will be made October 19th. They will be discussing bringing industrial marketing to the table, the framework on the master plan, and the EIS process. They will also be holding an open house on November 16th to discuss the same information that will have been discussed at the Port Commission Meeting on October 19th. A Public Scoping Meeting on the EIS will be held either December 1st or 2nd.

People will have a lot of opportunities to see what the Port has been working on over the summer.

Discussion:

Kenworthy: Is that a work session on October 19th?

Burke: Yes. It is a public meeting.

Coney: Where is that?

Burke: Pier 69.

Kenworthy: The open house is where?

Burke: We don't have a place yet, but it will be on November 16th. I will get that information to Brad to distribute to you.

Kenworthy: Could you [Burke] clarify industrial marketing?

Burke: We've been doing a lot of work on an industrial market assessment. The first day that will be discussed is October 19th.

III. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?

Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager

Kirk added that the Open House, scheduled for October 26th, would also be used to provide summary information of the discipline reports. He said it will also be a time to check with the public to make sure the project team hasn't missed anything. Kirk indicated the Design Commission is a little frustrated because they see SDOT proposing to build another structure with the bridge while at the same time the City is talking about trying to reduce the amount of structures. Some Design Commission members aren't as familiar with the Magnolia Bridge Replacement project. One Commissioner asked why not replace the bridge exactly where it is today. Kirk said the answer boils down to maintaining access to community and minimizing the shutdown period.

Discussion:

Burke: Did all those comments come from the Design Commission?

Jones: Yes. We brief them about once every six months.

Kenworthy: Are the minutes from the Design Commission on the website?

Spiker: Yes. I also have a copy if you would like to look at them here. I think all the alternatives are missing something. The Design Commission supports the former alternative with two access points. We feel the current alternatives are a step backward. That said, we recognize the challenges of the neighborhood and its competing interests.

Hoff: I will send an email around with the link to the Design Commission minutes.

Jones: There was a lot going on with the design team over the summer. After Option 6 for Alternative C was selected, the team had to bring it up to the level of design of the other alternatives. The decision was given to the authors of the fourteen discipline reports to amend. This occurred in the latter part of July and early August. Thirteen of fourteen reports have been submitted to the City. Six have been sent on to WSDOT. Three are in the process of being sent on. Four need corrections. We are going to push WSDOT to turn them around and wrap up as soon as possible. They have to review and approve the reports to make sure we've covered everything. A summary section is brought over from each discipline report to develop the EIS. We will be starting EIS activity, such as format and other draft stuff, this month. We believe WSDOT will not find significant issues. That's been our experience on other projects. Most of the time it is just a formatting issue. We will be talking about presenting the basic findings from the reports at the Open House. There is one thing I want to make you aware of about the EIS process. We have included in our revised schedule a decision point to make a request to WSDOT and FHWA to do an Environmental Assessment rather than a full EIS. Most of the impacts look like they can be mitigated. If we have to go to a full EIS, it will be the first of July. A preferred alternative would be decided next summer, and a final EIS would be the end of next year. If we are allowed to go to an Environmental Assessment we will be making a decision in the first part of the year. Public comment and recommendations would take place on recommendation of preferred alternative. The EA could shave off up to six months from our schedule for moving ahead with the design. We may make that shift if we get an okay from WSDOT and FHWA.

Kenworthy: Have you explained the green paper? Who has it been given to?

Jones: It hasn't gone to anyone yet. It's just a summary of the overall project goals, which will be distributed at the open house.

Kenworthy: I think from day one we've said that we need to preserve marine jobs and maritime activities.

Jones: We are well aware of that.

- Hoff:** Part of why we'd like the DAG's input is so we can adjust these handouts prior to our October 26th meeting.
- Kenworthy:** We need to collectively be thinking about the tax base so we can have the quality of life we all want. From what I notice, people in this neighborhood care about this big picture.
- Jones:** Are there other comments? What about on the open house materials? Are there any additional corrections on the Project Goals Handout?
- Spiker:** There is nothing here that addresses design quality. We are building a huge structure. What about urban and civic design? It should be part of this issue.
- Hoff:** Adjustments will be made to the handout and emailed out for your review.
- Coney:** It is important to include a generous bicycle/pedestrian connection across the Garfield Street Viaduct. Eric, which alternative do you think is best?
- Fahlman:** I have some questions about the alternatives before I make a judgment. Alternative C allows some access to the park. I'm not seeing any bypass connections to Myrtle Edwards Park? With Alternative C, if you are coming down the bridge, you could get off and hit the bike span and not have to hit West Galer Flyover—I think that would be very good.
- Jones:** Maintaining and/or improving bicycle and pedestrian connections is an overall goal.
- Hoff:** Please give us any ideas on the handouts that you think your neighbors may want to see at the Open House.
- Traven:** I'd like to see some sort of recognition of tying into a multi-modal or transit hub (monorail, HCT, etc).
- Burke:** I think it is important to use the words "multi-modal connection".
- Hoff:** If there is nothing else to add, we will make corrections and circulate via email. I'll be taking edits and will then send out a "final" product. Now shifting to the alternatives handout, one of the things we will have at the Open House is a larger matrix detailing the impacts found by the discipline reports. No significant impacts were found. If we give someone a 3-page matrix will they take the time to read it? We tried to boil it down to what will grab the average citizen. We will have a full matrix available plus a simplified board version.

- Jones: With that in mind, why don't we walk through these and see if we've left anything out. These are some of the more significant impacts from the discipline reports.
- Kenworthy: We don't yet have a final version?
- Jones: No. City staff has been reviewing before they are sent on to WSDOT and have not found any significant errors. The information we have here is good basic info.
- Kenworthy: I think these are good points to bring up, however I'm uncomfortable deciding what is or is not important. I'd like more transparency in the process. What is it that you think is important to the average citizen? What do you think did not need to be included?
- Hoff: I can send a copy of the full matrix out via email.
- Fahlman: I think slope would be relevant--shorter/steeper hill vs. a longer/more gradual slope.
- Jones: They all have a 6 ½% slope.
- Coney: I would like to see a bullet relating to neighborhood access specifics. Some of the alternatives give Magnolia more access to the lowlands/valley. Alternatives A and D do not give access to the valley floor.
- Jones: The intersection alternatives for A and D are not shown because the ramp would be hidden in this picture because of the perspective.
- Coney: It looks like it is not possible westbound on the S curve to get on the Garfield Street Viaduct. Does the viaduct remain one way?
- Jones: Yes, going westbound.
- Burke: In the last 6-7 months has cost been evaluated, and should it be included?
- Jones: We will be talking about that a little later. Please notice on every picture we took out the tank farm. Bids are in next week for removing the tanks. We also show the polluted body of water known facetiously as Lake Jacobs filled in. The NW Harvest warehouse has also been removed (their contract is up). The Port originally didn't fill in Lake Jacobs because of concern it would cause stress on the bridge. The Port of Seattle has a permit to fill it, has already completed the mitigation for filling it and they want to fill it as soon as possible.

Burke: Both Alternatives A and D have a T intersection. There is a signalized intersection and a 2-way ramp that goes to the north. The bridge today does not provide for eastbound traffic to make a left turn and get down to the surface. The new proposed ramp with the intersection would change that. There are two versions of A and two versions of D.

Kenworthy: That is a very important community impact.

Hoff: Does it need to be shown on the document?

Kenworthy: Yes.

Fahlman: All three would have a connection to the spine road.

Kenworthy: I don't think we should judge what others' thought pattern might be. All the information should be out there.

Spiker: It needs to be clearer.

Lorentzen: Maybe you could have an impacts sheet that describes the impacts no matter which alternative you choose.

Kenworthy: How would the list of impacts be different if you had not received the discipline reports? How do the summaries reflect information in discipline reports?

Jones: They all reflect the information in the discipline reports. All have been evaluated for impacts on travel time based on traffic and construction.

Kenworthy: What about an economic report?

Jones: That hasn't been finalized yet.

Kenworthy: The economic impacts are much broader than just the relocation of two businesses.

Katsaros: One of the details of the report talks about mitigation and relocation of cluster businesses. The report gets into all issues and the fact that those issues can be mitigated.

Kenworthy: I think that report would be good to see before we distribute an assessment of the impacts. We need a foundational assessment first.

Hoff: What I'm missing with your question is, I know the marine business is important to you, but I'm not understanding what you want or what you would like to see?

- Kenworthy:** I believe there will be a differential impact between the documents. I'll be happy to discuss with you (Hoff) later.
- Jones:** We want a fairly concise document for the public, so as people look they will see the differences in impacts. That's our goal.
- Hoff:** Please remember, in addition to this piece, the public will have a chance to review the full matrix of all the reports.
- Jones:** Maybe we've summarized too much?
- Fletcher:** What we have is good. We need a broad, quick overview. If there is too much information, people won't read it.
- Burke:** I agree with Erin. What is a good way to talk about the ramp differences? Is the T vs. ramps a small difference, and can that be explained?
- Jones:** There are two key impacts: travel time and cost. With the intersection provided by the bridge structure, people from Magnolia can get to surface road quicker and therefore the waterfront. The T ramp is more expensive than the other ramps. A signalized intersection will add 20 seconds in travel time to cross the bridge.
- Spiker:** Why can't we have an Alternative A and A1 and an Alternative D and D1?
- Hoff:** The main issue with that is real estate on the page. Are there significant enough differences? Other than travel time and cost, there seems to be no other differences. You [DAG members] are more dedicated and interested in details than the average citizen will be.
- Spiker:** Why is the closure time for Alternative A 17 months? Does that have to do with existing bridge?
- Jones:** Each alternative's amount of closure time has to do with how much of the new bridge overlays the existing bridge.
- Smith:** So no bridge for 17 months on Alternative A is hypothetical?
- Jones:** Yes.
- Hoff:** Closure times are significantly longer than we initially thought.
- Jones:** We tried to get them down to what we've already experienced, which is 3 ½ to 4 ½ months.

- Hoff:** We need you [DAG members] to explain these longer closure times to your constituency.
- Smith:** If Alternative D can be done quicker, and you are a business owner, it will significantly impact your decision.
- Jones:** The project team is going to be spending four days in a workshop identifying risks and how those risks may affect cost. We will be using what is called a SCoRE (Scope, Cost, and Risk Evaluation) process to determine a range of costs for each alternative. The lowest cost is Alternative A, which is approximately \$100 million. Right of way itself is over \$20 million. It is \$23 million with the intersection. The third highest is Alternative C at \$116 million. Alternative D is \$140 million with the intersection and \$130 million with ramps. That's using today's dollar and not yet applying risks. We'll also explore the value of land underneath the old bridge. We'll factor that in during our right-of-way discussions with the Port. They will charge us a certain amount per square foot and we'll want them to subtract the value of the land under the bridge, which would revert to them after the old bridge is removed. We will sit down as a project team next week to see what risks there are, and if there are opportunities to change these figures.
- Kenworthy:** Would these cost estimates be on the handout?
- Jones:** No. We need to make the Mayor comfortable with these numbers first.
- Coney:** Looking at contrasts, as a "Queen Anner" what are the differences in mitigation costs for directing traffic? If this is a long closure, we need to plan ahead for this. I think there will be considerable expenses to keeping traffic moving.
- Jones:** We experienced about \$5,000 a day in traffic mitigation costs during the last bridge closure.
- Coney:** What will you do to minimize slow downs at Emerson and Dravis?
- Jones:** I've already talked to traffic people about adding another left turn lane at Dravis.
- Smith:** If there is a way to make trucks and buses use the spine road or something at grade through construction that would help the traffic on 15th. Buses and trucks at Dravis is why it's hard to have two left turn lanes there.
- Jones:** That may well be worth it. Those are all discussions we will have.
- Traven:** Mike's suggestion was basically what I was going to propose.

- Hoff:** Let's keep in mind that anything using a potential spine road would require the Port to keep their gate open.
- Burke:** This project is so multi-dimensional. We can't just look at the bridge alone. A lot depends on what happens with the Port.
- Kenworthy:** I remember being very impressed when the bridge was shut down because of earthquake damage. What was it that was done then to help them get ahead of schedule?
- Jones:** The contractor realized he could work 24 hrs instead of 16 hrs a day. There was a \$5,000 a day bonus for each day they finished early.
- Kenworthy:** I think that is something both Magnolia and Queen Anne business districts would be very interested in. A lot of things involve balancing. Because it is an industrial area there may be fewer noise restrictions.
- Jones:** We still got noise complaints at night.
- Spiker:** What about the impacts of the monorail? Is the timeframe for construction the same?
- Fletcher:** The Monorail construction (2009) will be ahead of the bridge construction. The Monorail will already be constructed when the new Magnolia Bridge construction begins.
- Jones:** We will go underneath the Monorail structure.
- Fletcher:** There are other potential conflicts for monorail to work with (Viaduct, etc.).
- Hoff:** Did we miss anything that should be included on the handouts? Anything other than a description of the ramps and some text listing how they can obtain a full matrix on back?
- Burke:** What about light and glare?
- Jones:** Alternative H was the biggest concern for that.
- Burke:** We heard quite a bit about Alternative C pushing up under the green belt—should this be a big concern?
- Hoff:** There are more light impacts with the current structure. The hill will act as a buffer.
- Kenworthy:** It would be helpful to identify the project website on the handout for people to get more information.

- Coney:** I would urge the project to work with the office of arts at the appropriate time. The Galer Street Flyover and the new park on the bluff are two options for art. I would rather see visible works of art than artists advising bridge engineers on design. Maybe office of art is too chicken to promote original, “visible” pieces of real art.
- Hoff:** We should revisit that idea closer to design phase. The list of action items I see are: send out link to Seattle Design Commission minutes, make edits to alternatives handout, add ramps/intersection and option for full matrix and website on back. Are there other pieces I’m missing?
- Fahlman:** Is it possible there will be a ped/bike connection on Thorndyke for Alternative C? Pedestrians aren’t going to like walking an extra ½ mile. It would be great if there were a bike path. I think that would be a distinct benefit to Alternative C. This may be premature for the alternatives summary handout for the open house.
- Jones:** Your point is well taken.
- Hoff:** It would be great to see you all on October 26th at the Open House. Please look for emails mid-month.
- Kenworthy:** On a different note, there is a ship canal clean-up taking place this Sat. We always need more boats. There is a prize for the best miscellaneous floating object (MFO). Please join us.
- Conclusion:** With no further comment, the meeting was adjourned.