



Design Advisory Group Meeting #31

Magnolia Community Center

August 1, 2007, 4:00 – 5:30 PM

Summary Minutes

Agenda

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Updates
- III. Design & Aesthetics
- IV. Next Steps
- V. Public Comment
- VI. Adjourn

Attendees

Design Advisory Group

- Dan Burke
- Fran Calhoun
- ✓ John Coney
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- Doug Lorentzen
- ✓ Jose Montaña
- ✓ Mike Smith
- ✓ Janis Traven
- Dan Wakefield
- Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)

Project Team

- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Matt Dalton, HNTB
- ✓ Gerald Dorn, HNTB
- ✓ Brian Elrod, HNTB
- ✓ Katherine Jones, SDOT
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- ✓ Kit Loo, City of Seattle
- Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Lauren Stensland, EnviroIssues
- Yuling Teo, City of Seattle
- Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

Meeting Handouts

- ✓ *Agenda*
- ✓ *Draft DAG #30 Summary Minutes*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – 3D Images (1.1 – 1.4)*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – 3D Images (2.1 – 2.3)*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Wall Treatments (3.1 – 3.3)*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing & Paving (4.1 – 4.2)*
- ✓ *Bus Stop Options (5.1 – 5.2)*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Pedestrian Pathways (6.1 – 6.4)*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Pedestrian Pathways (7.1 – 7.2)*
- ✓ *Temporary Route During Construction (8.1)*
- ✓ *CD containing complete Type, Size & Location Study*

I. Welcome

Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues

Sarah welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. She asked for any edits to the June 6 DAG meeting summary by the following Wednesday.

II. Project Updates

Kirk Jones, SDOT

Port of Seattle Coordination

Kirk shared that SDOT continues to work closely with the Port of Seattle and have made pier adjustments to accommodate their development and we're talking about how to best work the pedestrian connection at the east end with the entrance to the Port property.

Discussion

Kenworthy: We've been asking for more specifics from the Port and the SDOT on detour planning and coordination and they need to be forthcoming with what they have at this point. It can be a draft but we need something concrete.

Traven: Has the Port talked about transportation, given the plans they have for North Bay? At our district council meeting we were shown some plans.

Kenworthy: My understanding is that the Seattle Planning Commission will be strengthening industrial planning and that local groups don't want destination shopping in this area.

Smith: How big will North Bay development be?

Jones: We have shared the Magnolia Bridge design with them and the bridge is a given they have to plan around for any new streets. There's a trigger level of development after which the Port will need a North Bay bridge to help bring traffic in and out of the Port. That's what I know about their transportation plan.

King County Metro Coordination

Kirk explained that Metro has asked SDOT to assume two bus stops on the bridge, one on each side of the structure to serve both directions of travel. We'll need some way to connect our path to the stop on the north side. There are two options, either a pedestrian ramp connecting to the stop, or a sidewalk where pedestrians exit the bus and walk down the main off ramp along the sidewalk. We're looking a cost comparison between those two options.

Type, Size & Location (TS&L) Study

The DAG received CDs with the complete TS&L report. The TS&L is finalized and will be posted on the SDOT website shortly.

Environmental Update

Kirk shared that the soils investigation was completed and we examined the seawall and all the reports from that are coming to the designers. They are working on the foundation

designs. SDOT has received comments from WSDOT on the Biological Assessment and are responding to those and returning responses next week. Kirk's team has checked on the status of the Environmental Assessment (EA), SDOT was supposed to have comments within thirty days of releasing the hard copy of the EA, which would have been July 20, so they are hoping to receive comments soon.

III. Design & Aesthetics

Brian Elrod, HNTB

Brian and his team have continued to work on the plans for design and aesthetic elements for the bridge, using the DAG's feedback from last meeting to guide their work. Brian will share the next level of design and ask for further input from the DAG regarding these current design developments. The first graphic in the upper left (1.1) shows the design of the overlooks, including the two-foot wall and the steel railing.

Discussion

Kenworthy: That's the tube railing?

Elrod: Yes and the railing has a slight arc that makes it hard to climb on, for safety.

Kenworthy: Is the hanging lamp the same as the maritime lamp?

Elrod: Yes, people referred to that both ways. It has that hanging lamp shape and a maritime feel to it.

Kenworthy: Which one is the pedestrian light?

Elrod: One the second page, in the large image.

Kenworthy: What's the lower right on the first page here?

Elrod: The roadway light; these reflect what we talked about last time

Coney: Are both lights connected to the pilaster?

Elrod: The roadway lights are connected to the barrier between the roadway and the sidewalk. The pedestrian lights are connected to the barrier on the outside edge of the bridge, on the other side of the sidewalk. There will be a pedestrian light every 150 feet and the pilasters are every 50 feet. The upper right image (1.2) shows the walkway adjacent to the traffic barrier, as well as the outer barrier.

Coney: How high is the barrier?

Elrod: It is 54 inches tall.

Coney: How does that height address WSDOT requirements for throw-barriers over railroads and roadways?

Jones: Yes, the railing will be higher in those areas.

Coney: There's a group that's still meeting about suicides on the Aurora Bridge and it turns out that fifty percent of those were over roadway. I don't know about the suicide risk for this bridge.

Jones: There's not really a history of that.

Smith: But it has happened.

Kenworthy: Why are the overlooks over concrete instead of over water?

Elrod: They're designed to be over the bridge columns.

Dorn: There were also designed to at specific locations, such as where the ramps met the trail.

Elrod: The overlook at the left in your diagram is also designed to have the most panoramic view of the bay.

Kenworthy: There may also be Port development in this area, so you might consider moving the overlooks to over the water. That would provide a view of boats instead of potential rooftops.

Jones: Good point.

Traven: How high are the overlooks?

Elrod: This one is about thirty feet.

Traven: The buildings would be forty-five to ninety feet.

Kenworthy: Well, that's in play in the City Council.

Jones: That's something to think about, moving the overlook to have a view of the water.

Smith: I have a thought about the foot-level lighting. It seems that those could provide enough light to preclude the need for the tall maritime lights. We could fewer pieces sticking up into the air.

Elrod: The low wall lights don't provide much light.

Smith: There might be other kinds of lights that provide more illumination.

Kenworthy: There could be many advantages of having lights that provides real lighting and not just an architectural feature.

Smith: It would create an architectural feature, still, but you could have more lighting down low, less stuff sticking up. It's a beautiful bridge.

Elrod: There could also be lights not only on the outside barrier but on the inside barrier, for additional lighting.

Coney: I think there's a basic safety and security issue. You need to light the sidewalk and you need to light people's faces

Kenworthy: I think Mike [Smith] is not suggesting a low-lighted area; there is a security issue with lights. The cruise ships are also building an office building at the end of the pier.

Coney: That would really light the underside of the bridge, though.

Kenworthy: Could you get back to us about those options and what stronger lighting might be available?

Elrod: Sure.

Smith: There's a lot of lighting on the roadway.

Dorn: Yes, it's city-level lighting. The roadway will be well lit.

Coney: I would argue strongly against thirty inch high lighting figures.

Traven: Is there a plan with the City to have energy efficient lighting? I don't know what they're using now.

Jones: The sodium vapor lamps are less energy consuming than mercury vapor, the city made that change a long time ago.

Coney: Sodium looks very orange?

Jones: Yes, more like that.

Elrod: In the lower right image on the first page (1.4), you'll see that we talked about using overlooks to provide some art of some kind and we'll coordinate with the city artist. One comment from last meeting was that we should carry the pattern on the sidewalk beyond just the overlook area to indicate the special area to bicyclists and others. On the second sheet, the columns are shown under the bridge. There has been some different direction on the box girder that Jerry [Dorn] will explain.

Dorn: We had talked previously about a solid section under the bridge, so the underside would be one smooth surface. In the design, we have one long straight stretch of the

bridge and doesn't turn or vary in width as we expected it to, and that area also has difficult soil. For that section, we'll use a pre-cast box method. The aesthetic will be somewhat different, though from the side view it will look identical.

Jones: It's a compromise, something between the single solid box and having many girders.

Coney: The bird nesting issue was one reason for the solid box.

Jones: Yes, and birds won't be able to nest on this type of structure either. Also, this change is only for the level section between the railroad tracks and where the bridge takes off up to the bluff. All the haunched box sections will still be cast in place (15th Avenue crossing and the Magnolia Bluff).

Smith: The roadway stanchions here could have the pedestrian lighting on them also and maybe there could be two lamps on one stanchion to have fewer poles in the air.

Elrod: That's something we could take a look at to see if we can meet all the demands.

Coney: But by not alternating the light sources you'll reduce the light on the sidewalk; why do you want to do that?

Smith: It just looks better.

Coney: Why?

Smith: For the view.

Brandt: We've clearly recorded both of your ideas and concerns.

Jones: And the intensity of lighting has to be appropriate, regardless.

Brian also discussed the colors for the bridge. The team and the DAG had discussed a pigmented sealer applied to the bridge, and SDOT is thinking of a taupe color. This would be a warm color that blends with the environmental and the girder would have a slightly darker color to reduce the visual effect – the coloration can really make a big difference. Right now they are not anticipating a colored sidewalk except for any art in the overlook areas, so it would be a natural grey. The third graphic (1.3) shows the whole design feel, including the overlooks with the special grading and the spacing of the lights and columns.

The sheet showing the wall textures (3.1 – 3.3) reflects discussion with the DAG about the rope texture that people liked. The design team took a look at the way the textures would appear on the actual bridge and thought having it on the columns and the retaining walls would tie it together visually. Those walls are highlighted in yellow.

Discussion

Kenworthy: The rope texture? Is that like the Galer Street overpass shipping lines texture?

Elrod: Yes, but the pattern won't be shaped in an arc as it is there.

Brandt: It will be a straight line with a twisting rope texture.

Brian also explained the bus stop options that were considered. The yellow line at the top of the westbound side (5.1) represents a five-foot sidewalk and ends at the bus stop. There's also a switchback ramp or trail that could head back to the bridge and tie in with the existing trail. The red arrows and lines show the circulation path we anticipate on the bridge.

The second bus stop, closer to the railroad tracks, would require another ramp structure on the north side.

Discussion

Kenworthy: Are you familiar with the recommendations of the Seattle Planning Commission that came out on July 18?

Elrod: No, I'm not familiar with that.

Kenworthy: They are an independent body and they've just issued recommendations about Seattle's future industrial land use policy. The thrust of those is not supportive of the North Bay plan, and I'm not sure who you're talking to at the Port of Seattle, but if you assumed North Bay was not going to be built, how would your design change?

Jones: We would still need to make the same pedestrian and vehicle connections.

Kenworthy: Corey Electric has been asking for a long term lease with the Port. One of the issues is how much infrastructure would those industries require? One of the arguments of the North Bay overlay is that it would spread the cost of infrastructure, but that assumes everyone shares the cost. The commissioners are skeptical of this plan and it would be important to hear back as to what extent these recommendations affect these plans. How about at the next DAG?

Jones: I think the biggest impact is how much and how intentionally that area is developed. What we have designed responds to possible development given the current zoning.

Coney: I would say that the planning commission doesn't have statutory control over how the overlay is put in.

Kenworthy: True, City Council does.

Coney: The planning commission is influential but I think the City and the Port have an agreement.

Brandt: We find that plan on their website?

Kenworthy: Yes.

Brian also described the designs for the pedestrian ramps, reminding the group that the ramp must meet ADA requirements. The options presented (6.1 – 6.4) are mostly for the south end connection, but they also looked at the north end. The north end ramp was very difficult to fit into the available space and the design team didn't think it worked as well as (7.1 – 7.2). The other thought was to connect both the north and south ramps under the bridge, but there was not enough clearance under the structure to accommodate that.

Jerry introduced the detour routes (8.1) and explained that the yellow on the top of the page are some detour routes. The group has talked about using the Galer Flyover and using the existing bridge to maintain traffic in the corridor.

Discussion

Kenworthy: Would this be only during construction? Can we label these “temporary detour routes?”

Jones: Yes, there are temporary routes for twelve months of the construction.

Dorn: The intent is to keep traffic in the corridor and this is still a detour that will be worked out.

Kenworthy: I just want to be clear what this is because it will have implications later.

Dorn: In this version, instead of using the old bridge as a detour, we use the new bridge. You could build the new bridge up to this ramp and then deconstruct the whole old bridge without having to use the existing as a detour.

Kenworthy: Have you run this by the cruise ship staff?

Dorn: Yes, we have comments coming from them.

Kenworthy: We also need to make sure this is blessed by the seaport operations person. Please share those comments with the DAG as well.

Dorn: Their concern is focused on any traffic coming through the Port facility. They are also looking at relocating the security zones to outside of the construction zone.

Kenworthy: Where will it be relocated?

Dorn: I believe on the right side near City Ice.

Kenworthy: Where exactly?

Jones: We can get more detail once we have comments from seaport operations.

Brandt: Thanks for the helpful discussion today.

IV. Next Steps

Kirk Jones, SDOT

The DAG will meet next on October 3 from 4:00 to 5:30 pm at the Magnolia Community Center. Sarah Brandt and Lauren Stensland will be hosting the Magnolia Bridge project display at the Magnolia Summerfest this coming Friday and Saturday. The team is also planning the future opening house, looking at an October date.

V. Public Comment

Kirk Jones, SDOT

There were no members of the public available for comment.

VI. Adjourn

Kirk Jones, SDOT

With no further comment from the project team or DAG members, the meeting was adjourned.