Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project Speakers Bureau

Group/Organization: Date: Location: Team Members: Port Commissioners February 11, 2003 Port of Seattle, Pier 69 Kirk Jones, Lee Holloway, Teresa Platt, Brad Hoff

Overview

The project team went before the Commission to inform them of the four alternatives that will be studied in the EIS. It was also an opportunity to let them know that alternative B was still be studied (as they had encouraged) and that the 12-18 month EIS process would dovetail nicely with the Port's master planning process.

<u>Notes</u>

Miller: Regarding Alternate H – What street is the northern route connecting to?

Jones: Wheeler St.

Miller: Tell me, if they had another "event" or earthquake and the bridge came down, could you move faster and how much faster?

Jones: There are emergency provisions in the environmental process.

Nordquist: When do you pick one of these four, and you need input by when?

Jones: The preferred alternate will be chosen in Spring 2004. The team will be working with the Port staff all along in the process and we can brief the Commission regularly.

Nordquist: (He reads from draft 2nd Level Screening memo.) This memo states that the Commission voiced support for alternate B and did not voice any support for other alternates. I want to clarify that the Commission has four alternates on the table and that is it.

Miller: To be fair, I asked about B because it was different. We did not take a position by a vote.

Jones: The memo will be corrected to accurately reflect your position.

Edwards: The EIS process would still need to occur if there were the other three alternates, correct?

Jones: Yes

Port Commission Brief Speakers Bureau 02/11/03 **Davis:** There is nothing in the (Port briefing) memo about the master planning. We do need to coordinate Terminal 91 planning with the bridge project. When can we make some decisions? (Port staff and Commissioners had a discussion about their master planning process. Master planning will be done in Spring 2004.)

Tierney: The schedules mesh better now (that the bridge project added time for the EIS process).

Davis: We have to make decisions before (it is too late). For the record, the Port is not just standing around. This is very important.

Miller: We need to have and iterative process, not just at the staff level, but include the Commission.

Molloy: I am quite interested in the stipulated order. Have we looked at this?

Chamberlain: Yes, our attorney reviewed the agreement and met with the City's attorney. Judy (City's attorney) is very familiar with the agreement and was one of the signators.

Jones: Judy is doing research; we don't expect a report for a month or so.

Molloy: I want to see a copy of the agreement. Are there other agreements on Port property that could impede the process? We have heard of other agreements, how do we know of other agreements? Is there a master file?

Miller: Can you describe the order of magnitude of the costs for each alternate?

Jones: D & H are the most expensive. A & B are relatively the same order of magnitude and less costly.

Miller: I would have guessed that B would be a lot less.

Jones: Not when you consider major retaining walls along the steep hillside and all the mitigation and environmental impacts.

Nordquist: Does A take out the houses at the top of the bluff? It looks like it from the alignment on the map.

Jones: No we do not intend to take any houses at the top of the bluff.

Action Items

No action items were set.

Briefing Materials

PowerPoint presentation