



## Summary Minutes

### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome and Approval of November Meeting Summary
- II. Getting from 9 Alternatives to 3 – Applying the Screening Criteria
  - a. Environmental
  - b. Transportation
  - c. Urban design
  - d. Costs
  - e. Initial Reactions to Criteria Evaluations
- III. Review December 5<sup>th</sup> Open House Materials
- IV. Public and Closing Comments

### Attendees

---

#### Design Advisory Group

- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ Dakota Chamberlain
- ✓ John Coney
- ✓ Eric Fahlman
- ✓ Grant Griffin
- ✓ Bob Holmstrom
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- ✓ Doug Lorentzen
- Jose Montaña
- ✓ Eric Schmidt
- Mike Smith
- ✓ Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- ✓ Robert Foxworthy (alternate)
- ✓ Janis Traven (alternate)

#### Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Richard Butler, Shapiro and Associates
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Lee Holloway, HNTB
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- Andrew Laski, KPFF
- ✓ Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- ✓ Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ Design Advisory Group Contact Information – Revised
- ✓ Design Advisory Group #2 Summary Minutes – Draft
- ✓ Screening Criteria
- ✓ Open House Board Reproductions



## I. Welcome and Approval of November Meeting Summary

---

### **Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues – Facilitator**

Brad welcomed the group and walked through the agenda and meeting materials. He then invited comments and corrections to the minutes from the second Design Advisory Group meeting (November 6, 2002). Lise Kenworthy asked that her comments reflect her specific mention of Trident Seafood and City Ice as keystone companies and major employers, and that the project team contact the two companies for their input. Secondly, she noted that page 12 of the draft summary accurately conveys her question of when it is appropriate to include an additional criterion in the project evaluation process. However, she did not see confirmation of the agreement to suggest and record such criteria, even if they cannot yet be measured. After further review, it was agreed that the second bullet of this section's conclusion accomplished this goal.

**Conclusion:** Sarah Brandt agreed to make the necessary edits to the second DAG meeting summary. With no additional corrections, Brad turned the floor over to Lee Holloway to discuss applying the screening criteria.

## II. Getting from 9 Alternatives to 3 – Applying the Screening Criteria

---

### **Lee Holloway, HNTB**

Lee explained how the screening criteria had been modified since the November Design Advisory Group meeting. For example, evaluation of a fourth access point was included in two categories, transportation and cost (it did not make sense in terms of environmental or urban design considerations). Other criteria that were added included infrastructure costs and impacts associated with cluster economy dynamics (e.g., the loss of tax revenue, secondary impacts of relocation costs, etc.). Some of these new criteria cannot yet be measured, but they are included as placeholders intended to capture these impacts in the future.

Lee described the work that the project team has engaged in since the November meeting. After completing preliminary evaluations for transportation, urban design, environment, and cost, the team met with city staff to discuss their evaluations and reach consensus about the evaluations. Some criteria titles were changed to improve clarity, and the team made several changes to how the alternatives scored according to various criteria. However, there were no changes to the basic criteria. Lee also explained that the rating system had changed because the pie symbols had proven cumbersome. Instead of using pie charts, the team decided to use the following symbols: ++, +, 0, -, and --. This allowed for five levels of impact instead of four. For urban design and transportation, if there was not much change from existing conditions, the criteria was scored as "0," and the evaluator could score as many as two steps better (using pluses) or who steps worse (using minuses). For environmental and cost evaluations, comparisons were made between alignments with "++" representing the best scoring alignments and "--" representing the worst.

Lee explained that after meeting with the city staff and design team, the project team re-evaluated the alignments and added comments to capture why alignments rated as they did.

The handout titled “Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project: Preliminary Alternative Evaluation” presents this information.

Lee stated that the project team wants the advisory group to understand this process and where the team currently is in evaluating the alternatives. He also explained that it would be good for the advisory group members to refresh their memories in terms of the nine surviving alignments, and invited Lamar Scott to quickly describe each.

Lamar briefly described all nine alignments and highlighted discoveries that the team had made in terms of impacts and benefits. He then invited questions and comments from the group.

### Discussion

**Kenworthy** Each of the alternatives you’re presenting now includes a spine road. It’s my understanding that there have been conversations between the city and the Port about this. If anything that the project team is deciding is premised on this, we need to know about it.

**Hoff** Yes, we recently talked with the Port and (Dakota, correct me if what I say is not accurate) we identified conceptual spine roads that could run through the Port property. Notice that the lines are dashed because they’re only conceptual at this point.

**Jones** What we’re concerned with here is that, where some of the alignments touch down on the Port property, there would be some sort of road. We are assuming that the Port needs some sort of road to serve future uses on its property and asked if we could show this road as a dashed line, not as a commitment, but as a concept.

**Kenworthy** Where are we at in this process? Has the commission approved a spine road?

**Chamberlain** At the executive level, yes, we have agreed that the spine road can be shown conceptually. The spine road is consistent with what the Port plans to do. We must protect our ability to have access to property.

**Kenworthy** Thank you, that sheds some light on the situation. We need to be kept informed of these developments, especially in terms of the Port Commission, which is the decision-making body.

**Jones** We will be presenting the project to the Commission next Tuesday [December 10, 2002, from 1:00 to 2:00 at the Port building].

**Kenworthy** Can we get clarification on which alternatives are dependent on the spine road?

- Scott** A lot of them require a spine road to provide access to the waterfront. Other than options A and B, the others need a public road to get to the marina.
- Holmstrom** Does access to the waterfront include the park, too?
- Jones** Myrtle Edwards or Smith Cove? Our project doesn't necessarily improve access to Myrtle Edwards Park, but access to all parks will remain as they currently exist. Our charge is to look at providing improved access only to Smith Cove.
- Calhoun** You currently can't get to Myrtle Edwards from Magnolia without using the Galer flyover.
- Jones** That's true, the Galer flyover provides access to Myrtle Edwards. The Galer Street closure is happening with or without the Magnolia Bridge Project.
- Scott** Some of the proposed routes might enhance access to areas like Myrtle Edwards.
- Jones** I guess our focus is to correct access that does not exist at this point in time. By this I mean providing access to Smith Cove so you don't have to go over the railroad tracks twice. The assumption is that current access [to other area parks] would remain unchanged.
- Calhoun** It's really hard to get across with flyover and get back to Myrtle Edwards Park, which will get even worse with the Galer closure.
- Scott** It will depend on how the spine street is shown and how it ultimately functions.
- Coney** The Queen Anne/Magnolia District Council stayed in session for quite a while after you presented to our group. The council includes many important stakeholders that are very broadly representative of both Queen Anne and Magnolia. The most significant input I heard was that of prime importance was to establish good connections to Smith Cove and Elliott Bay Parks from Queen Anne and Magnolia. Access to the waterfront from both neighborhoods was a key piece of input.
- Conclusion:** Design Advisory Group members are welcome to attend the Port Commission briefing on December 10 (1:00 PM at the Port building). With no additional comments from the group, Lee introduced Richard Butler to discuss the preliminary environmental evaluation.

## II(a). Applying Environmental Criteria

---

### **Richard Butler, Shapiro & Associates**

Richard Butler stated his desire to be brief, and directed the group to the handouts that show the overall evaluation summary sheet for environmental criteria. He explained that the pages following the environmental summary sheet describe how each alignment scored by criteria. In summary, Richard explained that the alignments could be grouped into four general tiers. The three that came out on top and scored similarly were A, D, and H. From an environmental standpoint, these are the three alignments that are supported for moving forward through further study. Alternative A is attractive because there would be no business or residential displacements, and no real changes (and possible improvements) to noise impacts due to the design of the approach. A downside of A is that it impacts the shoreline during construction because the bridge would be built so close to the water. Alternative D is similar to A, and obviously one of the major downsides to D is that it goes through parts of City Ice, which would be a major issue. Alternative H also potentially runs through City Ice facilities, which is a major impact.

The next rung would include Alternatives C and G. Neither of these had any residential displacements. The downside to C is that it would have similar impacts to shoreline areas where the alignment shares characteristics with A. Both C and G have steep slopes and are at least partially located in the greenbelt and landslide hazard areas.

The third tier would include Alignments E, F, and I. Alignment E has two major drawbacks in terms of business and residential displacements at the proposed flyover. Alignment I would have similar impacts associated with the ramp off of 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W, and also where the alignment ties into Magnolia.

The lowest scorer in terms of environmental criteria was Alignment B, primarily because it impacts aquatic shoreline (a buffer zone of 1000 feet), combined with similar impacts to those discussed above.

In summary, that's how the alignments graded out.

### Discussion

**Kenworthy** Alignment D could result in the loss of well over 400 jobs. These are jobs with good wages, pensions, and other benefits, and this is a significant impact.

**Chamberlain** It's my understanding that some of these jobs could be relocated on the same property.

**Jones** We're certainly looking at that possibility, and it's true that sweeping D to the north will create more land near the water where we might be able to relocate the impacted warehouses.

- Kenworthy** The subject of relocation is very important, and I think that you're making a major assumption here. Twelve to fifteen vessels depend on access to the pier to sustain their business. I've met with the folks at City Ice and Trident, and I question the validity of your assumptions.
- Chamberlain** Why would certain alternatives score worse in terms of water quality and stormwater than others?
- Butler** This refers primarily to short-term impacts associated with construction activities.
- Kenworthy** I question your assessment of business displacements. These are not benefits to City Ice or Trident. Alternatives A and B are rated as bringing positive impacts to bear on the area, but you'd be moving two businesses out. Many businesses are moving out of our city. I would urge you to reconult on the subject of business impacts and relocation. We need to know how those guys will move their product to the pier. I request that you have follow up consultations with those businesses.
- Conclusion:** Kirk and Lee agreed to set up a meeting with City Ice and Trident to discuss operational and business impacts related to the project. Kirk noted that Grace Crunican, SDOT Director, was meeting with Trident the following day. With no additional discussion, Richard introduced Don Samdahl to explain the transportation evaluation.

## II(b). Applying Transportation Criteria

---

### **Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates**

Don explained that the transportation assessment looked at several things, including traffic patterns, emergency service and bicycle, transit, and railroad connections. The three that showed best promise from a transportation standpoint were Alternatives B, D, and H. The other two alignments that were quite satisfactory, though slightly behind, were A and C.

The benefits of Alternative B include good accessibility into Magnolia, limited traffic impacts to Magnolia, good connections to the waterfront and Port property, and the maintenance of good emergency vehicle connections. Negative issues for Alternative B include potential construction impacts, and that B doesn't provide a fourth access point. Closures at east end would be necessary, where the existing bridge ties into Elliott and crosses railroad tracks.

Benefits of Alternative D include good accessibility to Magnolia, an improved interchange at the bridge's mid-span, good access to the Port property north and south, and good emergency vehicle access. From a transportation standpoint, D also operates very well.

Alignment H also scored well because there would be two access points. Because of the two points, this option would disperse traffic and limit neighborhood impacts. Moving a

connection north would be good for the Elliott corridor and provides a potential transportation benefit.

### Discussion

- Coney** Does Alternative D include a semi-fourth access point?
- Samdahl** We assumed that all alternatives would have good north and south connections, and all would presumably have access to the spine road on the Port property to access Magnolia. Alternatives A and D are similar, but the interchange in A would have to be squeezed in by the tank farm and would create difficult access to the north.
- Foxworthy** Which alignments have at-grade intersections?
- Samdahl** In terms of Elliott Ave up to Magnolia, A would not, B would (the entrance into the Village would have to be signalized), and C would (C creates an out-of-the-way distance to Magnolia and involves a couple of intersections). F has a different kind of access to Magnolia, but no access to the Port property via the north connection. In F, all drivers would have to access the Port property via the Galer flyover. This is a big drawback for potential development of the Port property. Some of the alignments would also impact the railroad.
- Coney** Alternative H has two connections to the Port property? Is that true?
- Samdahl** No, the northern structure is too high to include ramps to the Port property.
- Coney** Why wouldn't you retain the Garfield street crossing in H?
- Holloway** That's an option, but not what we drew for this particular alignment. I suspect that will probably turn out to be a requirement of the alternative.
- Foxworthy** I'm really concerned about intersections creating delay and congestion. Did you factor in additional intersections and congestion? D is the only one that looks like it will provide grade separation. It looks like there are many intersections in B, C, (not F or E), G, and H (none associated with I).
- Samdahl** We haven't yet gotten into that level of detail in terms of our traffic analysis. We will during the next phase of our evaluation.
- Conclusion:** With no additional questions or comments, Don introduced Lesley Bain to discuss the application of urban design criteria.

## II(c). Applying Urban Design Criteria

### **Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects**

---

Lesley explained that urban design criteria deal with quality of life issues, such as views and neighborhood impacts. Different groups see the criteria in different lights, and Lesley said that she was looking forward to hearing comments from the advisory group. She also explained that she cheated by using a “+/-” because some impacts would be considered negative to some, positive to others. In other words, for some issues it was hard to assign a straight plus or minus. The other thing that Lesley tried to do when she evaluated urban design issues was to leave criteria alone that were being evaluated by others on the team. She explained that she tried to close her eyes to related issues that were being evaluated by others, even though it was hard to de-couple some of the criteria. Lesley summarized some of the criteria she analyzed:

- ♦ Dramatic entry to Magnolia: Some of the alternatives do not include the dramatic entry to Magnolia that the current bridge provides. Some come through Interbay, which would impact the drama and sense of identity created by the current configuration.
- ♦ Neighborhood impacts: Some routes would impact Thorndyke by connecting a major route to the street, creating cut-through traffic and heavier traffic volumes, which is of concern to community members. Some of these impacts can be mitigated.
- ♦ Effects on Magnolia Village: The alignments could affect Magnolia Village, depending on the visibility of the route to the Village, increased traffic on McGraw (which would change the pedestrian-friendly character of the village), etc.
- ♦ Contiguous land parcels: The Port cares about contiguous parcels of land and improved access to their land. For example, A creates an obstacle between the uplands and water, but leaves a large contiguous piece of land.

Lesley then described highlights and drawbacks for some of the alignments. For example, Alternative A connects where the bridge currently exists, which is an advantage for some. Alternative C provides a rather circuitous route through Interbay. Alternative D allows more property to be associated with the water, but does parcelize the property. Alternative E leaves the site largely contiguous, but brings access to Magnolia way up north in a rather “ungainly,” smallish structure.

In terms of criteria rankings, things like ramps up the side of 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W received a “-” based on the serious impacts these structures would have on neighboring properties. The criteria associated with views received a “+/-” because a good view from above could also be a bad view from below. Some of the alternatives provided less dramatic views, as well. Quality of shoreline was also given “+/-”, and the toughest to evaluate for this criterion was Alternative B, which could either be good or bad depending on its final design. Also, Lesley took a look at how well the alignment meshed with the spirit of the Olmsted plan (also difficult to give a straight plus or minus). The Olmsted legacy called for a route up and around Interbay. While this project doesn’t necessarily need to recreate Olmsted, it should



at least maintain the plan's spirit (for example, improvements to Thorndyke could meet this goal).

In terms of parks, Lesley looked at issues associated with the greenbelt. It would be bad to run the alignment straight through the greenbelt, and use of the park property in the area is also problematic. Lesley also considered the quality of the connections to this parkland in terms of function and visibility.

Lesley explained that it was also difficult to rank alignments in terms of how development could support transit. She explained that whatever the project can do to take pressure off of 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W is good. Amgen will ultimately be an area of density to be served by a variety of transit-oriented, pedestrian-friendly development. If good transit connections are a priority, then the alignments that fostered these connections were given preference.

### Discussion

**Chamberlain** Some of the alignments really chop up the Port's property, like Alternative H, which cuts the area into seven or more pieces. Breaking up the area into many parcels is more of a concern to us than if we were to lose certain parts near the edges for the alignment.

**Coney** When we look at flyovers to get over railroad and this interaction with the monorail, are we potentially dealing with a fatal flaw?

**Schmidt** It will be better for the monorail alignment to go up and stay up (rather than move up and down). Moving the monorail route over any flyovers will be expensive, but probably won't be a fatal flaw.

**Coney** Could you bring the monorail down along the west side of the railroad tracks?

**Schmidt** We've looked at that possibility, and eliminated it because crossing the ship canal would be too tough to the north. It will also be a difficult connection north of Dravus.

**Kenworthy** It appears that all of the criteria were weighed equally. Was that the intent?

**Bain** Urban design criteria are not scientific, so it will be another issue to determine how the criteria are valued.

**Kenworthy** I think you need to provide more information about impacts. Perhaps I haven't conveyed the importance of considering the effects to our cluster economy in Interbay. Think of the businesses that are there as keystones. If we lose, for example, City Ice or Trident, we will lose trawlers that now use pier 90/91 to Tacoma. You've been asked to evaluate and measure impacts to the cluster economy, and I again ask you to go talk with City Ice and Trident about their operations. This isn't a matter of simply affecting one or two businesses, but the impacts that this project could have on the whole

mass of businesses in the area. This cluster economy brings in a lot of dollars, and not just through offloading fish, but also through product that is ultimately destined for China, Latin America, etc. We really have to understand impacts not on individual businesses, but on the whole network. I think we need to get help evaluating these impacts.

**Coney** In taking a parting look at the ramp at Wheeler and W Armory Way, if we were able to build a ramp at W Armory Way, would that route provide access to the Tsubota sites?

**Bain** I don't know, but I can check with a person I know on that. One of the concerns as a commercial village is how you get people in and out of the facility without clogging the right-of-way along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W. Several of these alignments involve a flyover and we should see if that is a fatal flaw.

**Jones** To the extent that the ramp gets down to the surface, yes that would help access.

**Conclusion:** Lesley will investigate how potential ramps along W Armory Way might connect to the Tsubota property. With no further discussion, Lesley reintroduced Lee to discuss applying cost criteria.

## II(d). Applying Cost Criteria

---

### **Lee Holloway, HNTB**

Lee explained that the cost estimates are not exact (nor can they be at this stage), but the team has taken a guess in terms of relative costs. Construction costs will be huge, and the team also incorporated the additional costs of right-of-way acquisition, business relocation, etc. The analysis indicates that the team will be talking about tens of millions of dollars. Some of the alternatives would cost more than others, but at this stage the team would hesitate to make any decisions based solely on cost because the differences between the alignments are not significant enough. In terms of comparative cost, Alternative G looked reasonably good, as did F and B. Those were the three that stood out purely from a cost standpoint. Lee opened the floor for questions about cost criteria, but there were none.

## II(e). Initial Reactions to Criteria Evaluation

---

### **Lee Holloway, HNTB**

Because meeting time was running short, Lee turned the group's attention to the evaluation summary sheet and explained the information that it contained. In sum, the project team made recommendations in each of the disciplines, and then pulled out salient points to list on the summary. None of the alignments look to be strong all the way across the page, and none of them are standing out as clear solutions. Therefore, the project team will need to work through the evaluations in more detail to really figure out which are the front-runners.

Some of the alternatives look like they will probably to fall out [because they scored low in almost all criteria categories]. Others are still in the running for future development. Brad and Lee then asked the advisory group members for their response to what the project team had done.

## Discussion

**Jones** I'd like to say that this evaluation just came into the city staff for review, just like it's hitting the advisory group for the first time. We want you to look at this whole process and hear from you and from the public tomorrow and begin to adjust our evaluation. For example, it was suggested that instead of using the Galer flyover for some of these, that instead we use the current bridge flyover at Garfield for greater capacity. We will tweak the evaluations and designs, then decide which are the three best, and really spend some time and money to eventually get down to one. Deciding on three is a ways down the road (though not too far), and there's a lot of work to do.

**Kenworthy** My concern is that you've presented a lot of information that your asking us to consider to be true on faith, and some information I do believe is factual, but there are other assumptions I question. Before we're able to make a factual recommendation, I think we need time to digest the information you've given us. I balk at making any kind of meaningful recommendation at this point.

**Foxworthy** I agree with Lise. We can see some of the issues that are associated with each of the alignments, but I don't want to rate alignments at this point. You've presented tons of information, and I do question some of your analysis.

**Jones** Maybe we can approach it from a different perspective. It looks like a couple of the alternatives are dropping off of the table. Are there any that you really don't like?

**Hoff** I just want to clarify here. We're not asking you to cast a final vote, we're just looking to you for a gut-level read on what we've presented. I also want to thank Eric for being here, and let him know that it's OK if he doesn't have much of a response this early.

**Schmidt** Oh, I think I'll have plenty to say.

**Hoff** That's great. And if the rest of you would like to use your time to state which routes you don't like, or that you're uncomfortable providing that kind of input at this time, that's fine.

**Chamberlain** It's in the rumor mill that you posted information about your three preferred alternatives on the project website, and there are checks on this summary sheet. Have you guys made any decisions yet?

- Holloway** Those check marks on the summary sheet represent recommendations of the design team.
- Jones** The posting this morning was a mistake, and that's the problem with providing open information so quickly. Sometimes things get out there that are mistakes.
- Hoff** Maybe a good way of looking at this is that the summary provides a snapshot in a vacuum of what we think are the leading alternatives. What we need to know from you is if we're on the right track.
- Griffin** I think it's important to consider combining some of these ideas in a different way. It seems that the summary sheet indicates that some of these ideas can be combined. I like the idea of B, where you get waterfront usage. Kirk took me on a tour of the area, and it looked like a nice thing for the community, but that's just my gut reaction. Looking at H, maybe instead of moving up through the Port property, you could do something more along the lines of the Alignment B route. I like the idea of H, and I like two access points, and being able to connect with businesses from the southern end. I like B, running along the waterfront, and maybe combining a couple of ideas. It struck me when we first started looking at these that F doesn't rate well, but it goes up and over the railroad at a good spot. Mixing and matching may be good in an attempt to find something really good. I like B, some of what's going on with H, and think A always has to be there because it has worked for so long.
- Coney** I concur that mixing and matching needs to be conveyed next time. Because I carry the Queen Anne torch for a fourth access, I would support H. This could be a combination with a shoreline route and Armory as a fourth access route. I see a lot to like in D, but I like H. One of the crankiest connections is Emerson, which has most industrial traffic on it, and so far we've focused mostly on City Ice's operation, but the outer ship canal in Magnolia has tons of industrial traffic on Emerson. That's why a fourth access is so important from the city and Queen Anne point of view to keep a strong connection to major parts of BINMIC. There is not a "one bridge" set of solutions.
- Kenworthy** I'm too uncomfortable with ranking at this point. I want to report that in speaking with City Ice and Trident, they thought E and F would work and the others would not. Because of the vessels that use fisherman's terminal and Pier 91, that's a really important consideration. We've got to know that we've got our facts straight before we start making decisions. If B works with the real flow of traffic on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W and existing businesses in Interbay, then maybe it would work, but it introduces intersections.
- Chamberlain** I'd like to couch my comments because you'll hear from the Port Commission on December 10<sup>th</sup>. They'll tell you what they're thinking so far. From the perspective of how to use Port property, B is interesting because it provides opportunity and doesn't compromise what we're trying to do with

the land. Alternative B also provides a tremendous opportunity to create an interesting shoreline. I see interest there. The other that I would say fits with earlier comments is F, using Armory Way and crossing north of the terminal. I think I'd like to add, too, that in looking at them, nothing jumps off the page as a bright shining solution. It's difficult, even if you go to 25 options, to pick the best solution. This is a very complicated area with so many things to consider, and I don't envy your position. In terms of opening the north end of the terminal, that's good, but will be a sensitive issue with the NAC [Neighborhood Advisory Council], but yes, if there's some way to open it, there may be opportunities.

**Calhoun** I think that my comments would be for A, B, and H. I know a lot of people who would like the bridge to stay where it is. I think B would be a nice entry into Magnolia. I also think that it wouldn't be hard to get homes along that alignment. Several of the homes on the beach are on the market, and owners want to move. The houses aren't selling (and they're on the market for around \$1 million each), so I don't think it will be as hard to negotiate as we think it would be. There aren't many houses there (8 homes), but you will have problems with the people living on 32<sup>nd</sup> (although that street is wide).

**Holmstrom** I can't add a lot to this discussion. I'm uncomfortable providing a ranking, and need to absorb the information that's been presented. I couldn't put my finger on any I like yet. I'm against any business dislocation. I also wouldn't like to see a route go into Thorndyke. I'm concerned about waterfront and park access, and like the idea of B. I can't offer more without digesting more.

**Fahlman** I like B, D, and A, with B being the best, particularly with a spine road. Alternative B would be a beautiful ride. My preference depends on how a bike path would be built into the bridge, and whether we would be competing with the cars. I nearly create a head-on collision on the current bridge frequently, when cars try to pass me. Connecting to Myrtle Edwards is really important. Maybe you could provide a flyover where bikes could get off earlier and get to Myrtle Edwards Park. I would like to talk to a few bikers about this statement, but I don't mind going further if the route's not as steep. If the route is beautiful, that's great (and recreational bikers would like the route better).

**Foxworthy** Everyone likes B, and I do too, but it may have fatal flaws. The alignment forces everyone through one intersection to the Village. The existing route fans people out into village. If the new route had a full four- or five-lane section into the Village, then everyone would be pushed through. Whether you signalize the intersection or not, you would really change the Village. Also, there are seismic issues associated with B, which could be ugly. I like the idea of a smaller road or a couple of roads. I've never thought a fourth access has been needed, and I don't like the idea of a "T" intersection into Thorndyke because there will be tremendous congestion, but if you made two alignments, you could maybe defray pressure. I'm concerned about

intersections, and whether they've been factored into this analysis so far. So, I like D. It's not influenced by any intersections and is a straight shot to Magnolia. Maybe some combination of B and H (making B a smaller alignment along the bluff and creating another connection to the north similar to H). There's also a place for A because it's been working.

**Schmidt** I think if you could recast B as a "bluff boulevard," buying 8 houses would not be insurmountable. Whatever you can do to get it around existing businesses and not lose 400 jobs, do that. From the monorail perspective, use D (I agree with Robert). If the spine road could become the fourth access into the neighborhood, then D creates more access to the Port property. The more you have at-grade roads, the better it is for development. The existing bridge is right in your face when viewed from the ferry, so moving the bridge north takes away the curse of the bridge in your face. The more you move it north for better views, the more you're asking people to go north to go south to go north. Why? It's also hard to fix that middle point until you know what the Port's doing.

**Conclusion:** With no additional comments, Brad moved to a brief discussion of the upcoming open house.

### III. Review December 5<sup>th</sup> Open House Materials

---

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

Brad explained that the advisory group had been reviewing the materials that would be presented at the December 5<sup>th</sup> Open House, and invited members to attend.

### IV. Public and Closing Comments

---

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

Brad invited the public to contribute any thoughts or feedback.

**Bartlett** If you selected Alternative B on the waterfront, would you be able to incorporate security at the Elliott Bay Marina?

**Jones** That hasn't been considered, but is a good point. People at the Elliott Bay Marina are saying that they're not having problems with crime because there is currently a dead-end road, but the Shilshole Marina is having problems because people can pick things up and have two ways out.

**Traven** I like B, and don't like a second route connecting into Thorndyke, but I agree that another access point into the Magnolia neighborhood would be good.

**Chamberlain** When will you be briefing businesses about the project?

- Hoff** December 12, 2002, at 2:30 PM in Amgen's conference room.
- Coney** I would encourage you to look at access to Armory Way from 15<sup>th</sup> Ave W and work with Eric. See where pylons might land, and how this might relate to the Tsobota property.
- Conclusion:** With no additional discussion, Brad reminded the advisory group that the next meeting would be January 8, 2003, at the same time and location. Brad adjourned the meeting.