



## Summary Minutes

### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Updates
- III. Preferred Alternative Discussion
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Adjourn

### Attendees

---

#### Design Advisory Group

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

#### Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein A|U
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Gerald Dorn, HNTB
- ✓ Molly Edmonds
- ✓ Cela Fortier, City of Seattle
- ✓ Mike Horan, KBA
- Katharine Hough, HNTB
- Steve Johnson, Johnson Architects
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Chelsea Tennyson, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle
- Terry Witherspoon, AMEC

### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ *Agenda*
- ✓ *DAG #19 Summary Minutes*
- ✓ *Updated DAG Roster*
- ✓ *Public Input Summary*
- ✓ *Revised Comparative Impacts of Alternatives Matrix*

## I. Welcome

---

### ***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

Sarah welcomed the group and gave a brief overview of the agenda, which included the following:

- Project updates
- Preferred alternative discussion
- Next steps
- Public comment

Sarah went on to introduce a new member of the DAG representing cycling interests, Martin Mortimer. Martin gave a brief statement about his background, mentioning that he rides his bike to work as much as possible and looks forward to getting involved with this exciting process.

Sarah asked if there were any corrections to the DAG 19 meeting minutes. The DAG did not ask for any clarifications or edits. Kirk Jones stated that members would have until Friday, December 9<sup>th</sup>, to review the minutes and provide edits back to Sarah.

## II. Project Updates

---

### ***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

Kirk Jones began by stating that the project team has made a concerted effort to provide updates to community organizations in regards to the alternatives, environmental discipline reports, and the impacts outlined in the matrix. The design team is making this effort to understand how people want the city to move forward.

Over the last month, the project team has visited the organizations listed below. The list includes a brief statement summarizing what was heard at each meeting. Kirk referred people to the *Public Input Summary* handout for more information about the input received at each meeting.

- **BINMIC Action Committee, November 9<sup>th</sup>:** BINMIC does not like the Rehabilitation Alternative. City Ice reiterated a preference for Alternative A. BINMIC is working on a draft position statement.
- **Magnolia Community Club, November 10<sup>th</sup>:** Kirk did not have time to brief the group on the project, but encouraged club members to attend the November 29<sup>th</sup> Open House to learn more.
- **Queen Anne/Magnolia District Council, November 14<sup>th</sup>:** The Council did not endorse a particular alternative, but did reiterate their concerns about the length of bridge closure time and how traffic would operate during this period. The Council discussed a draft letter they plan to send to the Port and City regarding emergency protocol in the event of bridge failure.

- **Open House, November 29<sup>th</sup>:** The project team talked in depth with meeting attendees, and had a lot of time for questions and answers. SDOT received 21 comment forms. Alternative A seemed to be the most favored, followed by Alternative D, the Rehab Alternative, and Alternative C.
  - **Alternative A** would cost the least and maintain the most direct route, but the public had environmental concerns about shoreline impacts. Alternative A also has fewer impacts on businesses.
  - Those who supported **Alternative C** liked the potential for future development and improved bicycle/pedestrian connections.
  - **Alternative D** supporters like the shorter closure time, the bridge's greater distance from the shoreline, and the potential development opportunities between the bridge and the water. Concerns were expressed about Alternative D's impact on the marine businesses in the Interbay area. Residents along the bluff voiced concerns about the additional noise and light glare that Alternative D would create.
- **Queen Anne Transportation Committee, November 30<sup>th</sup>:** The committee voiced concerns about costs and bridge closure time, but did not endorse a particular alternative.
- **Seattle Design Commission, November 30<sup>th</sup>:** The Design Commission recommended Alternative C as the best option. Kirk noted that the commission appeared to base their recommendation on the current trend to make shorelines more publicly accessible, and that the group believed that Alternative C allows the most flexibility in redeveloping the Port property. The commission voted 7-1 in favor of this preference for Alternative C, followed by Alternative D, Alternative A (distant third) and the Rehab Alternative (could not live with this option).

## Discussion

**Kenworthy:** City Ice has taken a strong position that they actually prefer the Rehabilitation Alternative to Alternative A.

**Jones:** Before the Rehab was on the table, City Ice had always said that Alternative A was their preferred option. We thought we heard this reiterated recently, but maybe we did not understand correctly.

**Kenworthy:** Over the last two years how many presentations have been made in front of the Seattle Design Commission?

**Jones:** This was our fourth presentation to them.

- Kenworthy:** Do the members of the Design Commission have an understanding of the business impacts of the Alternatives?
- Jones:** David is the chair of the Design Commission, and I believe he has a good understanding of the impacts.
- Kenworthy:** Did the Design Commission members review the Economic Impact Study prepared for this project?
- Spiker:** It's the Design Commission's role to look at how we view the long-term design impacts of projects. We try not to get too involved in areas we aren't experts in, like economic impacts.
- Burke:** Did the Design Commission take into consideration that Alternative C would not work with the Port of Seattle's plans?
- Spiker:** Kirk did give us the Port's position. There are two long-term trends we all accepted: 1) More shorelines are becoming more public, rather than less public, and 2) Businesses will transition and continue to change. We feel Alternative C is the best option because it gives the most land use flexibility closest to the water. It would be strange to rebuild a viaduct-like structure that would impede access to the water. I will say that the Design Commission historically preferred Alternative H, but given the alternatives that are currently on the table, Alternative C seems the best at this point. Given the nature of the Port's plans, I didn't see a problem with Alternative C coexisting with the Port's Master Plan. I personally don't see where the conflict is.
- Jones:** Are there other questions about the information presented?
- Mortimer:** What does impervious surface mean?
- Jones:** Impervious surface is any hard surface that catches water that has to be discharged through a storm drain system. Alternative A moves to the south and covers land not yet paved. Alternative D will not increase impervious surface because it would be built over an area already paved.
- Mortimer:** How does the impervious surface impact the surrounding area?
- Jones:** There is no significant impact. The runoff for any of the options will be treated before it flows to the Sound.
- Mortimer:** Is there any certainty that businesses might vacate this area?
- Jones:** Our goal is to relocate businesses on the same sight. For example, we are taking away Anthony's Seafood's truck loading access. This can be handled in several different ways. If they still want to occupy the top floor of the building, we could use elevators or ramps. If this doesn't work for them, we

could relocate them to another building on the site. Our goal is to keep these businesses in tact in this area.

**Kenworthy:** City Ice and Trident are large successful businesses in the area. Trident does seafood processing there. Trident has advised me that it cannot live with Alternatives C or D. Trident buys raw fish product, which is trucked upland from the piers. Trident, which has limited cold storage, depends on City Ice to hold thousands of tons of fish in its cold storage until Trident is ready to process it. There is a poor understanding in the city about how much revenue these companies bring into our community from other states and other countries. The product is later shipped out by truck or rail. Alternative D would destroy City Ice Cold Storage Building 390. If this happens without first building a replacement facility, Trident's operations will be disrupted. Additionally, the construction impacts of Alternatives C and D are much more negative than Alternative A because the impacts would be physically much closer to Trident's operations. Trident's process equipment is set in alignment that is sensitive to vibration. It also relies on its air filtering system in the immediate vicinity. Alternatives C and D would generate more dust and dirt closer to Trident's building, which will strain the air purification system.

**Mortimer:** The message I am hearing is that Trident would vacate if any option other than Alternative A were chosen. Is this correct?

**Kenworthy:** It's more likely. If City Ice has to stop operations, Trident will basically be dead in the water. The only possible way around this is if a replacement facility is constructed and up and functioning well before Building 390 is destroyed.

**P. Smith:** Also, the cost for jet grouting, a technique that prevents these kinds of vibration impacts, is very costly.

**Burke:** I haven't heard specifically that these businesses will vacate, but I had thought they preferred Alternative A. I also have heard concerns about vibration and dust. For Alternative D, the team made an assumption that the bridge could shift a bit to avoid one of these businesses' buildings.

**Kenworthy:** No one is saying they would legally be compelled to leave. Management is adamant that Alternative D does not work for them. I've met with managers of these businesses who are adamant that Alternative D will not work.

**Mortimer:** Do they lease the land?

**Jones:** Yes, they lease the land from the Port, but they own the buildings on the land.

**Mortimer:** Is there any certainty about how many businesses will potentially leave?

- Jones:** Discussions have shown us that they don't want to, but that there is the potential. Again, the goal is to keep them whole on the current site.
- Kenworthy:** Is your concern how many businesses will leave or how many people would be displaced?
- Mortimer:** My concern is primarily environmental. I don't want to make a rash decision.
- Burke:** Am I correct that once a preferred alternative is chosen, there will be no more analysis done on the other alternatives?
- Jones:** The Environmental Assessment will state what the preferred alternative is and then compare it to the other alternatives.
- Kenworthy:** Are all the discipline reports now available?
- Jones:** We are aiming to have a draft report to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) by March. We're optimistic that they would approve the discipline reports by April.

### III. Preferred Alternative Discussion

---

#### ***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

Kirk stated that the plan was to go around the table and hear from each DAG member about their preferences on the alternatives. The design team would like to see if there is any sort of consensus on what recommendation to pass onto the mayor. Because the DAG has spent a lot of time on this project, and likely have a better understanding of project issues than the general public, their opinions and concerns are greatly valued.

Sarah commented that while the goal is to come to some sort of consensus, the design team would also capture any minority opinions and summarize based on everyone's comments today. She asked that people be as concise as possible during the first round of input. Then, the group will have a chance to provide additional comments and engage in a broader discussion.

DAG members were asked to provide their final input on which of the remaining Magnolia Bridge project alternative (A, C, D, or Rehabilitation Alternative) should be chosen as the preferred alternative. Each member was encouraged to note which alternative was their preferred option, and whether the remaining alternatives were okay, not preferred ("Don't Like"), or unacceptable ("Can't Live With"). Each DAG member's comments about why they ranked the alternatives as shown below is also provided.

**Table 1. DAG Member Alternative Input**

	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Okay</b>	<b>Don't Like</b>	<b>Can't Live With</b>
Dan Burke*	A, D		Rehab	C
Fran Calhoun	A			C, D
John Coney	A	C		D, Rehab
Doug Lorentzen**	A			Rehab
Lise Kenworthy	A		Rehab	C, D
Jose Montañó	A	C		Rehab
Martin Mortimer	D	A, C		Rehab
Mike Smith	A		C, D	Rehab
David Spiker	C	D	A	Rehab
Janis Traven**	A			

\* The Port's input is currently a staff recommendation, *not* the Port Commission's preferred alternative. The Commission will likely determine their preferred alternative in February 2006. At this point, Alternatives A and D appear to be the best options, but the Port Commission will deliberate further in 2006 to determine which should be preferred.

\*\* Provided input before or after the DAG meeting.

Table 2 summarizes DAG member preferences. Most of the group prefers Alternative A and would not support the Rehab Alternative. Alternatives C and D received a mix of support and opposition.

**Table 2. Overall DAG Preferences**

<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Okay</b>	<b>Don't Like</b>	<b>Can't Live With</b>
<b>A</b>	8	1	1	0
<b>C</b>	1	3	1	3
<b>D</b>	2	1	1	3
<b>Rehabilitation</b>	0	1	2	6

DAG members provided the following comments about why they ranked the alternatives as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

**Coney:** Alternative A impacts the park at the bluff the least. It also leaves open the possibility for public space to the north and seems to support the existing industrial space the best. Alternative A would need a fourth access point to make up for the lack of transportation benefits. My second choice would be Alternative C, with Alternative D and the Rehab being unacceptable.

**Burke:** This is not the Port Commission's recommendation, but rather my input as a staff person tracking this process [the Port Commission will provide input in February 2006]. Alternative A is the Port's preferred alternative. Our tenants like it, and it's cheaper. There is also a certainty factor with this one. If we

wait for the other alternatives and there is a construction delay, we would be in limbo. The worst two factors about Alternative A are the environmental impacts along the shoreline and the lengthy closure time.

From the Port staff's perspective, Alternative D could also be the preferred alternative (I'd call it "Preferred-Minus," as it might be a little less favorable than Alternative A). Our tenants feel Alternative D could negatively impact them, although I think it could work overall for the community. Alternative D seems to be a close second for the public. I no longer feel Alternative D provides any great value in regards to opening up any property. Alternative C takes away from the value of enhancing the green belt and transportation system. I don't believe our plan and Alternative C could coexist. The Rehab would be a maintenance nightmare.

**Kenworthy:** I'm glad Martin has joined us. I do want to say that the DAG can be proud of the economic impact study completed for the project because it is broader than what is traditionally done. The fishing sector supports a lot of family-wage jobs in this city. City Ice supports other businesses that we want to stay here. Seattle has lost fishing businesses in the past to Tacoma and Anacortes. It would be a great loss to the city to lose these businesses and industries.

Alternative D is absolutely unacceptable. It would be fatal for several businesses. Alternative A has the least impact on truck traffic, and in general seems to have the least negative impact. Lesley gave a great presentation early in the project from a design perspective. Alternative A helps preserve the gateway into Magnolia. Residents living at the top of the hill have reason to be concerned about light. If economically feasible, the Rehabilitation Alternative would be acceptable; it offers advantages with the current security system, works for the businesses there, does not introduce general residential traffic, and does not impede traffic flow in the area.

**Calhoun:** The people I represent don't come to Magnolia very much. Personally, I don't like the Rehabilitation Alternative. My preference would be for Alternative A, and I just can't live with Alternative C or D.

**Montaño:** Alternative A is my preferred alternative. Alternative C is okay. I don't like Alternative D, and I can't live with the Rehab.

**M. Smith:** My preference is for Alternative A because it has the least impacts on businesses in the area. I don't like Alternative C or D, and I just can't live with the Rehab.

**Spiker:** As I stated before, Alternative C is the Design Commission's preference because we believe it has the most potential for development and least environmental impacts. Alternative D is okay. We don't like Alternative A because it feels like another waterfront viaduct, and we couldn't live with the Rehab Alternative. This region has a tradition of building cheap infrastructure.



- Mortimer:** I can probably live with any of the alternatives except the Rehab if they have a designated, clearly marked bike lane. I see Alternative D as the least destructive to the environment, so I would say Alternative D is my preferred right now. I am open to discussing this more with John. Second to my advocacy for a bike lane is my concern about the environmental impacts. Alternatives A and C are okay. I don't think I could live with the Rehab. This structure is long past its time. I'm more concerned with being "nickel and dimed" to death for maintenance.
- Jones:** Additional comments?
- M. Smith:** Access to the waterfront for Magnolia hasn't been addressed.
- Jones:** The City is assuming this will happen in the Port's development plans. My gut says they will be ahead of us. The connection would be along 21<sup>st</sup> Ave to the marina. If the Port backs off and the City gets ahead, then it's the City's obligation to provide this connection. The City Council gave us clear direction that the connection needs to happen.
- Kenworthy:** 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW is a vital artery. There is a need to improve mobility on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave no matter which alternative is selected.
- M. Smith:** One lane should be designated carpool/bus on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave.
- Coney:** What kinds of impacts does Alternative C have on the greenbelt? We are adding a lot of density throughout Magnolia, but we're not adding organized sports parks. This is the only big tract of level land for a playfield. To all who are concerned about parks, this is an important resource that needs to be taken seriously. Alternative A supports provision for a playfield better than others. It doesn't occupy/subtract from developable land the way Alternative C does. However, Alternative C does allow for a bike/pedestrian connection.
- Mortimer:** How wide will the new bridge be?
- Jones:** It will be 70 feet wide. The railing is currently so low, that if a vehicle bumps a bicyclist, you don't just fall over, you really *fall* over.
- Mortimer:** There are two other access points to Magnolia. I currently use Dravus-to-15<sup>th</sup> Ave-to-Emerson to get to work. There is already a lot of traffic leaving Magnolia in the morning. Won't the traffic only increase while the bridge is closed? Has there been a study done on how much traffic will increase during construction?
- Jones:** We have based it on our experience after the earthquake. Something must be done at Emerson to provide extra capacity going eastbound. We are looking

at how to better facilitate this movement. This will be studied further as we develop a detour plan.

#### IV. Public Comment

---

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

Three members of the public were in attendance. Kirk welcomed them and invited them to share any comments they had with the group.

**Susan Engquest:** I live on the ridge, and my neighbors and I strongly support Alternative A. We are concerned about the impacts of light and noise. Something that wasn't brought up is the stop light in the middle of Alternative C. We are really concerned about the flow of traffic. It doesn't take much to cause a back up.

**Tom Dyer:** There is a lot of evidence about the strength of Seattle's maritime sector and its prospects for the future. I am sorry the representative from the Design Commission left. They should be aware of the rapid surge of growth of container traffic into the Port of Seattle and the health of Seattle's maritime and fishing industry. Many of the nation's fisheries, except for one region's, are in distress. That region is Alaska and the North Pacific where Seattle's fishing fleet operates. Alaska has kept its fisheries healthy. These are Alaskan fish coming into Terminal 91 that we are speaking of when we talk about Seattle's fishing industry, and those fish will be coming into Seattle for a long time in the future.

#### V. Next Steps

---

**Brandt:** Please submit any additional comments about your preferences to me by Friday. We'll plan to email you a memo summarizing your comments by early next week.

**Coney:** Will this project go in front of the Planning Commission?

**Jones:** No.

**Coney:** Our weight has thereby increased.

**Jones:** The design team, which is made up of consultants and in-house staff, will be gathering next week to discuss the feedback we have received from you and the public and to see if we can come up with a preferred alternative. We are looking at not only technical/urban design elements, but also what the public wants. Your input is not only technical, but also political, in terms of influencing political decision makers. We want to be able to tell the director and the mayor, "Here's what the people are saying."

- Coney:** It would be good if some members of the group [DAG] could appear at the table when you brief the City Council. Jan Drago is the new transportation committee chair.
- Jones:** We would love to have some of you there. We will also be meeting again with the Port in an effort to fully understand their position. We plan to make a recommendation by the end of the year to the director and she will talk to the mayor. We're not sure how quickly we will get a decision back from the mayor. We want to also brief the Port Commission, probably at their meeting in February. I don't know if the mayor will want to wait that long to announce the preferred alternative. The DAG will most likely not meet in January or February. I think we can expect to meet again the first Wednesday of March, where we will plan to discuss the Type, Size, & Location Study. There will be fun things to look at for about the next six months.
- Kenworthy:** Could you be sure to alert us well in advance of the Port Commission meeting?
- Jones:** Yes. We will have draft minutes of tonight's meeting for you to review by the first of next week. Any comments should be returned by the end of next week.
- Coney:** As one of my outgoing duties as chair of the Queen Ann/Magnolia District Council, I will be reviewing possible funding packages. This project is likely to be on the transportation levy. Stay tuned to see what the City Council does there.
- Jones:** Thank you very much for taking time out of your day on a regular basis and being patient with us backing up and redirecting. You have been very helpful to us in this process.
- Conclusion:** **With no further comment from the project team or the DAG members, the meeting was adjourned.**