



Design Advisory Group Meeting #30

Magnolia Community Center
June 6, 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
- ✓ 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 #29 Summary Minutes*
- ✓ *Magnolia Community Emergency Access Strategies – Summary of City/Port staff discussions – June 6, 2007*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 5*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Lighting*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Overlooks*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Wall Treatments*
- ✓ *Aesthetic Treatment – Bike Path*

I. Welcome

Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues

Sarah welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. She noted that Brian Elrod of HNTB is attending to receive input from the Design Advisory Group (DAG) that will guide the advancement of aesthetic design elements during the summer. Sarah asked for edits to the May 2 DAG meeting summary by the following Wednesday and apologized for not sending the summary electronically in advance of this meeting.

II. Project Updates

Kirk Jones, SDOT

Kirk Jones shared project updates. He also asked Dan Burke of the Port of Seattle to share recent developments in detour planning between SDOT and the Port of Seattle.

Detour Planning

Dan Burke reported that he has been working with David Schneider, City of Seattle, over the past month. They have added some new language to the draft detour plan and Dan provided the group with a handout of the revised text (*Magnolia Community Emergency Access Strategies – Summary of City/Port staff discussions – June 6, 2007*). The revised document discusses potential detour roadways that would cause the fewest impacts to existing tenants and ship crews. The Port Commission has discussed their interest in updating this plan each year.

Port of Seattle Coordination

Kirk updated the group about project coordination with the Port of Seattle. The soil boring team is currently working on Port property and will be done in two to three weeks with all 23 borings in the area. SDOT and the Port are working together to make sure the planned foundation locations for the new Magnolia Bridge fit with the work at Berth M on the Port property. That pier is old and cannot support loads and the Port will rebuild the pier and the sea wall.

King County Metro Coordination

SDOT met with King County Metro two weeks ago to discuss the bus stop that is currently in the middle of the bridge. Metro sees a need for that stop in the future and generally does not change routes unless there is a big change in rider demand. For planning purposes, SDOT will assume the current bus stop location will remain. The bridge design at this time only has a sidewalk on the south side, so the team is thinking of ways to accommodate the bus stop on the north side. SDOT is also considering a bicycle and pedestrian trail from Myrtle Edwards Park to connect with the bridge and with the railing and platform for the bus stop. Another option is to keep the bus stops near the on-and-off-ramps and have a standard six- or seven-foot wide sidewalk that ends at the bus stop. SDOT will compare those two concepts.

Type, Size & Location (TS&L) Study

The final draft of the TS&L study was completed a week and a half ago. HNTB has received comments from Kirk Jones and Kit Loo of SDOT and are making adjustments.

The document is very large and SDOT will post it on the website in a week or so. The TS&L study encompasses all the work done to decide on the final alignment and structure type and will be posted as several files for easier downloading. SDOT will send the DAG a note when the TS&L study is online. There will also be CDs of the document available.

Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA)

The Draft EA and the biological assessment were sent to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) in March and they have not responded yet. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is going through a reorganization at this time and is also trying to respond to requests from higher-priority projects, including the Alaskan Way Viaduct and the SR 520 Bridge. Kirk did receive a note in response to his inquiry about the timeline and will be pushing staff in Olympia to respond in detail.

Discussion

Dan Burke: Do these agencies have a time limit for responding to us?

Kirk Jones: No, they don't. This project has federal funds supporting it and so is technically a FHWA project. They can take their time and we'll just hope they are quick.

III. Design & Aesthetics

Brian Elrod, HNTB

Brian introduced himself and reminded the group that last year they reviewed a variety of options for railings, street lights, pedestrian lights, accent lights, and other features. The input from that meeting has guided the continued development of design options, following the maritime and contemporary/progressive themes that were preferred. Brian presented the current design options.

Railing

The first page of the design handouts, *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 5*, shows Alternative 1 with concrete pilasters, steel tube railing, and inserts of wire mesh every 30 or 40 feet. The pilasters could have pedestrian lighting. This structure is 54 inches from paving level to the top of the rail, including a 6-inch curb. Alternative 2 shows a similar option with a 2-foot-high wall that might have more visual appeal. The top view of Alternative 2 shows the south side railing and the lower view shows the traffic barrier on the other side of the walkway. The roadway lighting in these options would be similar to what is there today – a city standard light that would be on the traffic barriers.

The second page, *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*, shows a top rail that is a steel tube with pickets in the middle and flat bars that serve as posts. The railing in Alternative 1 on this page is from the rail top to the curb, whereas in Alternative 2 there is a low concrete wall with pilasters. Alternative 2 would also allow some accent lights close to the sidewalk level that would help with way-finding, while the main light would come from pedestrian or roadway lights. SDOT could use the same accent lights on the traffic barrier.

Lighting

The lighting shown on this page, *Aesthetic Treatment – Lighting*, reflects maritime and contemporary themes. The team heard input that lighting should resemble the lights in the Magnolia neighborhood. The low accent lights shown have a maritime feel but also a modern look.

Overlooks

The overlook page, *Aesthetic Treatment – Overlooks*, shows various overlook areas the team is considering given the location of the columns and the best views available from the bridge. Locating an overlook at the third pier provides a 180-degree view from the bridge; the overlook at the ramps allows a view of the cruise ship area; and the overlook by the railroad tracks would be ideal for a pedestrian connection point. Options 1 and 2 for overlooks are included on the overlook page, and an additional option is shown on the second railing page, *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*. The team selected overlooks that would fit with the selected “curved flare” column type.

Wall Treatment

For wall treatments, shown on *Aesthetic Treatment – Wall Treatments*, the team looked at rustication and wall textures for concrete that would fit with the bridge design. The proposed pattern is a rope-like texture that provides interest and keeps with a maritime theme. The yellow areas on the map are the proposed wall locations and the three options for walls use the same texture, broken up in different ways.

Bike Path

Finally, the *Aesthetic Treatment – Bike Path* handout shows one new option for a bicycle and pedestrian connection (Option 5). The ramp is very long to meet ADA standards, so most options include several switchbacks. Option 5 has a loop that might be easiest for a bicyclist to navigate. The team will continue looking at these options and examining how to extend the ramps on the north side of the bridge as well.

Brian asked for comments from the DAG members.

Discussion

Sarah Brandt: Can you let us know the type of input you would like from the group at this time?

Brian Elrod: We would like to come to a conclusion about railing, lighting types, and other amenities so we can refine those details to the 30% level and get them into the bridge package.

Gerald Dorn: We want one preferred light, one rail, one pedestrian connection, one overlook, etc.

Doug Lorentzen: The difference between the railing options is that the flat bars (*Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*) look cheaper and the tube is better. I don't think the wire mesh (*Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 5*) does anything for the design. I prefer the look of Option 6, but I prefer the hanging style of lamp.

Jose Montaña: The tube railing is better. I prefer Alternative 2 (*Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*) because the pilasters break up the length of the pipe. Without that the structure is too big – breaking it up makes it more human scale. For lighting, I like the contemporary option (Contemporary Pedestrian Lamps, left side).

For overlooks, I prefer the curved option (see *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*). One change to that would be to have something that emphasizes the end of the railing, showing a place to stop. Comparing the other overlooks (*Aesthetic Treatment – Overlooks*), I prefer Option 1 because the curve is softer. For walls, Option 1 or 2 is better than Option 3 because there is no need to repeat the column shape as is done in Option 3.

Elrod: I forgot to mention that for the overlooks we are also looking at having different paving to indicate a different activity area. That might be an opportunity to introduce some artwork.

Montaña: Can we have lighting on the street side of the railing as well?

Elrod: There will be roadway lights on the street side of the walkway.

Lorentzen: If you're going to use different paving as traffic calming, you might want to start that texture earlier than the actual overlook area. Usually if a car discovers they are in the crosswalk by feeling the rumble of the texture, it is too late. That would be the same for bicycles here unless you start ahead of the overlook area.

Brandt: Great. Could we go around the table and have each DAG member share their opinion?

Mike Smith: I like the contemporary lamps (Contemporary Pedestrian Lamps, left side) and Option 1 on the overlook page. The wall treatments are all great and the tubular railing seems to be preferred.

Elrod: Yes, I made that note.

Fran Calhoun: I like the hanging lights with the more marine look (left side of *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*). I also like Alternative 2, the outside rail with the half wall, and the overlook shown on that page (*Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*). I liked Option 3 for the wall treatments until Jose (Montaña) spoke and now I'm not sure.

Janis Traven: I do like Option 3 for the wall treatment and I don't have strong feelings about the other choices. I prefer the hanging maritime-type lamp (left side of *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*) and I agree with having a tubular rather than flat rail. For the rounded overlook (*Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*) is the sidewalk lower than the road? What is the white object shown there?

Elrod: The roadway and sidewalk are at the same level and the white object is a bench.

Calhoun: Will we have increased pedestrian traffic on the new bridge?

Jones: On a daily basis we don't expect increased pedestrian traffic. On weekends there might be more pedestrians, especially with the trail connection to the marina area. If those connections are made then there may be more people using the bridge as pedestrians or even traveling up to the new viewpoint park that may be developed.

Lorentzen: What is rustication?

Elrod: It's an architectural term. I'm using it to describe texturing that either reveals the concrete or recesses it back to give some detail or interest to the design.

Burke: I like the half wall with the tubular rail (Option 2 on *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*) and the same maritime light and rounded overlook shown on that page. For the wall treatment I prefer Option 3.

Jones: Visitors are more than welcome to speak up.

Lynn Austin (public): I'm from Elliot Bay Marina. It's fun for us to see this development. I think there will be more pedestrian traffic on the bridge, because many people from the marina will go out walking. The wide walkways and the viewpoints will attract people to use the new bridge and as North Bay is developed that will also increase pedestrians. I prefer the hanging style of lamps and the half wall (Option 2 of *Aesthetic Treatment – Railing – Option 6*) and I prefer either the overlook shown there or Option 1 from the overlook page. For lighting, I like the longer rectangle shape (1st row, 3rd light shown under "Recessed Pedestrian Walkway Lighting" on *Aesthetic Treatment – Lighting*) because I'm a boater and it reminds me of the kind of light on a pier or dock. I also prefer Option 3 for the wall treatment.

Elrod: To summarize, there is consensus about the light fixtures and the low wall with the steel tube design and some pilasters to provide a pedestrian scale. For overlooks there is a tie between two shapes so we'll see which fits best with the design and the bridge haunches. For wall textures most people supported Option 3. We'll continue designing with those choices and add more details to see how different elements tie together. Thanks for your input.

Dorn: Are there opinions about the pedestrian connection?

Jones: The pedestrian connection will be a separate structure that may look connected with the bridge but will not be attached, so it will not be like the Galer Flyover connection. Any thoughts along those lines would be great.

Elrod: We will try to introduce design elements wherever there are connection points and try to tie the design together with all the overlooks.

Burke: Do these designs satisfy the ADA requirements – do we need an elevator?

Jones: The bike path fulfills the requirements because there are flat areas to rest and a gentle slope. This will be a combination bike ramp and ADA ramp. We stayed away from the elevator due to maintenance and operations concerns.

Smith: So Option 1 (*Aesthetic Treatment – Bike Path*) is a switchback and Option 5 provides more flow?

Elrod: Yes, though Option 5 also takes up a bit more space.

Jones: There was also an Option 4 that had switchbacks underneath the bridge.

Brandt: What should people do if thoughts occur to them later on?

Elrod: Feel free to email us or call us.

Burke: Are you looking for a group consensus or just individual input?

Elrod: I would like more of a group consensus.

Burke: Do you feel that you have enough of a consensus to move ahead?

Elrod: Yes, I do.

Jones: This was very helpful. We'll see which materials are available and take that into consideration as well.

IV. Next Steps

Kirk Jones, SDOT

Kirk explained that the DAG will meet in August, rather than July, to give Brian Elrod time to finalize some designs. Hopefully the FHWA will have commented on the project by then as well. The next DAG meeting will be on August 1 from 4:00 to 5:30 pm at the Magnolia Community Center.

Discussion

Brandt: The project will be at the June 23 Magnolia farmer's market, the Magnolia Summer Festival in early August and the farmer's market again in September. Feel free to stop by and see us.

Jones: We usually receive good feedback from those events and talk to folks that don't come to other meetings.

Smith: Has there been any discussion of doing preliminary work for some segment of the bridge and getting funding for that chunk of the work?

Jones: This particular bridge doesn't lend itself to being segmented. We are working on the foundation designs and carrying those forward to be prepared for any emergency response or future construction. The more advanced foundation design allows a future contractor to begin construction while the superstructure design is underway. That's the strategy for effective use of our funds. We're carrying design up to 30% for the whole structure and bringing the foundations to the 60% level. In an emergency we'd be in a good position, though hopefully that situation will not arise.

V. Public Comment

Kirk Jones, SDOT

The member of the public in attendance commented earlier in the meeting. There was no further public comment.

VI. Adjourn

Kirk Jones, SDOT

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