# Public Comment Report
## Open House 2
### Blaine School, December 5, 2002



## Introduction

The second Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project open house was held on December 5, 2002, at the Blaine School in Magnolia. This document includes the comments captured verbatim on flipcharts during the meeting, and input submitted via comment forms both at and following the open house (an evaluation and summary of submitted comments will follow). The five questions asked on the comment form were as follows:

- Which are your top three alternatives? Why?
- Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?
- Please comment on the evaluation process.
- The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if…
- Additional comments.

Several people attached additional documents to their comment forms or submitted copies of letters at the open house. These text from these documents have also been included below.

## Flipchart Comments

The following comments were captured on flipcharts during the second Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project open house (December 5, 2002).

### General Comments

- I like how you are looking at a wide range of options. This forces us all to think about priorities and alternatives. Debate is good!
- I approve of alternatives A and D.
- A and D are the best alternatives. Why eliminate our beautiful entrance?
- I like the use of the existing entrance and exit – this works well for access.
- I suggest providing a water-taxi from downtown during construction.
- We don't need another steep bridge like Dravus. Snow can close both and leave us with no access to Magnolia.
- The same location as the old bridge is best.
- A fourth path is needed during construction of replacement or repair.
- A link from Marina Drive to 32nd Ave W is okay, but without condemnation or extreme roadwork.

**Alignment A**

- This is the best option. We can live with a temporary bridge closure.
- This alternative offers the least impact to the neighborhood, and doesn't ruin the charm of why we live here!
- This is the only sane option presented here.
- I agree, this is the only sane option presented.
- Replace the bridge with a beautiful new one.
- This is the best of all possible worlds!
- A 2-year wait is nothing – people can deal with that.
- This is a fair solution. Impacts to residents remain relatively constant.
- This offers poor bicycle and pedestrian access and facilities, because of the steep grade on the structure.
- This alternative makes the most sense – we can live with a bridge closure during construction. This is the best solution for traffic flow and minimal disruption to the neighborhood.
- This is a huge structure on unstable ground.
- This alternative does not look to future needs of traffic flow.
- This alternative is poorest in terms of **safety** – it has the highest risk to City and residents because of the bad landfill.
- This has no/nominal aesthetics.
- This offers the best traffic solution. Traffic can dispense to 28th or Thorndyke on Magnolia Village without traffic controls.
- I don't mind a bridge closure during construction to maintain good access.
- Bridge closures are not a problem. This is a "100 year" bridge – what's a few months? Do it right.
- This is the best solution with the least impact on residents. It avoids traffic bottlenecks.
- This is the best proposal – "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." We can deal with the inconvenience for the right solution.
- I agree, this is the best solution and any inconvenience can be dealt with.
- This works now.

(Alignment A continued)

- I like this alternative!
- This alternative needs a "fourth access" for traffic during construction and to handle traffic to future developers of Port flatland.

- This looks very good.
- A straight line may cost less money and means minimal adverse impacts to property owners.
- We need a 4th access at grade. Earthquakes break bridges.
- This is a perfect idea with a perfect location.
- This maintains three good accesses to south, north, and west Magnolia.
- This is the only idea that makes good sense.
- This alternative is the most at risk to a future earthquake!
- It makes sense to use part of the existing route.
- Minimize the bridge closures during construction, or use a different plan.
- This is what I prefer. Now, I live in central Magnolia, so of course I prefer it. However, there are the greatest number of people in the Magnolia area severed by this alternative – and the most access to the Village.
- I like this alternative for biking.
- This option maintains great access to south Magnolia.
- This is my preferred solution!
- I suggest water-taxi and streetcar enhancements during construction, which would remain afterward. The streetcar would run from Magnolia Village to the Downtown Waterfront Streetcar.
- This alternative makes good use of the existing infrastructure on East and brings traffic into the appropriate area in south Magnolia. It works for the family wage job-earners now living there. "B" also holds promise with regards to a structure east of the bluff and cost.
- Yes.
- This alternative makes sense. It keeps the existing traffic pattern with the least disruption.
- This is one of the most logical alternatives.
- This one will work and does not have so many curves.

**Alignment B:**

- Not good for canyon residents. Environmental protest noise problems. Marine concerns. Least preferred.
- No "causeway" out over the water.
- Visual – noise blight on the Magnolia Bluffs – thumbs down!
- No! Keep the BLUFFS beautiful.
- Good backup for Magnolia residents and access to marina this should not be a major path but only back up. No condemnation of property and keep two lanes only!
- Does not smoothly diffuse traffic – dumps all traffic in one spot – ruins the feel of our magnolia community. Unsafe.
- I like this route, but I am concerned about the termination point. Traffic stays in a high-pedestrian area.

(Alignment B continued)

- I like this route. It provides great access to the marina, village, and provides gentle grad for pedestrians and bicyclists. The view to the water is a bonus.
- Great direct access to village (Magnolia Business Center) – keeps route out of neighborhoods (residential areas).
- Users of the marina would have easier access to village.

- Could be a beautiful entrance to the community.
- Best southern route. Low cost. Best as two-lane road. Must combine with north access at W. Armor Way to distribute traffic load. Best emergency access for SFD.
- Best long-term aesthetics will outweigh costs.
- Bravo! Two thumbs up.
- Provides needed south access and access to village and commercial areas.
- How do you get to Magnolia Blvd.? There is no access to the W. Howe St. Bridge.
- This would be the worst alternative!
- Worst idea I've ever imagined to ruin perfectly beautiful waterfront.
- This looks like the "Magnolia Viaduct" built along the beautiful waterfront. We don't want a bridge built along the water.
- Best way NO bridge at all.
- Have we not learned – no to another viaduct along the waterfront.
- Minimal shoreline impact, direct route to village but all the traffic winds up there…Queen Anne? Minimal impact on residential area.
- Terrible wetland impacts.
- Finally some relief for long suffering Magnolia merchants.
- To lose a good beach is nonsensical.
- Shop at village and walk to beach – couldn't if B. were used.
- Should open gate to Park and include path.
- This solution means residents lose their homes – drs. placed by road – houses razed.
- Eastern Segment could work if span is elevated further to allow moving cargo from pier to cold storage north of bridge. Has good possibilities.
- Good alternative – gives pedestrian & bicycle access to Magnolia without climbing a steep hill.
- This makes the least sense of any alternative. Destroys wetlands, eliminates park, destroys existing neighborhood, and puts too much traffic directly into village.
- High geological hazard is right! How can we build below an unstable slope in earthquake country?
- This is a very good way to go.
- Absolute Best. A great approach to a beautiful community.
- Good noise control.
- Why do we need more Thorndyke access other than Dravus? I like this.
- How is it beautiful to destroy the only remaining easily accessible beach in Magnolia? All the traffic winding up in downtown Magnolia will place a heavy burden on pedestrians. It's already very dangerous to walk through downtown. Who wants another Queen Anne traffic nightmare?

(Alignment B continued)

- Substantial noise mitigation for large number of people. Routes commercial traffic directly to commercial area.
- Outlandish! Sacrifice saltwater beach for a road!
- 1987 Federal Environmental Impact Statement? Just ignore it?
- Why ruin a lovely beach in Magnolia? Crazy!!
- We don't want a road built on top of our homes.
- Great Idea! Love it!

- Prohibited by federal impact study Jan. 1987 Elliot Bay Marina, Technical appendix, page P-27 & P-12.
- Makes perfect sense!
- What about the old Wolf Creek. Does this impact restoration?
- Like it – good access to west hill.
- Ridiculous! – High shoreline impact, urban design should not be graded so highly.
- Negative impact on shoreline and greenbelt.
- This will cause major traffic at the village and would require traffic lights. Boo.
- Seattle cannot use any more beach, and beach access – puts all traffic into center of village, bad traffic flow.
- Waterfront is our unique resource. Lets not put a major road on it.
- Why use waterfront instead of Interbay right-of-way??
- Save the beach – think of future generations use also! This alternative would drastically alter the pedestrian oriented character of Magnolia village not a good solution!

**Alignment C**

- No residential displacement but <u>significant</u> impact to homes on the hillside – including disturbing a slide sensitive area.
- Agree with above, also too long and complicated. This serves port group only and development of that property.
- Doesn't help us in Magnolia. Too curvy.
- Very poor for peds and bicycles – long way around and steep hill.
- Too close to hillside that is unstable. Vibrations from traffic may cause slides.
- No! And please quit assuming what Mag wants is rep on citizen's committee – these <u>all</u> serve the Village, marina interests, as well as, development at Smith Cove (about 1/3 Mag is involved…)…and DLCI can <u>approve</u> (probably will!) anything… BUT – slope is critical – how many millions have we spent since 1931 on "slope," earthquake issues – middle of road is Wheeler or some form of Lawton [?] Trestle of (old!). THANKS for your work!!!
- Don't like it – introduces a stop.
- No more stops.
- Free pork for the Port – NO!
- Ridiculous flow-design.
- This appears to have significant slide impact to residences along the hill.
- Wipes out path along greenbelt; path not shown on any drawings.
- A 90-degree turn? This doesn't make sense.

**Alignment D**

- I like this solution, especially from an environmental perspective. Let's keep the bridge with the Interbay areas, an area that is urban, not parkland and wild life habitat.
- NO! TOO LONG & INVOLVED. The "Magnolia Bridge" is being rebuilt to serve Magnolia not the Port of Seattle, which already has to many built in "perks" & little regulation in public oversight.
- Good: maintains access to southern Mag.
- Close to proposed ETC station.

- Good access to central business district.
- Poor access for pedestrians and bicycles.
- Too expensive – doesn't make use of new Elliott Ave flyover.
- Consider emission pollution for residents. Wind generally comes from SE.
- Huge noise and exhaust impact to residents above.
- High risk w/ slide area – high liability for city and drivers.
- Poor access for emergency vehicles.
- Simple, fluid solution takes unused space and uses it well. Non-Stop.
- Like it! Existing connection points work well.
- Adverse impact for property owners on east bluff. We already deal with Port and RR noise. Ditto- no freebies for the port!
- Great.
- Good, simple solution. Uses existing infrastructure at each end.
- It's a winner.
- Great! Nice way into Magnolia and future for Port property.
- Highest construction cost – let the Port build their own access.
- Looks pretty good.

**Alignment E**

- Good solution, in part, for extra pathway.
- Where would Monorail stop be located?
- Bad traffic impact – no direct access to village – filtering thru residential neighborhoods will occur.
- "T" intersection at head of bridge will create a bottleneck traffic nightmare!
- Very objectionable – no water access poor for village access.
- NO!
- Best Choice – No snow closures, due low grade on Thorndyke.
- How often does it snow?
- No access to southern Magnolia.
- Not aligned with (proposed) ETC station.
- Not good access to central business district.
- Makes walking to waterfront from central and southern Magnolia more difficult.
- Terrible – would turn W. Boston into a heavily trafficked thoroughfare, as its becomes the major access to village.
- NO! Very awkward & Boston St. can't handle that traffic.
- Moves southern Magnolia access farther north – BAD idea.

(Alignment E continued)

- (I'm a kid) to: the best school in the west from Sarah (?). I don't want the bridge to move because there will be traffic on Boston Street.
- Terrible alternative. Please improve access to Village and Magnolia. This makes it more difficult. Sight distances are already bad for drivers getting on to Thorndyke. Increase in traffic volumes will only create accident problems.
- Good option with Alignment B.
- Like it-.
- Works well.
- Hate it. Puts too much traffic through residential areas.
- Don't like. Will divert traffic away from Village, suppressing business and Village vitality.

- Don't like it – poor access to West Hill, forces traffic through residential streets.
- Again we loose our gracious "front door" and get another back door. No good.
- Most access is in North sector (already have 2 bridges in North).
- Would cause more neighborhood traffic, noise.
- Does zero to improve Village/commercial access.
- No. 1. Further to travel in congested 15th from downtown 2. Destroy neighborhood from Thorndyke to Village. 3. Too far from Village.
- Ditto #9's comments – the Thorndyke can't take more cars – Bad idea.
- Too close to Dravus access. Need more southern entrance to Magnolia.

**Alignment F**

- This plan is not consistent with the proposed ETC monorail station.
- The access to south Magnolia is not good!
- This is not good for central Magnolia residents.
- ETC has an alternate station at Gillian. This could be put at Wheeler.
- This is by far the worst option for businesses and residents!
- Thorndyke can't handle the traffic congestion. We lived through that twice and it took an hour and a half to go ten blocks!
- This is a bad idea. Thorndyke and Boston can't handle this traffic.
- No, no, no!
- This is very confusing. Good luck to our Village and our marina.
- This is the best northern route. It must combine with alternative A. Design a northbound exit from 15th Ave W at Wheeler as an underpass west into Wheeler.
- This is no good.
- This has no good access to southern Magnolia and is too close to Dravus to be useful. This could actually hurt Dravus businesses as I think most traffic would then opt for the Wheeler flyover. Keep the bridge where it is – in an urban and commercial area only.
- This is a bad location. The bridge should be kept where it is.
- This option would be bad for the Magnolia Village.
- This offers no access to south Magnolia.
- This seems like a good alternative. But what happens when the Y joins traffic concerns? What are the relocation and condemnation costs?
- This alternative would make it too difficult to access the west hill.

(Alignment F continued)

- Better access to the village is needed.
- This is a joke! Why not just send residents up Dravus?
- This alternative only helps the Port.
- This is a stupid location. Why not just use Dravus?
- This would destroy neighborhoods from Thorndyke to Magnolia Village.

**Alignment G**

- Bicycle access is a big plus!
- This is another example of constructing in a geologically hazardous area. When will the big quake happen?
- This is not good for walking or bicycle access and connections with the Myrtle Edwards trails.

- This is building along a slide-sensitive area with homes above. It puts extra exhaust fumes into a valley, which pushes the dirt and fumes up into homes.
- This is further from the Monorail station at 15th and Galer.
- This design is patently absurd, and way too long. We pay the Port enough in taxes without a further subsidy!
- This alternative is good for the Port, but not good for Magnolia.
- Isn't this a bridge to Magnolia? Forget the Port, all the way.
- This is a good option. It maintains the current access to Magnolia, which is good.
- This is too long. Let the Port build their own road!
- This alternative adversely affects property owners along the east bluff, with more noise than Port and railroad cause now.
- This is too steep and too long.
- No way! No pork for the Port!

**Alignment H**

- Can we afford two bridges? Could they be one-way (possibly a better use!???) Too much…stay with I – Village can attract customers if they practice "sound" (no pun intended) business practices serve customers needs!
- Fourth access is good especially when port develops flatland
- Need to retain existing 15th Ave ramp (along with flyover). Why? Southbound traffic off Magnolia.
- Good solution. Addresses Magnolia's future growth.
- Bad design too steep.
- The "bait & switch" scheme – you draw two and build one.
- Forces use of new flyover, which is used by trucks. Also introduces a stop.
- Displaces 500+ jobs – high mitigation cost?
- Don't force us over the flyover. Too slow.
- No
- Bicycles don't want to have to wait for traffic; too dangerous.
- Huge impact on homes above – noise – exhaust fumes.
- Don't want two bridges.
- Nose and pollution on hillside.

(Alignment H continued)

- Increased slide exposure to hillside.
- Marina access is confusing.
- Poor emergency vehicle access.

**Alignment I**

- It would be sad to lose our beautiful entry to Magnolia – save!
- With minimal impact to bike routes, will any access for bikes be provided?
- Will cutoff Mag. Village?
- Traffic nightmare for left turns at head of bridge. Sever impacts on Thorndyke residents. And the village is isolated.
- Bad traffic impact on Thorndyke – keep our current Gateway to Magnolia.
- W. Boston cannot handle the traffic.
- This is the worst idea. Horrible! Boston is a small, residential street. It isolates the village. I hate this one!

- This is awful. West Boston is too narrow and this would disrupt the neighborhood. Access to the village would be hampered with negative impact on business.
- Moves southern Magnolia access point farther north-bad.
- Steep grade hard for pedestrian and bicycle access.
- A good 4th bridge, keep I+H and A (?).
- Too close to Dravus Access. Need to put access further south.
- Not a good idea, bad idea.
- Does not support access to village.
- No clear how bus access would be impacted.
- Not aligned at proposed ETC station.
- Must have a bike path! Thanks.
- Street directly off bridge is too small to handle traffic that didn't know to go left on right. Very poor design traffic wise.
- Hate it!!
- Ditto that!
- Also above
- Streets too small to handle thousands of cars.
- Ruin village business.
- Too far to village.
- This is the worst proposed – I thought you were thinking to improve traffic?
- This is best by far…in all areas of consideration!
- Not connected to village business narrow street (Boston)
- Good compromise!
- Make a good use of currently useless space.
- (Incorrect this area is highest density of people)
- This stinks! We lose our "front door" and get another back door. Neighborhood streets can't handle the traffic
- No coordination with village access.
- Residential streets would become major thruways.

**Comment Form Input**

More than fifty comment forms were submitted during or after the open house. The input from these forms is captured below. Several comment forms were attached to additional documents, which have also been included. Comments from individuals are separated by horizontal lines.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
We are in favor of plan B – beautiful approach, quieter and most importantly seems to disturb fewer residences.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
Anything using Thorndyke as an entrance to or from Magnolia – Thorndyke would have to be widened, thereby creating condemnation, by eminent domain, of many dwellings.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*

Appreciation of efforts to involve residents of Magnolia, but wonder if our input will carry weight. Final decision will be the Port Authority, we think.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) It happens in our lifetime. Good luck!

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*

1) "A" – no residence or traffic changes.
2) "D" – no traffic pattern changes.
3) "B" – direct feed to the center of Magnolia, <u>but</u> at the cost of some homes, which I feel, is needless taking of property.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*

I, F, and E. All three would disrupt the traffic and arterial flows and would adversely affect the peace and quiet of the neighborhoods, as we now know them.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Not even one homeowner is forced to vacate.
2) It promotes arterial usage, not shortcutting through residential areas.
3) When it's complete, it feels as if nothing has changed.

*Additional comments:*

Magnolia is a fully matured residential area with established arterials and traffic patterns, not an opening of developable land. As such the bridge should be replaced in kind and location.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*

A, B, and D. They provide direct access to the south portion of Magnolia. The north portion is adequately taken care of by Emerson Street and Dravus Street. The new roadways <u>must</u> provide nonstop merging for southbound traffic onto Elliot Ave on 15$^{th}$ Ave without traffic lights or stop signs.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*

C, H, and G. They are too convoluted and do not provide direct access to the south areas of Magnolia Bluff.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*

Too early to comment – let's see some concrete actions first.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Its primary purpose is to serve the residents, i.e. homeowners of Magnolia, and is not biased to serve the Port of Seattle or the limited business interests on Magnolia, including real estate.
2) Both north and south traffic from the new bridge route have uninterrupted merging into Elliot Ave and 15$^{th}$ Ave W.

3) Access to the south portion of Magnolia is provided by the most direct route from Elliot Ave.

*Additional comments:*
Don't plan or engineer to accommodate the Monorail. It will be a passing fancy.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
1) Plan A.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
H – By far the best alternative if it can be financed. Hold a rummage sale and auction.
B – A great route to the center of Magnolia.
A – We won't need a road map.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
Listen to input and try to get more input by having a daylong display – I had just a few minutes available tonight.

*Additional comments:*
I like the presentation.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – Has the least impact and lowest cost. Straight lines are cheapest.
D – Offers minimal impact.
I – A good fourth bridge alternative.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – there is high shoreline and slope alteration, and high cost for a slightly quicker drive.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
No pens inside.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) A 4th access is made.
2) There are no slope or shoreline impacts.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
B is great because it does not rely on a high-level bridge and gives good access to the marina and Smith Cove. A is acceptable because it replaces what we currently have. D would also be okay as it is similar to A.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
E, F, and I put too much traffic on Thorndyke.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) There isn't too much disruption to existing traffic patterns.
2) There continues to be a "grand" entrance to south Magnolia.
3) Project schedule and budget are met.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
Only 2 – A and B for the advantages noted and connection with Magnolia Village.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
I – Too much residential impact.
H – Too much!
G – Too convoluted.
F – Too far north.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Good opportunity for input.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) A connection is made to Magnolia Village.
2) The least possible residential impact occurs.
3) A new structure is built close to the site of the current bridge.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – Existing entry. Keeps traffic flow as is. Limited disruption of homes or businesses. Keeps entry to Magnolia as it is. Also, by building beside the existing bridge, it minimizes closure time.
D – For the same reasons as A.
H – This adds another entry to spread traffic more.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – Would create havoc in Magnolia Village. All cars coming to Magnolia via bridge would exit at one location, which would be a nightmare.
G – No advantage over a just longer route. Also needs new exit lanes on 15th.
I – Enters Magnolia and requires an immediate left or right turn. Bad traffic flow upon entry.
F – Same as I, only worse.
E – Same as I, only worse.
C – Not good flow, longer route – no great advantage.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Excellent! Everyone who has an opinion can voice it.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Keep traffic flow to and from Magnolia smooth.
2) Do not jeopardize the waterfront or create new traffic problems.

3) Find an option supported by residents.

*Additional comments:*
Great process. A or D is very acceptable. H is best because it adds another entry.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
E – Straight shot into Magnolia, not a lot of building over Port land.
F – Same as for E, just two choices to jump onto bridge.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – Land not stable.
C – Hillside not stable.
G – Hillside not stable.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Looks like you are including people's comments. Thank you!

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) You really listen to residents.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
1) A – Well tested route
2) H
3) D

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B, C, and E. Too many curves on each.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Thanks.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Listen to the people.

*Additional comments:*
Please keep the bridge open as long as possible.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A & D are the only viable options. B harms the waterfront too greatly and all the others don't provide adequate access to Magnolia Village and south Magnolia.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*

All those that move the bridge dramatically north would greatly destroy Magnolia Village and create bizarre traffic patterns where residents would end up winding through residential streets to get to the Village, home, or Magnolia Blvd.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Existing traffic patterns aren't jeopardized.
2) Access to the marina is improved.

*Additional comments:*
Don't destroy Magnolia Village by forcing access via Thorndyke.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
The only one I like is plan B. It's the best for Village and marina businesses. Apparently, the City and consultants have not even thought about the problem of landslides along that route – so how can you figure an estimated cost? Plus – can you override DCLU and other legal barriers?

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
Most of the other alternatives are unacceptable to homeowners who will be impacted by that route.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
This style of presentations is nice, but limited. We need to hear a spokesperson (who can actually answer questions – not refer us to "that guy over there" who knows more). We need to sit down as a community group. You talk, we listen, and then we ask questions.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
Stop calling it a "Bridge project". Rename to "access route" or something. Make the new access peaceful, tree lined, homey. We don't need a <u>freeway</u> into our neighborhood.

*Additional comments:*
You should release a printout/record of comments from citizens. We are going to a lot of trouble to give you this feedback. I would like to know what others (no names necessary) say.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A, because it's about what we have and it works.
B, think it would be best for Magnolia business.
H, maybe, but a distant third choice. Would like more info first.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
E, too close to Dravus and seems redundant.
G, anything that parallels Thorndyke or east slope and cuts off pedestrian/bicycle access.
I, adds too much traffic to Thorndyke.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Great, good job – I appreciate it!

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) The southern Magnolia area is served.
2) Magnolia Village has good access.
3) No greenbelts, bike paths, or walkways are lost.

*Additional comments:*
I live on Thorndyke. There are documented problems with run-off and mudslides on the east slope. Also, Thorndyke already serves as a major arterial – please do not add more traffic to it. Finally, the Olmsted plan was mentioned at the meeting – it would be helpful to know what that vision was.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A is great; there's a need to replace the bridge.
B is a good emergency access idea, and offers great marina access.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
E, F, G, H, and I. These seem quite poor, and some will hurt Magnolia Village business.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Good process to hear opinions.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) South end access is improved – marina access is a plus.
2) Village business is fostered and access remains good.
3) Do a combination of alternatives A and B!

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A and D, as they offer the least impact.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
C, E, F, and I. Each afford multiple larger negative impacts.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) It goes fast and is most like the existing bridge access.
2) Minimal environmental impacts.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A. Works well now – no homeowners displaced. Good and even distance from Gilman and Dravus. Beautiful drive.
D. Both A and D are good ideas because they allow traffic to d.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*

Do not screw up beach with "B". Very costly. Would not fly with Shoreline Act. The Shoreline Management Agreement was signed in 1992 by the Magnolia Community Club, the Elliot Bay Marina, the City of Seattle, the Department of Ecology, and the Puget Sound Alliance, in which it was agreed there would be "No future construction" west of the marina! The marina was given its permits with this condition. Plan "B" is contrary to the basis by which the City received a deed to marina property. Plan B opposes Shoreline Act.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) It does not take away the serenity of the saltwater beach at the bottom of 32nd.
2) Does not dump traffic in one spot in Magnolia Village.
3) Does not congest the center of our Magnolia neighborhood. Right now traffic is smoothly diffused as it comes off the Bridge. Magnolia residents can use Thorndyke, 28th and the West Howe Bridge and disperse. Plan "B" does not diffuse the traffic smoothly but causes congestion all in 1 spot on 32nd.
4) Does not take homes or displace families.

*Additional comments:*
You are going to have EPA attorneys up the ying yang with Plan B. Very expensive maintenance building a road on beach clay! Think of the storms that are going to shut down the road. We like Magnolia quieter than Plan B will accomplish. Plan B will assure the City litigation.

*Additional attached comments:*
February 18, 1993

Melissa Riesland
Magnolia News
225 W. Galer
Seattle, Washington 98119

Dear Ms. Riesland:

Your front page article (February 17 issue) regarding the proposed bike trail was most interesting. I'd be remiss, however, if I did not point out some facts that were omitted, such as the following:

1. The Shoreline Management Agreement was not only signed by Elliott Bay Marina and the Magnolia Community Club but also by a) the city of Seattle, b) the Department of Ecology, c) the Puget Sound Alliance, and d) four individual residents.

2. The language in the agreement is fairly clear:

"No future construction of any kind may occur in the area between said line and the western edge of the Fill Area..."

"Such prohibition does not apply to underground utilities, underwater habitat enhancement...".

"Such construction prohibition shall not be deemed to prohibit the grant to the City of a public pedestrian easement over the access area... and the tidelands portion..."

3. The present easement is from our parking lot to the tidelands, not up to the Park property.

4. Elliott Bay Marina's property abuts the Park property. No one has asked EBM for approval to "use" more of our property.

5. The Environmental Impact Study may also play a factor - I'm asking our lawyers to look into this issue.

6. I believe I also have a document - although I haven't located it yet - that specifies that EBM had to build a fence, w1thout gates, separating our west property line from the Parks' property line. I'll try to find these agreements.

7. Elliott Bay Marina and the Parks Department to date have yet to resolve the dispute regarding the existing utility easement agreement.

Another very key question. Does the definition of "pedestrian" include bicycles? I don't believe it does.

Elliott Bay Marina has been asked "What's our position on this issue?" I cannot respond until the legal agreements are thoroughly critiqued and clarified. From my current perspective, it appears that nothing can be constructed west of the marina.

Sincerely,

Martin D. Harder
General Manager

cc: Dave Takami
Seattle Parks Department

bcc: Lee Horn
John Kaiser
Glenn Edwards
Don Filer

TO: Mayor Norm Rice
Hon. George Benson, Council President
Hon. Martha Choe
Hon. Cheryl Chow
Hon. Susan Donaldson
Hon. Sherry Harris
Hon. Jane Noland
Hon. Margaret Pageler
Hon. Jim Street
Hon. Tom Weeks

DATE: June 17, 1993
SUBJECT: Proposed Elliott Bay 32nd Ave West Trail (Via West Galer Street)

We urge your rejection of the proposed trail. It would run from the Elliott Bay Marina parking lot area upland, to the eastern terminus of 32nd Ave West.

Our Neighborhood Does Not Support This Trail

We live on 32nd Ave West, Logan Street & West Galer, a narrow, substandard street. Safe passage for bikers and pedestrians on West Galer is compromised, by it's narrow width topography, residence location, and parking. We enclose a picture for your understanding, and, we invite you to come out and visit with us to understand our concerns. Our neighborhood opposes the trail, and the Magnolia Community Club, despite efforts to get it's support, has not supported this trail. Further, parties to the Elliott Bay Marina dispute, (i.e., Haggard, et al) do not support the trail.

Trail Contruction Is Contrary to the City's Agreement and Permits for the Elliott Bay Marina

Our privacy and safety were issues which, in part, resulted in permit conditions to (a) build an earthen and vegetative berm to protect our residences from the marina, (b) build a fence on the western side to preclude public access to the uplands, and (c) provide only one fence opening for the one western access to the tidelands. Mr. Walt Hundley, Parks Superintendent, in his EIS comment, believed public access was desirable to the tidelands --and it was provided. Current efforts to add another access is contrary to the SHB settlement, and issued permits, (see enclosed letter from Joel Haggard).

Trail Authorization Will Likely Cause Us To Raise Substantial Legal Issues -- A Waste of Money and Time For All of Us.

Legal disputes over authority to provide the trail may be contrary to the basis by which the City received a deed to marina property. SEPA compliance for the legislative proposal authorizing the trail is an issue, so is the permit, SHB, and judicial review processes for trail construction. We raise these questions not as a threat, but as legitimate issues for your careful consideration.

Frankly, we believe what is far more important is the attempt to break our trust in the City. We believed the matter was resolved when (a) the City authorized us to install a gate to preclude public access to the upland area, (b) the Parks Department wanted only tideland access for the marina and we agreed, and (c) the marina plans were approved with a fence and only one public access to the west.

Please recognize our trust in, and dependence upon you. Please delete the Marina/32nd Avenue West trail from the proposed SPIF recommendation.

[Petition signed by 32 Magnolia residents.]

June 18, 1993

Mr. Henry L. Horn
3033 W. Galer
Seattle, WA 98199

RE: Proposed Elliott Bay/32nd Ave. W. Trail

Dear Lee:

You have requested our opinion as to the development of a trail connection from the Elliott Bay Marina parking lot area to the eastern end of a sub-standard street, W. Galer St. We conclude that the multi-party settlement agreement over the Elliott Bay Marina precludes such an extension. We also note that the agreement, contrary to assertions by trail proponents, binds the Park Department as part of the City of Seattle. Finally, we suggest such a trail extension is contrary to the intent and purpose of the agreement and presents liability issues for the City.

Our analysis follows.

CONTEXT: The Elliott Bay Marina Settlement Agreement and Documents Provided Public Access to the Tidelands --That Was All That Was Desired and Was Provided.

A proposal to develop a marina with associated shore facilities and a restaurant was proposed for the southeast shore area of Magnolia west of the Pier 90-91 area. The marina is west of the Smith Cove Open Water Park. The proposal required an EIS as part of the permit review process. Two issues relevant to the present dispute involved the location of the western terminus of the marina and the public access to the undeveloped portion of the property west of that termination point.

Mr. Walter Hundley, Parks Department Superintendent, wrote a comment letter on the DEIS on October 18,1984. Mr. Hundley squarely addressed the issue of public access to the west. He noted the applicant had proposed no walkway or other such development for pedestrian access to the west. Mr. Hundley suggested that a public access to the tidelands be provided. Supporting reasons included the public's opportunity to walk the tidelands from Smith Cove to Discovery Park. Subsequently revised and approved plans did provide for an access to the tidelands from the western marina development limit.

You and other neighbors along Galer had expressed concerns over any upland trail connection because of past security problems and the narrowness of the street. You also expressed concerns over times of tideland access to preclude people being forced by the tide to exit the tidelands through your private residential areas.

The issue of pedestrian access and public use of the western viewpoint area was a specific issue in the permit dispute process. Foremost in this process was the appeals (No.86-14 and 86-15) to the State Shorelines Hearings Board. A Stipulated Order resolving the appeals was entered on July 30, 1986. The Stipulated Order was signed on behalf of "the City of Seattle" with no indication that "the City of Seattle" excludes the Park Department.

The Stipulated Order contains provisions relevant to your question. They are:

1. No material deviation from the Revised Site Plan shall be allowed.

2. The Marina would quitclaim to the City a portion of the Marina property west of the western breakwater. No future construction of any kind may occur in the Undeveloped Area except for "the western access" and other items unrelated to this dispute.

3. The western access is specifically identified in Revised Plan B-1 and is required under Condition 15 of the SDP. "The Group (ed: Marina) shall not construct any other access nor grant any other easements for access to or from the western border of the Marina. /P7, Haggard et al/Marina Agreement.

4. The fence on the western border will be interrupted only by the westerly access at the western border of the fill area as shown on Revised Site Plan E-l. /P10, Haggard et al/Marina Agreement.

5. The City signed the Stipulated Order which affirmed the appeal was resolved in consideration of the imposition of the conditions and mitigation measures contained in the Haggard et al. Settlement as well as other settlement agreements.

The City Parks Department is reportedly now proposing to provide another trail access through Marina property westerly on the upland (not tideland) area to connect with the eastern terminus W. Galer St. No such access connection is provided for in the Marina Plans as reflected in the SHE order or the subsequently issued permits.

The Marina Settlement Agreements Preclude Pedestrian (or other) Access from the Westerly Portion of the Marina to Upland Areas.

The historic context of the permit review process affirms an issue over access by the public to the west, i.e.,

(a) Neighbors on 32nd Ave. W., W. Galer St. and Logan St. had concerns over public safety issues due to historic problems. To minimize these problems, the neighbors were permitted to install a fence near the easterly terminus of W. Galer St. to preclude any public access to the Parks Department upland property.

(b) Mr. Walt Hundley, Superintendent of the Parks Department, commented that the public should be provided access to the tidelands from the westerly portion of the Marina. This was specifically provided for in the approved marina plans by allowing one fence gate for the sole purpose of tideland access during daylight hours.

The access issue was resolved to the satisfaction of all parties, which includes the City of Seattle. The marina plans were revised to provide one access from the west to the tidelands. The approved plans provide no indication of any future, proposed or possible added trail connection to the uplands and on to W. Galer St. We, therefore, conclude that the existing permits preclude any trail installation event, such an upland connection is specifically contrary to the public access provision intent, and that is to the tidelands.

The SHE order specifically provides in /P2.b that the Marina Project shall be as shown on the Revised Site Plan. This Plan includes Exhibit E of the Haggard et al. Settlement. The SHE further provided that "no material deviation" shall be allowed from that Plan. The Plan shows no access to the upland area or future provision for such. The Haggard et al. Settlement specifically provides a basis for understanding what would constitute a material deviation from the Plan. /P3 of that settlement provides that no future construction may be done in the area between the Fill Area and the eastern line of property to be dedicated to the City except for enumerated actions including the western access. This western access provides access only to the tidelands. We also note that the Marina Group is specifically precluded from granting any other easements for access to or from the western border of the marina. Thus, provision for added access to the upland areas and to W. Galer St. would be considered a material deviation and be precluded by the SHE order.

The Present Trail Proposal Is Contrary to the Understanding and Expectation of All Parties.

Parties to the Marina dispute were concerned over the western extent of the Marina. Once this was resolved, the focus shifted to activities on the western edge. Immediate neighbors on 32nd Ave. W., W. Galer St. and Logan St. were concerned about noise, light and glare and public safety. These concerns were resolved, upon agreement by all parties including the City. An earth and vegetative berm was provided to shield the residents on W. Galer St. from intrusive activities. Access to the tidelands was provided but restricted to one access location and between certain hours. The current upland connection from the Marina to W. Galer St. is a material deviation from the expressed concerns and accepted access resolution.

An upland neighbor (i.e., the undersigned) was concerned over the potential fire hazard over public use of the area. This issue was resolved by providing for fire pit restrictions in the public viewpoint area. Providing upland public access would increase the potential fire hazard, particularly during the dryer periods.

While not explicitly referenced in the permits and order, we note that the City has permitted neighbors on W. Galer St. to install a gate to preclude upland public access. This action was well founded because of the illegal and disruptive activities that occurred.

We believe it is reasonable to conclude that additional access in the upland area between the Marina and W. Galer St. would be contrary to the understanding and expectation of neighbors who had participated in the Marina permit and appeal process.

Based upon the above, we believe that meritorious issues exists as to the Staff's proposed installation of a trail from the Marina parking lot across the uplands to the eastern terminus of W. Galer St. First, the City's compliance with SEPA is uncertain as to the overall legislative proposal which includes the trail. It appears likely an EIS is required. This can be reviewed further if you desire. Second, the City's right to construct the trail appears contrary to the implicit conditions of the property deed transfer it received as a result of the SHB settlement. Third, depending upon the SEPA issue and other concerns,

a judicial appeal may be appropriate over the validity of the legislative proposal (if adopted) which includes this trail proposal. Fourth, normal City permit processes as well as SHB and judicial review provide further mechanisms of challenge if the trail proposal is adopted.

Sincerely yours,
Joel Haggard

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – cost, route, no disruption to homes and low environmental impact.
H – reasons listed on comment sheet.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – higher cost, longer route, disruptive to homes currently along route up from water.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) The amount of closure/construction time is minimized.
2) It doesn't disrupt homes or shorelines.
3) The cost is low for a safe, efficient alternative.

*Additional comments:*
Why not keep same direct route as we have today? Don't ruin what makes Magnolia seem so charming.

---

*Additional comments:*
Concerning plan B and perhaps C:
Building over the Magnolia tidelands has already been to court and the City's position upheld – that it is contrary to the Seattle Shoreline Master Plan (SSMP) to build on or over the tidelands including above a submerged right-of-way. This was originally ruled by a City of Seattle hearing examiner in 1992 and when appealed by a real-estate developer was upheld by Superior Court, the Court of Appeals, and the Washington State Supreme Court in 1997.

Larry D. Zahnow
Vs.
City of Seattle, et al
Superior Court #95-2-21899-7
Court of Appeals #38114-8-1
Washington State Supreme Court #66073-5

Judith Barbow of the Seattle City Attorney's office represented the City from 1992-97. Magnolia residents were interveners in the case in support of the City.
I am astonished that shoreline options are under consideration. The City of Seattle has already spent an enormous amount of money and time to prevent such construction over any area that is within one or two miles of the Magnolia Bridge.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – least impact.
D – most like existing with minor changes.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
C.
E.
F – terrible access.
I.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Goes fast.
2) Most like existing bridge.
3) Minimal environmental impact.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
(A) Is the only sensible solution. Why waste money and time rerouting traffic and wreak havoc on the neighborhood when we already have a route that works?

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
(I) Because I live on West Boston and I see the impact of the traffic on this street already. It's very narrow and unsafe for what we have to accommodate now, let alone with <u>more</u> traffic.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Thanks for giving us all a chance to voice our opinions, but please just keep the location the same.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) It produces a safe new bridge where the current one exists.
2) It does not force people to accept major traffic passing through their streets after people have bought homes years ago and would now be unfairly impacted. The bridge has been here a long time and houses that were built near it were built knowing that they were near the bridge route.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A, B, and D. Least impact, utilizes current space for bridge. All other options seem to carry horrible traffic impacts to neighborhoods and Magnolia Village.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
I, F, and E. Just baffles me how traffic is supposed to flow via Thorndyke and Boston. Horrible negative impact, cuts off the Village.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Do you mean this process? As long as the comments you receive tonight are utilized, I think this is very good. Points for the patient explanations by employees.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) It makes sense to the community.
2) Solves the traffic objectives.
3) Has a reasonable budget.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
Alignment "D" is the only really practical way to build. It is only a slight detour from the Bridge itself.
H is also a practical way to go – least construction costs.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B, C, F, E, and I. These connect to Thorndyke and will force motorists to go to Dravus (only 2 lane) and cannot handle any more traffic. Or – go south to Blaine and go down Condon Way to get out of Magnolia Village.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
No taxes are raised – use Port and federal grants.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Costs are held to a minimum.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A, D, and H. They maintain traditional south bluff access to Magnolia Village and do not appear to require stop signs or signals.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B and E, no shoreline fill please. Also, one directs traffic away from the Village and into quiet neighborhoods. I live two blocks away from the Village and want to build economic vitality there.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
I like the diversity of alternatives even though I would not like some as a primary choice. Forces us to think critically. Thanks for all your <u>hard</u> work; I admire your openness and dedication.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Maintain Village directed traffic.
2) No stops or signals required.
3) Minimize shoreline impacts and stay within budget and timeframe.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – This bridge is for Magnolia, not the Port. Least impact on residences.
B – Nice except for buses and services to east hill.

I – Except for bus service to many.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
G – Too long, high impact on residences.
H – Winds around and still has steep grade.
C – Driver's nightmare!

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
I appreciate it but fear the decision is already made.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) You listen to ALL the people.
2) No side agendas.

*Additional comments:*
Make it work for us! Thanks!

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – Not my personal favorite but the fairest to all homeowners in the community.
B – I agree, could be beautiful. Access to the marina, good connection to Magnolia Village.
E – Simple and direct.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
C – Bad traffic routing, huge impact to homeowners, impact to slide-sensitive area.
D and H – Impact to residences, noise and fumes will flow from valley into homes.
G – Huge cost, huge impact to homeowners on the bluff, noise and fumes.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
It's frustrating to review nine alternatives but be told by representatives they really have it pretty well narrowed to two or three.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Does not impact homes with additional traffic, noise and car fumes.
2) Keeps views intact.
3) Flows to the Village.

---

*Additional comments:*
Proposal "A" is definitely the best!

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
H – No shoreline impacts, lowest mitigation costs, worse access to the waterfront is okay, as it needs to be preserved.
D – No residential displacement, similar to what the Bridge is now.
A – No residential displacement, no business displacement.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – Take the automobile count on top of the Bridge and insert it into 32nd W and Clise intersection, that is a dangerous safety issue. Greedy business merchants without integrity seem to be pumping this plan. Plan B is illegal by way in which the City conveyed the deed to the marina property.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Too many choices that are really not possible, nor would they even be doable. Like giving the community the choice between cancer and polio.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) It follows all proceeding treaties and conveyances of deeds.
2) Avoids damaging the environment.
3) No home displacement which would make the City look like a real bully, when there's other options.

*Additional comments:*
Please don't displace residences. It would send a bad message. Keep things the same if you must. A bike trail was proposed through the same area and was denied. Save yourself some time and money and look up the proposed litigation.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
Alternative B is the only one I like because it provides access up 32nd directly to Magnolia Village with the marina along the way. All others have either connections along Thorndyke or at the existing bridge connection – both in highly residential areas.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
I don't like Alternatives A, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I because they connect farther north than the existing connection, are longer (mostly) than the existing connection, connect to highly residential areas, and don't provide good pedestrian and bicycle access to the Village.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope our comments will be considered in the final alternatives analysis process.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) There is good bicycle and pedestrian access.
2) There is good connection for transit and access by monorail.
3) There is good access directly to the Magnolia Village (business center).

*Additional comments:*
As you can see by my comments I am a strong transit supporter. I don't drive, which makes my life very difficult living in Magnolia (bus service stinks!) If it weren't for my family, I would not live here. I grew up in Magnolia and like everything else about it. If you could provide good pedestrian and bicycle access, good access to transit services and good access to the Village, it would be most appreciated.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – clearly the best. Uses existing travel template and leaves port land available for a variety of uses. I don't mind the cost of having the bridge out of commission during construction.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – impact on shoreline and further stifles ability of north community to get access
H – accident on H1 shuts down bridge
C – its obvious – hard turn will slow traffic
D – looks like a port design

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Keep it simple in design.
2) Leverage what already works
3) Listen to the community the bridge serves

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
B, D and H – keep general existing access and supplement with improved/more access

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
Those eliminating access to village and "center"

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
I defer. You have good consultants and I trust their judgment.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Improves aesthetics
2) Improves access
3) Improves pedestrian/bike access

*Additional comments:*
Tough choices. KPFF is a great firm…excellent choice.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
B, B, B

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
C – least practical

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Does not increase traffic in Magnolia
2) Improves access
3) Is not too costly $$

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
D, G, and H

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B, C, F

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – no residential displacements. Keeps things as close to the same as existing.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – It would either bury or destroy the value of our home. No comparable sales so the city would just low-ball us.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Excellent public involvement/communication

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) If we can keep good access to the community
2) Without displacing anyone.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
B – will not be allowed per Fed. EIS dated Jan 1987. It is expected. No western vehicle access to the Marina except pedestrian across the tide flats signed by city, administrative judge, Puget Sound Alliance, Elliot Bay Marina several individuals, state shoreline hearing and board, Elliot Bay Marina. Also the end of Marina Drive is capped at its west end by 30 ft. of Marina Property separating it from the riffraff and beach. Also Marina Drive is riddled by slides and impossible every year or two. No brainer. Ice plant of the bridge, along the now bike path to 21st and Thorndyke. Used to be a heavy track route. The port can live with a temporary widening of 20 ft or so – only requires pushing the fence back, duh!

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
You use the ice planet – Thorndyke route, described above Construction costs – nil.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – All preserve (mostly) current vistas and traffic patterns. D and H

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – Difficult access to West Hill. Too much car traffic thru the village. We will lose our pedestrian-friendly village.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
Appears (so far) to be very sensitive to the desires of the community

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Maintain current vistas and traffic patterns
2) Avoid turning residential streets into cut-throughs and thorough-fares

*Additional comments:*
What is the long-term viability of Magnolia Blvd. between the current bridge and the Howe St Bridge? This area appears to be slumping towards the water.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – best, D – okay

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – "Magnolia Viaduct"
E, F, G, I – no access to south Magnolia. Hard to access central business district.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Maintain good access to south Magnolia
2) Maintain good access to central business district
3) Avoid building an "open eye sore" along the waterfront.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A, B, and H – These offer best routes to village with least traffic impacts on existing residential neighborhoods. B sound interesting in terms of rec. Use residents and access to village.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
I & E – bad traffic impacts on already overloaded Thorndyke, will negatively impact and ruin the East hill neighborhood as cars fan out to get to village, too close to Dravus, W. Blaine is not equipped for traffic flow to village. This neighborhood already has to deal with port noise – train noise, pile driving, air traffic, traffic would kill this neighborhood if proposals E & I are adopted.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
The public is kept well informed.

*Additional comments:*
I'm not opposed to a fourth access point so long as there is a route to the village along the lines of the current route.

---

*Additional comments:*
Plan A is the only one that neither destroys residential neighborhoods with narrow streets nor destroys wetlands – greenbelt integrity.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – only. Least disruptive to land which would be taken for other routes.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B & F – what would you do with heavy traffic at end in village?
I & E – westbound traffic would turn W. Boston into a heavy use route.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*

1) H because it provides a true 4th access. Use B alternative as south route. Use both W. Armory Way and Wheeler for entry/exit off 15th W. Try northbound access to Wheeler as underpass to eliminate flyover.
2) B. Create partial 4th access route with N/S surface arterial through Port uplands to Dravus/Thorndyke.
3) G. Has many surface arterial connections and improved Port land access at W. Galer Flyover.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*

1) A repeats current poor access to Magnolia, very costly, quake prone
2) C too slow, no fourth access
3) F. No S. access to Magnolia, but a good N. route.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Provides 4th access to ensure continuous access to Fisherman's Terminal and industry in N. Magnolia via Emerson Bridge when 1 of 4 accesses is closed.
2) Uses best combination of N and S routes
3) Refines 15th Ave W access points. Fits with Monorail for bus/monorail transfer

*Additional comments:*
Now mix and match for best combo of north and south routes connecting 15th W with Magnolia.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
B – Great idea for B along the water and into the village. Perfect.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
All the ones with the new steep bridges coming from the north. Might as well keep the old bridge.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Need to put costs of each project.

---

*Additional comments:*
Alignment D is clean and efficient in design and least complicated.
Alignment H addresses future growth and Magnolia's need for extra roads for influx.
Do not like any of the others.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
"D" flows the best. It uses what's existing to its fullest. Sets up north side of bridge for commercial development. Squeeze out the Port.
"A" I can live through construction, period.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
E, F, H, and I. This side of the hill already deals with train noise. Property values are now doing well. Having access as far south as possible impacts the fewest.
"C" is too roundabout.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
This seems pretty standard. Would like to hear a few speakers to explain the rationale behind each option.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*
1) Utilize existing traffic infrastructure
2) Don't dump traffic off of traffic system

*Additional comments:*
Port interest should be a much lower priority. Harbor Island and South Bay should be their focus. The Interbay area is only useful for fishing fleet.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
"A" is the most direct and equal access to East and West Hill.
("B" would be OK if another route to East Hill is made)

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
C and I – Too much traffic on Thorndyke.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
Alignments B, A and D – Good use of gully space; nice views; not through residential area; good access to Magnolia Village.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
Alignments I, F and E – Too far north; too close to Dravus; poor access to Magnolia Village and central Magnolia.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Good, thorough. Nice work. Lots of alternatives with pros/cons/impacts.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Stable structure that will last a long time
2) Good traffic flow / access to central Magnolia and Village
3) It works and makes sense
4) Keep heavy traffic out of residential streets that were not meant to be arterials

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
Alignment B – Solves many needs with this alignment. Excellent access to marina, waterfront and village merchants. The grades are low, which allows pedestrians and bicyclists to use this route.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
Alignments E, G and F – Hard to get to village. Businesses may be impacted by this routing through Thorndyke. Does not spread traffic from Dravus entry/exit.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Good displays and opportunity for input. Would like to know how the preferred alternatives will be decided and by whom. What are the criteria in the decision-making?

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Ties into monorail station – especially for other modes such as pedestrians and bicyclists.
2) Improves access for pedestrians and bicyclists
3) Keeps good access to the marina and the village.

*Additional comments:*
I would like to see the bridge replacement address the future needs of the community. Magnolia is difficult to access as it is. It would be nice to allow and encourage people to get out of their cars. Better access to the marina should be addressed along with more direct access to the village.

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*
A – Legacy solution seems nice even with the bridge down for a while.
I – Direct solution with access to Thorndyke
D – Offers non-stop access. Low environmental impact. Nice compromise.

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
B – Unthinkably damaging to beach and greenbelt area. Throws traffic into a congested area.

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Very fair, open and valuable discussion on this important project. Great job. I hope information will continue to be available.

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) No environmental impact

2) Cost is within reason
3) Does not introduce excessive traffic congestion

---

One person added comments to the reproduction of the board comparing the preliminary evaluations, indicating that Alternative A was best with the addition of a walk and bike way, and that Alternative B was a bad alignment because it ruins the park.

---

December 10,2002

President, Magnolia Community Club
3213 West Wheeler #136
Seattle, WA 98199

Dear President:

I have been following the Magnolia Bridge Replacement project and have become aware that one of the proposals under consideration, Alternative B, will fatally impact my home so, of course, I am against it. However, I would be against it even if my home were not threatened.

Alternative B will create a traffic nightmare in Magnolia Village as every single vehicle, after traveling up 32nd Ave W., will spill into the Village at the same point. There will be no dispersement of traffic as there is now. The Village streets were not meant to handle such a traffic load and reconfiguring them to do so will have a negative impact on the Village. The commercial core will no longer be a unique, pleasant, shopping area, but rather a noisy thoroughfare similar to Market St. in Ballard. Parking will be more difficult than it is now, encouraging shoppers to further defect to the malls and Fred Meyer-type stores where parking is assured.

Alternative B defies good Urban Design principles, which encourage pedestrian friendly shopping areas, off street parking and safe, quiet walkways for shoppers. Good urban design argues for the preservation of green belts and quiet enclaves, which is how the targeted section of 32nd Ave W. could now be described. Good urban design encourages the creation of community villages much like what we have now in Magnolia Village. Alternative B would destroy this.

Alternative B would damage and destroy sensitive shoreline property. It is hard to imagine that a major roadway along Elliot Bay shoreline is even something that is being considered. Environmentally, this Alternative is an assault on a precious and limited resource. We must not do more damage to our shoreline. Also, currently the beach is the only one in Magnolia that is easily accessible by foot and car. (Smith Cove does not have a beach and Discovery Park requires a long hike or a permit for a vehicle.) In a community that is surrounded by water we have little access to it. It is shortsighted to destroy a quiet beach by building a major roadway along it.

Like many issues that affect people, the final decisions are usually based on cost. I can only hope that Alternative B will prove to be too costly and therefore eliminated from the

list of considered alternatives. I don't know how many dollars it will cost, but I do know for sure that Alternative B will cost me my home, it will cost Magnolia Village its "village character", and it will cost the environment another piece of shoreline.

Alternative B should be removed from the list of options under consideration.

Sincerely,

Sue Olson, Magnolia Resident
2002 33rd Ave w.
Seattle, W A 98199

cc to: Paula Ross, President, Magnolia Chamber of Commerce and
Kirk T. Jones, Project Manager, Seattle Transportation

---

November 22, 2002

Kirk T. Jones P.E.
Project Manager
Magnolia Bridge Replacement Study
Seattle Department of Transportation
700 Fifth Avenue
Suite 3700
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Mr. Jones:

The Queen Anne Community Council wishes to be on record as supporting the inclusion in the four alternative routes to be considered in the Magnolia Bridge Study of a fourth point of access between the 15th Avenue West corridor and a Magnolia arterial.

Many Queen Anners work, shop, and use services in Magnolia which is an integral part of the BINMIC. When one of the three existing Magnolia access bridges is closed, trips for Queen Anners and others to Magnolia are slow, dangerous, and difficult. When only two access bridges are open, much Magnolia business is lost.

The Council looks forward to the results of your Magnolia Bridge Study. Please continue to use John Coney as your Queen Anne Community Council contact: djohnconey@aol.com

Sincerely,
Ellen Monrad,
President

---

*Which are your top three alternatives? Why?*

1) A – Existing connection points work well no matter where you live on the hills.
2) D – Keeps existing connection points – good access to Interbay if developed
3) B – Puts traffic on the center of the hill – still good access

*Which alternatives do you like the least? Why?*
E, F, I – putting all cars on Thorndyke forces traffic through residential areas. Also forces use of Condon and makes those who live on the west hill go through the village, making it less pedestrian friendly.
C – Introduces stop G, too circuitous and longer

*Please comment on the evaluation process:*
Like it! Good job!

*The Magnolia Bridge Project will be a success if:*

1) Existing connection points are kept
2) Don't mind bridge closure to do the job right!

---

[Hand-drawn proposed alternative plan utilizing combination of Alternative B and underpass at Wheeler, creating two connection points.]

---

[Hand-drawn modification to Alignment E, drawing traffic flow south on Thorndyke and utilizing a new bypass connection at Clise.]