

September 16, 2025 Meeting - Seattle Freight Advisory Board

Topics covered included: Holgate RCE Study; East Marginal Way 1st Ave S to 16th Ave S; Seattle Transportation Plan (STP) Draft 3-Year Implementation Plan

This meeting was held: September 16, 3:30-5:15 p.m., via MS Teams and in City Hall Conference Room 370

Board Members: Stanley Ryter, Nigel Barron, Geri Poor, Dan McKisson, Dan Gatchet, Herb Krohn

Public: Tyler Blackwell, Ryan Packer, 12*****42, Daniel Lokic, Warren Aakervik

Staff: Sara Zora, Ching Chan, Quinn Kelly, Wintana Miller, Christopher Eaves, Baker Council, Cass Magnuski

Attending: 18

Baker Council: We have a quorum.

Stanley Ryter: Okay, the Tuesday, September 16 meeting of the Seattle Freight Advisory Board will come to order. We are in City Hall Room 370. Let's take attendance.

INTRODUCTIONS

Stanley Ryter: On the agenda today, we are going to approve the minutes. We're going to have a little bit of public comment. We have the Holgate Study presented by Sara Zora of SDOT. We have the East marginal Way 1st Avenue South 16th Avenue South with Quinn Kelly. We are going to talk about the Seattle Transportation Draft Plan Review. We have a little subcommittee review of that. And we have closing public comment. Did you guys get the minutes from the August 19 meeting. I think they did come out today. Anyone want to make a motion that they be approved?

Dan Gatchet: I will move that they be approved.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

ACTION ITEMS:

Meeting opening

Herb Krohn: Second.

Stanley Ryter: Anybody have comment?

Geri Poor: I noticed, in reviewing the minutes briefly, that Nigel Barron had offered to work with us on the subcommittee in the minutes, but Marc Hoecker ended up helping us. So, sorry, Nigel, that we misremembered who was going to help on the subcommittee.

Baker Council: We will make those revisions to the minutes, Geri.

Geri Poor: There is just one other comment that doesn't read quite correctly, I think at the bottom there where Ryan was sharing. But the Transit Board and another board had a join meeting. So, if we could just add 'another board.' I don't remember which other board he mentioned. Okay, can we approve the minutes with those corrections, or do we need to wait until the next meeting?

Christopher Eaves: We have a document that has been amended. So we can approve as amended.

Stanley Ryter: Okay. Do we need a new motion to approve as amended?

Dan McKisson: So moved.

Stanley Ryter: And a second?

Herb Krohn: Second.

Stanley Ryter: And let's vote on approving the amended minutes. All those in favor, say 'aye.' All those opposed? Motion carries. Next up is announcement and the chair's report.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Announcements

Stanley Ryter: Anybody have any announcements from the board? Hearing none, we have a big agenda today, so I would like to dive into that. Let's go for opening public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Stanley Ryter: Has anyone signed up for public comment? No? Anybody from the public have any comment? Okay, that closes the public comment portion of the beginning of the meeting.

HOLGATE RCE STUDY

Sara Zora: Thank you for having us. I have Wintana Miller here, who is our consultant PM. I am the SDOT PM. I work in the development division of SDOT. We have a presentation that we are going to go over with you. We have a lot of slides. The last person who did a presentation about the Holgate Railroad Crossing study was someone named Kay (unintelligible), who used to be on my team. She has since left the team for a different role in SDOT. So now I am the project manager of this study. So, if you don't remember me from before, that is because I was not here before for the first presentation, which was when we were closer in 2024, I would assume. We have been pretty busy with this project, so we are very excited to be here today to share with you what we have going on, and especially what is coming up, because that is going to be the fun part of the study that is coming right now. Let me share my screen. Ching Chan is also here. She is our engagement lead that we have on the project from the City, as well. Thank you so much for having us. We are here to give you an update about the project.

First, I shall share that we at SDOT have our vision, mission, values and goals. I think that a lot of our core values and goals really match up to our Holgate Study here, with equity, safety, mobility, sustainability, excellence of design in the approach that we are trying to have. We really wanted to introduce where we are with this project and get a good understanding of where the board's perspectives are. We have a lot of bullet points here. Wintana and I are going to share the talking points on this, so we will switch off here and there, but we wanted to give you some project context in case you don't remember what this study is all about; the purpose and need for this study, our

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Public Comments

Sara Zora
Provides an introduction
on the scope.

schedule. We are working very closely with the technical workers right now, which is part of the four-tier part of public engagement that we have going on. Our team consultant team has already done data collection and has an existing conditions report, which we will share with you, and some considerations for the study, as we are in the process of moving forward with our level zero and level one concept and concept evaluation. And then we'll get to some next steps and questions. Please interrupt at any time during the presentation so that we can answer questions. You don't have to wait, unless the board objects. I will go with whatever the board likes to do for presentations.

As you all know, Holgate is smack in the middle of the east/west corridor. It is an industrial access street. We have a study going on here because of our adjacencies with Amtrak and BNSF, and we are really trying to understand some of their current and future maintenance facility improvements, and are really trying to determine what Holgate looks like for our City's future. What does that roadway look like with all of the adjacent projects coming in, some of the concerns we have for safety, and really looking at these two specific railroad tracks from BNSF. The two on Holgate are on the east side as the DOT 085583Y and the other one with the major series of tracks is the 972461X. And you will see the other at-grade railroad crossing south of Holgate. We do have some analysis and some thoughts going along there, because anything that we do, Holgate could or may impact how we are looking at at-grade crossings in the SODO area and the Duwamish MIC. We know that there is a lot of need for east/west movement in the SODO neighborhood and Duwamish MIC, and so we are trying to have a good assessment on what happens with Holgate, depending on some of these concepts that we are going to be looking at. It is a major freight route; it's a major truck street; it is part of our heavy haul network; it is part of our BNSF mainline of the north/south, with some Amtrak maintenance yards on both north and south of Holgate, as well. We have 4th Avenue to the west, and then 1st Avenue South as two small arterials on both sides of that.

Purpose and need: We have funding from the Federal Railroad Association as a grant for this project. So we had to go through a lot of initial documentation and approvals with the Federal Railroad Association to start the project. One of the first things we had to do was to draft and get approval for the purpose and need for this study with the FRA. So that is what these words mean. It is really a feasibility study. We are focused on the two at-grade crossings of Holgate, but are also looking at those other three that go

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Explanation of existing conditions on the segment, adjacencies, and planned improvements in the area.

Explanation of purpose and need for this feasibility study, including providing documentation for Federal Railroad Administration funding grant.

south of Holgate, really thinking about impacts to the rail crossings, the transportation network and the mitigation and safety improvements to really minimize some of the impacts that we have been seeing. It is to improve safety; to maintain access for all loads within the Duwamish MIC, maintain existing railroad facilities and operations and accommodate that future railroad maintenance facility expansion and other regional projects. So this was a purpose and need that was written in 2024 right at the beginning of this study, which helped set our sails for moving into the study, doing existing conditions.

The overview: So, the whole process of our study is kind of the typical planning process you know. We have done the data collection. We have an existing conditions report that we can send a link to Baker Council and Christopher Eaves to send it out, if you would like to see that. We are working on goals statements and screening criteria or evaluation criteria. We are also working on concepts at this time. So, we are going to be putting different concepts into level zero. It's really our first one for grade separation to see if there are any fatal flaws for potential grade separation options, if Holgate were to be closed. We are then going to take those options that make it through, as well as some other options that we have assigned, and we're going to be doing a level one assessment, which is really a quality assessment of these concepts based on these goals and these evaluation criteria. And then, we're going to funnel the larger level of level one concepts into the few level two concepts and bring that into a quantitative assessment to have a good understanding of what it could look like if we were to do something different with Holgate. We will have a preferred alternative. And with mitigation, and with some planning level (unintelligible), our grant that we have with the Federal Railroad Association is definitely a planning study. We are not getting into design typically. We will be looking into the feasibility of design to have a sense of how these concepts kind of roll out as we move through that process. We have a really important public engagement strategy going on. We have four tiers of engagement partners, the first being our technical workers, and we will have a couple to describe what they are and what they are doing with us. We also have tier two, which is our priority relationships. That's a lot of our modal boards, our City departments, our federal departments, our State departments that we would be working with on this project. We have other manufacturing organizations, our unions around the area, because we know a lot of different sectors of people utilize Holgate at this time. We really want to hear from them on how they are using it, what would the impacts be if

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Freight and Rail staff to provide existing conditions report to the SFAB. Holgate study team to consider evaluation criteria and prepare various initial concepts for grade separation, towards a preferred alternative if Holgate was closed. Breakdown of some public engagement elements, including relevant stakeholders.

something were different around Holgate. We are reaching out to the project neighbors, who are about 90 to about 400-ish now. I think, businesses that we are trying to reach that are definitely very close in proximity to Holgate, between Union and 8th Avenue, Airport Way. And then public open houses. We are going to have probably two open houses. One is going to come at the end of October or the beginning of November that we are still scheduling right now. So, a lot of different kinds of public engagement really focused in on how we can get good input from people about how they are currently using Holgate, and what we might see out of Holgate in the future. The part of Holgate that we are talking about is between Occidental and 3rd, but of course, when we look at implications of any Holgate design, we could be looking from Utah to 8th Avenue, as well. So, a whole range of potential things that we are going to be looking at.

Where we are right now: We finished our existing conditions data analysis, our data collection. We are into concept development right now. We just had our second technical work group team meeting yesterday morning to go over a lot of these details as we are moving forward, but we're really getting into our level zero and one evaluation between now and November. Then, once we have level one results, we will get back with our technical work group. We will come back to the freight advisory board, as well, to think about concept refinement and see which few level two concepts we bring to that quantitative assessment, where we would be doing more of a technical analysis, future forecasts, to see how some of these alternatives for Holgate react with what we think the future will hold. Some of that will be some sensitivity testing. Some of that is related to Port facilities. Some of that is related to the Seattle makers district and wanting to have and sense of sensitivity if there is housing associated to that north of Holgate and sensitivity analysis potentially related to public events, as well, because we know we have a lot of different variables of traffic operations and traffic volumes throughout the day, depending on if there is advance or not in our venues right there. So, by level two evaluation, we are really wanting to get some results of that by March, 2026. So, we will have level zero and one happening for the next few months, then we will really get into narrowing down the number of options and concepts for level two, and we'll do that at the end of this year into next year.

Technical work group: We are meeting with a lot of really important stakeholders, primary stakeholders that we have this study. We are definitely meeting with Amtrak

and BNSF, the Port of Seattle, Northwest Seaport Alliance, Sound Transit. So, it will be with Tyler Blackwell in the room there; WSDOT and their freight program, the Washington State Ballpark Facilities District, and the Washington State Public Stadium Authority, and then the Seahawks, the Seattle Sounders and Reign and Mariners. Those are our primary stakeholders that we have in the surrounding area of Holgate. We also have these different tribal governments that we are reaching out to continuously to see if they have ways that they would like to participate. A lot of the ways are tribal organizations and governments like to participate is especially if things are getting closer on design and construction. Since we are on the planning level side, there is not much engagement at this time with the tribes. This technical work group is a really important part of the study. We really have them to help review and approve different documents as we move forward, to help with our data requests that we had at the beginning of this process and offer alternatives and things to think about as we get into concept development. They have been reviewing our study variables, our methods and assumptions to make sure we are all on the same page, and really using their expertise. We have had particular meetings. I will call (unintelligible) out, as she is in this room. We have had meetings with the Port of Seattle and the Northwest Seaport Alliance to make sure we are on the same page about how we are looking at the future freight forecasts and what that means for our future technical analysis as we get into level two. We feel like we have been having some really good and productive conversations with our partners to make sure that the study is looking how all of our partners would like to see it in terms of the data provided and the future forecast and projections that we have that will be coming up.

We definitely have different things we are considering. Some said Holgate railroad elimination. We are definitely looking at Sound Transit projects, from their draft environmental statements, about the potential for Lander and a Holgate overpass. They are relocating the E3 transmission lines that go right down 5th Avenue, or the SODO busway right now, what happens to 4th Avenue South when Sound Transit has to shut down the SODO busway to be able to lay track, when the SODO busway will no longer be hosting buses. We know we have our East Marginal Way improvement project happening. We have different Vision Zero and Safe Streets for All projects. We are really looking at all of the operations for all the different modes that we can look at. We're going to share with you some of our existing conditions information, but we're looking at everything. Stadiums, pre- and post-event; we're looking at Port of Seattle

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

A reiteration of the various considerations going into this feasibility study, including Sound Transit improvement and other adjacent projects.

terminals; we're looking at detour preparedness, as well, if something were to happen on Holgate, and what we could do in a quick sense. So, a lot of different components as inputs into the study. I'm going to pass it over to Wintana Miller to take you through some of the existing conditions to see where we are right now.

Wintana Miller: Thanks, Sara. One of the things that Sara mentioned is that we completed our existing conditions report and just highlighting a couple of outcomes from that. One of the things we focused on was safety, crash incidents from 2020 to 2024, both in the SODO region, but also specifically on South Holgate Street. This data points to South Holgate Street, but even though our vulnerable users, the pedestrians and the bicyclists only make up about 21 percent of incidents on that corridor. They make up 83 percent of fatal or serious injury crashes. So that's a thing to keep aware of. We also collected some additional data through a near miss analysis using video analytics. So, we had some cameras up at the mainline crossing for about a week, which included the event and non-event stage, and it really just reinforces some of the anecdotal things that we've heard about some non-compliant people, both drivers and road users, by not listening to the gates, basically crossing while the gates were active.

We looked specifically at rail-related crashes, using data from the Federal Rail Association. They provide incident reports dating way back and looking at the crossings that are a part of our study area, on the one east of Occidental we saw eight incidents with two injuries and two fatalities. And then, the mainline crossing, the one just west of 3rd Avenue saw seven incidents with three injuries and three fatalities. The data spanned a long period and the fatalities all happened since 2011. And based on the data that we have, these incidents did involve some non-compliance or trespassing onto the rail lines.

We are trying to understand how many people are using Holgate. One of the things we looked at was volume. We collected some data on counts and solved for typical average daily traffic. In 2025, we are seeing about 5,000 or a little over 5,000 daily vehicles on South Holgate Street; looking at truck percentages, it is about ten percent of that traffic in the a.m. peak, while trucks are about five to ten percent in the late morning. Looking at when trucks are traveling on Holgate, you see that the majority of trucks have been in the morning, so between six and ten a.m., 32 percent, and between ten and three p.m., 44 percent of trucks are traveling. So, it's really the peak

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Wintana Miller
Noted existing conditions
and data analysis report.

for truck traffic. We looked at game days, specifically, we took counts on a Mariners game day back in May of this year. Holgate did carry more, not significantly more, but we saw 5,500 vehicles on Holgate Street. Edgar Martinez Street is how you connect to the highways there, but Mariners Street south of Holgate had quite a bit more traffic on it than Holgate did.

Truck activity: One of the data sources that we used was called Streetlight Data, that uses location data to track vehicles, heavy vehicles particularly, as well, and so we looked at where is truck traffic in the SODO area, so South Holgate Street looking at who is using, where people are going, that does play a role in local circulation, origins and destinations along 1st Avenue and also some destinations to the east of 4th Avenue and the Duwamish MIC. When we zoom back out to the region, Holgate only makes up about three percent of all truck activity in SODO; unsurprisingly, Edgar Martinez and South Spokane Street carry more as they connect to the wider region.

Understanding where we are coming from the data perspective, now we are ready to start thinking about what are our options for Holgate Street. Starting with our little buckets for where we see options on the table, first starting with the improving the crossing, keeping Holgate open, are there things we can do to improve the crossing, just looking at a permanent street closure and looking at what that means for all of the modes, potentially just closing it for vehicles but allowing pedestrians, maybe a grade separated option which would lead us into also looking at grade separated options for all modes, and looking at what that would mean, what are the touchdown points, and what is the feasibility in those options. I think Sara mentioned a level zero and a level one evaluation. Level zero we kind of added to this fatal flaw look to see if certain grade separated options just aren't feasible from a clearance standpoint, grade standpoint. You can't come back down and around quite as quickly. The rail crossings are very close to the mainline crossing and very close to 3rd Avenue, which is very close to 4th Avenue along Holgate Street. That is a challenge that we want to acknowledge and look at what can we do/what can't we do. And then once we eliminate a piece potentially with our fatal flaw analysis, we will go into our level one qualitative assessment, looking at several criteria, rating it high, medium. And the goal of that is to say these are performing the best and should be considered more for their quantitative assessment, rather. And give us the opportunity to combine and refine alternatives at that point. We will get into more detailed level two assessment with the smaller number

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Wintana Miller

Noted evaluation of various preliminary options and fatal flaws for Holgate to ultimately achieve a preferred alternative at the end of analysis.

of options at that point. The goal is to get us to a preferred alternative at the end of this analysis.

This is to trying to describe what we are evaluating against and what are the goals of this project, and we have identified criteria that attaches to each of these different goal areas. The main purpose of the goals of this project are around safety at the crossing for all modes, freight mobility, to, from and within the Duwamish MIC, multi-modal operation within the street network for all of those using Holgate and the surrounding transportation network, access to and egress from the stadiums, a key part of activity in SODO, needing to be compatible with some of the adjacent projects. Both are Sound Transit projects, as Sara mentioned, and Amtrak's projects. How do we work within those constraints? Constructability. What are the impacts? All of these things are goals, and we have criteria for each of those goal areas to help us evaluate the outcomes that we are looking at in this level one and level two evaluations.

Sara Zora: Our next steps are really to get moving on the level zero, the grade separated fatal flaw analysis for all of the grade separation options that we will put forward, and then we'll move very quickly to that level one, and hope that we have level one results in the end of November timeframe. We are still continuing ongoing engagement at this time. We are really wanting to hear from people that use Holgate very intimately, even with those that maybe just use it to get to the ballgames at some time. We definitely want to come back to the freight board to share some of the results that we have, and as we forward into level two, as well.

So, we are getting into the outside of existing conditions and moving forward on what some concepts could look like, and how we are going to be evaluating them, getting some results of that, narrowing down our potential concepts with a number of options to moving into level two, quantitative. And then, hopefully after that, we will have a preferred alternative to share with City leadership and SDOT leadership.

We would love to take questions or comments, suggestions on the study, things you want to make sure we are caring about, if you have concepts that you want us to consider. We will take all and any input that you may have on the fly at this point.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Sara Zora
Explained that next steps include producing and evaluating concepts towards a preferred alternative.

Stanley Ryter: Thanks so much, Sara. Thanks so much Wintana. Great presentation. Thanks for outlining the process. We are going to open it up for comments. We will start with Nigel Barron.

COMMENT

Nigel Barron: I was curious. When you are looking at the adjacent roads, you were talking about Edgar Martinez and some of the other streets around there. I think the capacities are somewhere around 25,000 on Edgar Martinez, and 5,500 on Holgate. Are you also look at whether -- if there is the vacation of Holgate, are you looking to see if there is actual capacity if there is adjoining the east/west streets to absorb those 5,500 cars?

Sara Zora: That's part of the quantitative assessment that we'll do on level two. What we have done is an operational analysis, a micro-simulation of Holgate, but also looking at intersection capacity analysis to Lander from 1st out there.

Dan McKisson: Thank you for the comprehensive report. A couple of questions. You named some grants that were received. Who requested the grants?

Sara Zora: The City requested the grants. We have one grant from the Federal Railroad Association. We applied for that grant probably in 2022 or 2023. Christopher Eaves might know the date better than I. We received it in 2024 . That was a \$2 million grant for this planning study. And then, we have the Move Ahead Washington WSDOT grant for \$400,000, to help do assessment from the study. And then we have local freight program funding, as well.

Dan McKisson: Okay, thank you. Are you looking at the commuters that come off Beacon Hill?

Sara Zora: Yes. We have some analysis about that, too. That will be within our model. We are hoping for and trying to get more outreach up the hill, because we do have some origin destination information. That is one of the key areas coming down from Beacon Hill using Holgate. So we do definitely incorporate some of their opinions and

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Sara Zora
Indicated funding grants
for the study: \$2M Federal
Railroad Association
planning and \$400K
WSDOT post-study
assessment.

thoughts on how they're using it, how they would use it in the future. And that is part of this push for engagement that we are doing right now.

Dan McKisson: Okay, thank you. Are we going to be provided the PowerPoint that you guys are using?

Sara Zora: Yes. For sure. If you have questions later, we will take in emails, as well.

Dan McKisson: I didn't see a lot of detail on the planned expansion from Amtrak. And I wasn't sure which lines were which in the presentation as far as the BNSF, different railroad tracks.

Stanley Ryter: Can you go to the last picture and just show those seven tracks?

Sara Zora: Can you see the slide?

Stanley Ryter: Yes, we can see the slide. Also, on the final picture, you had seven tracks.

Sara Zora: Oh, the photo. These are the seven tracks that are just adjacent to 3rd Avenue, and these are BNSF tracks on the very outside here. Amtrak does have this track, and right now, their expansion is really out of the right-of-way on their private property. They have a huge maintenance facility development in construction right now. So, at this time, Dan, we are not 100 percent sure what the Amtrak additional facility expansion plans look like, because I think they want to know what we might be doing in the street to see if the expansion plan may include different things if that street were closed. So, I think that there is a little bit of back and forth between what could we do at Holgate, and then would Amtrak think differently about future expansion if they had more space and potentially more certainty if there was no traffic or people crossing east/west. More to come on what it looks like for the future.

Dan McKisson: So, you think they plan to make more crossings on Holgate if they get what they want, or not?

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Sara Zora: We had a railroad diagnostic site visit in June, between BNSF, Amtrak, our team, SDOT, and we do hear that they have plans for adding more track, and it could get up to 15 total tracks on Holgate. Right now, we have nine tracks. So, they could potentially add six more tracks, depending on what that looks like at that time.

Dan McKisson: That would connect to their existing footprint? They need more land.

Sara Zora: I do not believe more land. They would have more opportunity to have trains better situated to go from maintenance yard to maintenance yard across both north and south sides of Holgate. I think that would be one of the things they would be looking at to make it more continuous tracks across, and will be able to store trains overnight if Holgate were closed, and have more capabilities potentially for maintenance and opportunities like that.

Dan McKisson: On your proposed grade separation studies, are you only using existing rights-of-way or are you looking at where you could condemn land and acquire land to make it work, because obviously, from 1st Avenue over, you need some kind of loop, because you just can't -- the grade would be too much.

Sara Zora: So, Dan, we're going to have a couple of different options for grade separated. For sure, some straight on for 1st and 4th, Occidental to 4th to see what is capable, what is technically feasible or not. We may show some concepts with ramps coming down on 6th or 4th or 1st, depending on the grades we have to be at and the slopes we have to be at. That was a question that we got from our technical work group yesterday. And we will have to see if some of these other grade separated ideas do not work, then how do we keep iterating on something that may actually work. We have not limited ourselves to just public right-of-way.

Dan McKisson: Okay. So, my final question is on your technical work, I don't see any of the land owners that are planning on putting housing down there. Have you reached out to them?

Sara Zora: We have been in touch with some of the City side, and we're trying to learn more from the applicants of the components of that land. We have not made contact with them yet. There is litigation happening right now, and we want to just make

Dan McKisson
Inquired about grade
separated options on
Holgate.

sure that we are being quite careful with any information that we are requesting. I actually had a meeting with our law team to just make sure that anything I request of particular proponents is okay with the litigation that is happening at this time.

Dan McKisson: And the next question is what land owners? Thank you. I appreciate it.

Sara Zora: Thanks, Dan. Appreciate your questions. Dan Gatchet, did you want to go next?

Dan Gatchet: Great presentation. Thank you! That technical work group -- I don't know if this is more directed towards Geri Poor, but I don't see the trucking industry represented any place on there. And I know on the South Holgate, they were involved, and frankly, I think the grade was acceptable, because any time you have any type of grade with older tracks that work in the harbor, it is difficult, especially if they are going to be heavy haul trucks. So, I'm just curious to know if there has been any outreach to the trucking industry. I'm not even sure if MacPiper is still going to be operating on their facility there. But I would hope they would be engaged.

Sara Zora: Definitely. We have all of the adjacent property owners as part of our engagement. They are our tier three, the project neighbors. We have four different tiers. Tier one is our technical work group that side with our primary stakeholders; tier two is priority relationships, and that's where we have our trucking association group of proponents, I think about 40 different entities or organizations. They just received an email from us letting them know that we are going to be at this meeting, and then they obviously operating other briefings. So, we're hoping to hear from people from different kinds of venues and ways that we are doing communication, and definitely our project neighbors are tier three, and that is where MacPiper, which is now a different name, but we definitely have been in touch with our new point of contact to just make sure we are hearing about how they are using Holgate, the importance of Holgate, and making sure that we are learning from that group, as well. So, they're not in tier one, but we definitely are engaging. If we haven't heard back from them yet, we will be reaching out again.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Dan Gatchet
Inquired about grade
separated options on
Holgate.

Sara Zora
Stated the study team was
in communication with 4
different tiers of public
engagement groups.

From Chat: Dan Gatchet: MacPiper is now Pasha Logistics, continuing operations on that site.

Stanley Ryter: Any more comments or questions? I will just ask, has BNSF had any indication about wanting to close the road to cars? I worked recently on a project where they are pushing eliminating that grade crossing. Any indication that they already told you that that is a preferred alternative? Or are they open to some different solutions?

Sara Zora: I think in the past I would say that they definitely would love to not have vehicles crossing east/west on Holgate. I think right now both Amtrak and BNSF are in that technical work group, and are definitely willing to go along and study with us, and think about different concepts, how we are evaluating those concepts. But safety is definitely a very big concern of theirs. We, in our existing conditions, data collection, and definitely hearing from other people do see a lot of noncompliance when we have gate down situations with trains in place and drivers and/or people walking, or biking, choose to do things that are very unsafe. So we do have a lot of different pressures and perspectives that will be weighing pretty heavily on this team as we continue to move forward.

Stanley Ryter: Thanks for that. Would the concepts involve any pedestrian-only crossings?

Sara Zora: Yes, for sure.

Stanley Ryter: I could see good design come out of several different options, and I think it is worth studying. I could see some at-grade crossings that could work (unintelligible). If you fix that and put a few more safety features in there. I also see a concept with cars and pedestrians being grade separated. (unintelligible)

Sara Zora: Yes. We're definitely coming back to you guys, and we'll work with Christopher Eaves and Baker Council to make sure we're coming in appropriate timeframes within this study. Thank you so much for your time.

Baker Council: And we will have the PowerPoint to you after the meeting.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Stanley Ryter: Okay. Sounds great. Is there any public comment?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Stanley Ryter: I'm not seeing any hands. I just want to thank Sara Zora and Wintana Miller for coming today. I think it's great that you are coming at the very beginning of the process here. I'm sure you will keep us informed.

Sara Zora: Yes, definitely. Thank you so much for your time. We appreciate it.

EAST MARGINAL WAY 1ST AVENUE SOUTH TO 16TH AVENUE SOUTH

Stanley Ryter: Next up, we've got Quinn Kelly from SDOT on East Marginal Way and 1st Avenue South to 16th Avenue South.

Quinn Kelly: My name is Quinn Kelly. I am also a planner in the project development corridors team. And coming here today to talk about a project that is currently at 30 percent design, so we are working toward figuring out our tech scope and concept here, and we're here to get your feedback. So, I appreciate your attention on this.

Just to give some background, this is a pavement preservation project. It is a federally-funded project. It started out as a pavement preservation project, and as part of that we go through our Complete Streets process to make sure that, as part of that work, are meeting the needs of all folks who are using the road, whether they are trucks, people walking, bicycling, driving, taking the bus. This is an over-legal route. It's a major truck street. There are a lot of freight needs along this corridor, as I am sure you are all aware. We need to make sure that we are maintaining turn radii for our larger trucks, the 67s. Also, Boeing uses East Marginal Way for the movement of very large assets, up to 40 - or 50-foot wide. There are a lot of constraints with regard to the design that we are keeping in mind to make sure that we are maintaining all of the freight uses that are currently in use along the corridor. East Marginal Way is also a bike-plus arterial. That means it is one of our streets that was designated in the Seattle Transportation Plan to help stitch together our City-wide bike network, and it also carries Metro 60 and 124 bus routes, and is a high priority bus corridor, and so is a location where we are

Quinn Kelly
Introduced the East
Marginal Way S Paving &
Safety Project

interested to see improvements for bus speed and reliability as well as transit rider experience.

To the north, we have King County and Boeing Field, as well as the Georgetown neighborhood, so residential areas that are quickly (unintelligible) with new townhouses and other medium density housing coming in there. And then, to the south, we have a lot of industrial, distribution, and maritime uses.

I will now say that, just like Sara Zora, I am happy to take questions during the presentation or after. So, feel free to jump in if anything jumps out at you.

Geri Poor: I wondered if you have statistics on the trucks, like what percent is truck use, or how many trucks a day are using it?

Quinn Kelly: Yes, we do. But I don't have those numbers on hand. But we do have classification counts that we can get from design characteristics.

Geri Poor: Could you follow up with Baker Council?

Quinn Kelly: Sure. Baker, if you will remind me, I can send them on.

Picking up on our design, we did a survey in August that sort of laid out everything that we heard from previous planning studies, including what you see on here, the Georgetown ability study, the Duwamish action plan, and Seattle Transportation Plan. We basically went to folks and said this is what we heard before we shared our 30 percent plans, and we asked if this matched their priorities with the corridor. And I will get into that a little later. We had a 30 percent design open house on the 3rd, and we are in the midst of modal board briefings. We are going to the pedestrian board and bike board, as well as the freight board. We are going to have ongoing engagement with lots of updates, and monitoring our project inbox, and meeting stakeholders, as needed.

From these previous planning studies, some things that we heard were basically a strong demand for protected bike infrastructure that connects to the existing facilities, linking across to West Seattle, as well as out through Georgetown to the Rainier Valley.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Geri Poor
Requested traffic counts in terms of the portion that were trucks.

We heard a strong need for improving safety, adding crosswalks, repairing sidewalks. We heard that pedestrian safety is a major concern, as well as sidewalk conditions and missing sidewalks. We also heard a lot about drainage issues that result in localized flooding, and the desire for better east/west connectivity. And then, as I alluded, we did that early survey. We got close to 200 responses, and definitely a lot of folks who were pretty satisfied with the proposal that we put forward as it relates to freight, Vision Zero, bike/ped, transit connectivity. We were happy to see that.

The corridor project scope is pavement restoration, so that is a two-inch overlay for the existing asphalt, as well as (unintelligible) where needed, restoring signal (unintelligible), updating curb ramps to make them ADA compliant, improving drainage to better manage storm water. We are looking at a southbound lane reduction, so going down from two to one lane between 4th Avenue and (unintelligible). I'll talk about that later. Upgrading bike facilities along the corridor, so using a combination of two lane (unintelligible) and directional bike lanes. We are looking at redesigning some key intersections where we have seen safety issues identified through our crash analysis. We are looking at some bike and pedestrian crossing upgrades, including new bike crossings at South River Street, as well as Carlton/8th Avenue South, meeting pedestrian intervals, sidewalk repair and bus upgrades.

Looking at our cross-sections. We are going to go from the north end to the south end of the corridor. This is the northern part, from 4th down to Corson. This is where we are proposing to go from two to one southbound lane. You can see on the right side the addition of the two-way protected bike lane, -- which I didn't really get too much into this, but this is a major priority for our work development that really connects the network from the recently installed Georgetown to South Park project over to the 1st Avenue Bridge, which gets folks to the Duwamish River Trail and the West Seattle freight network. So, it is really one of the few ways for folks on a bike to be able to get through the Duwamish Valley between West Seattle and southeast Seattle. Going south from there: So, south of Corson, we transitioned from that two-way PBL to a shared use path. That was largely because the section had a lot of sidewalk issues, as well, and so, in order to enable pedestrian accessibility, we also needed to address the pedestrian facilities. So, we're doing a shared use path so that we can preserve both the bike connectivity and the pedestrian accessibility, as well as the necessary through and travel lanes and turn lanes to facilitate access through the intersection at Corson.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Quinn Kelly
Highlighted some major scope elements, including pavement restoration, signal improvements, updating curb ramps for ADA compliance, and improvement of drainage.

Going south from there: So, the right-of-way opens up a little bit south of Carlton, and we were able to fit in that six-foot planking strip between the path and the street. This area is the lowest tree canopy in the entire City, basically. It is a high priority for increasing the tree canopies. Luckily, we were able to add a decent amount of trees into our 30 percent design. So, we are really excited to be able to do that to help address the urban heat effect, air pollution, all of the other things that trees are helpful for. And we are definitely super conscious of making sure that the tree plantings that we are using here are compatible not only with industrial uses, so making sure we have ones that are high up off the ground, so they don't impact trucks and buses, but we are also coordinating with the airport to make sure that we are including tree species that don't attract wildlife or result in other issues for operations. South of Ellis, the right-of-way really widens out, and we are able to preserve all five of the existing lanes as well as the planting strip and the (unintelligible) path, which is great, because Ellis is also where we see our traffic volumes increase and there is more of a need for that second southbound lane.

I guess I should mention that section is also where the existing Georgetown to South Park trail project was recently (unintelligible), almost the exact same cross-section as you see on the right here.

Geri Poor: If we could look at the next key map on the bottom of these slides that show us where you are talking about for people who may drive East Marginal Way, but may not know the cross streets Nogales and Carlton and those. It's hard to follow.

Quinn Kelly: Yes. I appreciate that feedback. I had that in a different version of this presentation. I don't know why I took it out, but I am happy to pull that up. This is the southernmost section of the corridor, and we are actually just preserving that existing cross-section but just upgrading the existing bike facilities to protected bike lanes. Looking at that in plain view, this is just zooming in on the key locations. This is near the end of the corridor at 4th Avenue. You can see some of the project elements. I'm not going to talk about everything here unless you have questions. Then I am happy to. For example, here we preserved two southbound lanes coming out of the River at 4th intersection. The purpose of that was basically to make sure that our large trucks that were making this right turn off of River Street, but still make that turn onto East Marginal

without crossing the double yellow. So, there are a few spots like that on the corridor where we may design modifications just to make sure that we can accommodate those large trucking movements. Here we have removed this little porkchop island that was previously out in the middle of the corridor and consolidated 4th to one leg. And that was done largely for pedestrian safety. We have seen intersections like this around the City and seen much higher rates of pedestrian injuries and fatalities. So, we're trying to make that turn a little bit tighter with this raised truck apron while still accommodating all of the necessary freight movements here.

Geri Poor: So, you have the little slip lane removed. Are you saying that you're narrowing it from two lanes to one lane?

Quinn Kelly: It's one lane in the existing

Geri Poor: On 4th Avenue South?

Quinn Kelly: Yes. The receiving lane is one and then it widens out to two shortly after. It's a little bit confusing, the existing configuration. But instead of it being a separate slip lane, it's just part of the main intersection. I don't know if that answers your question.

Geri Poor: Will 4th Avenue South be two lanes then? You said existing is one.

Quinn Kelly: We can look at the Google map together. I'm not sure exactly what the plans are. At this location, it looks like we are anticipating one receiving lane, but it does currently widen out to two. I would assume that's still the plan. But, yes, there are not two right turn lanes, so effectively there are still either one receiving lane on 4th.

Dan McKisson: So, what is removed? I don't understand what slip lane is removed. Where is it on that Google map?

Quinn Kelly: This is what we are talking about. Previously, it's just a much wider angle right turn. Maybe removal is not really the right language to use here, but we are reorienting the way that that northbound 4th Avenue lane interfaces with East Marginal Way.

Geri Poor: My question with respect to this would be if the freight team has looked at it and is comfortable with it, I would appreciate seeing the truck apron. And then, we want to check it against the volumes that you said you would be sending later. And just one last comment. Where the arrow is right now, I understand that you have to drop that left turn pocket back from the intersection, to allow the turns, but it looks like a truck would think they could turn into the more northern lane. You said there are two receiving lanes. But they are going to hit that (unintelligible).

Quinn Kelly: Which movement are you talking about?

Geri Poor: You have, coming from the left on East Marginal Way two lanes. And they are going to move into one pretty fast. And the way that is designed, it looks like they are headed into the yellow lane. The trucks that are on the inside lane on East Marginal north of this intersection and left of this intersection -- why does that inside lane south of the intersection....

Quinn Kelly: So, it looks like that inside lane would be 11 feet. I think perhaps this needs some additional markings to indicate that that is a merge situation, like some merge arrows and a dotted line here.

Geri Poor: Yes. That doesn't look very safe.

Quinn Kelly: Yes. Well, this is pretty early design. Sometimes, those channelization details can be added later on. But I appreciate your comment.

Geri Poor: To circle back, one person on the freight board is asking if you will have the freight team look at the intersection here.

Quinn Kelly: Yes, definitely. We have been working closely with Christopher Eaves, looking at all of the various spots along here, where we are trouble-shooting to make sure that we are maintaining freight access. But, yes, we will continue to include them in our review.

Dan McKisson: I'm having a hard time conceptualizing exactly some of these lane removals. Because you are going from five lanes basically to four so you could add the

Quinn Kelly
Per discussion with Geri Poor, it was recommended that this being an early design phase to consider additional markings to indicate a merge is happening on southbound East Marginal Way at 4th Ave as an important design feature. The freight and rail team would continue to be included in the review.

bike path and pedestrian. Whatever I think of East Marginal Way -- I think its a major freight corridor. And the thought of skimming or removing a lane right now doesn't sit real well with me. Some of these smaller areas like River Street and so forth, I'm not too concerned about that. But when you start doing it on a major corridor like East Marginal Way, that's a little different.

Quinn Kelly: Yes, I am actually going to get to that in a couple of slides, talking about the lane reduction. So, I'm happy to address that when we get there.

Stanley Ryter: I've got a question on where you were on the bike lane. This bike lane shows on the right, and then does the bike lane go across 4th Avenue South? It continues along East Marginal Way....

Quinn Kelly: Basically, here it merges into a 10-foot shared use path here. And then, the idea is bikes can cross here at River Street to get over to the 1st Avenue Bridge.

Stanley Ryter: Oh, okay. So, you can get on with the 1st Avenue South bridge there, but if you are bicycling towards (unintelligible) here, what happens when you cross 4th Avenue South? Is there a special signal?

Quinn Kelly: Yes. We don't have plans at this time to include a bike connection along 4th at East Marginal. That's not part of our proposed bike network. The idea is just getting folks to River Street and then they could connect in any direction along there. But we don't plan to continue the bike facility north of 4th along East Marginal.

Stanley Ryter: So, the bike facility ends there, and then you are pushing people across the street. Do you have this in a larger plan view, the bike network?

Quinn Kelly: Yes. I can pull that up. I don't have it in the slide deck, but I am happy to pull that up to look at it. Maybe I will add a list of things to quickly come back to at the end.

Let me move through these, and then I'll speak to the lane reduction. And then I can jump back to the bike network.

From Chat: Geri Poor. Over-arching comments for the end of the presentation:

- 1) 10' center lane isn't wide enough for a truck
- 2) the results of your survey said 60% were comfortable with the freight use, but that was the lowest of all -- do you know what their concerns were?
- 3) You mentioned that EMW was the one of the few ways for people on a bike to get through this area. -- Is that also true for freight? if you lessen capacity for freight, where would you prefer that the trucks go?

Quinn Kelly: Moving south along the corridor, this is just showing the intersections at Carlton and Ellis. I won't show too much on these. I can jump back to them as needed. And then, finally going south 14th to 16th. You can see that this is where the existing Georgetown to South Park Trail was installed, the bus stop upgrades, and a new bike crossing at 16th to make sure that folks can get to the other side of the street in case they want to continue south on East Marginal.

Speaking to the southbound lane reductions, this segment of East Marginal, where we are looking at the lane reduction. This is basically between 4th and Carlton. So, this section right here. This section has relatively lower volumes, compared to the sections of East Marginal north and south of here. There is a lot of traffic that goes up Ellis. There is a lot of traffic that goes back and forth along Michigan. The traffic volumes on here are actually far below the (unintelligible) where we would consider what we call a road diet or lane reduction. We did a really thorough traffic analysis and it suggested that doing this lane reduction from one to two southbound lanes would result in very minimal increases in traffic delay. Our main concern is making sure that we could preserve the truck access and we were able to make some design modifications to do that. But we don't anticipate any major increases and delay resulting from this. We are continuing to coordinate with major freight stakeholders, Boeing, WSDOT, all of the particulars you see here. Definitely during construction, we will be working with folks to identify acceptable detour routes.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Quinn Kelly
Indicated that a through traffic analysis for existing and future volumes would suffice in terms of lane reductions and not increase traffic delays. Likewise, the study was continuing to engage with Boeing, WSDOT and other freight stakeholders. During construction acceptable detours routes would be identified.

As I mentioned, we are at 30 percent design right now, and working towards 60 percent. We are on a bit of a tight schedule here because the nature of our federal grant funding requires that we are advertising the project for construction by 2/3/2026.

Now returning to some questions. I've got a few from Geri Poor, so "A 10' center lane isn't wide enough for a truck." Appreciate that feedback. We're really trying to work out how to allocate our right-of-way here. We have in our Streets Illustrated standards 12-foot outside lanes. It is possible that we could trim down and get a little space elsewhere to widen that center lane. I can definitely share that concern with our design team.

Geri Poor: Will you get back to us with that decision? I would appreciate your sharing it with them, but understand that it is something we need to follow up on. Because I think we have seen other places in the City where the lane got narrowed and then it led to safety issues.

Quinn Kelly: "The results of your survey said 60% were comfortable with the freight use, but that was the lowest of all -- do you know what their concerns were?" We definitely heard the main concerns about the two to one southbound lane reduction. I think that was the largest concern, particularly folks in the Georgetown neighborhood sharing concerns about the potential for truck traffic, choosing to detour through the neighborhood as a result of traffic that was coming out of this project. We are definitely taking that into consideration. We want to make sure that whatever we are doing here in terms of our lane considerations and signal timing is not (unintelligible). "The signal at East Marginal Way was one of the few ways to bike through this area. Is that also true for freight?" Currently, there is really no safe way to bike through here. It is not a safe route at all. The way that we are thinking about the freight is we are maintaining (unintelligible) for the volumes that we have. We think we are maintaining sufficient capacity for all of the freight traffic that needs to use this corridor to get through East Marginal Way. We definitely recognize that it is a really important freight route, and we want to make sure that we are maintaining those operations.

Geri Poor: Okay. And you said you would get us those volumes.

Quinn Kelly: Yes.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Geri Poor

Requested updates on lane narrowing be shared with freight board, to avoid safety issues on previous freight routes.

Stanley Ryter: It looks like there are 17 and a half feet of bike lane, and I think that you could probably squeeze out to add to the lane a little better.

Quinn Kelly: Yes. Are there any other questions?

Dan Gatchet: I have a question. You know what the truck caps are. Those are fairly easy to get. And again, that's a major freight corridor. And thinking about bike paths and pedestrians, any idea of how much will really be used. Because it doesn't seem like that would be a an industrial area where you would see a lot of activity from pedestrians or bikes.

Quinn Kelly: Yes. That's a good segue. I want to share this map which is from our Seattle Transportation Plan road networks, which I hope will show it. This has been a priority for our bike program and for the biking community in Seattle, and I think I can help explain why. Basically, if you are coming from Georgetown or really anywhere in southeast Seattle, the route that you currently take to get down if you're going to West Seattle, you're coming down from 15th and over on Lucille, or you're coming down Swift and Albemarle, either of those basically into Georgetown, at that point, the only way to over to West Seattle would be either going all the way up to the West Seattle Bridge, which is hugely out of your way if you're coming from anywhere down here, or you're going down south through South Park and then back up. This would unlock the ability to actually connect up East Marginal, over River Street, across the 1st Avenue Bridge, which gets you onto the Duwamish Trail. So, there is definitely not a ton of bike traffic today, but we anticipate this connection as a major priority for folks, and so we are anticipating that it will unlock a lot of network connectivity for folks to be able to actually get to different parts of Seattle safely on a bike.

Stanley Ryter: Okay, are there any other questions from the board?

Dan McKisson: Can you be a little more specific on the counts. What is the traffic count through that corridor? What do you see as an acceptable traffic count per lane. You said you made your decisions on those, and I'm just curious about those numbers.

Quinn Kelly
Responded to Dan
Gatchet's concern about
the need for extensive
bike/ped improvements
here, which was noted as
an significant way to
improve bike/ped
connectivity from the
Seattle Transportation
Plan.

Quinn Kelly: The traffic volumes, the ADT -- and I am going to preface this by saying that I am not an engineer; I'm not the one who did the analysis, so I can't really speak to the details -- but the ADT on this corridor, we are seeing 12,000 to 16,000 average daily traffic. And typically, our threshold for looking at a corridor for a four to three lane reduction (This is a five to four lane reduction.) But a four to three lane is anything below 25,000. This is way below our threshold for what would be considered for a potential lane reduction, solely just for a safety benefit. Because what we see in our crash analysis is these streets that had excess capacity encourages folks to be driving faster. And that results in more crashes. Just from a safety perspective, that would be our threshold for where we would look at a lane reduction. In this case, we didn't just look at those volumes and say it's going to be fine. In spite of the fact that it is pretty far below that threshold, we did a full traffic analysis where we created a model of all of the intersections and ran the analysis to see what the actual impacts would be of the proposed lane configuration. And the increase in delay at the very worst intersection at the very worst time of day was something in the range of four to six seconds. So, for most of the day, there would be little to no increase in delay for folks going north/south along East Marginal. We might see a peak hour four or five seconds more to get through that intersection.

Dan McKisson: Okay. We don't have a standard for lanes in the City, or is that ...?

Quinn Kelly: I don't know offhand what that standard is. I can't quote you that number.

Dan McKisson: Okay. What are your projected bike counts?

Quinn Kelly: We don't have projected bike counts.

Dan McKisson: And then when do you account for the language that you consider the idle time and implications?

Quinn Kelly: Definitely. We don't want to see folks who are waiting at a signal for multiple cycles. That's not the goal here. We are trying to make sure that folks move through this area efficiently. That is one of the things we account for.

Dan McKisson: Has some of this already been implemented on that route?

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Quinn Kelly
Responded to Dan McKisson concern about traffic volumes and lane reductions here, explaining that the current 16,000 ADT was way below the 25,000 ADT threshold for a 4 to 3 and this case a 5 to 4 lane reduction.

Quinn Kelly: There is a separate project, the Georgetown to South Park project, which installed a shared use path along East Marginal between Ellis and 16th. That has been under construction, and I think it is nearing completion. This would not go into construction until 2027.

Dan McKisson: Some of the stuff you showed us looked like it had already been implemented. Thank you. I must say that I admire you for coming in and doing the presentation, It's kind of hard when you have a board that is made up of freight interests. And again, we see, unfortunately many times, that the City of Seattle, or SDOT, that freight lanes are being reduced. It doesn't sit real well with us who make a living moving freight. Again, I admire you, who with a good attitude and smile to come in and do this presentation. So, thank you.

Quinn Kelly: I appreciate that. We're not trying to make enemies. We want to make sure that we're getting our trucks through the corridor without any unnecessary delays or issues. That's a huge part of our planning and design process. I appreciate your feedback. We will take a look at those lane widths and make sure that our freight team is reviewing this moving forward on an ongoing basis. I think Geri Poor asked for a link to that traffic study.

From Chat: Geri Poor: Can you send us a link to that traffic study please?

Quinn Kelly: Are you referring to the traffic study that was just about the lane reduction?

Geri Poor: Yes. What you just said, that you did the synchro-analysis resulting in four to five second delays.

Quinn Kelly: I'm not going to promise that I can give you that. I think we can. I just have to check with our project team. I think I should get back to you.

Geri Poor: Well, we all work for public agencies, so

Quinn Kelly: Yes. I know that you can get it through other means.

Stanley Ryter: Okay, great presentation. Public comment. Does anybody have any public comment about this presentation outside of the board?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Stanley Ryter: I think we can thank Quinn Kelly for coming today. The next item on our agenda is the Seattle Transportation Plan Draft Three-year Implementation Plan Review.

SEATTLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (STP) DRAFT THREE-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN REVIEW

Stanley Ryter: To refresh our memory, I believe at the last meeting, this had not come out yet. So we did vote that a subcommittee to review it and write a response before it was due, which would be the 17th, which is tomorrow. What has happened in the interim is that plan came out. Marc Hoecker is on vacation. Geri Poor read it. We found comments from Geri, and Geri wrote the letter. I will pass it over to Geri to see what the findings of the group are.

Geri Poor: Thank you very much. Could we take it from the first page? This is the proposed draft. I will try to get through it in like three minutes, if I can. Apparently, it was just sent to the boards, freight, transit, bike and pedestrian, and I have an introductory paragraph that describes what our role is as the freight board. In summary, the second paragraph provides an overview that we appreciate the system balance, and the visibility brought to freight needs. And while we advocate for freight system preservation, we also recognize that we have to have a fully functioning transportation system. And then, I grouped the comments into 'Well done.' For things that work well. 'Please provide more.' where we wanted more information. And then, the third bullet is continuing SFAB engagement with City staff, and a few technical comments. So, we are asking that they get back to us with some things that were intriguing, but are just beginning the process. So, on the 'well done,' I think you all received this from Baker Council late yesterday, and I hope you've had a chance to look at the things that we called out as being well done. I don't think we need to go through them in detail, unless anyone wants to. And then, 'Please provide more.' They had spotlight initiatives, like

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Geri Poor

Shared that the STP 3-Year Implementation Plan subcommittee had a drafted a letter, which identified initiatives and elements supported by the SFAB and aspects that should be improved upon.

responsible stewardship, transformative impact, and support ST3 with input again from Marc Hoecker and Stanley Ryter, we made some specific comments about responsible stewardship, making sure that they bring different design solutions to MICs, than what they might use in a residential neighborhood or urban area. On Aurora Avenue, we wanted to make sure that they identify where the trucks should be moving. And we wanted to add 'maintain industrial land to support freight movement to the Sound Transit discussion,

Then they have these fixed key moves, which are safety, equity, sustainability, mobility, economic vitality, livability, and one more, rightness and modernization. That's the next section of the report, and we made some specific freight comments on each of those. And on the third bullet, and Baker, we would hope to have a square box, that border on continuing staff engagement.

There were several things that we said it would be good for them to share more as they go into development. They have something called an industrial zone design guide. They said they have a signal concept at 4th Avenue South and South Forest Street. They are installing freight and bus lanes. And they said they would be doing an analysis of that. And we would like them to brief us on what they get out of the analysis. So Route 43 and bus lanes and other freight and bus lanes, such as on 4th Avenue South. The fourth request was that they use the term, 'digital conflict or area awareness management program. And I suggested we get a lot more information on that. Looks like we missed an 'S' in 'please engage with us' on the updated Streets Illustrated manual. There wasn't any timing provided for when they were doing that. But that's on the list. And then, they use the term 'intersection daylighting,' which is just a technical request for information. And the last thing was to suggest adding captions to the photographs because not everyone know where they are at.

That's what we drafted. If anyone thinks there is too much detail and wants to cut something, or has things to add, now is the time to discuss.

Stanley Ryter: A big thank you to Geri Poor, for really doing the heavy lifting on this. I sent some comments in, but Geri worked all weekend to pull this off.

Dan McKisson: Geri, thanks for doing this. It's ironic. As I looked through this before the meeting and then I hear this presentation about East Marginal Way, I thought something is not adding up here. Forget about enhancing the freight corridor, it's just trying to maintain and keep the freight corridor. I just see here goes Nickerson Street all over on East Marginal Way.

Geri Poor: I think we made the points as best we could and I think we have to continue to reinforce our values and beliefs in writing.

Dan McKisson: Yes, thank you. Good work on this. I really appreciate all of the work that was put into this. On that 'Continuing SFAB engagement with City staff to get peoples' comments,' on the first bullet, it says, 'Please brief SFAB on the industrial zone design guide,' is that industrial zone design guide their language, or is that something that we put in there?

Geri Poor: Yes, that is something that they have on page 45.

Dan McKisson: Okay. The reason being is I think we need it to really focus on what is going on in the industrial zones and actual deployment, and I don't know if that would be industrial employment zone design guide. I know that we are using that language, but the language gets bland and doesn't indicate that there are actually jobs, and people feeding families in these areas. That would be my only suggestion, if you guys think that is worthwhile.

Geri Poor: I think if the board wanted to do that, we could say, 'please brief the SFAB on the industrial zone design guide and suggest renaming to recognize the role of employment.' Maybe you could offer some language to that.

Dan McKisson: I would just insert the word, 'employment' zone. That's what it is. We need to recognize that and the jobs that we are losing because of changes and the decrease in that. So, I think our narrative should always be 'industrial employment zones.' or 'industrial employment areas.' We ask for an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan using language like that. That's my suggestion. I'm not going to live or die over it. I just think we need to change the narrative.

From Chat: Thanks, everyone, for your attention and your comments! I will follow up with Baker regarding your requests.

Stanley Ryter: We have proposed language. Baker Council, do you have this down?

Baker Council: Sure. Would you like me to add 'employment zones' or just a separate bullet point?

Dan McKisson: I just think the narrative should be 'industrial employment zone.' That's kind of changing their language. If people have a problem with it, I understand.

Christopher Eaves: Can I comment regarding 'industrial zone design guide?' That is a document that the freight program is developing. In order to get better clarity on non-arterials, the industrial areas, to also provide that 'this non-arterial is different than a residential non-arterial' and we may be sure that the type of work and land use being performed remains accessible. So, if I were suggesting anything regarding industrial employment areas, it would be, perhaps, to describe that all of this should be seen as such within the context of the City. But that is myself potentially putting words into the board's mouth. I want to make sure not to do that.

Dan McKisson: Thanks, Chris. I don't want to complicate it. Let's just move forward.

Geri Poor: Dan, I offered some language, which was 'Please brief the (unintelligible) on the industrial zone design guide and consider renaming to 'industrial/employment zone guide,' to recognize employment uses in these zones. Do you like that? It's in the chat, too.

From Chat: Geri Poor: Industrial zone design Guide and consider renaming to "Industrial/Employment Zone Guide" to recognize employment uses in these zones.

Nigel Barron: Just while we're on that section, the only piece that jumped out at me -- Geri, you referenced page 22, as well -- was the expanding of bike buffer hardening and maintenance to upgrade protected bike lane treatments and build out even better bike lanes. The concern that jumped out at me on that was hardening the bike lanes

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Chris Eaves
Explained that the freight team is preparing an "industrial zone design guide".

and making sure that we take into consideration the turning radii for the trucks. It's different when it's a flex post versus a hardened bike lane.

Geri Poor: Yes. Can you suggest some tips?

Nigel Barron: I would say please continue briefing SFAB on hardening bike lanes as that relates to turning radii. Something along those lines. Keep briefing SFAB on bike lane modifications as they would affect turning radius. We need to wrap this to page number. I was 22 where they talked about that.

Geri Poor: Should we move for approval?

Stanley Ryter: I think we are good. Geri, do you want to sign this?

Geri Poor: I think the chair gets to do it.

Stanley Ryter: It's a great letter and in my view, to have a good freight product like this in time to get our comments in on short notice, is a great product for the month here.

Dan McKisson: Should I make a motion to approve?

Stanley Ryter: I think we made the motion last time to just do it. I don't think it hurts to make a motion to approve it for the record.

Dan McKisson: Motion to approve as written, and to submit.

Stanley Ryter: Do we have a second?

Nicole Calais: Second.

Stanley Ryter: All in favor? Let's do it. I will sign this document before I leave this room, and we will go from there. Back to the agenda. Any closing public comment?

CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENT

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Nigel Barron
Requested continued
briefing to SFAB on
hardening bike lanes as it
relates to turning radii.

Stanley Ryter: Hearing none, we will go to the October agenda. Baker or Chris, anything on the horizon for October?

OCTOBER AGENDA

Christopher Eaves: I will start. Two of the items, one was the industrial employment zones and the other, the Route 40 bus lane analysis. It might be possible for us to get a presentation regarding the design guide. And pushing it forward. Baker Council is the person in engagement with the Route 40 research, working with the freight lab. They won't be past data collection until early 2026. So, that could be an item that we have when we have information delivered. And I will see what we can do about the 4th Avenue South and South (unintelligible) design, as well.

Geri Poor: May I propose for discussion another item for the October agenda? We had worked in 2024 on that work plan, and Christopher sent it around to us today, and I wonder if we might want to revisit that and have a discussion about what we anticipate that the 2026 plan could look like. I think that many of the projects will remain the same, but we could take some of the projects listed there for the three-year implementation study and add them to the list, and take out things that are done. And if anybody wanted to work with me on proposals, we could bring that forward in October.

Stanley Ryter: Yes, let's add that to the agenda, revisiting the work plan. I know that Geri Poor set it up today, and it's probably a good time for it. Anybody want to work with Geri Poor on that?

Geri Poor: Okay. I'll just mark it up.

Stanley Ryter: That sounds pretty good.

Geri Poor: Put it this way. I'll work with our staff liaison.

Baker Council: I will get you that information.

SFAB 9/16/25 MEETING

Stanley Ryter: It's 5:15 p.m. and I think that's about it. Anybody have anything else, or a motion to close the meeting? I think we're good. So, we will adjourn the Tuesday, September 16, 2025 Seattle Freight Advisory Board meeting. Thanks so much.

SFAB XX/XX/XX MEETING

