

## February 15, 2022 Meeting - Seattle Freight Advisory Board

### Topics covered included:

This meeting was held: February 15, 2022, 9:00-10:30 a.m., via Webex

**Board Members:** Jeanne Acutanza, Geri Poor, Mike Elliott, Warren Aakervik, Pat Cohn

**Public:** Thomas Noyes, Ryan Packer, Eugene Wasserman, Eric Wright, Rachel Ludwick, Martin Arroyo

**Staff:** Christopher Eaves, Radcliffe Dacanay, Cass Magnuski

**Attending:** 14 (All via Webex)

**Christopher Eaves:**

### INTRODUCTIONS

**Christopher Eaves:** I want to make a couple of notes real quick. When I came in, I was talking with Cass and Warren. I really appreciated Cass Magnuski's suggestion of highlighting/bolding the large transcript. I used an adjusted set-up where I have a sidebar that takes on some notes and then used highlights. It lets me have links, such as to the Draft EIS for the industrial and maritime, rather than trying to insert it in the copy areas. What is important is it makes for a 30-page document, but if you just look at the sidebar, you can read through and find and highlight the areas that you're interested in, or that you want to comment further on. It made my distillation of the transcripts into minutes of highlights an order of magnitude faster. I put it in front of Jeanne Acutanza, and I will put that in front of you and the board to see if this is acceptable.

SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

SFAB Meeting opening,  
Attendees, Introductions.

Chris Eaves notes easier  
minutes format.

I also want to note that at this point in time, while we still have our potential new board members interested and actively so, we are holding until Council and the Mayor's Office resolve whether they want to make different recommendations. And this is across all boards -- or continue on. So this is our second month of the year where the meeting has been deferred. And again, a reminder: That Council meeting happens to occur monthly at the same time as our freight board meeting. So, with any luck, you won't see me as we go and confirm new members at some point, hopefully next month. So, that is where we are, and I know I'm hopping into things, but I'd like to know what the updated record looks like.

**Warren Aakervik:** If there's conflict with the transportation committee, is it possible to just move the meeting to a little bit different time, or a different day for that one?

**Christopher Eaves:** It is possible. I would hope that -- I would like to keep us as close as we can to our original meeting schedule. And if it has me moving outside of the meeting for half an hour and then coming back in, that would work also. I just want to make sure that you're aware that we have, potentially, a point where I won't be here. Somebody else might be for a period of time as we get the new members finalized.

**Warren Aakervik:** I thought maybe we could hold the transportation committee meeting on our board meeting.

**Christopher Eaves:** We might. It would be interesting, for sure. I'm showing online what the minutes would look like right now. This is just a representative point. If I see something that's of value in the text, I'm highlighting it and describing what we're looking at. This is the part where we were discussing the maritime and industrial. Here, I was able to pull out the action alternatives and what was said. Again, I highlight that this is a lot of pages, but here things like information that I can quickly connect the industrial and maritime link, the strategy report itself, pointing to the areas where we were discussing them. And

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Chris Eaves notes new board member appointments are being held until new administration has input.

Also, Transportation Committee meets approximately the same time each month as SFAB

that lets me also do highlights of questions and move through what the outcome is. It looks daunting when you see 30-pages, but Cass does a great job of making sure she knows who is saying what. And then, over on the sidebar, we can at least highlight and sum up what the salient points are. So, it's rather a quick read if you take the sidebar, and then add, discuss, or approve, and I think it can be a little more easily done when you can basically say, no, you need to add things like Warren said this, or meant that. But at this point in time, I was hoping to get peoples' view on whether or not this might work, or if we want to try something else.

**Warren Aakervik:** I think as we look at it, we can see how workable it is. Yes, I think it looks great.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** And if there's a way to highlight that action, a way to pull them. They're in that sidebar, as well, but just to make sure they come to the front.

**Christopher Eaves:** Okay. We literally can highlight the actions. This is an active Word document. What I can do is I will send this out to the board to make sure that they have that available and use that as a template to start working our way through what was a rather large set of documents.

**Warren Aakervik:** So, **that sidebar effectively becomes an executive summary.**

**Christopher Eaves:** Yes!

**Pat Cohn:** It seems like a big improvement to me.

**Christopher Eaves:** Thank you. It helps me a great deal, too, so I appreciate it all. Thank you, Cass, for the suggestions, greatly, wonderfully, hopefully.

So, I've taken a few minutes of our time. I would ask Jeanne to start us up?

SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Discussion of use of Sidebars with transcript and highlights to create minutes and executive summary.  
-example to left-

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Welcome, everyone, to our Seattle Freight Advisory Board. It's Tuesday, February 15. We will open with public comment. Let's do introductions, and then we'll do public comment.

## INTRODUCTIONS

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Welcome, everyone. I have no announcements. I appreciate everyone's movement on the discussion of the minutes. Sometime in the near future, it would be great to get a handle on the Move Ahead Washington, if there's anything in there for freight that we need to be aware of. But I would like to open it up to any other announcements. I see none. Let's move to the freight. Were you more interested in the freight lane policy or the EIS?

**Geri Poor:** Both, obviously, and I am happy to meet offline and catch up on the discussion about the industrial and EIS and the new presentation on the freight lanes policy.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I did say public comment earlier, and then I forgot to come back to it. Is there any public comment at this time? Okay, the floor is yours, Chris, for introductions.

**Christopher Eaves:** Radcliffe Dacanay has made his way on, and he's going to be doing a presentation regarding the draft freight lanes policy. In terms of background, I'll let him introduce himself. We've been working on this for a while to get an idea of what could help us as part of our larger toolbox of options on our roads in Seattle. Without further ado, Radcliffe, do you want to say hello?

## DRAFT FREIGHT LANE POLICY

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Great! Thank you, Chris! Hello, everybody. My name is Radcliffe Dacanay. I'm a principal planner at SDOT in the Policy and Planning Division of the Transportation Planning Group. I have been working with Chris

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Introductions  
Public Comment

Draft Freight Lane Policy  
Presentation

Eaves and quite a few others on this draft freight lane policy. I'm happy to just go over with you the slide deck that gives an overview of where we're at with the policy, and then would like to have a discussion with you on your initial feedback from the presentation and how we might be able to incorporate some of your thoughts and feedback on the draft freight lane policy. So, if you'll bear with me one moment, I'll just get the slide deck up. Can everybody see that okay?

**Christopher Eaves:** I can, but it seems rather small.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Yes, I'll put it in presentation mode right now. How's that?

**Christopher Eaves:** That's better.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** All right, thank you for having me here. It's been a long time coming. Back a year-plus ago, we started thinking about a freight only lane policy, and we've been doing some work with our colleagues around transit and looking at how there might also be an opportunity for freight and bus lane sharing. So, this now is a little bit more broad, and it's a freight lane policy that has an overview on freight only, and also freight and bus shared lanes. It's what we're calling FAB lanes right now.

By way of introduction to you, this draft freight lane policy just gives you an overview, the background, purpose, need for this policy, the existing policy context, a draft policy statement that we've written, and then some initial tactics and actions going forward for this year. And then I'll give you also a map of some conceptual locations. These are just ideas right now for discussion purposes only. And then, we'll close out the session with a discussion with all of you and see if we can get some comments and feedback, and then I'll go over some of the next steps.

The project team at SDOT includes the City engineers, staff of policy and planning, traffic operations, transit and mobility and urban design, and others that are working on some transit projects to see where there could be some capacity

Draft policy discussing both freight-only and shared freight and bus (FAB) lanes.

for freight to integrate with some planned or already existing transit lanes. It's a broad effort within SDOT. We thought it might be a shorter-term effort, but it has taken us a little bit longer and we have been collaborating with a number of staff within the department. Now we're happy to do some engagement with you on this policy.

Background and Need: When we started out this conversation, we talked about freight bottlenecks that are increasingly becoming part of the normal experience, daily, weekly, within the manufacturing and industrial centers. We looked at drafting this freight lane policy that builds on the Freight Master Plan. There are a number of actions and strategies within the Freight Master Plan that suggests we should be looking at freight-only lane policy. And then, as we are moving to update our modal plans, we did a modal integration effort, sort of a white paper internally and look at opportunities to integrate and balance freight improvements with other modes, meaning we would explore ways for freight to move efficiently and safely through congested segments within the City. And looking at the synergies between freight and transit, where a shared lane could be a net position for both freight and transit. And of course, not only for those two modes, but for people walking and people biking, as well, to ensure safety for all of the different ways that people and goods move about the City. And our focus here is to start with larger-type commercial trucks, and the Class 7 and Class 8 vehicles, but perhaps with a future opportunity, we would be able to look at smaller-type vehicles, as well.

Some key goals from the Freight Master Plan: This freight lane policy advances the strategies and actions that were identified in the Freight Master Plan to implement key goals and support SDOT values. So here, around equity, being able to help reduce pollution in areas that disproportionately affect communities of color. And of course, safety is very important, making sure that we have predictable movements to ensure not only the safety of goods movement, but also people in and around where those goods are being moved, and then having a more robust freight network that supports a thriving economy here in the Seattle region. Reliable connections to the manufacturing and industrial centers

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Freight Master Plan suggests a freight lane policy

Goal is safety and predictable movement with a first focus on commercial trucks

Opportunity to reduce emissions from delay

And support reliable connections in the MICs and business districts

and business districts, and to more regional and State and national freight networks, as well. And then, having goods movement operating more efficiently through the City in turn lowers the overall emissions.

Some of the existing policy context: Building on the Freight Master Plan. here are just a few that I have listed, but one of the key ones is **Action 1.9.2, explore shared transit freight-only lanes and their application. So, when we started to look at freight-only lanes and having conversations with our colleagues working on transit lanes, it made sense to expand our scope to look at that, too.** And then we have all of the different Modal Master Plans, and each of those plans speak to some sort of integration with other modes and making sure that there are transit vehicles that are operating efficiently, considering safety for cyclists when thinking about freight mobility. And then simply, in the Pedestrian Master Plan, just designing and planning for and building Complete Streets to move people and goods. So, that is the freight aspect there. And then, as I mentioned earlier with the modal integration policy framework we did last year, completed last year, it is looking at the benefits of an integrated approach with other modes when thinking about freight movements in manufacturing and industrial centers.

So, the draft freight lane policy that we've written so far -- I'll just read it out here - - is dedicated freight-only lanes, and transit lanes that allow freight will be considered in locations where they can improve freight mobility and avoid negative impacts to other transportation system users. Some of the initial tactics that we'll do to get there, when we're thinking about implementing a freight-only lane, or a freight and bus shared lane, we'll start out with testing them as pilots and evaluate them before we permanently install them. So, when we go out there, everything will be temporary at first. When we are sharing with transit, we'll be looking at possibly transit lanes that do not exceed 20 buses per hour. And I'll go through some maps that show where some of those opportunities might be. And then, of course, making sure that transit reliability and rider experience isn't negatively impacted.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Existing Freight Master Plan Policy

Also looking towards an integrated approach with other modes.

Freight only and FAB lanes will be first tested as pilot projects before any permanent installation is considered.

Freight-only lanes and shared bus route lanes: Freight-only lanes will be focusing in the manufacturing and industrial centers; and then the freight and bus shared lanes primarily on major truck streets that already have transit lanes, or have plans to add a transit lane. Freight and buses sharing dedicated lanes, like I said, we'd only do that after we do sufficient compatibility analysis and make sure that we don't impact the transit experience. And then, for freight-only lanes as well, we'll be thinking about locations within the MICs that provide access to commercial and industrial activities that are experiencing frequent bottlenecks. And then, as I mentioned earlier, this phase of the work will be focusing on larger sized freight vehicles Class 7 and Class 8 vehicles.

**How might we operationalize these freight priorities? For freight-only, we're going to start in the manufacturing and industrial centers. They are highlighted with the pink arrows, the SODO area and Ballard. And then, for freight and bus shared lanes, we have examined route segments with 20 buses per hour, relative to the freight network. I'll go through an animation here, so you get a sense of where those might be. This is the composite of a.m./p.m. mid-day and p.m. peaks relative to the freight network.**

**Geri Poor:** I'm going to ask that after this, you go back to the prior slide and highlight by name what streets you're proposing?

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Yes. As I go through the animation, you'll see where they are relative to the freight network. Here' the freight network is in purple, light purple. AM peak, route segment with 20 buses per hour relative to the freight network. It's no surprise that 3rd Avenue in downtown, and then some other segments outside of the downtown area. And then the mid-day is primarily in the downtown area and the University District. So, that's in yellow. And then on top of that, the dashed blue pretty much mimics the a.m. peak. And when we're thinking about possibly where we would impact transit and where there could be some capacity to share freight and bus movements, in this map here, we begin to see where some of those might be. The yellow here represents freight and bus

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Freight-only lanes will be focused in MICs with FAB lanes primarily on Major Truck Streets that already have transit lanes or have plans to install a transit lane.

opportunities. And then the pink boxes are we're beginning to think about possible freight-only lanes within the SODO area.

**Geri Poor:** Could you call those out by name, please, Radcliffe?

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Yes. This top one here is Aurora Avenue, the northern end of Aurora Avenue starting around 45th Street to 146th; Westlake Avenue, where the Route 40 team engaged with us to say there could be a possibility here and offering a freight and bus shared lane; and then 15th Avenue and Elliott Avenue. Again, those are just ideas for consideration right now, in conversation with our transit lane colleagues. And then, for freight-only lanes, in SODO, East Marginal Way, the Spokane corridor, we are examining opportunities there where there could be freight lane opportunities; and then, South Park West Marginal Way.

**Geri Poor:** How far south is that? I'm sorry to keep interrupting with questions.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Yes, it's fine. The boxes are just intended to show the segment that we would be looking at. They wouldn't be that whole segment. I think that this is a question for discussion here. One of the questions is what would be the minimum length of segment for an appropriate freight-only lane in those concept boxes?

So, that's the presentation, and we've got some discussion questions that if you would all like to jump into. There was a policy approach relatively clear, having a freight-only lane in the manufacturing and industrial centers, and then a freight and bus lane approach outside of the manufacturing and industrial centers where there is capacity to share freight and bus movements. and then, potential value that you see in where in the initial pilot would be good to start. And then, we're looking right now at data and metrics as part of our SEPA process and other data and metrics we should be considering, for example, minimum length of segment. And then, any other initial or immediate reactions, questions, thoughts, comments.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Street names noted for potential FAB and freight only lanes. - highlighted

Segments identified are illustrative and not intended to show the entire segment would be considered for review.

There will be a SEPA process, and other data/metrics will be considered

Also considering time of day as a way to create FAB lanes

One of the things we were thinking about is time of day sharing of freight and bus lanes when we would restrict freight times that would work relative to the different transit peaks. So, I will open it up for discussion or any questions or thoughts.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Thank you, Radcliffe. I think folks have questions. I see one.

**Warren Aakervik:** I have several, not necessarily in your order. First, beginning with the policy, you have equity. And I think that what is getting lost in equity is that peoples' jobs that have to have freight movement to and from them is important, of course, to get them to their jobs on the transit side of it. And the distribution centers in various neighborhoods so that the freight can actually get to the stores in the neighborhood in the larger sized trucks rather than the small. As far as an equity matter, a lot of people in those communities don't have the availability to have Prime come in five times a day. They actually have to go to the store to buy stuff. And I notice that you did put in there the connection to and from the MICs, like 15th and 99, and those are very important. It's not just within the MICs, but it's getting to them, especially since we have the two M&I centers at opposite ends of the City, and they're interdependent on each other, especially the maritime stuff in the Lake Washington Ship Canal. And a question of when they're not in use. Some of the transit lanes when there are three lanes like on 15th and Elliott, that lane goes into parking. And I think that if we take the transit and freight lanes and turn it into parking, we get away from having it available to use for freight and the rest of traffic. Last but not least, I see no criteria for lane width and auto-turn radii when it's not a straight line and you're having to turn to and from one major truck street to another, which is the problem with the freight plan already, but at least that needs to be considered, because if there's only one lane and you can't move and it doesn't allow the connections. Those are pretty much the ones I hit just right off. Thanks.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Great. Thank you so much.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Other folks? I have a couple of questions. Anyone else?

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Warren Aakervik –

Part of equity is getting goods to neighborhood stores.

The connections between the MICs are very important

Some transit lanes become parking outside of am/pm peak. That will need to be reviewed if using a FAB lane

See no criteria for auto-turn radii to get into/out of FAB lanes.

**Pat Cohn:** I don't have a question. I just have a comment. I think it's a very enlightened policy, because warehouses in industrial areas are moving further and further away, like to Sumner. And it's a green policy, because if we encourage freight closer to the City, we're going to have our goods closer to us, and that's going to eliminate a lot of extra driving miles, very expensive driving miles, in terms of environmental cost. A very enlightened policy, a very good policy that would encourage the *status quo* and stop some of this spread to areas so far away.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Thank you, Pat.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Are there some more questions?

**Christopher Eaves:** A question that Eric put into the chat asking would trucks be required to use the shared lanes.

**Mike Elliott:** I just wanted to add that these MICs and these freight routes are connected to family wage jobs. here on the railroad, you know we've been here 130 years, and some of the stuff that started was squeezed out by the idea of going to deliver everything by air drop or some other thing, there are a lot of jobs lost to Seattle residents. So, I hope that these routes are protected. i hope that this planning that we're looking at here has taken that into consideration, that these family wage jobs for Seattleites are very important, that they have these jobs for future generations. Thank you.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Great comment. Others? A couple of questions that I have, and I'm sure you have thoughts on this: What were your metrics now. Some of the things I'm thinking of now are related to width and turning radius, encroachment into adjacent lanes, accident potentials for collisions is another metric, and then travel time. What are the real benefits of having a freight lane? Is that something that industry people say is really helpful to them? That's the kind of thing that I'm looking for. Did we do any kind of survey of businesses or industry to find out if it was helpful, to have some assurances, assured travel

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Pat Cohn – The policy supports goods movement and encourages industrial areas and distribution centers to remain closer to the city.

Eric – would trucks be required to use the shared lanes – ‘no’ from Chris Eaves

Mike Elliott – Noting MICs and freight routes are connected to family wage jobs. Hope these jobs are protected and this planning is taking these jobs into consideration.

Jeanne Acutanza – What were your metrics?

time, for example? Usually, we give an exclusive lane to transit, for example, to ensure a preferential travel time or an uncongested travel time. And then, the collisions. Let's make sure that we're looking at how the trucks are using the lanes. Is it helping to reduce collisions for trucks, or impacting them if they're trying to turn? Just other metrics that you are looking for.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Yes. We listed metrics that we would look at during the initial evaluation phase. Some of those do include travel time, what is the accepted range of travel, and then making sure, having predictability of where all of the different modes are going to be located. That was one of the things we considered when thinking about where freight lanes or freight priority, freight and bus lanes would be located is could they be separated. In downtown, we allow the bus, and then we also allow cyclists on 3rd Avenue. We think that's not appropriate necessarily when you're now adding a bigger truck into that mix. So, where we do blend larger vehicles, we need to say, yes, cyclists need to have their own parallel route. And then, where there aren't those opportunities, we're going to have to look really long and hard at what the right approach would be to mix these different modes. It's a no-brainer, but a 200 lb. small vehicle is going to lose to a Class 7, Class 8 vehicle. So, yes, we've been looking at that, and with our colleagues are working on transit lanes. They've had a number of metrics, as well, to make sure that there aren't negative impacts to transit, but I think it's a good idea for us to also do some outreach with businesses to find out what makes sense for them relative to installing a freight lane, and what's good for them. From what we've also generally observed, where there are right now bottlenecks, we will account for those and see how we can dislodge that bottleneck, and make sure we have a little bit more reliable use of that space where that bottleneck is happening, and so that our right-of-way isn't being used as a parking lot for larger trucks to enter into a commercial space or an industrial land use that they're just trying to get into.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I see Warren has a question. And if others have questions, please either raise your hand or put a note in the chat.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Metrics listed include travel time and predictability.

When trucks enter the mix we need to consider if cyclists have their own parallel route

Need to consider how we can overcome bottlenecks and how to better allow large vehicle access

**Warren Aakervik:** Yes. Radcliffe, I have a question because I believe that SDOT has not really done a good analysis, or the City has done really done a good analysis of where the originations are of the big trucks, the WB67s, sevens and eights, and the locations where they're going to. I have one time, just in my own little world, mapped lower Ballard and the Lake Washington Ship Canal on the southern side, on the Magnolia/Queen Anne side. And I had 55 locations where big trucks' access to get into the maritime industries and into the shipping and distribution centers, just along that area. When you look at it, you don't put those into mind very well. And the other thing is the turning radii. I always ask that question. Right now, we're not protecting those. And in most cases, bigger trucks cannot see anybody on the inside turning radii on semis. And so, it's a very, very difficult thing to get people to realize that they're putting themselves in harm's way because we have no idea that they're there, which has been evidenced by several deaths of bikes and pedestrians. And somehow, we have to deal with that. So, we need to make sure that we're making those connections. Like I say, the two MICs are so far apart, and the supplies that we need from the north and the south are always there. We need to protect those corridors, not just in the MICs themselves, but the corridors to get that transportation in.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** This is why, to do the best we can do right here and now, we've got those freight and bus shared lanes through 15th and Elliott, trying to link down through the downtown area, and then down to East Marginal. I don't know if we would be able to do a freight lane through the waterfront there, but again, thinking of managing some of that space on a timed basis. And then, for your comment around data, we did some research for another project this past summer, beginning to look at more (unintelligible) probe data. So, we think it's promising we will, I think, with available funding be able to do more of that, and to also look at the different types of vehicles that are traveling through, especially with the rise of delivery and smaller vehicles doing a lot of the delivery at the distribution sites for Amazon and other delivery companies. Chris, if you want to add anything to that, please feel free.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Warren – need to protect turning radii and visibility as well as the corridors between MICs.

Trying to protect the corridor and consider FAB lanes through 15/Elliott

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I was going to ask a similar question, and I'll be that Christopher Eaves has an answer. Which class types of vehicles would this pertain to? And another question is about monitoring the impact to the facility. These are big trucks. We have been focusing on this heavy haul network. We've been focusing on trying to create those heavy haul facilities, East Marginal Way separation. Are you going to monitor damage impact to the roadway? Those two questions on the side, impact to the roadway. And maybe those are things that you will think about.

**Christopher Eaves:** I'm going to hop in and try to answer some of the general questions. On lane width and turning radius, because of the locations that we're describing, they would all have at least a minimum of 11-foot width. Industrial areas already -- I think we were looking at East Marginal Way, Spokane Street -- those would need the 11-foot width. If we were to incorporate a shared bus and freight lane, they too have minimum widths, which is why the concept of keeping the large vehicles together with large vehicles was what we're trying to explore. The minimum size or class type: The goal is to focus on the larger, the Class 8 or above vehicles, which effectively require a CDO, a commercial driver's license. It means that that vehicle would have to be registered for 26,001 lbs. or above. Effectively, the goal is to make sure that we focus on keeping the largest vehicles in that lane without having that lane be overwhelmed by all of the other smaller commercial vehicles. Some of the data and information that we have used actually comes from the University of Washington, where they took that very deep look downtown and in the Ballard area, and were able to give us information that morning commute peak is not the same as truck commute peak or truck movement peak. That leads into one of the questions that was talking about time of day as assured use option. I'm bouncing everywhere, so I apologize. One of the other concepts was in terms of metrics, how is resiliency, how is stable travel time considered, which came into a question about what is the minimum length of a segment, where do you get the best benefit? In terms of requirement for a shared use lane that Geri Poor brought up, there is not going to be a requirement because at times, a truck would have to move out of that lane

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Jeanne Acutanza – What types of vehicles and roadway impact?

Chris Eaves – Lane width will be minimum 11'  
The goal is to keep larger vehicles with larger vehicles, so we're considering vehicles licensed for 26,001 lbs. or greater which require a Commercial Driver's License to operate.

Some metrics can include resiliency of route, how stable is travel time, what is the minimum length of segment to get a 'best benefit'

No requirement for trucks to be in the lane. It is an option.

to make a left turn rather than going straight through in the segment to access their final destination.

Impact to roadways, that was a question that was brought up. We are still working to figure that out. And one of the pieces of information that we were able to tease out is that even in the peak hour, the largest of trucks, which we're focusing on right now, are somewhere in the 20 to 30 vehicles an hour expected on the routes we're looking at, which when you look at the 20-ish buses an hour, we're trying to make sure that there is as little impact to moving people, and as much impact to moving goods as we can manage. Again, all of this is draft. It's conceptual. And we're coming here to ask these questions, of which you are bringing up exactly the salient points we are hoping to understand better.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I see that Warren has a question. And, we are at 9:50 right now, so just keep an eye on the clock.

**Warren Aakervik:** One comment I'd like to make as we look at the damage to the roads: Remember that an articulating bus is empty on their rear axle. Some of them are 24,000 lbs., and even the heavy haul is 21,000 lbs. per axle. And the maximum on a WB67 is 18,000 lbs. So, I think damage from big trucks to the roadway is not as important as a lot of the other issues. It should be looked at, but the buses are a heck of a lot heavier. That's why they're building all of the concrete pads to be able to handle the buses.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** And electrification will make those buses heavier, I understand. And electrification of trucks might make them heavier, too. Any other questions? Anybody from the public? Radcliffe, when will you be back?

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Thanks for that segue. We are going to take your feedback and incorporate that into the policy document, and just to let you know, too, we're also, from the work we're doing on electrification and increase in EVV vehicles looking at the impact of weight more closely on our roadways. So, it will be a comprehensive look from the EV side to freight vehicles as we move forward with

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Chris Eaves – Impact to roadways is still being teased out. Data indicates 20-30 large vehicles per hour use the roadway, but does that impact moving people if they are in the same lane.

Warren  
Road damage by trucks versus buses

Jeanne – electrification will make all vehicles heavier

Radcliffe – we're working on electrification and will want a comprehensive look at all vehicles.

this policy, which will probably be one of the things that we look at as part of a SEPA review. We're going through that right now. We will continue stakeholder engagement in the spring and summer. We were invited, also, to give a briefing to the Transit Advisory Board on February 23. We will do something similar to this with the TAB, and likely with our transit lane colleagues, as well. And then, we would like to return to this advisory board with an update in summer, if that makes sense, with any new information that we have moving towards an implementation of the the pilot, which is our goal by the end of Q4 this year. Whether it's a freight only lane, or shared freight and bus lane. We're shooting for the end of Q4.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** You would start the pilot? Is that right about what you're saying, or would you complete the pilot?

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** I mean we would start the pilot, select a location that makes the most sense, given all of the other things that are happening relative to the segments that we're thinking of as places that would be a good location.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Perfect! Well, thank you so much. We look forward to talking with you in the summer. If there's anything else in our thoughts, we could probably toss them off to Chris Eaves.

**Radcliffe Dacanay:** Great. Thank you so much for having me. Have a good rest of your day and rest of your meeting.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** We're going to go back to the industrial and maritime EIS. I see that Geri Poor has dropped off. I wanted to open that up, too. Chris, did you want to bring back that presentation?

## **INDUSTRIAL AND MARITIME EIS DISCUSSION**

**Christopher Eaves:** Yes, I'm working to pull that up right now. There we go. So, I'm bringing up the previous presentation that Jim Holmes had brought. I also

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Radcliffe looking to start a pilot by end of Q4 this year

Industrial and Maritime EIS Discussion

have a couple of other screens on standby, discussing the EIS. I think what may be best to do, and you'll forgive me if I jump this all over the place, I believe that we had an extended period to comment, which means we are able to comment through March 2. If you have anything that you would like to bring forward or reconsider, let me get all the way back to as close to the beginning as I can.

They provide a history, and then begin to discuss the proposed land use concepts. These are variations on different types of activity. Notice that they start with the core of the manufacturing and industrial logistics, then bring in the different types of land use. And I will push a little more descriptive points in a moment. I have that keyed up. Where they wanted to do work in terms of context, and again I recognize that I'm moving very quickly through these, they also begin to discuss different levels of impact for planned use, with no action, limited or expanded. In terms of this, there are variations from zero to 2,000-unit potential housing. There are various buffer zones, and then there are variations in the amount of green space, and different types of access to green space. The discuss, as a top level item, the different types of actions that they would take. Again, that's on this screen here. They begin at high level in discussing of the impacts and not just the impacts but what the EIS looks like. It's a 700-page document, so it's rather large. And I'm going to go back to this point here. I'm going to also next bring up -- it will take me a moment to bring this up since I'm running through several different screens. They are high level, and summary and story map that brings in a better set of details than I would be able to provide, and I will get those to you. There we go. This is the part I was looking for.

This is what the proposed land use concepts are being described as. At a high level, the maritime and manufacturing logistics is effectively the traditional uses we've seen. Industry innovation is changing to include multi-storied buildings to MIC's different uses. And urban and industrial is to move employment and entrepreneurship. These also have, I believe, buffer zone and then a mix of uses in near industrial and urban villages. So, in concept, they're becoming more proscriptive, I believe, of the types of uses and where they can be. But I have no idea of how the MICs will occur. Again, I'm sending what we have done

SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Chris Eaves provided a recap of January Presentation

previously last month into just about five minutes. A lot of this time is open and available not just to ask questions, but to try to understand if there is anything that we want to highlight or bring forward -- ask for more; ask for less. And this is an opportunity for people to get information and then see if, as a board, there are comments to be made.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Chris, I just want to confirm the process again. They have three discreet land use forms. They could end up somewhere in between them, as well. Correct? It doesn't have to be one or the other. But if we wanted to make comments in one or the other, that's up to us. Is that right?

**Christopher Eaves:** Absolutely. And again, it's three new land use concepts, and four alternatives. You always have the 'no' option, and simplified, small, medium, and large impacts of the varying uses. That's why the map has become important. And I can move any links that you need for what we are discussing, as well. And again, this is a whole bunch of information to give you to begin to distill. So, it might be great to ask a question or two that you would want me to try and research and provide answers to with a relatively quick turn-around. I note again, we really only have two weeks to make any type of comment if we want to make comment at all.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Does anyone have comments? I haven't had the time to drill into it. I see Warren has his hand up. Go ahead, Warren.

**Warren Aakervik:** Okay, and I haven't had the time, either. I never wanted to read this much. I did start to look at the 80 pages of Section 3.10, which is transportation, and there are so many things that are in there. I keep on coming with the thought that there's a lack of protection in the current or even the future industrial. And as you gentrify and put the uses in, you impact that more. And it gets like they're trying to justify development, housing and everything else around stations and everything, but they're not protecting the current uses. If you have industrial to leave, you should identify it and say, 'please leave.' I know that's probably not the intention, but just where we are here, the development that's

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Jeanne – want to confirm process – comments are up to us.

Chris Eaves – Yes, note the three new proposed land uses

Warren – focus on transportation section (80 pages)

going behind it, the 500 units, the lack of ability of a safe passage for pedestrians and bicyclists. When you mix the big trucks that have to get into the industrial area, especially in the water-dependent shoreline areas -- like I say, I just started flipping through pages in the very front of it someplace. There's a part in there that lists the whole Lake Washington Ship Canal as a lake. And when you at the reason it was put in, the locks are put to bring ships in, to work on them, to move coal. And I think that concept may have been lost someplace without identifying that the jobs are there. And that all comes back into equity, because if you don't have jobs for everybody -- not everybody wants to work downtown, or even go downtown, so I think that some of the protections -- in fact I see a lack of protections. I'm very concerned that they're not protecting the current status. Even in the current status, they're not protecting the industrial areas the way they should if they wish to sustain.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Thanks, Warren. Other comments? I think what I read in the upfront policies was to protect transportation facilities for industrial access. But I would like more definition around that, so I guess that's where I would want to focus my energy. And if there are other uses, especially uses that bring in residential, and also amplify the desire for other active modes, we would want to make sure that when they're developed, there is that, like on East Marginal Way, distinct separation and safety for active modes. And minimize and promote access for industrial uses for big trucks. What we've preserved our time for. Other comments?

Chis, I'm not sure how to make that comment. I want to think a little bit more about it, but I think I'm saying what Warren is saying. Lane uses are going to change, and it's going to affect other modes that are not industrial-driven, not as supportive of trucks. For separation and safety, I think we have to be clear that that is our priority.

**Warren Aakervik:** I like to keep on reminding people that freight is not for us, it's for the public. It's a public service. So, if it's our priority to be able to serve the public in the best manner that we can, not to just go out in a truck all over a

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Warren – mixing large vehicles with other uses to access the industrial area impacts employment and employment access. Even in its current form industrial areas are not being protected.

Jeanne – highlighted comment

Warren – highlighted comment

neighborhood to see what's going on. There's a useful purpose for freight. Obviously, I think the greatest thing in the world was when Washington State Patrol shut down Snoqualmie Pass for freight trucks only. That's the first time in history, but it kind of identified that there's a serious problem when we can't move your freight.

**Christopher Eaves:** I would like to share again a portion of the draft executive summary. It's a summation of the types of impact associated with transportation. Noted in some of this is that alternatives three and four, even high range ones would result in significant impacts on freight on these corridors. There is discussion of mitigations and outcomes. One of those is to reduce the share of non-industrial jobs in alternatives three and four, which were in the medium and high range uses. And one of the outcomes here, since all of the pedestrian and bicycle network adds are not likely to be addressed in areas where more vulnerable uses would be walking or biking, there would be significant unavoidable adverse impacts to active transportation and safety under the action alternatives. As Warren, I believe, correctly focused, we are advising the City on the transportation network, these are summaries and certainly, you cannot get into one sentence what the impacts would be to hundreds of acres of land use changes, but it may be that, I think as Jeanne Acutanza described, maintaining the safety which means having a very clear understanding of where the bicyclists and the freight vehicles are, and how to get them to interact in a predictable manner might be where we'd want to discuss goals and desires. Again, I'm also only reading high level. And if we wanted to have any points brought out, then it would be good for us to try to focus down on those.

I will also be sharing these links with you. In fact, I'll try and put them into our chat as well as email. (Draft EIS link <https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/ongoing-initiatives/industrial-and-maritime-strategy> The storyboard is also linked on the main page link above. <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/b7d5f3183c924ace99b69d2e094a4303?item=5>) While I'm doing this, I'll stop sharing real quick so you all will have opportunity to discuss.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Chris Eaves - draft executive summary discusses mitigation and outcomes  
Highlighted

Direct links to draft EIS – highlighted.

**Warren Aakervik:** You know, Chris, I'm not very computer-literate. But I think there are 81 pages of that 3.1 transportation segment. If you could just pull that out and send that as a separate piece, it might help us. Eight-one pages is not as bad as 700+plus, so at least there's a chance that we can look at it.

**Christopher Eaves:** I will do so. The link that I sent was the executive summary, which is about 15 pages. That's where I noted the transportation impacts. There is a storyboard, which is actually really nice and interactive. I will include that in these links. Given that it is a very large document, and if we were to only focus on transportation, it's still 80 pages, it sounds like our goal is to emphasize our interest in safety and accessibility for the large vehicles to the industrial lands. And I'm going to insert my words here: predictable access.

**Warren Aakervik:** And safety for other modes. Since we can't see them, we somehow have to identify the control when we can't see anything. So, safety.

**Christopher Eaves:** Okay, yes. And, Thomas Noyes has just noted in the chat that the first link I've tried to put in did not work, so I need to update that. Thank you, Thomas.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I guess the only thing that I would add to that, Chris, is that we should also note that it is a greater concern where -- it's less of a concern with the first option, manufacturing, and a greater concern where there's a change in land use. I know there's a lot of pressure to find other land uses. And if these could be places where people live near where they work. I think we're all sensitive to the need for more residential, but I think, as you mentioned, if it increases our concern as stated, then there should be some mitigation to protect and for predictability, as you mentioned.

**Warren Aakervik:** I think there's a big challenge to identify that navigable waterways have a different impact than industrial areas that are not adjacent to those navigable channels. And the railroads also have the same application, that

Comments include

Predictable Access and Safety

Jeanne – Greater concern is changes in land use and need for mitigation (to protect industrial lands) and for predictable access

Warren – note the need for access to navigable waterways.

if an industrial area is served by -- and we always looked at the modes, when it was served by two modes, or three modes. We've got rail. We've got water. And we've got land or truck applications. So, if we're served by three out of the four modes, I guess we should just put a helicopter landing and we could do all four. But I think we need to identify that those navigable channels, navigable waterways are very important to the economic benefits to this City.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I think that Mike Elliott pointed out that those uses have been there for a really long time. We don't want to push things related to marine and rail. These are efficiently next to each other for a reason.

**Christopher Eaves:** Okay. So, what I think I'm hearing is, at the high level, maintaining access and I am unsure how we provide input at this moment. If there is a specific set of details that would be worthy of putting a letter in, or noting other information, we can do that. And I remind that we have two weeks and two days, I believe.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I don't think we have a quorum today.

**Christopher Eaves:** Well, we would with ....

**Jeanne Acutanza:** ...with Geri Poor, if she came back.

**Christopher Eaves:** So, again, at this point, it's information only. We wanted to have some discussion about this previously. And if we don't have comment, we don't have comment. And if we do and we have something that we'd like to discuss and put together, then we can and should.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I don't think we need to put together an eight-page letter, but maybe a one-page memo. Chris, with some of the things you stated, which I think were really spot on, maybe Cass Magnuski could read them back to us or send them back to us of what you said, we could shape that into a memo and

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Warren – Seattle has water, rail and truck access

Jeanne – those modes are next to each other for a reason

then circulate it, as we have done for other memos. What do you think about that? And what do you think about that, board?

**Mike Elliott:** I think it's appropriate that the board be heard, and that's the whole purpose of the board. Our mission is clear. And I think if it's in a memo, or eight-page or one-page or whatever, they need to know that. So, yes, a memo is appropriate, and circulating it to the board members who couldn't be here, and we can go from there. But we should comment.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I agree, Mike. And Pat, any other thoughts or comments?

**Pat Cohn:** Well, I just think it's very important to protect the shrinking industrial areas that we do have. It even relates to the supply chain problems we're facing so severely right now. As we move our industrial base out, it makes us more vulnerable.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I agree.

**Warren Aakervik:** And I agree. I think that Geri Poor would be very helpful in identifying those issues, because they're pertinent to the Port, just as much as the rest of us in the maritime industries.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** I suspect the Port has comments. I don't think any of us have seen them. Why don't you and I take a shot at that, Chris, and then circulate a short memo?

**Christopher Eaves:** Okay. Given that I have a new and easier opportunity to work the minutes, I'll be able to push this much more quickly. And Jeanne, as soon as I have the minutes, I will connect with you and we can talk about the comments that were brought up. With your help, I can put a bullet point together for your distribution for circulation.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Mike – it's important the board be heard

Pat – it's important to protect the shrinking industrial areas

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Absolutely, yes. Thank you so much. Anything from the public on this topic? I just want to make sure we're including everyone. Thomas, Rachel, Eric? Okay. Like I said, i don't think it has to be real long. It doesn't seem like what we say could be real long. A couple of pages would probably be just fine. Thanks, Chris, for sharing them. And take a quick look. It's the transportation section that I kind of really wanted to read. I like the policy they put out about preserving transportation with industrial in mind as a priority. But if we could get a couple of bullets, that would be great. And I can help circulate it.

**Mike Elliott:** I notice that Thomas Noyes made a comment in the chat that I think is worthy of making sure that Cass Magnuski has it in the minutes. **Noyes:** (WSDOT is currently reviewing the Industrial & Maritime Lands DEIS and will be submitting a comments letter by the March 2nd deadline.) I understand the deadline for the ST WSBLE DEIS is March 24th (?).

**Thomas Noyes:** I just wanted to say that we're reviewing the document, and we will be submitting a comment letter.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Thanks, Thomas.

## NEXT MEETING AGENDA

**Christopher Eaves:** I wanted to note, and I'm rolling into future discussions. The West Seattle/Ballard Light Rail Extension is ripe for comment, and internally, we are beginning to ask the boards for comment, offering presentation, although none has yet been developed at this exact moment. So, it's just a foreshadowing of WSBLE, West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions, open for comment. It's rather a large project, and it's definitely a decade in the building at its current level. So, we're at very high level at this moment. And if that is of interest to the board, I believe that we can work to put some type of presentation together, not just SDOT, but also (unintelligible) -- thank you, Thomas, who understands the deadline for WSBLE is on March 24. So, it looks like next month we may be doing some discussion.

## SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Mike notes Thomas Noyes made a comment – highlighted.

Next Meeting Agends

WSBLE may have time for a presentation

**Warren Aakervik:** I'd like to make sure that we keep in mind that the 15th/Elliott corridor and up to the major truck street that goes all the way back out to Northgate or 145th is an important corridor, because it is the only trade corridor that isn't a State or federal highway. It actually goes through Seattle, and we can actually use it. That, including the waterfront. Just make sure we don't lose track, that that corridor would not be compromised there, when they can build around it and not compromise it.

**Christopher Eaves:** Okay. I don't have other, in terms of information. We will see what type of memo we can put together. And that was all I had for future discussion at this point in time.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** That's great, Chris. It would be good to get an update. you probably will have a board status. How many of us....

**Christopher Eaves:** We are, almost exclusively on your graces at this point in time. Appointments to board membership is continuing. We did have five people, Eric Wright being one of them, a prospective candidate. We are waiting for Council to meet the Transportation Board specifically. And we're also, I believe, waiting for the Mayor's Office and Council to understand how they want to make any and all board appointments now and into the future. So, it is not just the freight board. All other boards are being held up at this moment, as I understand.

**Warren Aakervik:** Any indication of what that change is going to be, or is it maybe more some input from the boards. I was at a June meeting with Alex Pedersen, and said it would be really nice to have somebody from SDOT as director who had some idea of what freight is about. So, we'll see what that does. But there are a lot of good people who can do a lot of good stuff. If you have people who are not really involved with freight, it's really hard for them to understand what we do.

Warren – Note 15<sup>th</sup>/Elliott corridor is only N/S Major Truck Street that is not state/federal in Seattle

Board status – holding for council to decide how to proceed.

**Christopher Eaves:** I have no information on goals from the Mayor's Office. I wish I did. Because then I would be able to get a better idea of what our turnaround would be.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Thank you, Chris, as always. I know you're working hard for us. Any other comments, or any other thoughts about updates that you want for our next meeting, for the agenda? Okay. Thanks. Any other topics?

**Warren Aakervik:** I guess I have a question. If Eric Wright is a potential for the board, I just wonder if we scared him away, and he won't talk to us now.

**Eric Wright:** I'm not that easy to get rid of.

**Christopher Eaves:** Well, good then.

**Jeanne Acutanza:** Thank you for attending. And Rachel, too, and Ryan. Thanks for attending our meeting. Anything else for the good of the order? We don't have a quorum, but I'm going to adjourn. It was great seeing everybody. All right. Thanks, Chris. Have a great day, everybody.

**ADJOURNMENT**

SFAB 2/15/22 MEETING

Adjournment