



BALLARD-INTERBAY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Interagency Team Meeting #2

March 18, 2020, 8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Attendees:

IAT Members

- Brand Koster, King County Metro
- Chris Arkills, King County Metro
- Frank Gibson, Washington State Military
- Geri Poor, Port of Seattle
- Chris Rule, Sound Transit
- Emily Yasukochi, Sound Transit (joining for first time)
- Dan Turner, Sound Transit (joining for first time)
- Travis Phelps, Washington State Department of Transportation

City of Seattle

- Diane Wiatr, Seattle Department of Transportation
- Chisaki Muraki-Valdovinos, Seattle Department of Transportation
- Jonathan Lewis, Seattle Department of Transportation
- Ellie Smith, Seattle Department of Transportation

Consultant Team

- Jennifer Wieland, Nelson\Nygaard
- Tom Brennan, Nelson\Nygaard
- Jeri Stroupe, Nelson\Nygaard
- Kendra Breiland, Fehr & Peers
- Chris Breiland, Fehr & Peers

Unable to attend:

- Robin Mayhew, Washington State Department of Transportation
- Brian Ziegler, Washington State Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
- School District Representative, *TBD*

Summary of Meeting Business

Welcome

Jennifer Wieland welcomed the IAT meeting attendees, reviewed the protocols for the virtual meeting, and referenced the supporting materials. Diane Wiatr reiterated SDOT's values and focus for the BIRT study.

Jennifer began introductions and asked participants to share something they hoped to get out of the meeting. IAT members expressed an eagerness to learn the priorities from each agency related to the BIRT study, discuss a path forward for traffic forecasting and public engagement, and receive some guidance and understanding about how to manage large meetings moving forward. Tom Brennan reviewed the status of the consultant team's work and where the project stands relative to the overall scope of work and anticipated timeline.

Stakeholder Engagement Updates

Jennifer provided an update on stakeholder engagement and reiterated that SDOT is hoping to learn 1) which employers and employees they ought to connect with, and 2) how to approach targeted public engagement.

- Geri Poor noted she has regular tenant meetings for Terminal 91, Fishermen's Terminal and Salmon Bay Marina on a quarterly basis. Diane will follow up directly with Geri to discuss how the BIRT team can interface with those key stakeholder groups.
- Sound Transit may have channels SDOT could use for engagement, and Emily Yasukochi will check. Chris Rule agreed to look through list of stakeholders identified in the West Seattle to Ballard Link Extensions (WSBLE) project.
- Frank Gibson is at the Armory, and he noted that Maul Foster Alongi (one of the consultants on the Armory project) may have some information already collected.

Diane reviewed emerging themes from SDOT's stakeholder engagement to date. People tend to prefer a tunnel under Salmon Bay, and there has been a lot of input around biking, such as 15th Ave NW needing improved facilities and reflecting current bike traffic counts. Chisaki Muraki-Valdovinos shared some of the input she's gathered from small businesses, and Diane explained how the BIRT study is coordinating with the Mayor's Industrial and Maritime Strategy led by the City of Seattle Office of Economic Development and Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD)

- Geri asked about any overlap in agency participation on the Mayor's Industrial and Maritime Strategy and BIRT studies. Diane confirmed there is agency overlap on the project teams, but no individual staff overlap.

Plan Review and Previous Studies

Jeri Stroupe provided an overview of the plans and studies the consultant team has reviewed and is incorporating into baseline assumptions to support upcoming modeling and traffic forecasts. She shared the key findings by category from more than 20 plans completed or ongoing since 2010. Jeri asked the IAT to identify any critical missing plans, projects, or developments, and to confirm the key themes.

- Emily noted that the West Seattle Ballard Link Extension is in draft EIS phase now and wants to confirm the consultant team has the most up to date documents and plans. Kendra Breiland confirmed that ST has been supportive in providing plans and sharing data. The BIRT and Sound Transit WSBLE teams will need to coordinate more to discuss respective bridge options.
- Geri noted that the project map showed only Magnolia Bridge Alternatives 1 and 3, but four alternatives were analyzed. Jeri explained that the maps show only the two alternatives that are being proposed to be carried forward into the BIRT modeling assumptions, a decision made based on support for those alternatives.

Baseline Assumptions and Methodologies

Kendra Breiland and Chris Breiland (Fehr & Peers) provided a brief overview of the Methods and Assumptions Memo, which describes the analysis approach the BIRT team will use to identify potential mobility improvements.

Kendra noted that the team intended to complete multimodal traffic counts during peak periods in cases where existing counts are too old or where development is planned or underway. However, given the impacts of the coronavirus on people's travel behavior, new counts are no longer feasible. Kendra requested that project partners provide any recent count data; she also explained that the team will need to leverage professional judgement in circumstances where data is not available.

Kendra reviewed the four future scenarios the team intends to use for modeling. Two alternatives have been defined, and both assume a horizon year of 2042, when WSBLE is in place, and the same mid-level Ballard Bridge. Alternative 1 assumes an in-kind bridge replacement for Magnolia, and Alternative 2 assumes a new bridge between 15th Ave and Armory Way. Two additional alternatives will maintain these transportation assumptions and vary the assumed land uses to reflect recommendations from the Mayor's Industrial Maritime Study.

Kendra introduced the draft evaluation criteria and reflected ways that feedback from the first IAT meeting was incorporated. IAT members were asked to confirm 1) if the criteria are measuring the right outcomes; and 2) if the IAT members have data available to support the evaluation.

IAT members were asked to provide input on the modeling assumptions by March 27 and on the evaluation framework by April 3.

Next Steps

Jennifer provided an overview of the next steps and reminded the group that the next IAT meeting would be open to the public. The IAT will be consulted on how to best accommodate public participation in the weeks to come.

Action Items:

- Diane will follow up with Geri, Frank, and Chris Rule regarding stakeholder engagement they could leverage or help support.
- Chisaki will follow up with Geri regarding small business and tenant input.
- IAT members will provide comments on modeling assumptions by 4/37.
- IAT members will provide comments on evaluation framework, methods, and data by 4/3.
- NN will circulate the draft plan review memo for the IAT to review by 4/8; IAT members will provide comment by 4/15; NN will finalize by 4/22.