



**Design Advisory Group Meeting #5**  
Magnolia United Church of Christ, February 5, 2003, 4-6 PM

## Summary Minutes

### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome and Approval of December & January Meeting Summaries
- II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?
- III. The EIS Process
- IV. 6-8 Week Look Ahead
  - a. Transportation
  - b. Refining Alternatives
  - c. Urban Design
- V. Public and Closing Comments

### Attendees

---

#### Design Advisory Group

- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ Dakota Chamberlain
- ✓ John Coney
- ✓ Eric Fahlman
- Grant Griffin
- ✓ Bob Holmstrom
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- ✓ Doug Lorentzen
- ✓ Jose Montaña
- ✓ Eric Schmidt
- ✓ Mike Smith
- ✓ David Spiker
- ✓ Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)
- ✓ Janis Traven (alternate)

#### Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Richard Butler, Shapiro
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Lee Holloway, HNTB
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- ✓ Anthony Katsaros, Shapiro
- Andrew Laski, KPFF
- ✓ Teresa Platt, City of Seattle
- Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- ✓ Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ Design Advisory Group #4 Summary Minutes – Draft
- ✓ Alignment Alternatives Memorandum – Second Level Screening – Revised
- ✓ EIS Process Flowchart
- ✓ March and April Meeting Location Notification
- ✓ Traffic and Population Growth Figures



## **I. Welcome and Approval of December & January Meeting Summaries**

---

**Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues – Facilitator**

Brad welcomed the group and walked through the agenda and meeting materials. He then invited comments and corrections to the minutes from the third and fourth Design Advisory Group meetings (December 4, 2002 and January 8, 2003, respectively). The meeting summaries were approved for December 2002 or January 2003 with no further changes.

Brad explained that it was clear at the January meeting that the group appreciated a detailed update from Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager, about the past month's activities.

**Conclusion: With the December and January meeting summaries approved, Brad turned the floor over to Kirk for an update on the previous month's project developments.**

## **II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?**

---

**Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager**

Kirk explained that the design team left January's meeting knowing that they did not have enough information to accurately compare all four alternatives (Alternatives A, B, D, and H). It was clear that the team needed more data, should not drop Alternative B, and should continue developing quantitative information about the routes (which the team will do as the project moves into the next phase).

Support for keeping Alternative B on the table was heard at the open houses and from various parties through different means, and Kirk took the question of whether to bring forward three or four alternatives to the City staff. Eventually the Mayor was briefed. It was determined that the additional cost of carrying four alternatives forward instead of three would cost approximately \$125,000 more. The City said that it was fine to keep a fourth alternative on the table, and the team will consider all four as it proceeds with the project.

Kirk explained that he received the City's approval after the January 20<sup>th</sup> holiday, and as soon as he did he started letting interested parties know (including the design team and those living along 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue West). The design team is adjusting its scope in the contract to detail the additional work, and will create an addendum to the current contract.

The reaction Kirk received for keeping Alternative B was varied: he received several email notes expressing support and the belief that carrying four was a positive step, while others did not and wondered why the design team was even thinking about doing so. Kirk explained that he'd had about five individual conversations with residents on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue West, some of whom experienced immediate financial impacts, and others who believe that the decision puts a cloud those properties. Owners believe that people will not want to buy a house along 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue West, or will want to negotiate a discount due to the potential impacts of the project. Kirk explained that the project team is not sure how to address that issue yet.

Some property owners have asked what the City will be doing to work with them, and Kirk explained that federal regulations provide very liberal rules when a full taking of a home occurs. Compensation includes full market value for the home, can include helping the owner find another place to live, moving, etc., when dealing with the taking of a single-family home. People have also asked if they would be compensated if there were no taking of a right-of-way (ROW) area and there was a reduction in value of their property due to the change in neighborhood character. Kirk is in the process of conducting research with City staff, but his gut reaction is that federal funds could not be used for that purpose, but perhaps City general funds could. He recognizes that there are issues with people along Alternative B (and other alignments), and expressed the intent to treat those impacted people fairly, within the City's legal capabilities.

Kirk next responded to concern voiced at the January meeting that the project was moving too quickly. The project team has met with the Port about planning coordination, and asked for insight into ideas they might have about use of their uplands property. Kirk explained that the team and Port know that in the not too distant future the Port will have planning information, and the Magnolia Bridge project team doesn't want to do something too soon that could preclude certain Port options. With the decision to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the team thinks it can better mesh its schedule with the Port's master planning process.

The project team had set up a meeting with WSDOT staff (prior to the decision to retain Alternative B) to discuss what would need to be done in the next phase. In the project's original contract (created in early spring of 2002), the scope was for a Type, Size, and Location (TSL) study. If only minor impacts or alignment adjustments were expected, the team would have completed an Environmental Assessment (EA). The City also put in the contract the possibility that an EIS might be needed, which has proven to be the case. This decision was made after project staff met with WSDOT, who explained that the TSL study had gone beyond what is typically covered. Traditional TSL studies look at minor "tweaks" with an alignment and how it works in a fairly defined corridor. Kirk explained that we've been doing more of a corridor study, and that all other alignments (except A) require evaluation through an EIS in accordance with the NEPA process.

The City gave direction to the consultant team to clearly identify the steps required in an EIS, and to approximate the additional cost to work through the process. The City will soon be negotiating an addendum to the original contract. In talking with WSDOT, Kirk raised the question of schedule, and was told that the team would be looking at a 12- to 18-month process to complete a Final EIS. That means that the Draft EIS could be out as early as late 2003. After publication, there will be a public comment period and public meetings, and then the draft will be finalized, identifying a preferred alternative. The whole process could take the team into the middle (spring) of next year. As a first step, the team will hold a public scoping meeting. The team is in the process of selecting a date, creating announcements, and getting the public involvement process set.

Lastly, Kirk explained that the design team met this month with Jeff Hummel, the architect who spoke at the end of the last meeting and was looking at redevelopment and transportation in the whole area. At the meeting, the group looked at issues and ideas Jeff had, and reached consensus that the team would move ahead as they had been (current

designs do not preclude what Jeff would like to see happen). No action items emerged from the meeting, and Kirk reiterated that the team is working with Jeff and understands where he is coming from in terms of redevelopment plans.

## **Discussion**

- Hoff** I wanted to mention that we have in fact used one of Jeff's ideas, the underpass on the northern H segment.
- Jones** Yes, originally we showed H with an overpass, and now the northern connection on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue W will be an underpass. Also, when heading eastbound from Magnolia, Jeff proposed diverting that traffic to the southeast on Armory Way (already a street ROW). From there you would have a free right-flowing lane, and a left turn lane if you wanted to go northbound. This has been one of Jeff's early ideas that we've already incorporated.
- Coney** Are we past the time window of mixing and matching elements of different alignments?
- Jones** No, we're still in the planning stage, and if there's a better way to mix and match alignment components, we'll consider it.
- Coney** If Alternative B proves to be legal and practical as a two-lane road, could it be matched with H north [the northern alignment proposed as part of Alternative H]?
- Jones** That's a possibility. A City attorney is also researching significant legal issues associated with Alternative B, and it will probably be a month before we get advice from her. We're still looking at environmental costs and their implications as far as what that means for the team moving ahead.
- Conclusion:** **With no action items or further discussion, Kirk introduced Anthony Katsaros (Shapiro) to discuss the EIS process.**
- .

## **III. The EIS Process**

---

### **Anthony Katsaros, Shapiro**

Anthony introduced himself as an environmental planner from Shapiro, and explained that he would be talking about "the exciting world of environmental compliance." Anthony explained that WSDOT determined the project needed to go through a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) EIS process. There are both state and federal laws that require environmental review of government decisions. Because the Magnolia Bridge Project will receive federal funding, the project team knew from the beginning that they would have to go through the federal process. The main reason the project needs to go

through an entire EIS process is because the team is looking at alignments outside of the existing ROW.

In general, an EIS requires looking at alternatives to a proposed project and evaluating the impacts associated with elements of the environment. The project team has already made progress in evaluating and identifying alternatives, which may change if the team decides to mix and match. The EIS process is also iterative, so as things are “tweaked,” the team can go back and reevaluate those changes. The project team plans to look at four build alternatives and a “no action” alternative (required under both NEPA and state regulations). In this case, the “no action” would likely include retrofitting and resurfacing the road, but nothing outside of the existing alignment. The team would then look at how each alignment impacts each component of the environment, such as earth, plants and animals (compliance with the Endangered Species Act), transportation, air and noise, public services, and socioeconomics.

The first step is describing existing conditions, to which the team can then compare the potential significant impacts of the alignments. The team would recommend mitigation measures (some of which would be proposed as part of the project, while others might be additional suggestions to be put in place later). Ultimately, the team would describe significant adverse, non-avoidable impacts (impacts that cannot be mitigated) associated with each alignment. For example, an intersection might provide a very low level of service (intersections are rated from “A” to “F,” with F indicating that the intersection is not providing adequate service). If an intersection were rated a D, E, or F because of the project, and there was not a way to mitigate this low level of service, this could be considered a significant adverse, non-avoidable impact.

Anthony then summarized the basic steps of the EIS process. The team is now going through scoping and budgeting exercises for the EIS. Starting in mid-march, the City will issue a Notice of Intent (NOI) and scoping notice, which will start the 30-day period when citizens and agencies can present written and oral comments about what they want evaluated. This is essentially a chance for the City, agencies, and public to say “you missed something.” The team will evaluate the scoping comments, and determine if they should make changes to alternatives or think of an additional alternative. They would then create a study plan and public involvement plan.

As development of the EIS proceeds, the team will create discipline reports (federal requirements are more strict about these reports than state regulations). Anthony noted a number of discipline report documents that are required by other federal regulations. For example, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires an assessment of historic and cultural resources in the project area. A Section 4(f) study requires the evaluation of impacts on public lands (parks, recreation areas, national wildlife refuge areas, etc.). Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires a look at threatened and endangered species, in this case probably the presence of salmon. Developing discipline reports continues throughout the process in parallel to writing the EIS.

The preliminary Draft EIS will be reviewed internally, and then the City will publish the DEIS. This will begin the second phase for agencies and citizens to comment on the

content of the evaluation (which Anthony believes is a 45-day comment period for the city). At that time, the team will also have a hearing for public testimony. When the comment period closes, the team will compile all of the input, draft responses to each of them (which will be included in the EIS), and may revise the EIS given the comments received. The team will do one more internal review, make additional changes, and then publish the Final EIS. The City will use the Final DEIS to make a decision about which alternative will be the preferred alignment. After the Final EIS is published, a Record of Decision (ROD) must also be published that records the findings of the EIS. Anthony explained that he's positive that the team is far along in the process of developing alternatives.

Anthony explained that there are some regulatory and review issues that can create delays in the EIS process. If the team decides to build in the water, the "Section 404 merger process" between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency will be required to review aquatic zone construction. This is a lengthy, albeit simultaneous process that can affect the schedule. Anthony said that he anticipates that each of the five alternatives will be presented on equal standing at the beginning of the EIS process, and that the Final EIS will probably identify the preferred alternative.

## **Discussion**

**Fahlman** Given the schedule you just presented, how long will the Design Advisory Group last?

**Hoff** At this point, we're looking at meetings through June of 2003 and beyond through the EIS process. We've talked about continuing on a monthly cycle through spring. We're not sure if there would be enough information to present monthly beyond that, and we must talk about that as a team.

**Jones** The City would like to continue the DAG, and if you personally wouldn't like to continue, we're hoping you can get a substitute to represent your group. We like the mix of representatives on the group and would like it to continue.

**Fahlman** I see. I was just curious.

**Hoff** How frequently we meet is the issue.

**Jones** Yes, there could be dead space during the process when we won't hold meetings. It will be an issue of how quickly we develop new information.

**Bartlett** If the bridge fell down tomorrow, would we continue with this same process?

**Jones** I don't know. That's a tough circumstance. One of the biggest things we heard early in the process was to leave the bridge up as long as we can while building.

**Smith** Emergency provisions are available in the permitting process.

- Kenworthy** I assume that the legislative body makes decisions based on the content of the EIS? I'll assume the answer is yes. Is it fair to say that economic impacts are not factored in unless they are considered significant, direct impacts?
- Katsaros** No. Indirect impacts would be considered. There's an element of subjectivity associated with all of these elements, and we'd need to get into indirect impacts when we were developing the EIS.
- Kenworthy** On page four of the *Alignment Alternatives Memorandum – Second Level Screening Criteria (Revised)*, there are no criteria that address the implications of alternatives on all of the related marine businesses (e.g., moving one business will affect others, like cold storage facilities suffering if product isn't brought to the piers on vessels).
- Katsaros** Socioeconomics is an element covered under NEPA. That would be an element to bring up in scoping. You should comment on that right away.
- Kenworthy** I would ask for wording that captures that impact. It's somewhat at variance from what we have.
- Holloway** I think page 6 captures what you're talking about. I'd be happy to work with you, Lise, to write the new criteria.
- Kenworthy** I don't think what we have right now fully addresses the problem. I'd be happy to work with you to write the criteria. Talking about relocated business doesn't deal with impacts on the fleet of vessels or on refrigeration companies who need that product. That's the issue that I'm trying to bring up. The Mayor has set city policy to reverse what's happening, because this city is bleeding jobs. I think we need to make a run at these criteria, and understand the impacts that these alternatives might have. If we want a healthy city, we've got to consider that.
- Jones** Grace Crunican and I have met with City Ice and Trident, and have heard you loud and clear on that point. We told those businesses that we will keep them here, that they're important, and that we'll work closely with them. We just need to articulate that point.
- Kenworthy** I am delighted to hear that and would like to work on the criteria with you. I just want to make sure we recognize that the EIS process is very thorough on some topics, but has been roundly critiqued on others.
- Hoff** We will follow up on working on the criteria with Lise and Lee and Kirk.
- Spiker** Are any of the alignments impacted by shoreline regulation?
- Jones** Alignment A and B occur in a shoreline area.

**Katsaros** As I mentioned, the Section 404 merger requires coordinated review of projects constructed in an aquatic zone. The board that makes these decisions meets quarterly, so we'd have to present our design at one of these meetings. If we needed to make revisions, we'd need to wait for another three months.

**Jones** Would this impact the EIS process or permitting?

**Katsaros** Because the board could impact design, the EIS could be altered (and the time to complete it lengthened). Permitting could also be impacted.

**Jones** As a team, we've already started to establish contacts with agencies to enable quick processing. We hope to be able to meet with staff (not just the board) as early as possible (and as often as necessary).

**Conclusion:** **The project team will continue to work on solidifying the future design advisory group schedule. Brad will arrange a meeting between project team member and Lise to help revise criteria designed to measure business impacts. With no further questions, Brad introduced Pete Smith to discuss ongoing transportation work and the analysis to be conducted in the next couple of months.**

## **IV(a). 6-8 Week Look Ahead: Transportation**

---

**Pete Smith, HNTB**

Pete Smith provided a brief review of the figures that Don Samdahl sent to the group regarding traffic modeling and population growth projections. He noted two adjustments to the *Magnolia Traffic Growth* figure. The 2030 traffic volume for Elliott Avenue is now 64,000 (it had been 67,000). Also, the volume of cars coming into the study area is lower than what the team projected a month ago. The team is now developing daily forecasts, and is in the process of developing morning and afternoon commute period figures. Initial traffic estimates will be reviewed with City staff, and the team will use those in developing the EIS. Traffic figures will also be used to assess noise and air impacts.

### **Discussion**

**Chamberlain** To satisfy my curiosity, I was under the impression that Magnolia is a fairly mature community. However, you note a 40% increase in 30 years. Where is that coming from?

**Smith** Looking at the evening rates, you can see a 1% increase in peak growth per year. Most growth will be in multi-family housing throughout the Thorndyke corridor. Other increases in the Port and southern areas are assuming employment growth for companies like Amgen.

- Coney** Why is 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West not studied in these figures?
- Smith** We are studying it, it just hasn't been reported out aside from what's entering 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West southbound (from Ballard) and northbound (at Galer). We'll get to that eventually.
- Coney** Will future versions of this information show traffic increases? Is there a chance we might not see it?
- Smith** Yes, you'll see more detail in future figures. These are more major cut-line traffic figures. We didn't show you arterial numbers.
- Coney** Several major arterials feed into 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue W between Galer and Ballard Bridge.
- Smith** We have meetings with City set up, but those are the only changes to report so far.
- Coney** Have Monorail figures been rolled into the study?
- Smith** I'll have to get confirmation on that. I've been told that 2030 projected monorail ridership has been factored in.
- Conclusion:** **Pete will confirm that monorail figures are being included in the project's transportation modeling. With no further discussion, Pete introduced Lamar Scott to discuss ongoing alignment revisions.**

## **IV(b). 6-8 Week Look Ahead: Transportation**

**Lamar Scott, KPFF**

Lamar provided a brief update on modifications of the four final alternatives, though he explained that the design team was not yet showing the alignments in any more detail. He said that the team was looking for conclusions about how the final routes should look based on traffic evaluations. The team is looking at gross numbers now, and will use more refined calculations when they are evaluated. In addition, mix-and-match scenarios will be tested to see if they work better than the proposed alignments.

- ◆ Alternative A has not changed.
- ◆ Alternative B includes a minor change: The southwestern portion of the alignment has been pushed out of the water, and now runs along the shoreline. It was decided that not moving the alignment out of the water would have serious environmental implications and would make the route very difficult to permit.
- ◆ Alignment D is the same as seen before, but the design team has acknowledged that the alignment will need to move further south to avoid conflict with businesses. This will

alter the available room for ramps, so the design team will study how the ramps will work.

- ◆ Alternative H has been adapted to show a “Y-shaped” couplet that will move traffic in two different directions on the east end of the northern segment. The design team hasn’t run this piece through a traffic model yet, but will soon.

Lamar concluded by stating that reworking the alignments is like squeezing a tube of toothpaste: “If you move something here, it changes something else there.” The design team will continue to revise alignments until they have identified the best routes to study in the EIS.

### **Discussion**

- Jones** All of the new alignments have just been posted on the project website.
- Coney** How far south are you planning to move Alternative D?
- Scott** The alignment will now go south through the smaller building used by City Ice.
- Schmidt** What does the Alternative H profile refer to?
- Scott** To the southern alignment of Alternative H.
- Schmidt** What are the elevations for the Armory Way portion of the alignment?
- Scott** The alignment meets 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West at-grade. It will be a bridge to a point, to get over the railroad tracks from the west, but it will then go to grade. There is some complexity about how traffic will move under the bridge at Wheeler Street. The grade falls off quickly, and will be coming in almost flat to get over the tracks.
- Coney** Does the southern access on H still depend entirely on the Galer flyover?
- Scott** Yes, that’s how we’re showing it to start the analysis. We’re also going to include a free right-turn modification from the flyover.
- Holmstrom** In terms of Alignment B, would there be exits off the bridge that went up north that could connect to Thorndyke? Have you thought of that?
- Scott** With Alternative B, the road drops to grade immediately after crossing the tracks. We are looking at connections up to Thorndyke from the route.
- Holmstrom** That could disperse some of the traffic from the route.

**Kenworthy** I was wondering if you could elaborate on the modification associated with using the West Galer flyover.

**Scott** It's not easy to move over the flyover and turn off to the right onto 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West, so we want to provide a free right-turn off of the flyover to help split that traffic. This is an acknowledgement that the flyover doesn't have the necessary capacity. We're looking at whether the flyover has the capacity if we split traffic. We're taking an initial look to see if it works.

**Conclusion:** **With no additional discussion, Lamar introduced Lesley Bain to discuss ongoing work in the area of urban design.**

## **IV(c). 6-8 Week Look Ahead: Urban Design**

---

### **Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland**

Lesley Bain described some of the urban design opportunities she's been exploring recently. She passed out a map of potential monorail stations that could occur in the project vicinity, and explained that it was important for the project to coordinate improvements in the transportation infrastructure with other local projects. Lesley stated that one of the issues that's driving the project and the monorail planning is the presence of the Galer flyover, and described some of the options that the monorail team was reviewing. She also informed the group that the monorail project was nearing the end of the public scoping period, and encouraged members of the group to make comments if they had opinions to share. The monorail project will likely announce a preferred alternative for the route on April 2, 2003.

Lesley then described her evaluation of the monorail and bridge infrastructure. In terms of the EIS, there are some good things about design that can be explored in tandem with other efforts. Lesley hopes that the Port's process of land use strategizing proceeds, because the design team needs to propose infrastructure that coordinates with land use in the Port uplands, with the monorail, and with other projects. Allowing 12 to 18 months for the EIS will give the team enough time to evaluate these things.

Lesley has begun looking at the routes in much greater detail, using three-dimensional figures [of which she provided examples] to help with the evaluation. She will be pursuing analyses of land use (in terms of economics) and streetscapes in greater detail over the next couple of weeks, and provided some examples of these reviews. She wants to examine the connection between wonderful waterfront pedestrian connections and the "zigzag trail" from Queen Anne (using the zigzag trail would place a pedestrian in close proximity to the bridge.)

In terms of intermodal connections, Lesley explained that there is an important separation of levels (e.g., trains at-grade, the monorail at a higher level, and potential vertical connections between the modes). Intermodal connections and levels of activities are very interesting to the design team. In addition, there are fantastic citywide bike trails, and their connection to the existing waterfront is an important consideration. Views from everywhere will also be considered (e.g., from homes, the waterside, and public spaces in particular). Use of the

Thorndyke ROW (approximately 100 feet wide) will also be examined, particularly in conjunction with Alignment H. Lesley stated that the good news is that there's a lot of space to work with along Thorndyke in terms of boulevard improvements. The potential new connection(s) will be very interesting as the design teams delves further into issues of public open space, land use, and transportation levels.

## **Discussion**

- Spiker** Is there a proposed monorail station north of Garfield station?
- Schmidt** We still plan to do a station at Dravus, and there would still be one to the south of Dravus. Prospect is another potential location for a monorail station.
- Bain** Another thing to look at is where the ridership draw would be from. As the monorail project moves forward, they will look at these in detail.
- Schmidt** One of issues is future ridership. We're also looking at whether, when someone comes off the bridge from Magnolia on a bus, they would stay on the bus or hop on the monorail.
- Spiker** A station seems critical at the Garfield location. The location of a station seems like it could do a lot to help or hinder growth.
- Bain** That's an interesting point. We know that area will increase as a job center, and that the Port's plans are unknown at this point. There's a lot of potential, and I think that it's important that locating the monorail station should take that into account. The beauty of this area is that you can connect pedestrian levels to buses, the monorail, etc.
- Schmidt** The only thing I'd add is a dotted line to represent the monorail maintenance yard. It is good that Armory Way is at-grade, because the monorail may be 35 feet high. There are two different kinds of cars that we're still looking at, which will be determined by the DBOM (design, build, operate, and maintain) contractor.
- Coney** How much trouble do you anticipate with the slide area?
- Schmidt** One charm of the monorail would be it's connection to Queen Anne, which would be much better if it were located on the east side of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West. We're still looking at slide issues.
- Coney** Have you looked at the connection to the commuter rail and Sounder?
- Schmidt** That's why it would be good to have the monorail on the west side to connect with the rail. That's an opportunity not to be missed.

- Bain** One observation about the multi-modal piece is that we want things to not be scary to people using the facility. Levels would provide views, separation for BNSF, etc. Creating quality stations will makes or break their use.
- Coney** I second that point, and add that bus connections and transfer convenience will drive how Magnolia uses the monorail. Transferring must be easy, pleasant, dry, and make the monorail great to use.
- Schmidt** Because 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West is so flat, it's not out of the realm of possibilities to put a flat station in so if Sounder comes to life, we could move the station to connect. Capacity is the limiting factor, but flat ground offers opportunities for stations.
- Homes** I understand that a station might be located at Prospect. Would it be possible to go further south?
- Schmidt** Once you get to the dotted line [on the figure he was referencing], you can't make reasonable stations. That's why we're proposing north and south stations. We'll be looking at both.
- Hoff** The great news is that we have a good connection with Lesley and Eric to continue wrestling with these issues.
- Conclusion:** **With no further discussion, Lesley passed the floor back to Brad.**

## V. Public and Closing Comments

---

### Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues

Brad Hoff invited members of the public to make comments.

**Charlie Ordine** I'm wondering a couple of things. Now that Alternative B is part of the process, it is clear that environmental impacts will be more of a driver (due to potential impacts on salmon). You mentioned the Section 7 process, which requires consultation with NMFS and USFWS for listed anadromous fish. Do you see a consultation, or Biological Assessment, begun in the EIS process, and how would you respond if NMFS opined that this [Alternative B] is the only one that impacts salmon. Would that occur in the EIS process?

**Katsaros** Alternative A also could impact salmon, though a lot less so.

**Charlie Ordine** I think the EIS would be easier to get through without B, and B ratchets up the cost and lengthens the time needed. Without considering that implication, people legitimately wonder about the process. The Muckleshoots also have tremendous influence on the 404 and 401 processes,

and will oppose B, so each process will grow because of B. Does that justify political correctness, going down an ever-growing trail because of so many competing issues? Have you factored in and thought about this? I ask because the general public wouldn't have a way to ask it. The advisory group appears to be the driver to bring the alignment back, but there is an environmental driver to drop B. Are you still looking at the daunting nature of time and money required to move B through this process, and aware of how NMFS can stop, especially in light of the federal trust to honor treaty rights?

**Katsaros** Yes, we are aware of those issues.

**Kirk Jones** Yes, we have that same gut feel you do, but it is our responsibility to spend a little more time to articulate the issues of how additional time and costs could be involved. Any one of the alternatives could create issues, and if something comes up, and it looks like we could waste taxpayer money, we will decide if we should go ahead. There are enough issues or questions we can't answer, and we need to create some quantitative answers and information.

**Sue Olsen** I live at the corner of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue West and 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West. Alternative B will impact me personally. Aside from my personal concerns, I wonder about the negative impacts of B on Magnolia Village. My question is about H: Why are you proposing two roadways?

**Kirk Jones** One of the issues we heard at the beginning of our study was that there's a problem with only three access routes, so when one goes down, which has happened twice in the last several years, there are huge traffic problems with only two remaining access points. People asked us if there was a way to create two more routes in case one goes down. We figured we should study this option in at least one scheme.

**Dwight Jones** I'm the manager of Elliott Bay Marina, and I apologize for not being more active in this process. Our business will be drastically impacted if B is selected. I want to state clearly that we are clearly against Alternative B. I won't state all the reasons here, but we like the way the marina is now (quiet). We are in favor of the others, but our position is against Alternative B.

**Patty Groesbeck** I've canvassed the neighborhood, and residents are shocked that B is on the table. There are two neighborhood hills, as well as 32<sup>nd</sup>, Crockett, 33<sup>rd</sup>, basically the whole south end that would be impacted, and once neighbors understand this, they will come out against Alternative B. There are safety issues. Where the bridge is now, there are industrial activities. It's a lively area. It seems to me that roads may be beautiful to those making them, but keep them where industry is, and keep them away from neighborhoods. Another problem is that B will affect two parks and one open space. The greatest thing about Magnolia Park is that it looks at an unobstructed view of Puget Sound. You'll also be constructing a road that comes over the top of a

street-end saltwater park that is very cherished by the public. Putting a park near an existing road I can understand, but not putting a road next to an existing park.

- Traven** It's my understanding that from Magnolia, Alternative B would be at-grade and wouldn't obstruct views?
- Charlie Ordine** I think it would be appropriate to have a 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue West representative on the advisory group? Or maybe someone from the Marina?
- Kirk Jones** We'll get back to you on that.
- Schmidt** I wonder if you should hold some sort of offshoot meeting for residents and businesses along B?
- Hoff** Good point. We're already working to set up a meeting with those neighborhoods.
- Ordine** It would be great to have community impact on the DAG, so the group wasn't considering options in isolation.
- Coney** If you expand the DAG with more people from Magnolia, I propose that you expand it to include more Queen Anne, BINMIC, or special interest representatives.
- Hoff** Your point is well taken. We will discuss that issue and debate how large the group can actually get and still remain effective. I want again to note that the next two meetings will be at the Queen Anne library.
- Kenworthy** In light of the poor parking around Queen Anne library, I'd recommend reserving a room at 157 Roy (the neighborhood center).
- Conclusion:** **The project team will discuss the size of the Design Advisory Group and the option of adding more members. With no additional discussion, Brad reminded the advisory group that the next meeting would be March 5, 2003, at the Queen Anne Library (400 W Garfield Street, Seattle, 98119) and adjourned the meeting.**