



## Design Advisory Group Meeting #28

Magnolia Community Center  
February 7, 2007, 4:00 – 5:30 PM

### Summary Minutes

#### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Updates
- III. Type, Size and Location Study
- IV. Biological Assessment
- V. Next Steps
- VI. Public Comment
- VII. Adjourn

#### Attendees

---

##### Design Advisory Group

- ✓ Dan Burke
- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ John Coney
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- Doug Lorentzen
- ✓ Jose Montaña
- ✓ Mike Smith
- Janis Traven
- ✓ Dan Wakefield
- Darrell Vange
- Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)

##### Project Team

- Dirk Bakker, KPFF
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Matt Dalton, HNTB
- ✓ Gerald Dorn, HNTB
- ✓ Chad Durand, Anchor Environmental
- Brian Elrod, HNTB
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- ✓ Kit Loo, City of Seattle
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Lauren Stensland, EnviroIssues
- Yuling Teo, City of Seattle
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

#### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ *Agenda*
- ✓ *Draft DAG #27 Summary Minutes*
- ✓ *SCC Transportation Committee Presentation Summary – December 12, 2006*
- ✓ *Type, Size, and Location Study Report – Table of Contents*
- ✓ *Alternative A Aerial Photo Overlay (Revised January 4, 2007)*
- ✓ *Cross-section view of construction at Smith Cove (February 2, 2007)*

#### I. Welcome

---

##### ***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

Sarah opened the meeting and outlined the agenda. She reviewed the anticipated schedule for upcoming Design Advisory Group (DAG) meetings, which will occur every other month

until further notice. Sarah asked for edits to the meeting minutes from the previous DAG meeting and reminded the group that she will take edits to the minutes through next week.

Kirk Jones introduced Kit Loo as SDOT's structural engineer for the project as we move forward into more technical design issues.

## II. Project Updates

---

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

### **Seattle City Council Transportation Committee**

The project team met with the committee in December to present a project update. They shared the final selection of Alternative A and the conclusions of the Type, Size and Location study, including renderings of the entire bridge span. The only change to those renderings since the last DAG meeting is that the span over the park is even longer, now completely spanning the park area. The column on the western edge is now positioned on the bluff and will rest on a level platform where a home was demolished in 1997.

### **Seattle Parks Department**

The Parks Department has seen the new, longer span renderings and will now be able to include another practice soccer field on the park property. SDOT and the Parks Department have been working closely to best develop that park area for the public interest. They now have a joint development agreement that has been signed by both agency directors. This agreement should meet the requirement of Section 4F of the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) rules for transportation development near park facilities.

### **Port of Seattle**

SDOT has continued working with the Port to develop action plans in an emergency situation involving Magnolia Bridge. SDOT has a white paper outlining actions for moving traffic from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the Magnolia area in the event of a bridge failure. Details about responsibility for different aspects of the plan are still being negotiated.

### **Discussion**

**Kenworthy:** How long do we expect it to take to resume access to Magnolia in an emergency situation?

**Burke:** I had said previously that if there were a need for emergency access, it would be our hope that a path could be cleared in one to three days. I have since talked to people at the Port that are cautious about being that specific in any agreement.

**Jones:** We have a draft strategy and we're working toward an agreement.

**Kenworthy:** As we try to do emergency planning for the Magnolia area, I'm going to request that we get to see something from you both as soon as possible. When can I expect to see a draft of some agreement?

**Jones:** It will probably take three months – there are people to talk with and get approval from higher levels of management within both SDOT and the Port.

**Burke:** The spirit of working together is very clear in our discussion, but in an emergency situation involving the whole city, it's difficult for the Port to commit to specific actions in this area. We can give you a strategy, not necessarily an agreement.

**Kenworthy:** When will we see this strategy? Can we have what you have done now?

**Jones:** I think we could give you the white paper next week – I don't have a problem with that.

**Burke:** Yes, I think it would be good to have some review.

**Jones:** We've been spending time with the cruise ship terminal developers and have given them detailed designs for footing and columns and discussed the work they need to do.

**Kenworthy:** I wrote a letter on behalf of BINMIC and the Seattle Marine Business Coalition expressing concerns about traffic. I have not received a copy of the full EIS that was released on Monday. I would like a paper copy from Dan [Burke].

**Burke:** It should be online and I can get you a paper copy as well.

### **Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA)**

Kirk reported that SDOT is going through the cost and risk estimation process and is not expecting a significant change from what has been discussed in the past. The base costs are near the same range as what was used two years ago. SDOT is looking for an economist to provide a long-term inflation factor for construction costs. This project might not be constructed for five or more years, so they need an inflation factor that takes into account regional construction in the next four to five years and estimates inflation for equipment, materials, and other needs. Other than that inflation factor, the cost estimate is ready to go. The base cost is still right around \$135 million. With the risk factors included our estimate was \$196 million.

SDOT has also met with the Navy and FHWA about the Navy property. The Navy is doing an Environmental Assessment and they are divesting themselves from that property.

SDOT is working with Anchor Environmental on the Biological Assessment (BA) and Chad Durand from Anchor will provide an update on that report during this meeting. SDOT also updated the discipline reports for the Draft EA to include the new parks agreement and the additional community involvement work they've done. SDOT is sending the BA, the Draft EA and updated discipline reports to WSDOT and FHWA by the end of the month.

### **Discussion**

**Coney:** The Navy property is the Admiral's House property on the Upper Park, correct?

**Jones:** Yes, it's the Admiral's House – it's between upper park and lower park.

**Coney:** Do we need to have that property in order to build the bridge?

**Jones:** The property is right where the bridge abuts the hillside.

**Coney:** Yes, but could we go over the property and delete that cost from the budget if we needed to cut costs?

**Jones:** No, we need the property. We'll negotiate the cost of going over the property, though it should be less than we've estimated in our budget.

### III. Type, Size and Location Study

---

#### ***Jerry Dom, HNTB***

Jerry explained that the Type, Size and Location (TS&L) study is a summary of all work that went into selecting a bridge type. It is a record of all the alternatives and bridge types that were considered by the project team, including the rehabilitation option. The TS&L is a project milestone and puts the process of alternative and bridge type selection out for public review. The document is intended to show how the team arrived at the final conclusions of the report.

#### **Discussion**

**Kenworthy:** This report has been issued?

**Dorn:** No, not yet, it will be reviewed and then issued in a month or so.

**Wakefield:** Will it be online?

**Jones:** Yes. It's a huge document including many photos. We think we'll put it on three disks for those people that cannot download something so large – we're still figuring that out.

**Kenworthy:** At our last DAG meeting both Mike [Smith] and I were asking about detour routes. You had said we could see more specific detour routes in January. Will there be any information about detours in the TS&L report?

**Dorn:** There are possible detour routes indicated, but the document does not specify a chosen detour plan.

**Jones:** All the routes we've discussed are included in the TS&L. As we move into more detailed designs we'll further develop detour information.

**Kenworthy:** There are some real problems with some of the detour options, as we talked about at the last DAG meeting.

**Jones:** I know the surface route raised some concerns – I thought the ramp option was less problematic.

**M. Smith:** You mean the option using the [Galer] Flyover?

**Jones:** Yes. I know using the Galer Flyover causes concerns also, and we have not fully explored the detour options.

**Dorn:** What the TS&L study shows is that the structure type we've selected can be built and traffic can be routed around the construction.

**Kenworthy:** Will the TS&L clearly say that there has been no decision made about detour routes? I would appreciate a clear statement to that effect.

**Dorn:** Yes.

**Brandt:** Are detours a topic the DAG will discuss later this year?

**Jones:** Yes, we will. As we do more design work we'll ask for input from this group.

**Kenworthy:** The physical location of the surface option is the most problematic element for me. Do we know when this group will talk about detour routes?

**Dorn:** Well, we're beginning final design work now and we'll need to do a construction workshop with contractors to talk about construction time, methods, and detours. We'll get to about 30% design over the next six months and then do a review of our progress. Then we'll design as far as we can with the remaining funds – likely around 50%.

We're having a DAG meeting every two months or so, I'm not sure about the exact timing of a detour discussion.

**Kenworthy:** Could we make detours an agenda item for the next few months?

**Jones:** Yes, let's do that.

**P. Smith:** It's also important to keep in mind that until there is construction funding and we start the final planning, we don't know what conditions will be around the project site. They may change depending on the timing of the construction, so there's a limit to how much planning we can usefully do.

**Jones:** Right. For example, if timing is such that the Port has gotten ahead of us with development, we might use their access road as part of the detour.

**Kenworthy:** I understand that situations change. I'm interested in seeing a concept that is disruptive on the ground removed from consideration and finding reasonable alternatives that we can consider. We'll keep discussing this issue together.

**Dorn:** In addition to detours, we'll be discussing other design issues as this process goes forward, including railings, lighting, pedestrian connections, and overlooks. Those elements are mentioned in the TS&L report but not advanced to a decision-making stage. We'll make some decisions as we get up to the 30% design level and then stop there.

**Burke:** So you'll be working on the design for the next year and will reach 30% design in the fall of 2007 and then finish what you can through the beginning of 2008?

**Jones:** Yes. Right now we're looking at how we can best use the funds available for design. I've been asking that we first design portions of the bridge that will need to be farthest along in the event that future funding for construction becomes available or we have an earthquake. For example, designing the foundations first is useful because they are unlikely to change between now and when they are constructed, unlike approach roads that might change depending on other construction in the area. In addition, in the event of an earthquake we would have foundation designs ready to hand over to a contractor to start building while the rest of the bridge is being designed. We could also start construction of the foundations as soon as funding is available. Either way, we're looking to put a package on the shelf that will be useful and put us at an advantage.

## IV. Biological Assessment

### ***Chad Durand, Anchor Environmental***

---

Chad presented an overview of the Biological Assessment (BA) for this project, including both the content of the assessment and the estimated schedule for completing the BA process. The United States Endangered Species Act requires that all projects examine any at-risk animals that might be impacted by the project in a BA document. For this project, the in-water work is where the biggest impacts occur. Pile driving and other activities in the water can cause turbidity, shoreline habitat disruption, and other concerns. Anchor Environmental examines those impacts and looks for ways to minimize the impact of construction. Along with in-water impacts, there could also be air and noise impacts to bird species, such as bald eagles, but eagles in the Magnolia area perch on the opposite side of the bluff and are not a big concern for this project.

Stormwater impacts are also important, since as stormwater hits the road it can collect dissolved copper and zinc, along with other contaminants, and cause turbidity and other negative impacts. In the case of the Magnolia Bridge, the current bridge has no stormwater treatment and the new bridge will have stormwater treatment. Therefore, although the new bridge will have more impervious surface than the existing bridge, the loads carried in the stormwater will decrease.

The BA is being reviewed by the City of Seattle and then it will go to WSDOT and FHWA for their comments. It usually takes around 180 to 210 days to get comments from FHWA. Once the team has comments it will take four to six weeks to incorporate those and review the revised report.

### **Discussion**

**P. Smith:** In the aerial photo we've included [*Alternative A Aerial Photo Overlay*] you can see the areas of concern during the in-water work. We'll be doing construction below regular high water in the tidal zone. The main portion of the bridge has one large pier in the water, the on-ramp has two piers in the water and the off-ramp has piers in the marine habitat. On

the positive side, we're removing the existing on-ramp and the wood wharf. The net area of the wharf we're removing is greater than the permanent structure we're adding.

**Durand:** When the BA is reviewed, the agencies will ask why we've built a road over the water and we'll show them what other options we considered and why that was the best choice. We'll also show that we've worked hard to minimize the in-water work.

## V. Next Steps

---

### ***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

Kirk discussed funding strategies for the bridge project. SDOT has been looking for grant funding and has been unable to secure any money. Unfortunately, this project is not eligible for much of the available funding because it's not in the federal highway aid system and is also not a regional project that could be funded under the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID).

One funding source is direct federal appropriations, but those appropriations may not be available. SDOT will continue pursuing that and other sources of funding. The agency will emphasize the 20,000 residents affected by the bridge and the industrial and semi-industrial businesses in order to make the best possible case for funding. Funding sources will ask how much local funding is committed to the project, so local money will be needed as well. One possible source is the Bridge Replacement Advisory Committee (BRAC) – a committee of city and county officials from Washington State that review bridge projects and distribute funding based on where funding is most needed. Funding for the bridge is an ongoing effort on the part of SDOT and they will continue searching for funding sources.

John Coney suggested a LID [Local Improvement District] for the Magnolia area. Kirk responded that a LID was used to build the original bridge, but noted that the high administrative costs for this kind of process would make it an unlikely choice. There's also a strategy that uses bonds, and the City would need to consider its bonding capacity and then ask the Port of Seattle and BNSF Railway to contribute additional funds. SDOT will continue to ask grant agencies and talk to Washington's senators.

Kirk is anticipating a project delay in the 5-year range, though it could be longer. Barring a catastrophic event, the bridge can be maintained for another 15-20 years. They are preparing for a catastrophic event, so the project will be ready to use emergency funding quickly to create a replacement structure. To prepare, SDOT has started working with the utilities that use the bridge. Qwest uses the bridge for a major communications cable and SDOT will push them to remove that cable in the next four to five years so bridge construction can begin quickly if funding becomes available.

Kirk thanked the group for their persistence and patience over the years. The DAG has been a great sounding board for the project and the project team appreciates that input and support. The DAG will meet every other month so that the project team will have enough new information to share – the next DAG meeting will be April 4, 2007.

## Discussion

**Kenworthy:** Thank you for being so thorough about funding possibilities – that’s an ongoing task and we need to advance it.

**M. Smith:** When we say “local” money, is that King County and City of Seattle money? Or do we mean more local?

**Jones:** Local money is usually City of Seattle, but the Magnolia neighborhood might be a part of the funding effort also.

**Kenworthy:** You’re not suggesting that the Magnolia neighborhood would have a particular responsibility for funding certain roads when we’re funding the whole city, are you?

**Jones:** I would say a LID is highly unlikely – even though it was done in 1929. The administrative costs and the complexity make it unlikely. There might be some other special assessment district, but I’m not sure state law even allows that approach. So we need to consider different ways to get local funds.

**M. Smith:** It seems like this group is about halfway through the steps of the process where we can be useful. We’ll have just as much we’ll need to know and say in the next four years as we have in the last four years.

**Burke:** I’m wondering if members of this group have a good sense of what Transit Now will bring along the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor and I’m curious if anyone would be interested in learning more about that.

**Jones:** You’d like more information about the special bus lanes on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the bus rapid transit plans?

**Burke:** Yes, I’m curious what it will look like. Could this group have a briefing about that?

**Kenworthy:** Yes, a briefing with concrete information would be useful.

**M. Smith:** We want freight mobility up and down 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. If it was up to me we’d get rid of the street parking. Bring the Transit Now representatives, that sounds great.

**Jones:** Okay, we’ll try to arrange a presentation about Transit Now. Maybe we can even get them here for the April meeting.

## VI. Public Comment

---

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

There were no members of the public in attendance.



## VII. Adjourn

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

---

With no further comment from the project team or DAG members, the meeting was adjourned.

### **Action Items:**

- Kirk to send Lise the white paper on SDOT/Port of Seattle plans for emergency access through Magnolia Bridge area
- Dan Burke to assist Lise in obtaining a paper copy of the EIS for the cruise ship development
- Detour planning update to be added to agendas for future DAG meetings
- Kirk and Sarah to research having a Transit Now representative attend a future DAG meeting