



Summary Minutes

Agenda

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Charge to Advisory Group (Overall Project Process)
- III. Important Factors
- IV. Criteria for Developing and Evaluating Options
 - a. Travel Conditions
 - b. Urban Design Opportunities
 - c. Environmental Review Process and Criteria
 - d. Location/Corridor/End Point Considerations
- V. Next Steps in the Process
- VI. Closing Comments

Attendees

Design Advisory Group

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

Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Richard Butler, Shapiro and Associates
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Lee Holloway, HNTB
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- ✓ Andrew Laski, KPFF
- ✓ Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- ✓ Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle
- ✓ Cynthia Robinson, SDOT – Traffic Management
- ✓ Doug Stanley, SDOT – Design
- ✓ Eric Tweit, SDOT – Policy Planning/Major Projects

Meeting Handouts

- ✓ Design Advisory Group binder (for group members)
- ✓ Meeting Agenda
- ✓ Design Advisory Group Contact Information – Draft
- ✓ Stakeholder Interviews Master List
- ✓ Magnolia Bridge Replacement Process – Flowchart
- ✓ Reproductions of Draft Display Boards
- ✓ Potential Meeting Schedule



I. Welcome and Introductions

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues – Facilitator

Brad welcomed the group and led introductions around the table. He asked that Design Advisory Group members check the contact information listed in the binder and report any revisions or changes.

Conclusion: With introductions complete, Brad introduced Kirk Jones, Seattle Project Manager, to provide context for the Advisory Group.

II. Charge to Advisory Group (Overall Project Process)

Kirk Jones, Seattle Department of Transportation – Seattle Project Manager

Kirk provided a brief history of the Magnolia Bridge and the current process established to explore its replacement. The bridge is 70 years old, and natural calamities (Nisqually earthquake and slope failures/landslides on both ends) have closed it twice. After the Nisqually earthquake, Senator Patty Murray secured a \$9 million grant to complete a design replacement study. The City has kicked off the process quickly because they recognize the need to remedy this problem in the near future.

Kirk explained that the City has now begun the process to complete a Type, Size, and Location (TSL) Study, which will take approximately one year (a report should be ready by July of next year). The study's aim is the selection of preliminary preferred alternative, and Kirk said the Design Advisory Group will review project team progress and provide important feedback. Kirk invited the Advisory Group members to review on a monthly basis the work that's been done, receive an update on the project's progress and direction, comment back to the project team, and likewise report back to their own constituents for input. Advisory Group members are thus serving as liaisons with the groups they represent.

Kirk directed everyone to review the purpose statement he created for the Advisory Group. In sum, the Advisory Group will not have decision-making or veto authority, but it will influence how the project progresses, and will have the opportunity to review information that the team is gathering.

Kirk noted that the project team has been working hard since August, has individually interviewed many stakeholders (including most Advisory Group members), and from those interviews has begun to identify relevant issues. He said the first Advisory Group meeting is an opportunity to present some of what the team has learned, get the Advisory Group's response, and begin filling in gaps. An Open House scheduled for October 9 will also help the team gather additional information and public input. He noted that the display boards presented at today's meeting are in draft form and will be used at the upcoming open house, after the Advisory Group has had a chance to provide input.

Conclusion: The advisory Group understood their role in the process and had no questions for Kirk.

III. Important Factors

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues

Brad explained that EnviroIssues has interviewed more than twenty stakeholders, including agencies, residents, business owners, etc. (a list of those interviewed was provided). EnviroIssues used a common list of questions, but allowed interviews to generally take their own course given the perspective of the stakeholder. From the interview summaries, the project team culled a list of common themes that were repeatedly mentioned by stakeholders. Brad presented a board that listed these common themes, and explained that it offers a sense of what the project team has heard, but is not a comprehensive list.

Brad appreciated the broad thinking of those who were interviewed, and encouraged Advisory Group members to “think outside of the box.” He compared the current process to a funnel: the current project is currently at the wide end of the funnel, and the project team hopes to create a list of 6 to 8 alignment alternatives in the near future. From this list of 6 to 8 alternatives, the project team will then create a series of criteria to reduce the list to 2 to 3 possible alignment options. Finally, a preliminary preferred alternative (PPA) will be selected.

Brad then quickly summarized the **common themes** that the team has identified:

- Community values: appreciation of Magnolia’s “Island feel,” preservation of the working waterfront, maintaining the general livability of the community, etc.
- The new facility must withstand seismic events, etc.
- Magnolia Bridge is clearly a lifeline to Magnolia Village, providing direct access that effectively funnels drivers to area businesses. Magnolia Village is the commercial heart and soul of the community.
- Whatever the project team does, the facility must support family-wage jobs.
- In terms of land use, “change is a-comin’,” and we need to plan for the future. The Port is beginning their master planning process, and we’ll need to coordinate with that process. In addition, development of the uplands will certainly change over time, and we must try to create a facility that gives us future options to support this development.
- In terms of land use, the project team must plan for the future, which is a moving target that none can predict. For this reason, the new facility must not “tie our hands” when it comes to future land use and urban design opportunities.
- All stakeholders said that the bridge must remain open during construction! During past closures, Magnolia Village has experienced as much as a 70% slump in business.
- The project team must look towards working with a multi-modal transportation system. While the project team doesn’t know yet if systems like the monorail will materialize, the new solution must complement and work with future transportation systems and alternatives.

Discussion

- Coney** From a Queen Anne point of view, I would like to see as part of this scope money for study of a fourth access facility to connect the 15th corridor to Magnolia. When the bridge (or either of the other two access points to Magnolia, Emerson and Dravus) is closed, traffic can only be moved with the help of police officers. These access points are important to people driving to jobs, future recreational opportunities, and homes. These are important routes to Queen Anne residents, but they're not very good when one is shut down. We're also concerned about emergency vehicle passage when routes are slow or closed, as well as Magnolia Village's dependence on the bridge for business. The local area has grown up enough to get a fourth access point, which should be within this project's scope.
- Fahlman** From a bicyclist's perspective, there are pros and cons to adding a fourth access. It would certainly affect the community's "island feel." A fourth access could serve freight mobility and future development. What kind of new industries are proposed in the area?
- Coney** I've heard rumors of proposed research and development activities, which some see as industrial, others do not.
- Lorentzen** I'd like to reinforce the need for a fourth access point. When the Magnolia Bridge closes, Dravus gets backed up as drivers discover this route to circumvent the closure. What we want to achieve with a new access point will be lost if other points become so congested.
- Holmstrom** I'd recommend exploring an excellent fourth access point alignment that would take surface routes along the waterfront, past Palisades, and up 32nd Ave. This would provide great emergency access to Magnolia. I'd also like to support John and Doug's previous comments.
- Kenworthy** The Ballard/Interbay area is responsible for more fishing commerce than any other part of the U.S. The fact that so many ships and fishing vessels come here to create jobs and export revenue (which is essentially new money for the community) is really important. The bridge must not hinder these local activities. In addition, I've heard people talk about how they really appreciate the view from the bridge coming into Magnolia; there's a sense of "lightening up" as one comes into the community. If the new bridge were to be a replacement, the view is less important to Seattle Marine Business Coalition, but is a concern that I've heard from Magnolia residents.
- Montaño** I think that it is very important to have access to the marina and to Smith Cove Park, which will likely be enlarged (through acquisition of additional land), and maybe augmented with some athletic fields, etc. Egress and ingress to this area is hugely important. I consider waterfront access to be one of the important issues for consideration in the design of the bridge

regardless of where it is located. If the bridge can accomplish more than just reaching Magnolia Village, that's very attractive.

- Fahlman** Enlarging Smith Cove Park would be great, and tying into Myrtle Edwards Park would also be great. A bike path circles all the way around Terminal 91, and while my route is actually on Magnolia Bridge (eventually connecting to Elliott Ave), many cyclists use the Myrtle Edwards path for exercise during the day. Additional connectivity between paths would be great. The safety of bikers (collisions between fast cyclists along the Myrtle Edwards path) is a concern, and separate facilities for pedestrians and bikes might be a good idea.
- Coney** I hope that this study dovetails well with studies being done for the monorail. Several stations are proposed throughout the 15th Ave corridor, and there will certainly be a Garfield Street station if the monorail is funded. The monorail will need some space to operate, covered transfer points, and trolley transfers (if the trolley extends that far), etc. There are certainly intermodal issues to consider. The way that the city and Metro battle out busing routes and issues will have an impact on this project. In addition, we need to keep traffic flowing in the 15th Ave corridor. Every time we add business capacity to the area, we will have slow-down issues.
- Griffin** The thing that stood out in my mind when Kirk was talking about the process was that the project team must be sure the design follows federal guidelines. The facility will have to in order to get the kind of federal funding it needs.
- Calhoun** I think the common themes board captures the concerns of the Queen Anne Chamber.
- Chamberlain** Talk of coordination with the Port's planning process is important. The Port is looking at the North part of the terminal and considering opening up that end (possibly creating room for a fourth access point). There is interest in moving the streetcar barn, though they will have to find space for it. I've seen early plans showing the streetcar barn moving to another location, and the Port is interested in that. I'd also encourage considering future uses and tying those considerations to overall plans. The Port is also interested in shoreline access issues associated with Smith Cove Park, particularly in light of the potential Navy property swap.
- Conclusion:** Lee Holloway and Kirk Jones requested that the fourth access point and shoreline access be added to the "Common Themes" display board. Brad Hoff also explained that the project team is trying to find someone or a group that best represents the 15th Ave/Elliott Ave business corridor, and asked that the Advisory Group let the Project Team know if they have any ideas.

IV. Criteria for Developing and Evaluating Options

Lee Holloway, HNTB, Consultant Project Manager

Lee Holloway discussed the project team's charge. At this point, the team is dealing with more questions than answers, and doesn't know what the future will bring to the project area. What currently exists in the project area won't be there for the life of whatever replacement is chosen, and we don't want to build something that hinders future development. Rather, we want to encourage and help appropriate development take place.

To help identify alternatives, the project team will develop a series of criteria on different topics (including transportation, environmental impacts, and other goals the Design Advisory Group creates). The team will then develop 6-8 reasonable alternatives and then use the screening criteria to narrow down the field to three alignment options. At that point, the three alternatives will be further developed and refined.

The team will then reach a decision point: if it happens that all three alternatives are not controversial, and one is clearly the leader over the other two, the team may not need to complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. Instead, the team will complete an Environmental Assessment (EA). If that's the case, the team will march on through analysis and then begin to develop roadway plans, bridge plans, aesthetic studies, and complete the TSL report. Thereafter, the team will go into design. The project is currently budgeted through construction documentation (design), and during design the team will also start looking for construction dollars.

If an EIS is not required, construction would be expected to start in approximately three years. If there isn't a clearly preferred alternative among the three final alternatives, or if there is controversy about a particular option, the team will go through the EIS process to determine the preferred alternative. Completing an EIS would add a year to schedule, and then the team would start creating the 10% design plans.

Conclusion: The Design Advisory Group had no questions for Lee, who then invited project team discipline leaders to introduce the display boards they will use at the open house, as well as discuss the work they've completed thus far.

IV(a). Travel Conditions

Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates

Transportation may not be the most important factor in the bridge redesign, but the eventual solution needs to meet future use and functionality requirements. The team is starting to look at the bridge corridor and current and future conditions (until the year 2030). For perspective, Don explained that the aerial photo on display at the meeting approximately represents the study area the team is using to evaluate transportation issues. There are potential impacts to transportation in the immediate project area and, to be effective, the team must also look at issues beyond this area (e.g., Downtown Seattle, Ballard, etc.).

Don presented a board on existing travel conditions. The Magnolia neighborhood has approximately 60,000 cars entering/leaving per day carrying approximately 100,000 people.

The Magnolia Bridge carries roughly one-third of all traffic in/out of Magnolia per day. All three Magnolia access points (Magnolia Bridge, Dravus, and Emerson) carry similar amounts of traffic. When one route is closed, this obviously increases the load on the other two facilities. The Elliott Ave corridor is the main thoroughfare in the area. Thorndyke could be affected in terms of traffic volumes depending on the different potential alignments chosen. The amount of local traffic will be considered as part of the study, as will traffic on smaller neighborhood streets (the study will not simply focus on major arterials).

Don presented a second board on travel patterns, and explained that city and Puget Sound Regional Council models were used to assess travel patterns and to look at existing and future conditions. The team will look at the characteristics of Magnolia and how the area ties to the rest of the city. An important question they've been focusing on: Where are people going who are using the Magnolia Bridge? Users of the bridge are very heavily focused in the southern part of Magnolia. A relatively low number of people cross the bridge to head north, because it is more convenient to use one of the other two access points. The team will also look at whether conditions might change in the future (currently, 40% of drivers crossing the bridge are going downtown, 30% are going to South Queen Anne, Aurora, and South Lake Union, 10% are heading north over the Ballard Bridge, 10-20% are heading to West Seattle, and a small percentage use the bridge to head to the east side). These travel patterns start to dictate what needs to be accounted for in any kind of replacement facility.

Discussion

- Coney** It doesn't look like we've charted where Seattleites are going. We need to consider what's going on in the Elliott Ave corridor independent from its tie to Magnolia. Another graphic similar to the existing travel patterns diagram should be created for Elliott Avenue.
- Kenworthy** From an industrial perspective, industrial interests up north maintain a very low inventory to avoid taxes, and therefore head from Ballard to Duwamish to pick up parts frequently. To talk of who's using SR-99 is not nearly as important as who is on the Ballard/15th Ave corridor. [Note typo on board: the board actually refers to the 15th Ave corridor, but says "SR-99"; this will be corrected for the Open House]. In terms of the function of the area, all users of 15th Ave are critically important and don't necessarily need to be tied to Magnolia. If we restrict that artery in any way, there will be serious freight mobility impacts.
- Chamberlain** It would make sense to look at traffic flows at Dravus/Emerson, and perhaps look at all connections from the Ballard Bridge southward. This would help the Advisory Group get a better feel for the numbers.
- Lorentzen** It's also important to think of the 15th Ave corridor as a truck route that replaces SR-99. Traffic often exits from SR-99 at Winchester Road and can hop back on at the Viaduct. There are important traffic considerations associated with industrial areas to the north.

- Kenworthy** The Friday Group has started thinking about what happens when work starts on the Fremont Bridge. How do we connect work there with this project? Is the Fremont Bridge funded?
- Jones** A grant was just received for the bridge, and the project is close to being fully funded. It is on the three-year project list.
- Coney** At stakeholder meetings for the Fremont Bridge, they are projecting the start of construction in 2005. We don't want our project to overlap with Fremont's construction.
- Kenworthy** Is the project team choreographing project construction activities in the area with other major transportation projects?
- Jones** Yes, the project team will address this issue, and construction coordination is in the consultants' contract.
- Coney** It would also be helpful to add to the display board traffic numbers to/from Smith Cove/Elliott Bay Marina and to/from the Port facilities.

Don then presented his third board, which provides information on local future population and growth trends. Most employment growth is expected to occur in the Ballard/Interbay area, while residential growth is expected to continue at a slower pace in Magnolia.

Conclusion: Don Samdahl agreed to try to look at all patterns mentioned above by the Advisory Group, and will provide a graphic that characterizes the 15th Ave corridor for the Open House. It was also suggested that the team clarify the title and subject matter by using two-way arrows.

IV(b). Urban Design Opportunities

Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects

Lesley Bain presented two boards, the first of which summarized urban design issues. She explained that the City needs to create a transportation system that takes advantage of wonderful things in the project area, and that also supports future development that can't yet be predicted. In designing the facility, the project team should strive to respect community characteristics and values, support job creation, increase public access to the waterfront, take advantage of amazing views, and recognize the very valuable real estate for marine industrial uses and public open space. The project team also needs to minimize conflicts between the rich diversity of uses that are in the project area.

When working in this area, the project team must also take into account the need to maintain and further create an inter-modal/multi-modal transportation system. That picture is not clear yet (it could include rail, water transport, Metro, streetcar, etc.). The new facility will not only have future impacts, it should also accommodate what's there now (e.g., the needs of existing users like City Ice). Urban design in this area is fun because it could potentially take advantage of the many levels present in the area (while remaining aware of

minimizing conflicts between disparate uses). Urban design is also exciting and challenging, as the area needs to support industrial uses, provide public/marine access, and support single-family residential areas. Leslie acknowledged that certain infrastructure needs to be built, but noted she wants to make sure that other important purposes and needs are met in the process.

Lesley also presented a board that notes existing and potential connection points for a new facility in the project area.

Conclusion: There were no comments or questions for Lesley from the Advisory Group.

IV(c). Environmental Review Process and Criteria

Richard Butler, Shapiro and Associates

Richard Butler explained that he would be looking at both the built environment (as described by Lesley), as well as the natural environment. There are certain requirements that need to be followed in the replacement process. The project team is not yet doing an EIS/EA, and won't be doing huge documents at this stage of the process. Rather, it will be doing an environmental review summary, essentially a large and fairly lengthy checklist (Richard presented a board on the issues that the summary will cover). Stakeholders have already mentioned many of the issues that will be looked at from an environmental perspective. Environmental criteria are one lens the project team will be using to screen alternatives. Other sets of criteria will also be added to a systematic process and used to eliminate alternatives.

Richard then presented three of the maps the team is reviewing in the information gathering process (these maps are just a few of those obtained from Seattle). Some of the more prominent issues will include landslides and soil stability, surface water runoff, and fisheries and ESA compliance. The team will also look at public facilities, and specifically at public recreation facilities. Federal guidelines look carefully at protecting (existing and potential) park and recreation activities and resources (e.g., the areas involved with the Smith Cove swap are protected as a potential park resource).

Discussion

Kenworthy Does the team have any graphics of public assets invested in the project area? (BINMIC pays a disproportionate amount of taxes, and this is an area of major public investment.)

Jones This kind of map doesn't exist, although utility layers in GIS format are available.

Kenworthy Do any of your maps show where the rail routes go?

Butler The graphics do include the railroad, which will be an important consideration.

Kenworthy The BINMIC area is competing for cargo in the area, and many of our jobs depend on this factor (i.e., cargo is a big part of economic picture). I don't see recognition of that priority emphasized in the boards, and I've heard that 1-in-5 jobs depend on rail to some extent. The impact of the Magnolia Bridge Project on cargo rail will be crucial.

Chamberlain [In response to a question about what the Port is thinking about doing with Terminal 90/91]: The Port is trying to get their master planning study underway. The Port looked at the area during Harbor Strategy 21, which assessed keeping property south of the bridge designated for marine business, and evaluated the financial and development possibilities for the uplands. The Port has started collecting background information about what new facilities might look like, but at this point hasn't made any decisions about what might be developed. There is as yet no formal outside planning process, and the Port Commissioners haven't commented on results of the work that's currently occurring.

Conclusion: No specific action items resulted from discussion following Richard's presentation.

IV(d). Location/Corridor/End Point Considerations

Lamar Scott, KPFF

Lamar gave a brief summary from an engineering perspective about the work that's been completed to date. The project team is now gathering alignment ideas through stakeholder interviews and other methods, and will try to firm up some potential alignment proposals so the team can begin looking at them rationally. As the team continues to synthesize alignment options and firm up project goals and criteria, real options should start to become clearer. As has been said previously, the team will attempt to pare down options to three alternatives, and ultimately select from those a preliminary preferred alternative.

The project team will look at issues of functionality (how would the new facility suit objectives), "buildability" (could the new bridge actually be constructed?), potential impacts on the built and natural environment, and how the facility could maximize opportunities. The sets of criteria that are established will help the team "score" factors as they work through this process. When the number of alignments has been limited to three, the team will begin to do harder engineering, set some vertical and horizontal controls, and create firmer options.

Lamar explained that the display board depicting "Alignments Heard so Far" is an attempt to get people's creative juices flowing. Obvious alternatives that have been mentioned frequently (and are thus depicted) include a route along the waterfront and up 32nd Ave, tying to Magnolia Village. There are also a number of existing variations on the current bridge location, as well as many potential locations on the north end of the uplands. No conclusions have been made yet about possibilities. Kirk Jones emphasized that the team has heard some things about potential alignments, but the team is open to other thoughts.

Discussion

- Coney** Why is the fourth access point not included on the poster? [It was, but was depicted in a color that was difficult to see.]
- Fahlman** Any extra distance added to bike routes would discourage cyclists. For that reason, the further the possible relocation is moved to the north, the more cyclists might decide not to ride. I like the red or green options (which were the waterfront route linking to 32nd and existing location) more than the purple box (surrounding the fourth access area). I also think that it's telling that one-third of commuters use each of the three Magnolia access points. By moving the bridge north, we'll lose that advantage.
- Calhoun** If a fourth access point feeds people across to Thorndyke, we'll see more traffic on side streets due to people trying to get to Magnolia Village. We will have opposition to that from local residents.
- Chamberlain** Has anyone talked to the streetcar folks about climbing the steep grade to Magnolia Village?
- Coney** The route actually used to be streetcar route.
- Holloway** A streetcar to Magnolia Village is a great option, but the project team isn't far enough along to know grade possibilities or have that discussion.
- Conclusion:** The Advisory Group recommended that the purple border surrounding the proposed fourth access on the display board should be changed to a brighter color. The project team agreed to change the color before the Open House.

V. Next Steps in the Process

Brad Hoff

Brad Hoff asked the Advisory Group if scheduling future meetings on the first Wednesday of the month would work. Most Advisory Group members were agreeable, although Lise has a potential conflict for the next few months.

The next steps for the team are to continue fielding alignment ideas at the open house and to begin developing criteria to help sift through proposed options. These topics will be tackled at the next Advisory Group meeting. Members of the design team will also begin to flesh out some design concepts to begin preparing for future meetings.

Discussion

- Coney** Would it be a good idea to invite a monorail representative to Advisory Group meetings? Harold Robertson would be a good liaison, but it could take a while to get some time on Harold's calendar. It would also be valuable

to invite Ethan Malone, SDOT, to provide information on the streetcar extension.

Conclusion: Brad tentatively set the future Design Advisory Group meeting schedule as the first Wednesday of each month, and agreed to work with Lise to find a solution to her conflict. Brad also agreed that inviting a monorail representative would be a good idea, and said that the team would know whether to do so after the election in early November. Brad emphasized that the team will be working hard over the next month, and will have more definitive information in November to share with the Advisory Group.

VI. Closing Comments

Kirk Jones, City of Seattle

Kirk invited those in the audience to share any comments with the group (discussion had to that point been limited to the project team and Advisory Group).

Discussion

Foxworthy I'd like to raise a procedural concern: it's important to allow audience members to at least be allowed to ask clarifying questions about data and information during the course of the meetings. I had a question about data that I wasn't allowed to ask because you were confining conversation to those at the table.

Conclusion: The project team agreed and will think about how to respond to Robert's concern in order to meet that need at the next Advisory Group meeting.