



Summary Minutes

Agenda

- I. Welcome and Approval of December Meeting Summary
- II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?
- III. Three Finalists: Are We on the Right Track?
- IV. The Long View
- V. How the Magnolia Bridge Fits into the Olmsted Legacy
- VI. 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 and Associates
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Lee Holloway, HNTB
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- 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 #3 Summary Minutes – Draft
- ✓ Alignment Alternatives Memorandum – Second Level Screening
- ✓ Alignment A, D, and H Color Reproductions
- ✓ Olmsted Plan Summary



I. Welcome and Approval of December Meeting Summary

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 Design Advisory Group meeting (December 4, 2002). Because some members of the group did not have a chance to review the meeting summary, Brad suggested that approval of the summary be postponed until the February meeting. Members of the Design Advisory Group agreed with this course of action.

Conclusion: Approval of the December Design Advisory Group meeting summary will occur at the February meeting. Brad introduced Kirk Jones to provide an update on recent project activities.

II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?

Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager

Kirk recalled that the second project open house was held the day after the December 4, 2002, Design Advisory Group meeting. Nearly 300 people attended the open house and many people had comments (Lee presented a board that summarized the number of positive and negative comments received on each alignment). The most significant input received by the project team was from citizens along 32nd Ave and Galer Street, who presented the 1986 Elliott Bay Marina Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and pointed out that an agreement had been reached that would not allow a vehicular connection between 32nd Ave and the Marina (which would eliminate Alternative B from consideration).

After obtaining a copy of the EIS from a citizen, Kirk met with a City of Seattle lawyer (who had signed the agreement) who reported that the agreement could not be changed without agreement from each of the signatories (which included several regulatory agencies and six residents along 32nd Ave). On the day following the meeting with the attorney, the project team briefed the Seattle Port commissioners and discussed the nine surviving alternatives. The Port commissioners asked the team to keep Alternative B on the table, and City staff agreed to meet with the Port's attorneys to further discuss the agreement.

As a result, the consulting team has recommended that Alternatives A, D, and H be put forward for further analysis. In addition to the legal issues surrounding Alternative B, there are also significant environmental and traffic concerns associated with the route (other alternatives didn't change local traffic patterns so significantly upon entrance to Magnolia).

At the last Design Advisory Group meeting, concern was also voiced over potential impacts to businesses on Port property. Both Lee and Kirk met with City Ice and Trident Seafood employees shortly after the advisory group meeting to determine potential impacts and necessary mitigation needed to keep those businesses whole and viable at the same locations. Subsequently, Grace Crunican (SDOT Director) and Kirk met and toured City Ice and Trident Seafood facilities to observe the volume and kind of activities at the plants, and the layout/use of buildings. The City desires to keep these businesses whole and in the same

location regardless of the alternative selected. Almost all of the alignments would have some impact on Port property businesses due to construction.

The consultant team then sent their recommendations to the City, which suggested proceeding with Alternatives A, D, and H. City staff representing different disciplines reviewed and agreed with the basic recommendation, but asked for more information to help strengthen the evaluation. From there, Kirk will present the revised recommendation to Grace Crunican. She is aware that Alternative B still has interest. Kirk also has a meeting next week with Mayor Nickels to brief him on the project so everyone in the City will be aware of where the team is headed. Official direction from the City will probably be obtained by early next week.

Discussion

Chamberlain Is it safe to say that all three recommended alternatives will impact Port property businesses not just during construction, but actually materially impact their operations?

Jones Yes.

Kenworthy Could you please clarify what you mean when you say that City staff were concerned about inconsistencies in the evaluation.

Jones Their concerns came from reviewing the detailed sheets with four categories of criteria [provided to the Design Advisory Group in December]. They thought, for example, that evaluation of some of the environmental criteria should have been ranked as “neutral” instead of “negatively impacts.” There were about ten different elements that the staff had questions about. Potential inconsistencies didn’t change the overall recommendation, but the comparison of alternatives could be more accurate upon further review.

Kenworthy Will we get to see the revised criteria by the next meeting?

Jones Yes.

Coney How much cheaper is Alternative B than A? How many millions of taxpayer dollars would be saved with Alternative B rather than A?

Jones That’s one thing the City staff had concern about. Environmental mitigation costs were understated in terms of Alternative B. In addition, the time cost involved just to get permits needs to be considered. We felt that these mitigation costs were understated, so we changed the evaluation slightly. Most of the cost estimating we’ve done so far simply allows us to compare relative costs, and our initial cost estimates are based on structural elements to be built, and the amount of ROW to be taken (not mitigation).

Holloway The amount of mitigation could be high for individual alignments and may not have shown up in our totals during our first cost estimations.

- Coney** Are we talking about a \$10 million savings? \$20 million savings?
- Holloway** I don't think we can answer that yet with any accuracy.
- Chamberlain** I don't agree that the cost of mitigation for Alternative B will be much more than the others. Certainly if you build in the water, that will be tough, but not impossible. The Port's position is that Alternative B still deserves consideration. We're not ready to walk away from that option. In terms of where we're at, it might be premature to move ahead. Alternative H is very problematic, and we're not ready to say that we're OK with Alternative H because it introduces three roads that chop up our property into 7 or 8 pieces. In terms of overall process, there's a lot going on (e.g., Monorail, Elliott/15th Ave congestion, Sounder, etc.) and we may be rushing to decision here.
- Holloway** From what we've done so far, we're interested in taking the next step.
- Chamberlain** I would argue that you haven't yet considered key components like the Monorail, Sounder, or the Port's issue of what they plan to do with their property. We don't see a need to rush to decision because there isn't enough time [i.e., there's no hard deadline driving the process]. It may serve us well to take a look at what we're doing in that area collectively. We haven't heard enough from constituent pieces to definitively say that Alternatives A, D, and H are the finalists.
- Holloway** Would you be comfortable if we said our finalists were Alternatives A, B, D, and H?
- Chamberlain** Well, the Port likes Alternative B, but we still haven't looked at the Sounder station, the Monorail, Elliott/15th Ave intersections, etc. The cluster of intersections to the south is problematic and needs more analysis.
- Jones** To move beyond where we are, we want to spend time on a small number of alignments to answer just those questions.
- Chamberlain** At this point, we aren't supportive of going on. There's Tsubota Steel, and the National Guard wants to move out. There's a lot going on in that area, and I haven't heard enough about that. What about available capacity on Elliott Ave?
- Lorentzen** I'd suggest meetings with lawyers to talk more about Alternative B. A lot has changed since 1986. Have you made contact to see if signatories are willing to negotiate?
- Jones** One EPA attorney who lives on 32nd Ave stated that he would keep us in litigation for years if we proceed on Alternative B.

- Chamberlain** I don't think that one threat of litigation should preclude negotiations.
- Bartlett** It seems to me that those most opposed to Alternative B are on the beach. Would a federal mandate override the underlying private agreement? If it looks like that's the way to go, then could "eminent domain" supercede the need to go through lengthy negotiations with property owners?
- Jones** We're not sure about that.
- Chamberlain** We need to take some of time to work on cooperative studies to look at what's going to go on in the project area. We don't know yet what actions will have a huge impact.
- Kenworthy** The reality is that the project is happening in a large political context that could have enormous regional impacts. The Port looked at a complex Master Planning process that took 1.5 years, and this project has now gotten ahead of them. I wonder if it is the best use of city resources to charge ahead? Does this timetable serve the city or region best? We haven't heard how the bridge will enhance traffic mobility on 15th Avenue. The team's done great work so far, but I still don't have an idea about who's got the whip. I have serious concerns about such a quick schedule, and would like to hear more about what is driving this process.
- Jones** We don't have a specific date that we have to get this project done by. There is some flexibility to the schedule, and we're attempting to figure out what's a logical way to screen the alternatives and what is the amount of time that it would take. That's how this project has been set up. We knew we'd be ahead of the Port, but we think we're looking at the best way to replace the bridge and recognize the future development that could occur (this has been in the back of our mind throughout the process). We didn't want to get into the position of spinning our wheels looking at things that aren't moving us forward in a focused direction. That was our concern. We want to spend this money effectively.
- Chamberlain** But what if we make a decision that is in direct conflict with what the Port would like to do with, for example, Pier 91?
- Holloway** Where I was coming from, with us being ahead, is that we know the area is largely going to be developed, and we know the kinds of things you might want to do, so we think we can aggressively put in transportation infrastructure that would serve those uses, even at this point when we don't know exactly what will be done. Do you have an example of how we might conflict?
- Chamberlain** Using Alternative H as an example, it chops our land into 7 or 8 pieces with a northern, southern, and north-south road. This may work with what we

eventually do, but to take the area and chop it up may hinder the Port's ability to attract large-use development.

Hoff I think we've heard that concern loud and clear. This is in many ways a balancing act. Using State Route 520 as an example, they've studied, studied, studied, but nothing has happened. It's a matter of actually doing something versus studying enough to make good decisions.

Conclusion: Members of the Design Advisory Group support reconsideration of Alternative B, slowing the overall process, and integrating the project with the Port master planning process. Additional action items included:

- ◆ Sending the revised criteria evaluation to the Design Advisory Group for review, and
- ◆ Reviewing the procedure necessary to negotiate with property owners along Alternative B (specifically 32nd Ave landowners).

Brad introduced a new member of the group, David Spiker, a member of the Seattle Design Commission and practicing architect with 25 years experience. Brad then introduced Lee Holloway and Lamar Scott to discuss the final three proposed alternatives.

III. Three Finalists: Are We on the Right Track?

Lee Holloway, HNTB Project Manager
Lamar Scott, KPFF

Lee presented a matrix that compared the team's initial screening, and explained that early in the process it looked like Alternatives B, D, and H were the three that should be studied further (Alternative A was also a possibility). Cost estimates were a little soft, but the team didn't think that there were any alternatives that were outrageously expensive, so cost wasn't considered something that should limit the alternatives that were considered. The project team then took this evaluation to the open house (after covering up the check marks that showed Alternatives B, D, and H as the leaders). People at the open house didn't look at the matrix much, but they did spend time reviewing each of the alignments. Many people also submitted comment forms, and the team took those (and additional comment forms received by mail), and tabulated the positive and negative comments made about each alignment. From that tabulation, it was clear that there was public support for Alternatives A, B, D, and H. There was very little public support for the others.

Lee then summarized why the team recommended dropping six of the alternatives:

- ◆ Alternative C: There was no community support, and very little from the design team, largely due to the fact that the alignment would (1) take drivers so much out of the desired direction of travel and (2) add stop lights, etc.

- ◆ Alternative E: This option would bring all traffic onto Thorndyke Ave, north of where drivers are used to connecting to Magnolia. The project team thinks that they can bring the road into Thorndyke Ave in a way that would work, but think that there still must be another connection in the south to work well. The alignment also forces drivers to take a long ways around from the south, and people in south and west Magnolia were not happy with the indirect route. Alternative E would cause many to travel through neighborhoods (cut-through traffic). The project team thought it was important to keep a connection located in the south.
- ◆ Alternative F: This option presented the same type of problem as Alternative E (poor connection point with Thorndyke Ave).
- ◆ Alternative G: Again, this option does not include a southern connection, and would create a very long route compared to the existing route.
- ◆ Alternative I: This option is an attempt to make a nice, short connection, but does not function well due to the intersection with Thorndyke Ave at Boston Street. Alternative I would also create severe neighborhood impacts.

Lee explained that this reasoning limited the potential finalists to Alternatives A, B, D, and H. In terms of Alternative B, public comments were split approximately 50/50. Many good things could be said about the route from a transportation and urban design perspective, but environmentally it would be a nightmare. Cost-wise, Alternative B initially looks like it would be on the lower end, but as Kirk has mentioned, environmental mitigation could be expensive. The connection would be fine into south Magnolia, but the route would put all of the traffic up 32nd Ave. Westbound traffic would be in good shape, but people wanting to head back to Thorndyke would find it tougher, and probably wouldn't want to wrap all the way around from 32nd Ave.

Lee also noted that he is also personally concerned with the effect the route could have on Magnolia Village. By forcing all traffic up through 32nd Ave, motorists would be drawn towards the Village, but if there is too much traffic, pedestrians and other regular customers could be driven away. While this concern is not a “deal killer,” it is an issue that needs consideration. It's also clear that the Department of Ecology and Army Corps of Engineers would have significant issues with construction in or near water, and obtaining permits would take a great deal of effort.

After describing the team's reasoning behind eliminating some of the alternatives, Lee explained that there was a possibility that the team could be persuaded to reconsider other alternatives, or potentially evaluate four instead of three alternatives.

Lee then discussed the recommended alternatives.

- ◆ The public favored Alternative A because people are used to it, and because it would not result in much of a change [over current conditions]. There are some environmental problems with constructing near and over water, and it could be tough to include eastbound ramps. If there can only be westbound ramps like today, the

team would need to figure out another way of creating access to the marina from the west.

- ◆ Citizens also favored Alternative D, which swings north to open up the waterfront a bit more. The option will have an impact on businesses, and the team will need to do further studies to keep City Ice and Trident Seafood whole and in a similar location. Lee thinks that a solution can be reached to make this happen.
- ◆ Alternative H provides a fourth access point and relies on using the Galer Street flyover for the southern alignment. The northern alignment is new and would connect to 23rd Ave W and Thorndyke Ave. The project team envisions that neither alignment would operate independently and effectively to support traffic, so the two routes would need to be used in combination. The way that the alignment will connect from West Galer Street will also be problematic, and the team will have to do some revisioning to make that work. The team will also need to look at business impacts in the Interbay area to see how they can be mitigated.

Lee explained that in general, each of the recommended alternatives offer a different look at the connection between Magnolia and 15th Ave W. He then invited Lamar Scott to present information about possible revisions to eastern connections associated with Alternative H.

Lamar stated that the connections originally presented as part of Alternative H could be modified to work better. The advantage to Alternative H is that it disperses traffic in and out of Magnolia well, and thus could enhance traffic flow. The project team is now looking at how different connections might work, and are trying to put something new together. There are three ways to work the Wheeler connection on the east:

- (1) Create a ramp (the team is looking at different ways to connect northbound traffic to Wheeler),
- (2) Create a flyover at Armory Way (this raises the issues of right-of-way takings and potential conflicts with the Monorail), or
- (3) Create a “Y-shaped” intersection (suggested at the open house by Jeff Hummel) that would use Armory Way for southbound traffic off of Magnolia (this could create some difficulty with business circulation) and a tunnel crossing under 15th Ave for northbound traffic connecting with Magnolia.

The third option doesn't interfere as much with Monorail and works in terms of grade. The team is now looking at benefits and costs associated with the three options.

Similarly at the southern connection, it looks like using the Galer Flyover to get over 15th Ave does not provide the capacity that would be needed for the amount of traffic that will be generated. To improve the connection, the flyover could be modified to include a right turn-lane off of Galer that would directly connect southbound traffic to 15th Ave. Or, rather than use the flyover, something could be done that was similar to the crossings provided in Alternatives A and B to get over 15th Ave. (This essentially becomes Alternative D with a second northern connection, but it still needs to be looked at as a possibility.)

Discussion

- Coney** Does Alternative A become an earthquake hazard again?
- Holloway** No, we'd need to do soil improvements on areas of fill, perhaps like "Super soil" or some other soil/concrete mix. We'll probably need to do soil improvements regardless of which alternative we choose.
- Chamberlain** Part of Alternative A is a structure on pile, not fill, between the west yard and Pier 90, so you'd be working in a shoreline area, not an area of fill.
- Kenworthy** What is your rationale for looping Alternative D to the north?
- Holloway** To get it away from the waterfront and allow more contiguous land for maritime uses.
- Scott** The alignment also gives us more flexibility to make better connections to the Port property (e.g., room for eastbound ramps).
- Kenworthy** It's ironic that to protect water-dependent businesses, you're proposing to go right through them.
- Jones** Moving the connection to a more central area could allow for east and west connections.
- Kenworthy** Can you say more about the connection on the east end and how you envision that Alternative D might enhance mobility on 15th Avenue, an important arterial.
- Holloway** I don't think it's going to enhance mobility, but it won't hinder it, either.
- Kenworthy** Will an effort be made to see what will enhance mobility?
- Samdahl** We're not far enough yet to talk about enhancing mobility. We have a few ideas, but we'll need to take a closer look at the alternatives to determine how the project will impact 15th Avenue.
- Kenworthy** Would it be fair to say that you'll eventually look at what will enhance traffic on 15th Ave?
- Jones** That's what we're going to do during the next step (along with looking at other concepts more closely).
- Coney** Does Alternative D retain the Garfield portion of Bridge? Would that be a good way to design this alternative? [The ramp build in 1957.]

- Holloway** We're looking at using that portion or replacing it in a similar configuration. The answer is yes.
- Spiker** On Alternative D, could you just use the Galer Street Flyover?
- Holloway** That's not a great option. What can be done is the addition of the southbound ramp from the flyover that would enhance traffic that wants to move from the west and go south.
- Coney** How many reiterations of designs would there be? Would we get to see those reiterations?
- Jones** Probably around three on those alternatives carried forward. You would see them monthly at your regular meetings.
- Holloway** Yes, at least two or three. We've got some work to do to get these straightened out.
- Coney** People from several neighborhoods are interested in impacts to the 15th/Elliott Ave corridor. This corridor could become a big blockade.
- Holloway** I think we're close to having a good group of recommendations to analyze further. I think that we've got three fairly distinct, different alternatives to look at. A lot of them end in the same places, but where they go and the services they provide in between are different. (And we may decide to look at others.)
- Hoff** We're running a bit low on time, and I wonder if you'd like to see Lamar's piece and perhaps save the Olmsted discussion for February?
- Kenworthy** Last time Lesley talked about the opportunities to improve Olmsted linkages and I think it wouldn't be helpful to go away today without a discussion of that topic. It's hard to understand why Alternative H is still on the table.
- Conclusion:** Group members would appreciate more information on impacts and potential improvements in light of the Magnolia Bridge Project. With no additional discussion, Brad introduced Don Samdahl to discuss the implications of future growth in the project area.

IV. The Long View

Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates

Don described what studies of future demographic trends have revealed. Keeping in mind that details are still fairly vague, as are characteristics about how the routes might function, the team looked ahead 30 years to 2030 conditions to help figure out what needs to be considered when looking at possible design options.

To evaluate growth projections, Don broke the project area into four sections (which didn't cover all of Magnolia, but did encompass the eastern parts that were most impacted). Magnolia is projected to see a total increase in households of about 25%, most of which will be multi-family dwellings in the Thorndyke area. This area has been a focus for the city as part of its planning efforts (and planning efforts of the Puget Sound Regional Council). Don explained that he would be happy to entertain questions about specific numbers, but to date has been looking more at general implications and trends. This increase in households would be coupled with some, but not much, increase in employment.

To the north, employment projections have been based on current zoning. This area could see a substantial increase in employment. The Port and southern areas could also see a substantial increase (due to Amgen, etc.). Potential numbers are given in terms of growth, and Don will determine what this means in terms of traffic by running the numbers through a model. The team will compare existing conditions against 2030 conditions. Based on initial estimations (during afternoon peak hours) the team expects pretty substantial increases in traffic.

By taking an initial look at what this growth means to individual facilities, the team then reviewed existing daily traffic on facilities. By the year 2030, many local facilities (like Magnolia Bridge) are looking at a 50% increase in demand due to growth, which the team would need to take into account when designing a new facility. The team is most concerned with impacts to Elliott Ave/15th Ave, as was voiced by advisory group members. At this point, modeling is showing 50% demand increases south of the bridge, and greater demand north on the Ballard Bridge (which can't actually handle that large an increase). The team is trying to figure out why that's happening.

The increase in demand on Elliott Avenue is coming from Magnolia (30%), Interbay (30%, attributable in part to Amgen and the Port), and through-traffic and growth from other areas to the north (30%). The team will be able to bring better numbers to the February meeting, and will also be looking at 2010 scenarios.

Discussion

- Coney** Are you taking into account future increases in residential growth in fisherman's terminal.
- Samdahl** I'm sure we do. We've got estimates for those areas and can provide them to you.
- Coney** Will you also provide volume/capacity ratios for the area?
- Samdahl** Yes. We'll provide several different ratios (e.g., delay, capacity, congestion, etc.).

- Kenworthy** Can we get copies of these maps, and also a statement of the source of these projections. That would be helpful.
- Samdahl** I was going to hand some of this information out today, but we were still working on them, so I'll be able to provide that information prior to our February meeting.
- Hummel** Am I right in thinking that you're showing traffic increase on Elliott Ave that is less than on the Ballard Bridge. Isn't that a reverse trend? Where are you predicting traffic flows are increasing?
- Samdahl** Your point is well taken. You would think those numbers are reversed. We're still looking at why that's occurring. Some southbound traffic could be heading toward I-5 before getting to Elliott Ave.
- Kenworthy** In terms of that comment, it would be helpful to have origin/destination information. To date, generating this kind of traffic information has not been taken seriously by Seattle. This would be good to know. The connections to Terminals 5 and 18 are critical for freight, but some vehicles are not coming all the way south (they cut east toward I-5). Nickerson, for example, provides a route to the freeway.
- Samdahl** We do have information on basic traffic patterns.
- Spiker** Have you considered impacts associated with the Monorail?
- Samdahl** Not much to date. We'll have to look at that interaction more closely.
- Conclusion:** Don will conclude growth and traffic projections prior to the February Design Advisory Group and will send this information (maps, sources of information, etc.) to the group members. Brad then invited Lesley to provide additional information on the Olmsted legacy.

V. How the Magnolia Bridge Fits into the Olmsted Legacy

Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects

Lesley provided a brief explanation of the Olmsted legacy and how it affects what the group is considering for the Magnolia Bridge replacement facility (particularly in relation to Alternative H). It has been almost 100 years since the Olmsteds were hired to do comprehensive planning for the City of Seattle. Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr. (of Central Park fame) is sometimes called the father of comprehensive planning, and passed the company on to his son. The Olmsted's worked all over country, and worked for many years in Seattle on the plan and on private estates and parks themselves. They also worked in places like Spokane, the Gorge, Tacoma (plan was never implemented), Portland, Denver, and California. The Olmsteds worked at times when cities were growing quickly, and were

remarkably prescient. Lesley believes that it's amazing that we're still looking to the Olmsteds for guidance nearly 100 years after the plan was presented.

The car was introduced to Seattle in 1900 (there weren't many cars in downtown for several years), but there were many bicycles and carriages. The Olmsteds thought that Seattle should have a linked system of parks and green areas. At the time when they were working, they were interested in creating a system of pleasure drives. As Lesley stated, if we think about that today, it sounds like an oxymoron, but the wisdom of that spirit is what we might want to consider in this project. Lesley explained that she copied relevant pages from the plan that the Olmsteds presented, and explained that some of the principles they emphasized could be incorporated into the design team's efforts. Some of these principles include scenery (boulevard system of beautiful drives), suitability (use of natural topography), sanitation (attuned to the physical and mental health of the traveler), and spaciousness. The Olmsteds favored swooping routes where vistas would change. (Our current behavior of "beeline commuting" does not mesh well with Olmsted's intentions.) Another highlight of Olmsted's plan was the separation of different transportation modes (e.g., carriages, bicycles, horses, pedestrians, etc.).

Lesley directed the group's attention to the map she provided and explained that Interbay was not always tidelands. Lesley said the team has been thinking about how to separate users, and she thinks this could be a good idea to, for example, create separation between industrial and residential uses. Alternative H presents interesting concepts by, for example, creating a difference between street-level and overpass traffic, and could do a better job of supporting Port and Interbay development. Lesley also stated that she was less fond of routes that take residents at the at-grade level through Interbay (because they are much less attractive routes for the driver). These questions will require a good amount of thought. Thorndyke Ave was initially a part of the Olmsted plan and holds promise as a boulevard street (it could be quite beautiful).

Discussion

Spiker The idea of grade separation supports the notion of not using proposed routes. Are you suggesting that Thorndyke not become part of a route, or that it be enhanced?

Bain I don't necessarily have an answer to that question, and don't know exactly how to integrate Olmsted. I just want us, to the very best of our ability, to support users and be mindful of good ideas. The "beeline" mentality might be O.K. It's a matter of value judgments and what's appropriate in our day and age.

Conclusion: With no further discussion, Brad opened the floor to closing and public comments.

V. Public and Closing Comments

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues

Brad asked the members of the design advisory committee to comment on how the process feels to date, and to offer any thoughts about presumably moving the three proposed finalists forward. He noted that there has been a large amount of information presented, and that it might take a while to process all of it.

Discussion

Lorentzen I'm not totally sure what you're looking for, but I think the format is comfortable. Maybe when you're setting up the timeline, you might anticipate and set up an agenda where more time is allotted to complicated questions. Otherwise, I feel comfortable. It's almost impossible to anticipate what might generate a lot of discussion, but leave enough time if you can. If you misjudge, it's no crime to end a meeting early. Winnowing down the alternatives has been a good process, and my experience has been good. My thoughts on Alternative B, which I understand is half-way on table, is that in spite of litigation, I think if you give it a little more time, you may come up with things that change minds, which is worth a try. In terms of the groups I represent, the Friends of Queen Anne met at the beginning of December and felt that they'd rather wait to weigh in on the discussion until there is more "meat" than what I had to present at that time. They rely on this group [the design advisory group] to represent neighborhoods, and will wait for more fleshed out detail to comment.

Holmstrom I'm enjoying being a part of this process. I'm confused sometimes and appreciate the questions of others who are here. I'm also concerned that Alignment B might be dropped, I think it deserves further consideration. Lee said he was concerned about dumping all the traffic from 32nd into the Village. I'm sure we can address that issue creatively. Cost-wise, too, I think Alternative B would cost less. Also, I like how we went over the different alignments, and I jotted down notes during that discussion. I realize that we're on a long journey, and that nothing will be decided overnight. I'd like more time to get and give feedback. I haven't heard a lot about the project from the average person on the street. Many have supported Alternative B, and this choice was important to those I have talked to. I'm not sure Alternative H will work with the connection to Thorndyke. Having lived on that side I think cut through traffic would be an issue. I'm also not clear on how the ramps would work on the northern part of the alignment.

Smith Clearly, the best parts of the four finalists will be looked at and melded. If you have four good alternatives (and I think it's premature to dump Alternative B), I think having one at-grade (Alternative B) is pretty important, especially if you tied it in with Alternative H. Before this project, I never would have thought that two access points would be needed, but if we got to use Alternative B and Alternative H further north, it might work. Magnolia Village is really happy with the concept of Alternative B, and if just one EPA lawyer threatens, then I think you should deal with it. I think the

process is good, the Magnolia Chamber loves Alternative B, and the idea of an at-grade option provides added seismic safety.

- Fahlman** From the two-wheeled perspective [bicyclists], I'm still waiting. It really doesn't matter where the alignment falls, but whether there is a bike path and connections. Alternative B is the best, and I echo others in their support of the option. You may have to sweeten deals. I wonder: must you condemn, then go through a negotiating process, or go through the negotiation process and then condemn? As we get closer, groups that are more affected will say "wait a second." There are a couple of big players here, and their vote is important. Someone is going to have to take the lead. We don't want to be wrapped up for the next 10-15 years, but maybe our group should be pushing the tempo. I think that it would be OK to take a month or two off at this point.
- Calhoun** I don't get much feedback from the Queen Anne Chamber because most of the members don't go to Magnolia and don't want to be bothered with this project. Personally, I come over to Magnolia a lot. I will often take the bridge, but if I'm going south, I will almost always take Dravus and won't come down to the Magnolia Bridge. I then use Government Way or Thorndyke, and I think many others do the same. Maybe one time in 100 I'll take Magnolia Bridge from the north. Providing access from the south, and having the extra bridge to the north, I would use that more than one further south.
- Montaño** I agree with the Chamber's support of Alternative B, as it improves safety (we need to look at one option that will be more safe and at-grade). The Magnolia Community Club supports exploration of this option. Safety is a very important consideration. From an aesthetic point of view, the existing bridge provides spectacular views. Alternative B doesn't have the most attractive approach (dark and somber). Neither of the schemes show how Magnolia residents will have access to the marina (and Alternative B looks like it wipes out Smith Cove Park). There is great hope of having a sports complex there. I do understand, though, that you can't do too many things.
- Chamberlain** In terms of process, right now it feels rushed. With three alternatives, you still need to go see the Port Commission, and you're moving very quickly. There seems to be some inconsistency in the evaluation, I just sense that, in terms of our feeling rushed and where we are. I think it would be prudent to complete cooperative studies to see what's going on in the project area. There's a lot going on, and it would make sense. In terms of the proposed finalists, I've already stated my opinions. I hope that Alternative B continues to be evaluated. It is concerning that you received threats from one EPA attorney and, in a matter of hours, you pulled Alternative B off the table. That's a concern, which may just be from our perspective, but that's how it looks. I think it's time to slow down.

- Kenworthy** I think it's time to take deep breath. It was particularly useful to hear about projections on future growth in the area. I wonder how the consulting team work could be sequenced so the Port could move forward on master planning without this project being on full-throttle. I'm eager to see how the project could work to improve 15th Ave traffic. If you think of an artery, it's an appropriate comparison (as this corridor connects the north to the south, and if it doesn't work, we choke). We are the most freight-dependent state, and the 15th Ave corridor is crucial. Could this work be sequenced? I also appreciated Kirk providing some political context. What I'm hearing from constituents is "Do we really need to replace the bridge, and what's wrong with the current alignment?" I recognize that the structure is an engineering feat, but the alignment is not broken. Why, when there is a huge shortage in funding money (for project's like the Viaduct) are we looking at more expensive options? Magnolia is just one neighborhood in a city with so many transportation issues. Again, I think that time is a cure-all. I appreciated Jose's comments about the aesthetics of 32nd Ave, but I think Alternative B is still an attractive option. Time might solve some of the issues raised about Alternative B. The market might be worked out if given time.
- Spiker** I'd like to pass today.
- Foxworthy** I think that there needs to be more discussion about the separation of modes that Lesley brought up (regarding intersections and traffic through Interbay). What sort of impacts to local commuter traffic will occur with these options? I think it is worthwhile investigating Alternative B. It shouldn't be summarily abandoned, and attempts should be made to find solutions. I also think we need to find out more about Port property, and I support Lise and Dakota. In looking into the future, I feel like we're engaged in a kind of ad hoc master planning, but we don't have a feel for what's actually going to be there. We have no idea what might be developed.
- Traven** I was devastated when I heard about taking Alternative B off the table because it was the only one that excited me. It's the only one that's different. Alternative H is nice because it provides two access points, but it does nothing for the Village. Of those I've talked to, most can't understand why we aren't going to look closely at Alternative B. I don't relish the idea of this group plotting to take people's homes, but this process has helped me understand that there is a greater good, and that we can work towards community goals.
- Hummel** I brought copies of an alignment I created, which is a variation on Alternative H. I'd originally used Alternative B, but pulled it off after hearing about the litigation.
- Jones** Jeff Hummel is an architect who has worked in the Interbay area for the last 5 years, and on Pier 89.

Hummel My goal was to integrate all thinking in the area, not just the Magnolia Bridge, monorail, etc., and to try to resolve transportation issues that affect all property owners, adjacent neighborhoods, etc. Without considering alternative transportation options, transportation solutions are moot. We have a really great intermodal opportunity in Interbay with rail from the north, the trolley, etc. Alignment B would be preferred (32nd Ave was originally for the trolley). This is really a transportation scale issue that must incorporate the trolley, bus, rail, cars, monorail, and bikes, by combining and studying them all at the same time (rather than as individual activities). We need to try to consider how stakeholders look at property (e.g., leaving the Port property wide open to waterfront, connections to the north, etc.). A southbound ramp behind Art Hayes' property could work, and the team could also create park opportunities, Olmsted opportunities, etc. This alignment includes sweeping curves that don't interrupt Port property, and provides a gracious entry into Magnolia.

Conclusion: Many group members noted their desire to keep Alternative B on the table. With no additional discussion, Brad reminded the advisory group that the next meeting would be February 5, 2003, at the same time but at a *different location*.^{*} Brad adjourned the meeting.

^{*} Upon further review, the project team notes that the February 5th meeting will be held at the same location, Magnolia United Church of Christ, at 4:00 PM. However, the following two meetings (March 5th and April 2nd) will be held at the Blaine School cafeteria.