

CENTRAL WATERFRONT STAKEHOLDERS GROUP

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting #3

March 22, 2011

MEETING INFORMATION

Meeting #3, March 22, 2011

5:15 – 7:15 p.m.

Seattle Labor Temple, Hall #1

ATTENDANCE

Stakeholders

- Geoff Anderson
- Don Benson
- Dave Blandford
- Richard Breslin
- Bob Davidson
- Dave Easton
- Katherine Fountain Mackinnon
- Craig Hanway
- David Hiller (for Chuck Ayers)
- Susan Jones
- Nicole McIntosh
- Lee Newgent
- Vince O'Halloran
- Katherine Olson
- Vlad Oustimovitch
- Ted Panton
- Geri Poor
- David Ramsay
- Theresa Schneider
- Mickey Smith
- Dale Sperling
- Brian Steinburg
- Tom Tanner
- Alicia Teel (for Charles Knutson)
- Heather Trim

Staff

- Bob Powers, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
- Bob Chandler, SDOT
- Stephanie Brown, SDOT
- Steve Pearce, SDOT
- Jennifer Wieland, SDOT
- Paul Elliott, SDOT
- Hannah McIntosh, SDOT
- Linda Smith, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)
- Mark Williams, TetraTech
- Erin Taylor, EnviroIssues
- Ridge Robinson, TetraTech
- Bob Fernandes, BergerABAM
- Drew Gangnes, MKA
- Jim Brennan, JA Brennan
- James Corner, james corner field operations (jcfo)
- Tatiana Chouluka, jcfo
- Lisa Switkin, jcfo

Approximately twelve members of the public were in attendance.

WELCOME

Bob Powers, SDOT Deputy Director, welcomed the group to the third Central Waterfront Stakeholders Meeting and thanked the Seattle Labor Temple for use of their facility. He reviewed the meeting objectives:

- Outline the parameters for seawall construction,
- Further define Elliott Bay Seawall Project alternatives, and

Advising on Waterfront Seattle and the Elliott Bay Seawall Project



- Compare the differences between Elliott Bay Seawall Project Alternatives A and B and their flexibility.

HOUSEKEEPING

Erin Taylor noted that a summary of the second Central Waterfront Stakeholder Group meeting is included in the meeting materials, and asked if anyone had questions or clarifications to the document. There were no comments. Erin also said that in response to stakeholders' request for more detail about habitat as it pertains to the seawall, a portion of the next meeting will be dedicated to that discussion.

Stephanie Brown, Project Manager for the Elliott Bay Seawall Project, summarized the team's schedule and process for coordinating with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). She reminded stakeholders that the proposed schedule for the seawall requires congressional authorization prior to construction. The team is currently working with the federal delegation to achieve authorization, which is subject to the availability of funding. She clarified that the alternatives described this evening have not been approved by the Corps and are required to follow a set process for approval within the organization. The Corps will also continue to work with the City to incorporate stakeholder comments into the alternatives.

Question: The construction schedule is very aggressive given the team's current project status. What are the consequences of slippage in this schedule in terms of cost and community impacts?

Response: The team will make sure to address that concern.

WATERFRONT SEATTLE UPDATE

Steve Pearce, Project Manager for Waterfront Seattle, expressed that their team is hard at work to design the new waterfront. The first design ideas will be presented in late May, 2011, at a public event. Steve introduced James Corner, lead designer of James Corner Field Operations.

James Corner explained the design team's assignment, which is to design the public realm from the waterfront into downtown Seattle, and to establish stronger connections between those areas. Also, the team will attempt to revitalize the appearance, use, and programming of the waterfront, as well as design new places for social interaction. James explained the coordination between Waterfront Seattle and the Elliott Bay Seawall Project, and highlighted the good working relationship that exists between the two projects. James specifically noted his interactions with Drew Gangnes, MKA, with regard to understanding the seawall engineering and construction options available to incorporate into the design of the waterfront. He noted that the two alternatives to be discussed are the result of joint work between the projects. He expressed his excitement to work on these projects, and thanked the stakeholders for their input.

Bob Powers asked if the stakeholders had questions or comments at this time.

Question: The Elliott Bay Seawall Project's and Waterfront Seattle's characterization of waterfront zones are different. How do those differing zone concepts work together?

Response: The two concepts work well together and are mostly congruent. Places where they differ are merely technicalities and have no effect on the body of work.

SEAWALL CONSTRUCTION

Bob Fernandes gave a high-level description of seawall construction sequencing and techniques. Bob explained that discussions about constructability are still preliminary, as many issues must still be worked through such as parking, access, ferry system and fire station operations, tourist activities, etc. Referring to a slide depicting a potential cross section view of the waterfront during construction, Bob indicated (from west to east) the locations of heavy construction equipment, a haul road, a temporary roadway, and pedestrian walkways.

Bob described a temporary roadway concept, potentially located underneath the Alaskan Way Viaduct, as a roadway used for a period of years as the seawall is constructed. This roadway would likely not remain following seawall and restoration completion.

There is a possibility of scheduling three construction seasons. The team is considering starting construction in the north end to minimize conflicts with the proposed bored tunnel in the south end, and to have gained a great deal of experience by the time the Washington State Ferry terminal area is reached and activities will be more complex to coordinate.

Referring to a slide illustrating a Type B seawall at low tide, Bob described how holes in the sheet pile previously allowed fill to seep out from within the master pile bulkhead. Then, Bob described the major steel beams included within the master pile bulkhead. Rather than remove that massive structure, Bob said the team suggests encapsulating it and replacing the seawall face as an "in place" scheme.

Bob described two methods of construction: Jet grouting, and drilled shafts. Referring to slides that depicted those techniques, Bob pointed out support structures, piles, overwater decks, potential areas for light penetrating surfaces, and other important elements.

With regard to construction sequencing, Bob described the sequence of events potentially involved in the jet grouting:

1. Excavation occurs and a frame is set to store spoils from the graveling process. This also acts to shore the back of the excavation and provides as much room as possible for the haul road.
2. The existing cantilevered sidewalk is removed and a new seawall face is installed. During this process, erosion control may be required. This consists of in-water work and cannot occur between February through July.

3. A temporary pedestrian access way is installed.
4. Soil improvements are made.
5. Installation of anchors occurs.
6. Structural work occurs.
7. Backfilling occurs.
8. The overhang on the piers is constructed.
9. Filling is completed.
10. The restored road is installed.

For drilled shafts, the contractor would pull behind the existing seawall face to stay out of the water as much as possible. In those cases, the wall itself would separate the water from construction. Bob asked for questions.

Question: Thank you for responding to our request for more information about these techniques. Do “construction seasons” follow normal yearly seasons? Can one section be completed in one season?

Response: Seasons include fall, winter, and spring. Summer is excluded to avoid working both in the fish window, and to allow for activities during the high season of the waterfront. The sections of the waterfront have been broken into pieces that can be accomplished in one season.

Question: Will the businesses located on the piers be able to sustain themselves through construction?

Response: The project intends to make sure the businesses are able to sustain themselves through construction.

Question: How do utilities fit into construction sequencing? Was the location of utilities a limiting factor in choosing wall locations before?

Response: Depending on the particular utility and its current alignment, utilities will have to be relocated in advance of this construction. The location of utilities was never a limiting factor for wall location.

Question: What will happen to parking?

Response: The area adjacent to the temporary road and perpendicular to businesses potentially could be used for parking. It is too early yet to know those details.

SEAWALL ALTERNATIVES DEFINITION

Stephanie Brown explained that currently the team is in the process of establishing a range of alternatives for analysis in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The purpose of developing this range is to develop bookends in terms of impacts. The team will then write a series of discipline reports for the alternatives and summarize them into the Draft EIS. Details on the following elements are required to complete an EIS:

- Wall location
- Habitat enhancement measures
- Sidewalks and railings
- Multi-use trail
- Restored roadway
- Flexibility for Waterfront Seattle
- Potential early wins

Question: Should offsite impacts be included in this list of items that make up an alternative?

Response: That list does not represent impacts. Rather, it is a strict list of design elements that need to be considered in the alternatives and included in the EIS. In a previous meeting, the team reviewed the different discipline reports that will be created. We will get that information back to you again.

- ✓ **Action:** Distribute list of planned discipline reports to the stakeholders.

Drew Gangnes compared Alternatives A and B, and explained that the analysis is broken into three sections: wall locations, nearshore habitat, and restored public amenities. Nearshore habitat will be discussed in more detail at the next meeting. Public amenities are elements that can be put back in place once the seawall construction is complete, but does not represent the finished design that the Waterfront Seattle team will create. Drew noted that the measurements and numbers presented here are preliminary, and will be refined as more information becomes available. For clarification, Drew explained that alternative A is, more or less, the existing wall in place. Alternative B provides ambitious wall pull-back in locations where it makes the most sense.

Drew described the details of the existing seawall and how both alternatives would look in zones one through four, using aerial graphics as well as more cartoon cross-section drawings.

Alternative A

From an aerial view, Alternative A is more or less the existing wall in place. He described details of the alternatives by zone:

Zone 1: The existing wall is a gravity retaining wall. There are difficulties in building a new wall exactly in place in this zone because of the deep bored tunnel and its proximity to the seawall.

Zone 2: This zone includes the Washington State Ferry's Colman Dock. The wall is pulled back 15 feet (east) to construct behind the existing gravity wall. The sidewalk can be cantilevered and would not have to move back 15 feet with the seawall.

Zone 3: This zone includes the master pile and tie rod assembly that the team would prefer to entomb for ease of construction in this alternative. The wall would be pulled out (west) three feet.

Zone 4: This zone includes the Aquarium, and also includes a master pile. The team would like to pull the wall back (east) nine to ten feet to construct the new seawall behind the existing one, and then remove the old structure.

Alternative B

From an aerial view, this alternative is more ambitious, especially in zones two through four. This alternative allows a great deal of flexibility for the creative design of the James Corner Field Operations team. Drew described the details of the alternatives by zone:

Zone 1: The existing wall is a gravity retaining wall. The wall would be pulled back (east) 15 feet. This would give the team more opportunity to improve habitat in this location.

Zone 2: Identical to Alternative A's design, Alternative B would pull the wall back (east) 15 feet to construct behind the gravity wall.

Zone 3: New construction would take place safely behind the existing structure 30 feet back (east) under Alternative A. The existing seawall would then be pulled out of the way.

Zone 4: This zone represents the most ambitious pull back of the wall, as much as 75 feet back (east). This enables the team to visualize what is called the "water scheme" and the "land scheme," two sub-alternatives. The chosen design could be anything in between those two sub-alternative options.

Question: Please explain Alternative A at Zone 3 in more detail, where the wall will be pushed out (west).

Response: The existing wall is five to six feet back from the face of the pier properties. The current sidewalk is cantilevered, and it would be removed before construction. Within that space, the wall would be slipped in, and sidewalk replaced, with shorter cantilever.

Comment: The alternative that is chosen could depend on what the Corps prefers from a cost perspective.

Response: The Corps has strict rules about how they establish funding levels. The team must get through that process in order to establish any amount. The Corps would also approve if the City decides to choose an alternative other than the Corps' preferred alternative, but they will not pay for any extra costs associated with it.

Question: How would these alternatives perform in the case of a tsunamis and sea level rise? In Japan, natural buffers were placed on the coasts to work with nature instead of fighting it with a hard structure.

Response: The University of Washington and University of Oregon are both looking at sea level rise as a local phenomenon. The mean high water estimate is approximately nine feet. The existing seawall is 16 feet, which means there is already a significant amount of space to work with. A published university study indicates a low potential rise of 6 inches, and a high potential rise of 50 inches. Tsunamis would not likely result from an earthquake on the coastal fault. However, an earthquake event on the Seattle fault could result in a tsunami. In order for water to breach the top of the seawall, a rare series of events including the simultaneous occurrence of extremely high tide, storm event, and a tsunami would have to be present. In short, the team is considering this in the design. They can either choose to build a structure to withstand the highest predicted rise or a structure with the flexibility for adaptations in the future. The actual design of the structure is driven by earthquake resistance, not tsunami resistance.

Comment: There was no discussion about zones 5 and 6.

Response: Zones 5 and 6 are similar, due to the fact that they will have a very narrow corridor for work. Utilizing Alternative A in those zones means constructing behind the precast concrete element and pulling the seawall nine feet back (east). Similarly, Alternative B would result in pulling the wall back nine to ten feet (east). Pushing the wall out is not an option because of additional overwater coverage which takes away from habitat enhancement. We are able to push the wall out in Zone 3 because it is such a modest amount of space.

Question: Why is the mean high water used, not extreme high water, when referencing the amount of space between the water and the top of the wall?

Response: Risk analysis associated with the probability of particular events have led us to use the mean high water level, because percentages say that extreme highs do not occur often.

Question: How far can a sidewalk be cantilevered, especially in Zone 4? Do we want all of that park land?

Response: The variations on sub-alternatives of Alternative B in Zone 4 is very much open to interpretation by the Waterfront Seattle design team. Structurally, it is possible to do many things.

Question: In reference to the alternatives matrix document, what is an early win? Why are early wins only included in the "Restored Public Amenities" section of the alternatives matrix? Early wins should be identified in the "Wall location" and "Nearshore Habitat" sections of the alternatives matrix.

Response: An early win is something that could be a crossover success between the Elliott Bay Seawall Project and Waterfront Seattle teams.

- ✓ **Action:** Identify potential early wins in all sections of the alternatives matrix, particularly related to habitat.

Comment: Please more clearly identify opportunities to touch the water.

Response: The conversation today was not illustrative of all of those opportunities. If the wall is pulled back (east) very far in areas, the grade of the step-down to the water is something that the Waterfront Seattle team will be working on.

Question: Is there a general sense of the cost variation between the two alternatives?

Response: The team will have completed cost estimates and will present their findings for the first time on April 25, 2011 to the City Council. That information will then be circulated to the stakeholders.

STAKEHOLDER CHECK-IN/COMMENTS/ONCE AROUND

Bob Powers asked each stakeholder to briefly describe what questions or concerns he or she had about the alternatives. The stakeholders responded as follows:

Vince O'Halloran: Complimented the presentation. Concerned about pedestrian access, control and space, especially in the southern zones.

Tom Tanner: Pass

Lee Newgent: Complimented the presentation.

Vlad Oustimovitch: Technical work is excellent. Still concerned about how it meshes with design work. Would like to see this information as a kit of parts that can be manipulated by the design team.

Geri Poor: Appreciates work, but requests more specific information about zones 5 and 6.

Susan Jones: Complimented the drawings. Would like to be confident whether or not the public will be able to touch the water. Incorporate that into drawings.

Theresa Schneider: Complimented the presentation. After the City Council and Mayor hear the presentation about costs, what is the next step, politically?

Response: Financially the project is funded through the end of 2012 to carry the project through design. Construction is planned to start in 2013, so a funding plan must be developed. The Mayor and City Council are working on that this year and next year.

Don Benson: Complimented the presentation. Please carefully consider the newly constructed Alaskan Way with regard to optimum traffic corridors, and signals. The Ballard community is highly affected by the cumulative impacts of the viaduct removal and reduced exits. Also, I encourage you to consider all of Seattle and not just localized groups when designing these projects. The design scheme should include relationships to the entire city.

Ted Panton: Has the team considered pushing the project limits beyond the public realm, for example, potential for eminent domain, to benefit the design?

Response: The team has not explored anything outside of the public right of way at this point, mostly to uphold the project schedule. The team's goal is to maintain flexibility for

the Waterfront Seattle team in the future. The Waterfront Seattle team is approaching the project with a big picture view. If there is an obvious design choice that requires purchasing a property, then they may well pursue those opportunities.

Dale Sperling: Complimented the process. Encourages continued work with Waterfront Seattle.

Dave Blandford: Concerned that designing the seawall is preemptive because the Waterfront Seattle project is more important to the overall waterfront. The Elliott Bay Seawall Project should accommodate the needs of the Waterfront Seattle project. Concern that the seawall design will become too detailed to remain flexible.

Dave Easton: Concerned about utilities during construction.

Mickey Smith: Concerned about the proximity of the seawall to the bored tunnel in Zone 1.

Response: The team does not know exactly how close the two will come; that will be a key point of coordination with the Design/Build team and WSDOT.

Craig Hanway: Complimented the phasing drawings. As a representative of Queen Anne, has concerns about changes in freight mobility and impacts to the transportation corridor due to many projects. Interested in hearing how those cumulative impacts are studied and mitigated. Would like to hear traffic predictions for this transportation corridor once the Alaskan Way Viaduct is removed.

Response: The team is cognizant of the cumulative impacts of these projects. This is a very dynamic issue and we will bring forward our ideas as they are identified. Predictions for traffic would be quite preliminary at this point. We will know more once our transportation discipline reports are completed.

Brian Steinburg: Complimented the diagrams. Concerned about stormwater runoff and potential opportunities to capture and use rain water in a synergistic way.

Response: The team is working closely with Seattle Public Utilities and is considering many options like those.

Heather Trim: Pleased to see the early wins identified for both people and habitat. Requested a list of background technical documents used as basis for seawall design. People for Puget Sound is advocating for a sinuous fish corridor. The drawings should reflect that opportunity, and should avoid locking the design into particular ideas. Requested more information in the future about ideas that were presented previous designs to dissipate wave energy near Piers 62/63.

David Hiller: Pass

Dave Ramsay: Complimented the presentation. Pleased to see references to sidewalks, and hopes that the new road and pedestrian alignments will improve opportunities for movement. Requested an explanation of a "restored sidewalk."

Response: The team uses the term “restored” to mean the condition after the seawall is constructed, but prior to the central waterfront construction. The team will take opportunities to improve existing sidewalks.

Katherine Fountain Mackinnon: Concerned about flexibility and environmental impacts. Encourages the team to think carefully about truck haul routes cumulatively across this and other projects, and consistency of those routes throughout the duration of the project.

Bob Davidson: Has an interest exploring more thoroughly Alternative B, especially in Zone 4.

Nicole McIntosh: Washington State Ferries is in the process of installing a permanent duct bank to feed its dock. They have interest in replacing their terminal’s timber trestle.

Response: The project team will set up a follow up meeting with Washington State Ferries to discuss this further.

- ✓ **Action:** Set up a meeting with Washington State Ferries.

Geoff Anderson: What is the benefit of setting the wall back in the land scheme of Alternative B in Zone 4? Also, with regard to light treatments on piers, which is more important: day light or UV light?

Response: There is flexibility with the Waterfront Seattle team if Alternative B is chosen for Zone 4. Research on the effects of light is new, and the team is unsure which kind of light is more beneficial for marine species.

Katherine Olson: Has interest in designing new gathering places, and is anxious to see how the designs of both projects fit together.

Susan Jones: Asked why the land scheme of Alternative B in Zone 4 is configured with maximum upland area.

Response: These alternatives show the bookends of available options. Something in between is also an option.

James Corner expressed his thanks for the team’s presentation, and reassured the stakeholders that his team feels comfortable with the Elliott Bay Seawall Project team’s work.

NEXT STEPS AND ACTION ITEMS

Bob Powers summarized the action items captured during the meeting as the following:

- ✓ Distribute list of planned discipline reports to the stakeholders.
- ✓ Identify potential early wins in all sections of the alternatives matrix, particularly related to habitat.
- ✓ Develop drawings that include touch point opportunities, especially in Zone 4
- ✓ Schedule follow up meetings with groups, such as Washington State Ferries.

The fourth Central Waterfront Stakeholder Group meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 10, 2011.