

WELCOME, MEETING PURPOSE AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Brad Tong, WSP consultant team and meeting facilitator, opened the meeting and reviewed the meeting agenda.
- Sam Assefa, Director of the Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD), welcomed and thanked attendees for their time. Sam discussed the importance of maintaining quality of life as Seattle grows; the current lack of public space in downtown; and the feasibility study as an exciting opportunity to build on the community-driven idea to lid Interstate 5, and to understand structural, financial, and community opportunities and tradeoffs.
- Lyle Bicknell, OPCD Project Manager, reviewed the meeting purpose, which is to provide an overview of the study history and background, set expectations for coordination and collaboration, and discuss study approach and timeline.
- Dave Warner, WSP Project Manager for the consultant team, introduced the consultant team and gave an overview of the team's roles and responsibilities.
- Brad Tong led the committee through an ice breaker activity and introductions.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

- Lyle Bicknell provided a brief background and history of the project and study area. He noted the potential to lid I-5 is a once in a generation opportunity to change the shape of Seattle. Lyle recognized the Lid I-5 Campaign and community members for the work they've done so far to build interest and generate community ideas related to the lid.
- Scott Bonjukian, Lid I-5 Campaign Steering Committee, shared the work the campaign group has done to date. The volunteer-based group has no preconceived idea about what should be on the lid. They have been leading grass roots, bottom-up engagement to generate excitement and ideas through workshops, charettes, walking tours, media, etc.
- Scott Bonjukian identified rapid growth, scarce public land, disconnections and environmental justice as key challenges that are motivators for considering a lid over I-5. He noted that downtown, Capitol Hill and First Hill are absorbing 29% of population growth at just 3.5% of Seattle's land area.
- Scott Bonjukian said favorable economics, planning ahead of private development interests, the opportunity to integrate with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) I-5 System Partnership and the Convention Center addition are catalysts for exploring the lid now.
- Freeway Park, Sam Smith Park, Mercer Island and State Route 520 are examples of local WSDOT precedents for lids over highways.
- Klyde Warren Park in Dallas and Capitol Crossing in DC are national examples.
- Scott Bonjukian noted that the Lid I-5 group collaborated with other community groups to secure funding for the feasibility study and other projects including Freeway Park improvements, affordable housing, Terry Avenue Promenade, protected bike lanes on Pike/Pine and 8th Avenue, and Olive Way pedestrian safety improvements.
- Scott Bonjukian talked about the Central Hills Triangle Collaborative that received a \$40,000 grant from the Seattle Department of Neighborhoods in 2018 to bring together interest leaders and designers to develop conceptual lid designs based on community wants. He also shared a

list of resources that the Lid I-5 group can share with the feasibility study team and Study Committee if needed.

Questions for presenters/discussion

- None

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON RUNSTAD DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT STUDIO REPORT

- Students from the UW Runstad Department of Real Estate Development Studio presented an overview of their project to analyze a lid over I-5, between Thomas and Marion streets. The project involved 12 students from disciplines including architecture, landscape architecture, real estate and urban planning. The students developed a project framework that aimed to maximize connections, and create open space and housing.
- The analysis explored connectivity, density, partnerships, financial analysis and development approach.
 - Connectivity – assumed keeping all existing connections and adding a new one at Minor Avenue.
 - Density – looked at five scenarios including low (68% open space), medium (49% open space) and high (38% open space).
 - Partnerships – assumed a master developer model in partnership with the City of Seattle and WSDOT.
 - Financial analysis – future residual value of the land is similar to downtown land prices, indicating a lid is financially feasible with public funding. Lid costs are the biggest variable, which the City's feasibility study will look at.
- Their study identified a preferred medium density scenario built by a master developer in three phases: start near the Pike/Pine corridor, build to the north in phase two and to the south in phase three. With full public/private funding, all three phases could be built in 7-8 years.

Questions for presenters/discussion

- None

STUDY COMMUNITY AND COORDINATION

- Dave Warner provided an overview of the Study Community comprised of various stakeholders and groups involved in the feasibility study including the I-5 Lid Feasibility Study Committee (LFS) to be established by OPCD, the Lid I-5 Campaign group, a Technical Advisory Team and community stakeholders who will be involved through targeted community engagement.
- Dave Warner said the feasibility study team expects to meet with the Study Committee five or six times over the next 12 months and shared goals for working together, which include:
 - Keep stakeholders informed of the LFS process.
 - Access community knowledge, expertise and information.
 - Understand community goals and priorities related to the LFS.
 - Identify long-term opportunities and constraints related to the study area.

- Test ideas together.
- Brad Tong asked the committee to think about ideas for additional members to increase diverse community participation in the committee.

Questions for presenters/discussion

- None

STUDY APPROACH

- Dhyana Quintanar, WSP Deputy Project Manager for the consultant team, provided an overview of the draft study approach and timeline.
- She identified two main goals for the study: explore the range of technical and financial feasibility, and create a framework to maximize benefits for all.
- Dhyana Quintanar discussed the structural assessment boundary (Denny Avenue to Madison Street) and the conceptual study area, which needs to be defined but will be a broader in order to understand potential future impacts and benefits. She noted that the Study Committee will be part of defining the study area.
- Dhyana Quintanar shared the three phases of the study and questions that will be addressed at each step:
 - Step 1: Define the Focus will define study approach, establish important assumptions, determine where a lid can be built within the study area and identify cost implications.
 - Step 2: Scenario Planning will determine what the lid can support and begin to identify priority uses.
 - Step 3: Scenario Analysis will look at how different scenarios perform and define next steps.
- The result of the study will be a feasibility report and strategic roadmap for future steps of the process.

Questions for presenters/discussion

- Will the slides from this presentation be made available?
- How will you engage and communicate with the Study Committee as you look at what is buildable?
- How much effort is being expended by discipline in each phase, such as structural, financial, engagement, etc.?
- There is potential to align our work with WSDOT's larger I-5 corridor efforts in the long-term. How will the feasibility study work well with I-5 in the future? The study can help to set WSDOT's thinking about future plans for I-5.
- The I-5 System Partnership is in the Governor's budget as a \$2.5 million study to look at scenarios for I-5 between Tumwater and Marysville. WSDOT will know if we have funding in April. If so, we will need to work closely and iteratively together.
- The existing footprint of I-5 is what WSDOT has to work with, maybe one more lane added from the existing right-of-way that is already.

- What are the biggest challenges and constraints in defining what is feasible? What is most challenging in terms of getting to a successful outcome?
- Please set committee meeting dates along with tentative agendas and decisions as soon as you can; make a committee work plan.
- How will the conceptual study area be defined?
- We need to think about the benefits regionally beyond downtown.
- Who knows what Seattle will be like in 15-20 years? When feasibility study scenarios are developed, we need to be clear about why certain scenarios weren't pursued so that in the future we can understand reasons and whether scenarios can be evaluated later when things change.
- The feasibility study report will need to target very different people – technical people, WSDOT, decision makers, etc. Can it include some mechanism for decision makers to see what the development/building process is and how long it will take based of various scenarios and start dates?

PUBLIC COMMENT

- This is a wonderful opportunity to do something big for our city. As you develop and consider scenarios, please stay aspirational and think big. Look at all possibilities without too many constraints in the beginning. The constraints will come naturally in future phases.
- I'm interested in the financial analysis part of the approach. I would like to know more about when it will happen and what it will include.