

## Magnolia Bridge Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

**Date and time:** May 1, 2018, 1 – 2:30 PM

**Location:** Magnolia Community Center, Madrona room

**Facilitator:** Wes Ducey, Seattle Department of Transportation

**Project Manager:** Wes Ducey, Seattle Department of Transportation

**Support:** Lisa Reid, SCJ Alliance; Marni Heffron, Heffron Transportation, Inc.; Gretchen Muller and Miguela Marzolf, Cascadia Consulting Group; Kit Loo, Seattle Department of Transportation

### Attendees:

- Ben Broesamle, Magnolia Community Council
- Lynn Hogan, Magnolia Community Council
- Carol Burton, Magnolia Community Council
- Fred Rapaport, NAC
- Ellen Monrad, Queen Anne Community Council
- Kate Lichtenstein, Sound Transit
- Kelli Goodwin, Port of Seattle
- Geri Poor, Port of Seattle
- Rosie Courtney, Port of Seattle
- Lindsay Wolpa, Port of Seattle
- Matt McNair, KC Metro
- Luka Ukrainczyk, KC Metro
- Dwight Jones, Elliott Bay Marina
- Jason Thibeaux, Magnolia Chamber of Commerce
- Pat Craft, Magnolia Chamber of Commerce
- Mike Smith, Magnolia Village
- Mike Stanley, Expedia
- Richard Vazaro, Expedia
- Bill Franks, Global Seas

### Meeting Summary:

#### Introduction & Agenda

The Magnolia Bridge Planning Study is developing a more financially feasible permanent alternative replacing the functional needs served by the existing Magnolia Bridge structure. Upon reviewing and evaluating the more cost-effective alignments from the original 2002 replacement effort, the design team has identified three possible alternatives to replace the existing Magnolia Bridge. The goal of this third stakeholder meeting is to share the findings of our evaluation and coordination processes, discuss the 3 draft alternatives, and summarize the next steps.

### Where We've Been & What We've Heard

A presentation was given to share updates on the Magnolia Bridge Planning Study. This presentation provided the results of the technical screening work the design team has been working through to determine the feasibility of the project components being considered. This presentation also introduced component #10 as a new component in response to public and stakeholder feedback. Lastly, the presentation identified the 3 draft alternatives as well as the next steps in the Planning Study process.

From the beginning of this current planning study, many members of the community forums have voiced their uncertainty as to how this planning study's work will move forward after a preferred alternative has been recommended. SDOT clarified that this planning study is investigating the more cost-effective solution alignments from the 2002 replacement effort and providing design and cost information to frame the decision that the Mayor, Councilmembers, and SDOT executives will have to make. The goal is to identify and recommend a cost-effective preferred alternative by this summer and share the design details as a comparison to the 2006 preferred alternative of a 1:1 replacement structure.

### 3 Draft Alternatives Discussion & Questions

- In presenting the 3 draft alternatives, SDOT reiterated their coordination efforts with both Sound Transit and the Port of Seattle, as all three agencies are in the planning phase of their respective developments. A stakeholder who served as a community member on the NAC mentioned that there seemed to be a component that SDOT was showing that the Port stated would not work for them. The Port confirmed that this have been the eastern perimeter road, component #9. In our stakeholder presentation, we noted that component #9 was no longer in consideration because of this conflict with Port operations.
- SDOT added that a benefit to these three draft alternatives is that they can be divided into distinct components. These components could be implemented in phases over time which would lead to more attainable funding packages.
- Another stakeholder asked why retrofitting the existing bridge was not being considered as a comparison to replacing the structure. SDOT restated that because of the structures age and type, retrofitting the current structure to meet current design standards and factoring in increased costs associated with maintenance would cost more than replacing the structure and was not a viable option.
- Another stakeholder member mentioned that the Magnolia Community Council was interested in one of the original alignments that connected 32nd Ave W to Marina Pl. They stated that this alignment would provide more direct access to Magnolia Village and should be included as an alternative. SDOT stated that they are not considering this alignment because of the WA State Shoreline Hearing case (#SHB86-14) clearly stipulated "No vehicular access between 32nd Avenue West and the Marina shall be permitted." The stakeholder mentioned that the Magnolia Community Council was moving to vacate their support of this Shoreline stipulation. SDOT asked if they knew and we're communicating

with the other original signers of this stipulations and if additional outreach has been done to talk to residences that may not have been a party of the original stipulation but would be impacted by revocation of the stipulation order. The stakeholder did not know specifically of the other original signers. It is SDOT understanding that MCC's vacating of the original stipulation would not change it's legally binding authority.

- A stakeholder mentioned the possibility of cost-sharing with Magnolia community as a potential funding source for a bridge replacement. SDOT noted this community idea and confirmed that the original bridge had been 50% funded by a Local Improvement District (LID) assessed to the Magnolia Community. In addition, the railroads contributed an additional 20% to the construction of the original bridge.
- A stakeholder suggested that the Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) improvements at 15th and Dravus (Component 3) seemed to have significant benefits irrespective of everything else. They wondered whether this components could be considered separately or just as part of packaged alternatives? SDOT reiterated that there is potential that a preferred alternative could be implemented in phases and it's possible that this interchange improvement could be pursued independently.
- A stakeholder asked if a study has been done to identify the impacts to the residential streets surrounding Component 3. SDOT stated that these streets would be captured in the traffic modeling, but other impacts to neighborhood street outside of this traffic modeling was not part of this study's scope.
- The Magnolia Community Council and Magnolia Chamber are concerned about the impacts to direct access to Magnolia Village businesses. They noted that businesses suffered during the past bridge closures.
- A stakeholder noted that it would be important to keep bicycle access and add better pedestrian access with whatever the solution ends up being recommended.
- A stakeholder recommended that, going forward, considerations should be made for the traffic impacts of future growth on access to Magnolia Village.
- A stakeholder asked if this project was freight mobility. SDOT confirmed that the design team was taking freight mobility into account in designing the geometry of the new/changed components.
- Concern was raised about the possibility that KC Metro may need to add more buses with one of the alternatives and therefore need compensation to offset costs associate with the longer route and more buses. SDOT responded that the modified SPUI (component #3) would be designed accommodate current KC Metro routing and stops along 15th Ave W. SDOT and KC Metro will coordinate further on how the routes using the existing bridge would be potentially modified for the draft alternatives.
- A stakeholder asked whether the SPUI (Component 3) widens Dravus. SCJ confirmed that the current layout does widen Dravus.
- Sound Transit brought up the need to understand the components and how they will work with ST3. SDOT will continue to meet with Sound Transit to identify crossings and discuss design options at this planning level phase.

- The Port reiterated a request to update the 2006 preferred alternative cost estimate beyond continued escalation assumptions. SDOT is looking at reviewing and updating the unit prices for the bid items identified as part of the 2006 estimate.
- The Port also asked that SDOT provide more information what opportunities stakeholders and the community will to stay involved as the Mayor, Councilmembers, and executive team decide which alternative to pursue funding and implementation.

### **Public Comments:**

*Don Harper, Queen Anne Community Council/NAC:*

If any one of these access points go down, then you're stuck on Magnolia; it's a SDOT failure. I'm curious about route 10, because if I understand it right, you're going to keep it at the same height that it is now, you're taking it all the way to 23<sup>rd</sup>, it seems to benefit the port which is an economic engine. It seems silly to not look at the rest of the way. I'm a real proponent of the port and I'm concerned you're proposing alternatives that are going to impact the port's use of Interbay property. You need to look at the long-term dollars at what the port brings to us and what you'll eliminate by taking up areas in Interbay.

*Pat Craft, Magnolia Chamber of Commerce:*

Deeply distressed by presentation; Magnolia isn't even shown. The current bridge is a wonderful approach and departure of Magnolia. New alternatives don't lead to retail of Magnolia. We're destroying the interactivity between folks and Magnolia Village. Seems like we're being ignored. Traffic is being injected without regard to experience of visiting Magnolia.

*Concerned Resident:*

I live down at 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave W by the water. There is concern that making the connection from 32nd Ave W to the Marina would negatively impact them and their property. Currently on Galer, 2 cars can't even get by one another. All my neighbors are wondering if there's any kind of consideration to provide a connection to Galer/32nd Ave W for public access.

### **Next Steps**

The next stakeholder meeting is tentatively scheduled for the week of June 4<sup>th</sup>. As SDOT reaches out through the online open house, they will share information from their traffic analyses, geometric analyses, and cost estimation findings. They will also continue to work with fellow agencies (Port of Seattle, Sound Transit, King County Metro) to identify and mitigate alternatives/components impacts.