

Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project Speakers Bureau

Group/Organization: Seattle Port Commission
Date: February 9, 2006 – 1:00 pm
Location: Port of Seattle Chambers, Pier 69
Team Members: Kirk Jones, Cela Fortier, Pete Smith, Sarah Brandt,
and Dan Burke (Port Staff)

Overview

Kirk Jones and Dan Burke, Port of Seattle staff and Design Advisory Group (DAG) member, provided a project status update to the Port Commission, including information about the Rehabilitation Alternative and recent inspections. Port staff recommended that the Commission support Alternative A as the preferred alternative because it:

- Would have less impact on Port tenants
- Is supported by the community and DAG
- Creates more predictability for future North Bay development, and
- Costs less than Alternative D

After hearing testimony from three marine industrial representatives who also favored Alternative A (see below), the Port Commission voted unanimously to support Alternative A as the preferred alternative. Approximately 20 members of the public were also in attendance.

Public Comments

Eugene Wasserman (North Seattle Industrial Association)

- The NSIA, including the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing and Industrial Center (BINMIC) and the Seattle Marine Business Coalition (SMBC), supports Alternative A
- This sector is concerned about impacts associated with Alternative D, and hasn't yet heard a compelling reason to select Alternative D
- The maritime industrial sector also likes to align with community preferences, and the community clearly favors Alternative A

Lise Kenworthy (DAG member, SMBC, BINMIC)

- This is an easy choice for the Commission: Alternative A is emerging as the strong consensus position
- The economic impacts analysis completed for this project – above and beyond the work done for many projects – clearly showed how important the maritime cluster economy is to this region

- Alternative D not only impacts Port tenants, but also creates a lack of predictability that is very difficult for businesses to handle
- It is important to create and maintain family wage jobs. The Port's tenants are healthy, growing businesses that employ diverse work forces. The Commission and City should not fix what isn't broken.
- Alternative A is superior to Alternative D for additional reasons (e.g., better security, less impact on day-to-day operations, etc.)
- In addition, the City does not currently have money to relocate buildings they impact, which is worrisome

Kim Suelzle, CityIce President

- As a Port tenant, CityIce supports Alternative A for reasons already stated
- The process to identify the best alternative has been long but good, and City and Port staff have been great and accessible

Questions/Comments

Port Commissioners had the following questions and comments. Responses are indicated in *italics*.

- Edwards: Would the Rehab Alternative essentially create an underground "beam" of stabilized soil?
Yes, it would.
- Edwards: What will you do with the vacated right-of-way (ROW)? Do your estimated project costs account for that issue?
We know we could potentially swap the vacated ROW to reduce the total cost of the project, but don't account for that in our current cost estimate.
- Creighton: Has anyone in the general public opposed Alternative A?
The Seattle Design Commission doesn't like Alternative A, and ranked it third behind Alternative C and Alternative D. Otherwise, no other major public stakeholders have opposed Alternative A.
- Fiskin: What do you think the odds are of obtaining funding by 2009?
We actually need funding by 2008 to prevent construction delays. Because we'll have the environmental and design work done, and will be in a good position to approach funders in the near future, I feel optimistic about our chances.
- Hara: Because you'll be encroaching on the Port's property, what do you plan to do with the old ROW?
We plan to vacate it. Because we think the bridge will benefit the Port, there are opportunities to partner with you when it comes to ROW issues.
- Hara: Are you serious about detouring traffic through the Port property during construction?
Yes. The Magnolia/Queen Anne District Council has asked that we develop emergency access plans in case the bridge fails or must be closed for construction. The Port specifies that it may build a north connector as part of

- North Bay development when demand warrants, and perhaps (depending on sequencing) this facility could be part of the solution.*
- Edwards: Will the bridges maintain access to the North Bay property? Will there be flexibility in how the bridge connects to the surface?
Under both Alternative A and D, direct access from the bridge to the guard shack will be lost. Both alternatives retain ramps to the surface and will provide flexibility to connect to the transportation system developed on the ground.
 - Davis: Which jurisdiction oversees shoreline permitting for this project, the City or State? Is this really a huge impediment?
The City will issue the permit, and it probably will not be a huge obstacle to overcome.

Port Action: The Port Commission unanimously approved a motion to support Alternative A as the preferred alternative.