



## Summary Minutes

### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Updates
- III. Odds and Ends
- IV. Public Comment
- V. Adjourn

### Attendees

---

#### Design Advisory Group

- ✓ Dan Burke
- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ John Coney
- Eric Fahlman
- ✓ Erin Fletcher
- Grant Griffin
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- Doug Lorentzen
- ✓ Jose Montaña
- ✓ Mike Smith
- David Spiker
- ✓ Janis Traven
- Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)

#### Project Team

- Lesley Bain, Weinstein A|U
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- Richard Butler, Shapiro
- ✓ Gerald Dorn, HNTB
- ✓ Cela Fortier, City of Seattle
- ✓ Mike Horan, KBA
- Katharine Hough, HNTB
- Steve Johnson, Johnson Architects
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- ✓ Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Chelsea Tennyson, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ DAG Roster
- ✓ Cost and Expenditures Update Fact Sheet
- ✓ DAG #17 Summary Minutes

## I. Welcome

---

### ***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

Sarah welcomed the group and gave a brief overview of the agenda, which included updates on the following:

- Rehabilitation Alternative
- Discipline reports
- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) vs. Environmental Assessment (EA) decision
- Cost and budget review, and
- Port of Seattle plans for North Bay

Kirk introduced a new staff member for SDOT and the project, Cela Fortier. Cela and Kirk will work together for the next 15 months, at which point Cela will take over as the lead on the project. Sarah asked if there were any corrections to the DAG 17 meeting minutes. No questions or comments were raised in regards to the meeting minutes.

## II. Project Updates

---

### ***Rehabilitation Alternative***

Pete Smith and Jerry Dorn from HNTB walked the group through the work conducted this summer to evaluate the Rehabilitation Alternative, which included:

- Geotechnical borings conducted in June/July
- Bridge inspections and testing
- Foundation inspections in September
- Computer modeling of existing and rehabilitated structures through September
- Updating Rehabilitation Alternative information
- Reporting in October

Pete began by reviewing the geotechnical borings work. He noted that Jerry's group did the modeling to look at the rehabilitation elements. The team looked at the original foundations installed throughout the alignment. They found the original pile foundations go down 40-50 feet. They also found large amounts of sandy, saturated materials that would be liquefiable in an earthquake. Two deep borings of 160-170 feet were conducted in the central section between Piers 90 and 91.

Kirk noted that the team didn't previously know the depth of the sandy material under the center section of the bridge. The borings indicated that it generally extended to about 100-110 feet deep, which verified the team's assumptions and gave some assurance that the estimated costs are correct.

Pete then described the inspection work that occurred. He showed several pictures of what the team found during the inspection. Pete noted that the steel bracing was added in the

1960s and 1970s and that epoxy filler from former repairs to cracked concrete is visible, as are areas where the steel is corroding. The Rehabilitation Alternative would replace everything above ground but the existing columns. The foundation, which was installed in 1929/1930, was also inspected. The team discovered that the piles were like new because they have been covered with dirt and water. Small borings were also drilled to ensure that the piles are solid and not internally rotting.

Jerry Dorn described the computer model used to replicate the existing elements of the bridge. Using the model, the engineers estimated which elements and segments of the bridge could sustain earthquake forces and which could not. This exercise helped identify the critical elements that must be replaced to bring the bridge up to current standards (and helped the team estimate associated costs). The results show that the existing bridge would perform very poorly in an earthquake. Significant bracing and foundation work would be required. The existing timber piles have no capacity to resist uplift forces because the footings are not connected to the piles. The analysis showed that there would be uplift loads during a seismic event so details were developed to carry these loads with shaft foundations. Shaft foundations were also added to resist other lateral and vertical loads caused by the design seismic event.

Pete provided a summary of the elements needing to be replaced and elements that would remain in place for the Rehabilitation Alternative:

Remain:

- 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West structure (built 1957 and seismically upgraded in the last five years)
- Ramps to and from Elliott Bay Marina (23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West)
- Existing foundations and columns from the railroad to the bluff

Replaced:

- Existing deck and concrete crossbeams from the railroad to the bluff
- Existing structure over railroad and ramp down to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West

Strengthened:

- 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue West structure seismically upgraded.
- Existing foundations strengthened with new grade beams and deep shafts from railroad to the bluff
- Columns from railroad to 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West ramps strengthened with steel cross bracing
- Columns from 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue West ramps to Magnolia Bluff strengthened with steel casing and cross bracing

Permanently removed:

- Connection to Anthony's Seafood Distributing dock would not be replaced
- Center ramps to Terminal 91

In addition to the above improvements, ground improvements would have to be made for the areas within about 30 to 40 feet outside foundations. This would probably require drilling a 2-inch hole and pumping in grout under high pressure to increase soil density and counteract liquefaction. Soil improvements are a big cost item for the Rehabilitation

Alternative. The team would have to do ground improvements along the whole corridor because improvements would be needed 30 to 40 feet around each column, and the columns are closely spaced.

Pete reviewed the closure times for each alternative:

- A: 15-21 months
- C: 12-18 months
- D: 6-12 months
- Rehabilitation: 18-24 months

Kirk noted that he will be employed through KBA [Kristen Betty & Associates under contract to the City of Seattle] through completion of the environmental and TS&L phase (approximately 15 months). He added that the team expects to have \$4 million remaining at the end of 2006 and to be roughly 10% through design. Based on past experience with developing contract plans without having money for construction, SDOT has found that they often have to redo plans due to changing design standards. The project team thinks that if they don't have construction funding, designing to the 50% level by the end of 2007 may be a good stopping point until funding is obtained. Kirk pointed the group towards the *Cost and Expenditures Update* fact sheet, which provides a brief summary of the dollars spent to date and what is expected to be spent over the next two and one-half years.

### Discussion

- Kenworthy:** What does the color-coding relate to on the computer modeling slide?
- G. Dorn:** The colors refer to the material being modeled. Red refers to the steel bracing on the bridge and blue is the vertical concrete columns. The color-coding really is not significant to this slide.
- Kenworthy:** Can you please provide us with handouts of the presentation for the next meeting?
- Coney:** What is the cost of the Rehabilitation Alternative?
- P. Smith:** Alternative A is estimated to cost \$196 million, Alternative C is estimated at \$214 million, Alternative D is \$213 million and the Rehabilitation Alternative is at \$178 million.
- Coney:** Is there a valid reason for continuing with the Rehabilitation Alternative?
- Jones:** Personally, I don't believe it is a viable option. We have continued the work on this alternative so we have it as background information. The City is constantly getting questions from public like, "Why not just rehab the bridge?" We are trying to spend the time and money now to make sure we have clear answers as to why in terms of cost and life expectancy it is not a viable option.

Coney: Is there a difference in quality for a bike/pedestrian path for the Rehab Alternative vs. the other alternatives? Would the Rehab bring the bike/ped path up to new standards?

Jones: We haven't gotten into ground-level connections, but the structure itself would have wider sidewalks. We have to work on making connections from the bridge structure to surface streets.

### **Discipline Reports and EIS vs. EA**

Kirk Jones explained that the team is in the process of wrapping up all the environmental work. WSDOT has approved twelve of fourteen discipline reports. The thirteenth, on noise, is conditionally approved. A few minor edits need to be made to complete this report. SDOT is also waiting for final approval of the historical and cultural resources report. The discipline reports and rehabilitation documentation will be submitted to WSDOT and FHWA. FHWA will then give a final determination on whether the team can continue with an Environmental Assessment (EA) as opposed to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). They have verbally stated that it will likely be an EA, but not formally.

### **Discussion**

Kenworthy: Will the discipline reports be available to us?

Jones: Approved reports can be made available electronically. If someone doesn't have a computer, we can get you a hardcopy. We will start posting them on the website too. [Note: Since the meeting, WSDOT explained that discipline reports are not considered final until they are included as appendixes to an approved EA, and are therefore not yet public documents. The project team will instead update the discipline report matrix to share pertinent information.]

### **Cost and Budget Review**

Kirk Jones directed the DAG's attention to the *Cost and Expenditures Update* fact sheet and described the information it conveyed. He asked for comments about the fact sheet's clarity so revisions could be made before it is shared publicly.

Coney: What is the projected funding source for the project? A transportation levy?

Jones: A levy is certainly possible. We are talking with agencies such as the Port and Burlington Northern about possible partnerships. We will also continue to pursue state and federal dollars. A lot of brainstorming is going on right now. This is a tough project to compete with projects like the Viaduct and the SR 520 Bridge Project taking a lot of federal dollars. We're trying to get creative.

Coney: Is this project an unlikely candidate for the Regional Funding Transportation District?

- Jones:** Yes, it's unlikely because it is a low priority compared to other projects, like the Viaduct and SR 520. It's a city street and not regionally significant.
- M. Smith:** What about the initiative to repeal the gas tax?
- Jones:** This would not impact the current funding on our project. It could possibly have an effect on future funding.
- Coney:** If I-912 passes, it would force more local and regional money into projects like the Viaduct and SR 520.
- Jones:** I think we should add a footnote to the handout that this quantifies expenditures to date as of September 1, 2005.
- Traven:** You might want to incorporate the money available and the money remaining into a table instead of buried in a paragraph.
- Kenworthy:** So at the end of 2006, we will be at 50% design?
- Jones:** No, we won't be at 50% for another 14-15 months.
- Kenworthy:** What you are saying is different than what we are reading. Can you elaborate on what would happen with design in 2007? I would add "assuming construction starts in 2009" as a caveat. You indicated that the Rehabilitation Alternative would not be a desirable choice, but when will staff draw conclusions on this?
- Jones:** The team will make a recommendation by the end of October [2005]. We are in the process of putting all of this information into a report and passing it on to the City to review. We are presenting to the Magnolia Community Club on November 10<sup>th</sup>, where we plan to release the results of what alternatives seem to have floated to the top and get feedback from the group on which they think should be carried forward as the preferred alternative.
- Kenworthy:** Will this info come to us first?
- Jones:** Yes, at the DAG meeting on November 2<sup>nd</sup>.
- Burke:** Because the Rehabilitation Alternative is \$18 million cheaper than any of the other alternatives, some might argue that that's significant. Can you talk about differences in cost, maintenance, etc., with having an old bridge as opposed to a new bridge?
- Jones:** Yes, the consultants are currently working on developing life cycle costs.

- P. Smith:** We are looking at doing enough work for the Rehabilitation Alternative to get another 75 years out of the existing bridge, so we will see how much that costs us.
- Traven:** Barring an earthquake, what is the life expectancy of the current bridge if we do nothing?
- Jones:** Maintenance keeps patching up the bridge. In about 15-20 years, we may be looking at having to restrict weight on the bridge by posting weight limits.
- M. Smith:** Do you guys worry what will happen if the bridge falls down before we are ready?
- Jones:** We haven't done any studies on this as part of this analysis, although we have had some informal discussions and some ideas have been thrown out such as using the Galer flyover bridge with a surface crossing to 21<sup>st</sup> or using the future North Bridge if it is already in place.
- M. Smith:** Can you implement some of these preliminary ideas, such as opening up 21<sup>st</sup>, sooner rather than later?
- Jones:** It probably would not be too difficult, but it's a matter of negotiating something with the Port.
- M. Smith:** These issues are almost as important as what the project itself is seeking to do.
- Kenworthy:** Just like we all need an emergency kit, we need a plan for a potential bridge failure that everyone knows. This isn't a decision that should be left to a volunteer group.
- Jones:** I will talk to City officials about the need for some sort of catastrophic failure plan.
- Burke:** And I will take this issue back to the Port, as well.

### **Port of Seattle – North Bay**

Dan Burke provided a brief update about planning efforts for the North Bay property. The last time he updated the group was in June, and the North Bay EIS was out for comments. On June 28<sup>th</sup>, the Port staff came up with a mix of alternatives for the preferred alternative. The Commission voted against housing but approved 3.7 million square feet of space including industrial and retail. The mayor's office doesn't want to deal with a comprehensive plan amendment, so the Port's proposal is to deal with it via zoning changes. They want to see height limits reduced to about 90 feet. The mayor will likely put together a package in the first quarter of next year for the council to approve. The Port was waiting to finish the

master plan until after a decision about the comprehensive plan was made. Another factor at play is the upcoming Port Commissioner elections.

### Discussion

**Kenworthy:** The City Council voted that they would not consider a revision to the Port's comprehensive plan this year. Who are the Port's attorneys? Is it safe to assume that work won't resume on a master plan until after the elections?

**Burke:** Tom Walsh is the lead attorney. I think that's a fair read to say we won't resume work on a master plan until after the elections.

**Kenworthy:** Who is in charge of this at the City?

**Burke:** Mary Jean Ryan, Tim Ceis, and Mayor Nickels.

**Coney:** Has the Port selected a preferred alternative for the bridge?

**Burke:** We have not selected what our preferred alternative would be. In the past, we have always remained neutral, but it's beginning to look like our preference would be for Alternative A or D. Alternative C doesn't work well for the Port. Alternative D seems to potentially impact tenants more, but it also pulls the bridge a little further north. We will be talking more about this soon.

**Kenworthy:** Can you clarify why Alternative C doesn't work for the Port?

**Burke:** Our emphasis for development is extending the greenbelt, and with Alternative C, the greenbelt would really be impacted where the bridge touches down. We adopted the NBBJ plan as our preferred alternative. The goal is to separate industrial uses from other uses with the green belt, and Alternative C really doesn't work with this idea.

**Jones:** We have also received negative public comment on Alternative C because of the additional travel time and noise. I forgot to mention that I have copies of the information that was handed out at our last meeting, which is a summary of impacts from each one of the discipline reports. None of the impacts are determined significant. All impacts can be mitigated. This is one reason the FHWA is looking at having us prepare an EA instead of EIS.

**Burke:** The North Bridge [proposed elevated connection from 15<sup>th</sup> Ave to the North Bay property along Armory] is estimated to be needed when North Bay exceeds 1 million square feet of development. A Port Commissioner has asked for a 15<sup>th</sup> Ave traffic monitoring plan. I think we all realize that the North Bridge could greatly benefit the community during Magnolia Bridge closures. A big tenant could push the need for the North Bridge ahead of the schedule that is currently anticipated.



- M. Smith:** Is there a funding source for the North Bridge?
- Burke:** It's really the Port's responsibility, although it would be nice to find some partners. The project is estimated to cost \$15-30 million.
- Coney:** Is BNSF a potential partner?
- Burke:** I don't know what their plans are. This discussion hasn't taken place. We are looking at ways to touch down at 20<sup>th</sup> Ave. and at different routing for crossing over.
- Kenworthy:** Would the [BNSF] mainline still be there?
- Burke:** Absolutely.
- Kenworthy:** Is there any indication from BSNF that they are interested in selling any property?
- Burke:** I've heard talk about moving operations to Everett and opening up the land for development.

### ***Next Steps***

Kirk encouraged DAG members to start talking to their constituents to get feedback and thoughts on the various alternatives. At the next meeting on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, the project team will be asking the DAG to report back and provide feedback on the alternatives and what direction the City to head in.

## III. Odds and Ends

---

### ***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

Sarah provided the group with a brief overview of the public outreach that took place throughout the summer. The project team hosted an information booth on three different Saturdays at the Magnolia Farmer's Market, as well as for both Friday and Saturday at the Magnolia Summer Fest. During the course of the summer, the project team talked with more than 200 people about the project. These events are important avenues for reaching different audiences.

Although the project team talked to several new residents that had not heard of the project, they also heard many of the same questions, such as when will construction start, how do the Port's plans affect the project, and has the City decided on an alternative? Overall, people seem to support Alternative A or D over the Rehabilitation Alternative or Alternative C. Sarah noted that she would be happy to forward any of the short, 1-page input summaries to anyone who is interested. She also noted that the project team would be visiting the Magnolia Community Club at their next meeting on November 10<sup>th</sup>. Anyone interested in

having the project team brief the group they represent should get in touch with Sarah, Kirk or Pete.

## IV. Public Comment

---

### ***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

Sarah invited any members of the public present to comment.

One gentleman commented, "It's been a long time since I've sat in on these meetings, so I've missed a lot. Families on this end of the bluff always lean towards Alternative A. Alt C looks like a dead duck."

Sarah thanked the gentleman for his comment, and reminded the group that she would email the presentation out to the entire group, as well as update the costs and expenditures fact sheet and make the discipline reports available.

### Discussion

**Kenworthy:** Can I ask that the minutes from today's meeting reflect the questions Mike Smith raised about what the City and Port will do if the current bridge falls down? Mike, I think you brought up some very valuable things for us to think about.

**Brandt:** Chelsea is in the back taking our notes for today, so we can certainly make sure that all of your comments are accurately reflected.

**Jones:** Thanks again for attending tonight and for your feedback and guidance. We will see you November 2<sup>nd</sup>. If anyone wants us to come to any of your groups we would be happy to, just let us know.

**Conclusion:** With no further comment, the meeting was adjourned.

### Follow-Up Actions

- ✓ Email meeting PowerPoint presentation to DAG members
- ✓ Investigate making discipline reports available to the DAG and on the web
- ✓ Update *Cost and Expenditures Update* fact sheet
- ✓ Arrange project briefings with BINMIC and, potentially, the Queen Anne Transportation Committee