



**Seattle  
Design  
Commission**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**16 October 2002**

Gregory J. Nickels,  
*Mayor*

Donald Royse  
*Chair*

Laura Ballock

Ralph Cipriani

Jack Mackie

Cary Moon

Iain M. Robertson

David Spiker

Sharon E. Sutton

Tory Laughlin Taylor

John Rahaim,  
*Executive Director*

Layne Cubell,  
*Commission Coordinator*

Projects Reviewed

Trans Lake/520 Expansion  
Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project  
Transportation Discussion

Commissioners Present

Donald Royse, Chair  
Jack Mackie, Vice Chair  
Laura Ballock  
Ralph Cipriani  
Cary Moon  
Iain M. Robertson  
David Spiker  
Sharon E. Sutton  
Tory Laughlin Taylor

Convened: 8:30am

Adjourned: 2:00pm

Staff Present

Layne Cubell  
Brad Gassman  
Anna O'Connell



Department of Design,  
Construction & Land Use

700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104-5070  
phone 206/233-7911  
fax 206/386-4039

---

**16 Oct 2002** Project: **Trans Lake/520 Expansion**

Phase: Briefing

Previous Reviews: 7 March 2002 (Briefing)

Presenters: Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT

Les Rubstello, WSDOT

Ethan Melone, SDOT

Attendees: Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues

Time: 1.5 hours

(SDC Ref. # 221 | DC00262)

**Summary:** **The Commission thanks the team for coming back and allowing them to participate again early on in the project, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Design Commission encourages the team to keep strong and consistent fiscal discipline when reacting to communities' wish lists;**
- **would like a balance kept between the creation of transportation and the making of urban places;**
- **urges the team to use landscape architecture, ecological, and urban design thinking in the foundation of the infrastructural design;**
- **strongly encourages the team to keep promises made to the communities realistic to avoid confusion in the future;**
- **supports the team's early work with biologists and ecologists in dealing with wildlife, habitat, and other environmental issues;**
- **supports integration of stormwater treatment into the design;**
- **encourages the development of design guidelines for affected neighborhoods that explain how this infrastructure project will be developed;**
- **acknowledges that the design precedents the team brought extensively use artists' work and urges the team to bring an artist on as a full member of this design team in the beginning; and**
- **is alarmed by the width and height of the preferred preliminary alternative for expansion and urges the team to do whatever they can to minimize both.**

SDOT staff explained how the Trans Lake Washington project relates to the framework for transportation investments presented in the Mayor's proposed budget: getting back to basics, making it easier to get around, and shaping the future through new solutions. The Trans Lake/520 Expansion is consistent with the first two themes, as the floating bridge is at the end of its useful life and currently the SR 520 corridor is a difficult place to move around and needs to be made easier. However, the City is not yet satisfied with how the project concepts shape the future in terms of urban form, the economy, and the environment. The question is how to add capacity and best shape the future. The Mayor asked SDOT to lead City efforts to influence the way the project is integrated into the transportation system and urban environment in Seattle. SDOT is very interested in engaging with the Commission to discuss strategies for influencing the project in positive ways.

Since the Commission's last review, the proponents have met with people from both the west and east sides of the bridge, and environmental agencies. The structure was originally built for 60,000 cars per day and to last 75 years, however much has been learned since then. When it was originally built, most of the traffic was into Seattle, but now there is equal traffic (about 100,000 vehicles per day) commuting both directions. It takes about 31 minutes to get across the bridge now, but is estimated to take about 47

minutes in 2020. The expansion of 520 is set to achieve increased mobility for goods and people and in the process come up with better ways to avoid environmental and public impact.

The preliminary preferred alternative is the six-lane option. It is just preliminary at this point and draft EIS are being done for all three alternatives (four lanes, six lanes, and eight lanes). To come up with the preferred alternative compromises were made on both sides: most east-side residents wanted the eight-lane option whereas west-side residents were interested in alternative modes of transportation. The six-lane alternative provides two lanes of traffic each way, an HOV and rapid transit lane. To accommodate additional capacity or more rapid transit in future phases, the design includes pontoons upon which the bridge can be expanded. There are some people concerned that in the future what will be added will be SOV or something instead of transit.

Proponents do not know what funding they will have yet, but the first phase consists of the following:

#### West of Lake

- Match existing SR520 east of Montlake Blvd.
- Rebuild Lake Washington Blvd. ramps
- Arboretum Loop Trail improvements
- Bike/pedestrian connection to Madison Park
- Sound walls east of Montlake Blvd.

#### Lake Crossing

- Replace floating bridge which can accommodate future HCT

#### Phase 1 Corridor Improvements

- Added HOV lanes
- Bike and pedestrian path
- Safety improvements
- Stormwater management improvements

#### East of Lake

- Option A has inside HOV lanes to Bellevue Way
- Option B has outside HOV lanes to 84<sup>th</sup>
- Flyer stops
  - Evergreen Point Rd.
  - 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave. NE (Option A only)
- Lids
  - Evergreen Point Rd.
  - 84<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE (Option A only)
  - 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave. NE (Option A only)
  - Sound walls west of Bellevue Way (Option A); 80<sup>th</sup> Ave. (Option B)

The seed money they have is to complete the EIS, complete Phase 1 design, and purchase properties they might need for Phase 1; it does not, however, cover any construction costs.

Proponents' goal is to push the envelope on design and look at ways of making the highway corridors more livable. They have looked to other cities, such as Duluth and Phoenix, for examples of different ways of doing lids, noise walls, etc. They would like to have neighborhood-specific art/texture on the noise walls and use landscape and architecture to show individuality.

In Montlake, they are trying to keep the lid short enough so fans are not necessary. The bike path is a major concern within this neighborhood; it is now being rebuilt and one will go in with Phase 1, but it is still a controversial issue. Another contentious issue is whether to keep the ramps through the arboretum.

They are a small detriment to an already bad situation on Montlake Blvd. and if they go ahead with the ramps they can still easily be dropped. If they are kept, they will be moved slightly to the east. As the bridge comes through the arboretum, it will be raised above where it stands now so that it is up off Foster Island and people can walk under it. Here, they would also like to deal with stormwater differently so that it does not go directly into the lake. However a balance must be found between getting the bridge up off the island and still have enough slope to allow stormwater to be directed so it does not go into the lake. Flying ramps will get moved out and put on the peninsula out of the water where they do not affect habitat. The bridge now has 6 hollow piers spaced at 100'; in the six-lane alternative, there are four larger piers spaced at 250'.

In Phase 2 of the design, they hope to accomplish traffic fixes from the original freeway such as getting rid of the southbound Mercer and Ship Canal weaves and creating a flyover to southbound I-5 to downtown exits. This phase will also see the addition of sound walls in places such as up and down I-5 through Eastlake.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Would like clarification as to what R51 is and what the budget if it passes would be.
  - Proponents stated that R51 gives them \$100 million. With that they can finish the EIS, Phase 1 design, purchase some right-of-way, and do some habitat mitigation. However, to build anything, they would need an RTID vote to fund the first building phase.
- Is concerned that the things in the plan that make it unique will be the first to go if there is not enough funding. Would like to know if the benefits are divisible from the transportation project.
  - Proponents stated that they got the mandate that these things are not separable and that first phase must fit the end vision, which is why a complete EIS is being done before the first phase is started.
- Is concerned that with the current situation the road goes from four lanes to five to four lanes again, which creates a choke point.
  - Proponents stated that in building only 1/3 of the design at first, it will not be perfect. The fifth lane coming across has one off ramp to Lake Washington Blvd. and one to Montlake Blvd. and the volumes getting off there are almost equal to one full lane of traffic.
- Would like to know what the width of the road is now.
  - Proponents stated that the width is 54' curb to curb, but it has no shoulders and the lanes are narrow.
- Points out that the preferred preliminary alternative is then almost three times as wide as the existing bridge.
- If the project gets funded, neighborhoods will bring out wish lists and the proponents must balance this mitigation among the affected neighborhoods. Feels that when there are fiscal parameters or constraints, you may get a better design because you are forced to push the envelope.
  - Proponents stated that they do not have an open checkbook and that they will hone into specifics of mitigations for different neighborhoods. They have already done that with the lids; the east side wanted lidding like that over I-90, so that has become part of the package.

- Believes that people have heard the analysis of SoundTransit's failure to deliver on promises to the community. Suggests that the proponents promises to the community be very clear and be seen as obligations.
- Would like to know what will happen if R51 does not pass.
  - Proponents stated that if it fails they will likely lose the Urban Corridors Office after next June and WSDOT would lay off up to 30% of their staff.
- Compliments the proponents on their presentation. Noticed that in some of the promises that were made proponents used the word "probably" in the Montlake area but not on the east side. Believes that they must say something will or will not be there to avoid confusion and misleading people and that broken promises will not be forgotten.
  - Proponents stated that the point is taken.
- Believes that the increase in width is substantial and would like to know why there are 4' between the HOV lanes and the SOV lanes.
  - Proponents stated that the 4' provides a buffer for the SOV lanes and is a new request on this project. It creates safety and increases reliability. Proponents further stated that SoundTransit wants it to increase the level of the HOV lane where they are running buses.
- Is concerned that if you add up the 10' shoulders and the 4' buffer that is equal to two more driving 12' lanes, or essentially an eight-lane bridge.
  - Proponents stated that the FHWA and FTA's expectations are that they will not building anything less than for the current safety standards, which dictate those widths.
- Would like to know if there are different lane width standards for different speeds.
  - Proponents stated that the 12' lane is standard for all speeds.
- Would like to know if the Urban Corridors Office has urban design people on staff.
  - Proponents stated that it is a small office with just a few people for all large projects. The majority of the work is done by consultants and some of them are urban designers, i.e., the Viaduct project has an urban designer on the team. However, the urban designers for projects are not necessarily WSDOT staff.
- Feels that traffic needs to be either second or equal to the livability of a place and hopes that there is that kind of equity in the decision making.
- Would like to know why there is a 4' shoulder in the four lane option.
  - Proponents stated that there is no HOV lane and that when there are two lanes in each direction, there must be a 10' shoulder on the right and a 4' shoulder on the left. When there are three lanes of traffic traveling in each direction, there is a 10' shoulder on both sides.
- Points out that a lot of what the proponents have put in their book of precedents show projects where a highway was built and then enhanced. Encourages the team to think of the infrastructure as a way to make the project more beautiful; urges the team to make it inexpensive, but beautiful.
  - Proponents stated that the current bridge span is made of cheap, precast girders. They believe that now that they will have 250' spacing, they can create beautiful girders with a rolling feel to them. They hope to incorporate the bridge into the beautiful landscape that surrounds it.
- Encourages the team to using landscape architectural thinking about how to shape the road bed and

the variations in elevation. Urges them to make it an interesting experience to move across rather than use plants to cover things up.

- Proponents stated that as soon as there is funding, they will get a landscape plan, however they do not think they will be able to do much with the roadbed and are hoping to just widen it while keeping it in essentially the same place.
  - A representative from SDOT stated that the urban design issues should be brought into the owners' perspective and the structure of project management has to include different disciplines.
- Believes that this is fundamentally an urban design project and would like to see urban designers as both owners and consultants in the project.
  - Proponents stated that, in light of keeping WSDOT staff to a minimum, they are trying to ingrain in all employees the concept of urban design. Urban design will be incorporated early on in detail and throughout project development.
- In terms of ecology, believes that there are many obstacles for salmon already and wetlands are at risk. Hopes that the team integrates dealing with these issues early on in the process rather than treating them as add-ons. Urges the team to design the bridge to prevent degradation.
  - Proponents stated that they have more alternatives in the Montlake area than everything else put together to serve that purpose. They used to bring in environmental agencies after the draft EIS, but now they have these consultants on board early.
- Points out that proponents mentioned purchasing a few homes in order to make the expansion. Would like to know if, along the same lines, there are any costs associated with paving over more of the lake.
  - Proponents stated that the lake proper is owned by the Department of Natural Resources and they do not know if there are any costs associated with expansion over the lake.
- Believes that to bring about a more innovative approach to controlling the bridge width, there should be associated costs.
- Would like to know if people can live on houses on top of lids.
  - Proponents stated that they asked the communities if they would want houses on the lids and none did. In addition, proponents discussed this idea with the attorney general and he said no because it is a huge liability.
- Suggests that, with regard to the ecological impacts, the team should look at the peninsula on the Montlake side of the bridge, which is made of fill, as a place for creative treatment of stormwater. Urges the team to think about how the ecological functions can be integrated into other necessary functions rather than being add-ons.
  - Proponents stated that they originally had a large detention pond on Foster Island for stormwater treatment, but were advised against that because there is good habitat there, so they will explore the peninsula option.
- Believes that mitigation does not make up for looking at the proper alignments and does not understand increasing the width by a factor of three.
- Shares these frustrations and is frustrated with the expectation of speed and safety are incompatible without adding space. Finds it hard to conceptualize the increase width and believes it must affect adjacent properties such as MOHAI.
  - Proponents stated that they are planning to hold the south line firm and encroach to the north. The first 100' north of the freeway in MOHAI will be taken along with the "meadow" (a vacant property whose ownership is unclear) and the NOAA fisheries building parking lot.
- Finds this troubling because it seems that the east side is not making trade-offs and the west side is

taking most of the hit right off.

- Proponents stated that the HOV lane will get lids.
- Believes that there is no discipline of the SOV user.
  - Proponents stated that the east side has been clear that even eight lanes is a step down from what they really want. Eight lanes does not meet the capacity need in that corridor even with buses and transit, which starts to affect I-90.
  - An SDOT representative stated that they want capacity constraints and that is the problem that they have with the expandable pontoons.
  - Proponents stated that if they do not have the expandable pontoons there will be no room for HCT in the future.
  - SDOT representative stated that the HOV lane could be converted to a HCT lane in the future.
- Believes that there is a lesson with respect to the Viaduct project and how a project is characterized from the beginning. Had the 520 expansion been characterized as a facility replacement for safety, the east side could have been told no and it would be a non-issue. How a project is characterized at the outset greatly influences the design.
- Would like to know what the height of the bridge will be relative to where it is now.
  - Proponents stated that the current bridge is right on top of the pontoon. The new bridge will be more of a road on piers to keep the waves off the road and allow room for people to walk underneath where it hits land. The new bridge would be about 20' high.
- Would like to know if the proposed bike path is really viable for both bikers and pedestrians.
  - Proponents stated that it is.

---

**16 Oct 2002** Project: **Magnolia Bridge Replacement Project**

Phase: Pre-Design

Previous Review: None

Presenters: Kirk Jones, SDOT  
Lee Holloway, HNTB  
Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland  
Brad Hoff, EnviroIssuesAttendees: Richard Butler, Shapiro and Associates  
Pete Smith, HNTB  
Milt Smith, HNTB

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 169 | DC00290)

**Action:** **The Commission thanks the team for this initial briefing and feels that this is an important piece of civic infrastructure, and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.**

- **The Design Commission supports the broad, comprehensive approach informed by environmental constraints, urban design issues, and the surrounding community that the team has taken thus far;**
- **encourages the team to develop and maintain a strong clear vision, quickly clarify the options, and focus on designing simple, elegant structure(s);**
- **recommends that the team explore reclaiming the historical waterway north into Interbay;**
- **urges proponents to use the Olmsted Brothers' work from earlier this century to guide the development of open space;**
- **would like the team to better define what can be accomplished and delivered within the funding possibilities;**
- **supports consideration of two roadways to allow south access to the waterfront and north access to the main part of Magnolia;**
- **offers its assistance, possibly through inclusion on the design advisory team, and looks forward to future updates.**

The original Magnolia Bridge was built in 1929 as access to what was then a developing community. The area has grown considerably since then and is now served by three bridges. Because of design deficiencies, reinforcing work has been done on the bridge since it was built; in the 1960s and 1970s steel bracing was added under the deck. In 1997 there was a major landslide and the bridge was closed for repairs and in with the Nisqually Earthquake in 2002 the bracing was destroyed and the bridge was once again closed for repairs. The bridge currently serves a little less traffic than the other two bridges in Magnolia, at about 19,200 cars per day.

Senator Patty Murry secured \$9 million for the design of the new bridge, but no money has, as yet, been allocated for construction. The team is currently in the very initial phase where they are doing a Type, Size, and Location study. This phase will last about one year and should be completed mid-summer next year. They will also be developing a cost estimate so they can go after funding. Late 2005 to early 2006 would be the earliest the construction could begin. In 1998, before making the decision to replace the bridge, the option of retrofitting the standing bridge was explored. Retrofitting would cost about \$30 million and replacement costs were estimated to be \$60 million. Given the expense of retrofitting, they decided it would be more worthwhile to replace the bridge.

One of the challenges of this project is that the future use of this area is likely to be different than its current use. The National Guard, who has a large area of property there, is willing to sell and the Interbay area is going to change. In addition, access to waterfront property and access to the main part of Magnolia need to be reconsidered.

The team wants to better connect those who live in Magnolia to their waterfront and create better pedestrian and bike paths—there is a lot of bike usage in the area. The 15<sup>th</sup> and Elliot corridor is an important piece of the project; it serves 44,000 cars per day and is a lifeline to the Duwamish and Interstate system. If the area begins to develop, it will generate traffic. What happens to the places where traffic connects into the 15<sup>th</sup> and Elliot corridor? 23<sup>rd</sup> and Newton, Wheeler, and Armory are all historical connections. 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> also used to be a connection point to the north, but have been fenced off because the community did not want to mix freight with community uses. On the bluff into Thorndyke is Olmsted Blvd., which could feasibly take more traffic. A potential at-grade connection for Magnolia also exists by connecting 32<sup>nd</sup> St. via the marina.

Proponents are currently looking at alignments and have narrowed it down to about 16 possibilities. They will narrow this down and look more closely at six to eight options and perform an engineer study on these. This will help bring it down to two or three alternatives, which will be analyzed in depth and one option will be chosen. When the final alternative is chosen, a bridge type study will be done. This process must be completed by next July for approval so it can appear in the budget. After all of this, the project will go into normal project development and design phases. There is possible deviation from the process when two to three options are identified. If, with those two or three alternatives, there appear to be environmental concerns that would require an EIS, the team will stop the process and do EIS for each alternative to determine the appropriate one. This would add one year to the project.

An important aspect of this project is interacting with the community to get a sense of what they want. One of the efforts to accomplish this is the creation of a design advisory group, which meets monthly with the project team. The design advisory group consists of representatives from a broad spectrum of community members, including residents. The team started with the advisory group when doing stakeholder interviews. Through this interview process, they found a number of areas/issues that came up more than once. People want the team to look at the broader picture and do not want it to be thought of as just replacing one bridge with another. The interviewees encouraged the team to think alternatively. The team will continue with stakeholder interviews and host a series of three open houses. In early December the team will be back in the community with six to eight alternatives; in February they will bring the community three designs upon which to comment. With the design advisory group, stakeholder interviews, and a website where people can provide feedback, the team is keeping the community in the loop.

The project area has a wide range of users, with differing points of view. The design team will look for areas of mutual benefit and ways of minimizing conflicts between divergent uses and needs. Specifically, they need to balance the visions of the residents who like the island feel and do not want Magnolia to be a destination with business owners and others who want it to be less insular and envision a fourth exit/entry point. The Port has just begun their master planning process, in which they are trying to maintain flexibility for the future, as well.

Proponents are doing initial research with the Type, Size, and Location study. Environmental reconnaissance will give them a good idea of potential environmental issues the bridge project will have to address. A set of evaluation criteria, environmental and other, is being developed to screen the alternatives from six to eight alternatives to three alternatives to the final option. In these initial studies they will pay close attention to seismically-challenging soils; steep slopes at the termini of the bridge; hazardous waste (clean up issues from the former landfill); shoreline impacts depending on alignment

(i.e., fisheries); impacts on businesses and residences (relocations and displacement); and aesthetic impacts.

Magnolia has all of the things that make up the essence of Seattle—topography, views, working waterfront, traffic, and established single family neighborhoods. The community counts on infrastructure to solve urban design issues and very different people (families and freight companies) need to be able to rely on this infrastructure. There are a number of legacies in the neighborhood from the Olmsted Brothers' planning to military use. The challenge is to work together and to look at different possible scenarios for the future and how infrastructure can serve those. The project is more than replacing a bridge; it is providing better access for and to Magnolia.

### **Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns**

- Would like to know if the fourth access point the proponents mentioned means that there are two bridges in this project.
  - Proponents stated that that is a possibility that is still on the table.
- Would like to know where the truck route is currently.
  - Proponents stated that trucks can go along 15<sup>th</sup> past the golf course, up to the Ballard Bridge and the industrial areas, but it is hard to get from Ballard to I-5. Trucks must go down 15<sup>th</sup> and get onto 99 to do that. Proponents further stated that trucks can use West Galer for access to the Port. Overall, Magnolia does not take much truck traffic.
- Would like to know where proposed pedestrian bridge is.
  - Proponents stated that it is at Prospect and is currently under construction. The Port is coordinating with those building the pedestrian bridge and they did a study looking at the triple bottom line. The outcome of that was that they need a master plan for the upland area, but it is unclear where the uplands start.
- Would like to know if the marina is part of the Port Authority.
  - Proponents stated that it is not; the marina is private.
- Believes that with the two camps in Magnolia, the idea of isolation versus security comes up. We tend, because of cost, to meet the needs of as many user groups as possible with one piece of infrastructure, but feels this is a liability. When you think of this in terms of disasters, one piece of infrastructure leads to vulnerability. There is not a lot of built-in redundancy in transportation and in the even that something bad happens, it impacts all user groups. Suggests the team think of separating some user group transportation needs to create more redundancy.
- Feels that there are so many connections, but in the end we need clarity. Suggests that we cannot do everything for everyone and we often end up not doing anything well. Would like to know if the Parks Department is interested in this project.
  - Proponents stated that Parks owns property at the top of the hill where the bridge now connects. In addition, the Parks Department is hoping to negotiate with the Port Authority who owns land at Smith Cove to trade the Parks Department inland property with the Port's waterfront property.
- Points out that in the 1929 photograph you can see a small creek running into Smith Cove. Acknowledges that the proponents have a map of historical connections, but would like to see a map

with this creek so they can suggest to the Port to open it up. Perhaps the creek can be a way to mitigate development and provide a new place with character.

- Proponents stated that in a charrette done at the UW several years ago this was floated as an idea. The team further stated that they are excited to be starting out with this project from very early on because they can explore all possibilities—there are no far-fetched ideas. This helps in working with such a diverse constituency.
- Suggests that the team's Olmsted drawing should be at the large scale of their other visuals to remind people that this connection is possible. Would like to see the project used to inform people, especially with the Olmsted Brothers' plan 100 year anniversary coming up and suggests that infrastructure can be an answer to making these connections.
  - Proponents stated that they will do that.
- Believes that this is a more generously-funded project compared to what the Commission sees. Feels it is important to focus on priorities early on and when push comes to shove they may only be able to do one great thing. Suggests the team explore what they think can actually get funded and focus public energy on this sooner rather than later.
- Urges the team to be clear early on as to what the project will actually consist of so there are not broken promises. Feels that this is not a citywide transportation issue, but rather it connects Magnolia to the city.
  - Proponents stated that this project is a tabula rasa to some extent. There will not be a lot of development at one time and they will need to look at the project as it is developing in each phase and respond to that.
- Believes that this project is an opportunity to not just follow, but lead the development in Magnolia area by location and position of the new bridge. Encourages the team to focus on where development should go.
  - Proponents stated that it is hard to know about development 50 years out. For example, Amgen has desirable property that is capable of housing as many as 2000 jobs.
- Would like to clarify if the goal is to develop three alternatives that do not require an EIS.
  - Proponents stated that no, that is not a goal. When they have three alternatives it is a decision point; if there are major environmental issues with one of those options, they will go through the full EIS process, which will add time to the project.
- Understand that it is not a limitation in terms of the alternatives the team will consider then.
  - Proponents stated that no, it is not a limitation.
- Would like to know if there are designers in the design advisory group.
  - Proponents stated that there are some designers—a couple of architects.
- Likes the idea of thinking long term about future uses and a modest at-grade crossing to get to the water and something further north to connect to the main part of Magnolia.
  - Proponents stated that they asked a WSDOT representative about coming to WSDOT with the idea of two bridges replacing one and the representative was encouraging and felt it was a viable alternative.
- Would support looking at two options and reconfiguring waterfront access if both could be done with available funding.

- Suggests that the ecological impacts on the ravine that would be affected by the south road to the waterfront need to be addressed.
- Would like to know if the bridge at Galer still exists in that scheme?
  - Proponents stated that it does, but it needs replacement.
- Suggests that proponents minimize the extent of the boulevard on the west and connect to the Galer flyover on the east. Feels that it is better to separate the routes than duplicate.
- Feels that the themes and factors explored so far are good places to start.

**16 October 2002 Commission Business**

**ACTION ITEMS**

A. TIMESHEETS

B. MINUTES FROM 3 OCTOBER—APPROVED

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

C. DC ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES—CUBELL

D. OUTSIDE COMMITMENTS UPDATE—CUBELL

---

**16 Oct 2002** Project: **Transportation Discussion**

Phase: Staff Briefing

Previous Reviews: 3 October 2002 (Staff Briefing), 19 September 2002 (Staff Briefing), 5 September 2002 (Staff Briefing), 15 August 2002 (Staff Briefing), 1 August 2002 (Staff Briefing)

Attendees: Kristian Kofoed, DCLU

Time: 1 hour (SDC Ref. # 219 | DC00231; 169 | DC00242)

**Summary:** The Commission addressed current issues involving the Monorail and Viaduct. With regard to the Monorail, the Commission discussed the upcoming forums this week and next, which it is helping to co-sponsor, and future potential roles of the Commission and the City in the project should the proposal be supported at the polls in November. The Commission hopes to see urban design integrated from the very beginning, especially given that the project would be mostly in the city's right-of-way. With regard to the Viaduct, CityDesign staff is beginning to work with SDOT to scope out a parallel waterfront planning process and how it might be integrated with that for the Viaduct. There will be another joint meeting in November of the Design Commission and Planning Commission for a more thorough update on the Viaduct project.

**Key Commissioner Comments and Concerns***Monorail*

- Would like urban design to have a part in the project from the beginning.
- There is a Town Hall forum next week.
- Would like to know about the Commission's role in the project if it supported at the polls in November.
- While it is not a CIP project, there is a commitment of City funds and much of it is in public right-of-way, so it is within the larger purview of the Design Commission.
  - A representative from SDOT stated that the project will involve a collaboration of City staff and Monorail authority.

*Viaduct*

- A member of CityDesign staff is beginning to work with SDOT scope out a parallel waterfront planning process and how it might be integrated with that for the Viaduct.
- The joint review session of the Design Commission and the Planning Commission has been postponed for two weeks. It will be an update on phase 1 design and the waterfront planning process. Grace Crunican may come to this meeting.
- In the short term, they are exploring tools to help market the waterfront with the broader region to get funding, i.e., video that shows what is there now and what could be there.