

November 15, 2022 Meeting - Seattle Freight Advisory Board

Topics covered included: Board Officer Elections Discussion

This meeting was held: November 15, 2022, 9:00-11:00 a.m., via Webex and in the Boards and Commissions Room, City Hall

Board Members: Howard Agnew, Dan McKisson, Geri Poor, Al Muehlenbruch, Rachael Ludwick, Nigel Barron, Stanley Ryter

Public: Thomas Noyes, Jeanne Acutanza, Warren Aakervik, Ryan Packer, Claudia Hirschey, Dan Gatchet, Megan Kruse, Shaun Kuo. Catherine Schmidt, Elsa

Staff: MaryCatherine Snyder, Christopher Eaves, Jackson Keenan-Koch, Cass Magnuski

Attending: 20

Christopher Eaves: I would ask that we take a moment or two more to come in. We do have quorum at this point in time. We have a couple of items of business, but we want to get as many people in as we can. for those who are remote, we have changed the speaker system a little bit here, and hopefully more people can hear us more clearly. If there is any concern over volume, please let us know in the room, and we'll try to speak up and enunciate. I would hope for us to get started very quickly, and one of our first orders of business is to have public comments and the approval of minutes. I have only just sent the minutes out, so I would hope to give us time to approve them at the next meeting. I wanted to note also that we have a December 6 rescheduled meeting that we approved last time. And I want to bring up a point. Our director, Greg Spotts, who is trying to make our meeting, has unfortunately been scheduled elsewhere and will be touring our industrial areas at the same time as the December 6 meeting. My understanding is that he could make a December 8 meeting, if we are interested in moving that time, from Tuesday, the 6th of December to Thursday, the 8th, which would be at the same 9:00 a.m. start time. I wanted to note that it's something that we should

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

ACTION ITEMS:

Dan requested copy of the grant application for the SMART grant

Meeting opening

Noting meeting rescheduling proposal 12/6 to 12/8 to accommodate Dir Greg Spotts' schedule.

discuss. In addition, we want to walk through, introduce ourselves, discuss public comment, if we have any, and any announcements. So, I'm just going to start with my introduction. I am Chris Eaves, the Seattle freight board liaison. We are going to walk through the room with the introductions.

INTRODUCTIONS

Christopher Eaves: Thank you. I think that's all of the introductions. Do we have any public comment?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Megan Kruse: Yes. I'm Megan Kruse, I came today to hear the Curbside Management Presentation by MaryCatherine Snyder. I'm particularly interested in this issue because it's a piece of the puzzle in trying to find places to unload. Another piece of this puzzle is the idea of keeping the box open that I'd like to board to consider is that some of this is being revised in this budget cycle. It asks for adequate standards for loading zones in the urban core, with access to (unintelligible).... I'd like to have Chris and you guys could (unintelligible)....

Christopher Eaves: Thank you, Megan. All right. Does anyone else have a public comment? Hearing none, I'd like to make some announcements. I do have one. Again, noting that we have a meeting with our director on December 6, and that a December 8 meeting would allow him to come and meet with the board. I am also noting that we should have election of officers, so I am asking the board if there is interest in moving the December 6 alternative meeting to December 8. And if that is of interest to anyone, and if anyone would like to talk about it before there would be a vote or a decision.

Stan Ryter: That works for my schedule.

Christopher Eaves: I'm glad it works for you. Does this work for the majority of the board and the people here?

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Public comment

Megan Kruse

December meeting moved from Dec 6th to Dec 8th to match SDOT Director Greg Spotts' availability

Geri Poor: Chris, do you want to do a roll call, or do you just want us to chime in.

Christopher Eaves: If we chime in, I think we can find that rather quickly. Can you?

Geri Poor: I, for one, can make that time. Yes.

Member: I have a question. Would the next opportunity be in January? Have we explored that?

Christopher Eaves: We have not. My personal hope is that we would be able to meet as quickly as possible.

Member: I won't be able to do it, but I think the board should.

Christopher Eaves: Rachael? Al, I think you're the only board member who hasn't had comment. Seeing that we do have five board members who are interested in making the change. I would ask for a motion and second.

Member: So moved.

Member: Second.

Christopher Eaves: All the ayes? Nays? All right. So, I am going to ...

Member: I have another question. You said he is doing an industrial lands tour on the 6th? Are you participating in that?

Christopher Eaves: As of this moment, now I can because now I'm not in a freight board meeting.

Al Muehlenbruch: I apologize. I couldn't get my computer to unmute. It just wouldn't react. So, yes, I'm fine with that.

Christopher Eaves: Thank you, Al. My apologies for rolling past. All right. So, I will make adjustment to the meeting time. Our next item, which is the first one on the agenda at 9:15, is board officer elections. I know that Eric Wright put his name up, but he's not here today. So, I'm a little reticent not to have the person nominated in the room for a vote. Do we have other people who have interest in this, as well? We could find a way to bring this to the December meeting. I apologize. If we want to have votes now, we can. I just want to make sure that we put this in front of other members who are not here.

Member: I move that we do not have the election today.

Geri Poor: Second.

Christopher Eaves: Okay. Thank you, and apologies. I appreciate all of your flexibility.

Geri Poor: Question!

Christopher Eaves: Yes.

Geri Poor: Chris, are you still looking for a vice chair, someone to stand in when the chair is not there?

Christopher Eaves: Yes. That would be the hope, as well as more board members present.

Geri Poor: I would encourage anyone to do this. As the one person on the board who came from the previous board, I think it's really helpful to have a second person. I also appreciate Eric stepping up. I hope that someone else would want to be the vice chair -- the power and the word of the vice chair position.

Christopher Eaves: I very much appreciate that. I would like to sneak in MaryCatherine Snyder a little bit early. She has a couple of items on the agenda. One is

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Elections Deferred to
December meeting

a letter of support request for a SMART grant. And then, I'd like to ask MaryCatherine to discuss what we can do.

LETTER OF SUPPORT REQUEST: SMART GRANT DISCUSSION

MaryCatherine Snyder: Hi, everybody. Thanks so much for your time. I actually have PowerPoint. so, I'm just going to share that.

As Chris Eaves mentioned, the curbside management team focuses on a wide variety of curb kinds of activities, paid parking, other kinds of management of the curbs for different kinds of things, but really a lot of our time is spent with good reason on our urban goods strategy, and the kinds of curb management strategies and programs that support commercial delivery, access to the curb for businesses for pick-up/drop-off and other things that businesses and residents' needs to get delivered and picked up, trash pick-up and all of that.

You all have probably seen SDOT's mission, vision, and goals. Our team, we take this really seriously, and see curb management as a critical part of how SDOT meets our core values. There are a lot of different ways we can think about it, but safety, how to make sure that drivers of commercial vehicles have access to the curbs so that they're able to load there, and the traveling certainly affects mobility for everybody. And really, trying to, with sustainability and livability, work towards how we can meet our climate goals in part with our efforts to dig through our curb management strategy for urban goods.

I am going to do two quick things today. We are applying for a USDOT grant. We have a super short timeline, but wanted to see if this is something that the freight board is able to support in a letter. I just wanted to give some highlights from our urban goods strategy, things that we're working on, that I thought you all would be interested in.

The grant that we are applying for -- and I should say up front, that our deadline is Thursday, this Thursday. So, if it's at all possible to work out a support letter, that would be awesome. If not, I totally understand. And we're certainly willing to come back and

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Request for letter of support to accompany USDOT funding grant titled Last Mile Freight Curb Access by Thursday 11/17

MaryCatherine Snyder speaks to the grant and project.

talk to you our program here, if we get the grant or if we don't get it. The title is Last Mile Freight Curb Access. And really, what we're trying to do is it's an innovative technology grant. We could get up to \$2 million in the first part of it. We would work really hard to understand and improve the literacy, the data we have for commercial load zones, not only just what we know about them, where they are, how they're working, but how we could provide that data to companies and drivers, so that they know where load zones are. Working with the University of Washington, we found that when drivers know where load zones are, and maybe know where they might be available or not, that really helps to reduce circling, extra driving, and other kinds of frustrations.

I've been to the board before, but we've had a commercial vehicle load zone program since 1990, and it hasn't really changed much. So, we're really trying to figure out how we can adopt a new permit and some payment options that really help businesses, but also help SDOT to meet our goals.

So, what we would do with the grant: the first part of it is really to talk with local businesses and big companies, such as you all. We need to understand that among the challenges and opportunities, how do we really specifically with curb access, how do we provide data that would be helpful, how can we update our permit system so that it is useful for both commercial delivery large carriers, but also for small businesses, or other kinds of permit holders. It has kind of been this catch-all over the years, and the problem is that this is not everybody's goals anymore, so we just want to understand that a lot better. And then, we would prototype, identify and install from technology. So, commercial vehicle permitting system, whether it's some kind of information sharing between vehicles to curb, how we can do that so that we could help understand how they're used regularly, how to make payment and permitting easier, and then we could also, with this effort, do more research with our Urban Freight Lab, which is with the University of Washington. Also, part of this grant is road collaboration with other cities that are also applying. We learn a lot, as I am sure you all do, when we're talking with other company friends and colleagues. We learn a lot from other City staff about how we can make improvements here in Seattle.

Go to the first question. I'm happy to talk more about the grant, but it would be to get, if the freight board is interested in a letter of support, It would just really help us. If we get this grant, we're really excited about expanding and improving our commercial permit, and I think that we can do a lot of great things. So, I wanted to first just check in and see if that is something you all are interested in. Maybe somebody is willing to be a contact. I'm happy to help Chris Eaves write a draft letter, and if this is something you all can support, we can move that forward. I'll stop there, but I also have a few slides about other things in our program.

Stan Ryter: Can you go back one slide? Slide five? Can you give us a little more detail on. You are saying, if I understand right, that there will be some kind of tag on a commercial vehicle that would communicate with the curb, some kind of receiver at the curb that would let people know whether or not the (unintelligible) was used. And this goes into some kind of system that the drivers have?

MaryCatherine Snyder: That is one approach we could take. Right now, I should say, we have a commercial vehicle permit. It's a decal, it's a sticker that goes on trucks or other vehicles. And we are trying to figure out change that into something digital. What is the least amount of information SDOT can know to know that someone has been at the curb; they paid appropriately for whatever amount of time they were there; and some kind of pay by use system akin to our pay by phone system that we have in our paid parking areas. How do we do that so that, while we won't know that you, Truck XYZ, is there, Company ABC, we might know that there is a vehicle there and it has been there for this long. Honestly, that's a big lift, but we think that there are companies out there that are working on that. There are other cities that are talking about that. And that is the information that could be beneficial to drivers and to the dispatch systems as they're planning their routes and working through that. We would have a better understanding of how load zones are used or not used. Are they in the right space? Do we need more? Right now, we are kind of blind. We just put them out there and hope that we put them in the right spot. So, we're really trying to understand more about what are the road demands up there, and how do we figure out how to meet them. Was there another question? I can't see them.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Stan Ryter:

Questions regarding
technology at the curb

Christopher Eaves: We have a couple or three questions. I'm going to take them in order from the chat. And I recognize that Rachael Ludwick has her hand up. Rachael, we'll get right to you. Geri Poor asked in the chat where the grant was from.

MaryCatherine Snyder: It's the U.S. Department of Transportation. It's a new grant that came out with the recent Federal Infrastructure Act. It's not in the traditional federal FHWA or FTA applications. They have a new SMART grant program.

Geri Poor: Thank you.

MaryCatherine Snyder: I hesitate to say the SMART grant, because 'smart' is such a word, and people might ask me about it. I think it's an acronym for something, and I have no idea. (Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation). Other questions?

Christopher Eaves: The next one is from the chat. It's a little long, so Claudia Hirschey, if you would like to speak to it?

From chat: **Claudia Hirschey** to everyone: 9:27 AM
MaryCatherine, could you please speak to how this system will work when the curb space is lost due to a change in the curb lane? Can this system guide delivery vehicles to the side streets? Could there be a data collection component to understand the level of violations when commercial delivery vehicles do not have access to a curb for a block or more.

Claudia Hirschey: The question is, MaryCatherine, if you could speak to if this system or how this system would manage virtual delivery space when the curb lane is changed and the delivery space is lost. Often there is an expectation that the vehicles move to the side streets. And to follow up with that, will there be any data collection component to know how these deliveries are managing their condition and how often there may be violations on the main street where they want to be delivering. Violation and congestion issues.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Geri Poor –

Question about grant origin

Claudia Hirschey –

Question regarding curbspace and how its managed when curb lane is changed and delivery is lost

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes. That's actually one of the things I was going to touch on later in other parts of our work, which is that we're actively engaged with others in SDOT, working on transit projects or multi-modal corridor projects, bicycle facility projects. Where there are load zones now, how do we make sure we're protecting that access or understanding it better and figuring out where we're going to put it. We're often the ones talking about how not only do the drivers probably need to be in front of the door or near the door for the volume and amount of effort in the loads that they're carrying. Sometimes some trucks have to be there because of the load that they're delivering. They can only go that far. But then, if we don't meet the load zone needs, and sometimes we can't, but if we can't, if people are there and they just stop, now we have an enforcement situation, but also kind of a gap in planning, right? So, we're trying to do better at that. And I think, overall, this effort and this grant helps us understand. We do have a data collection component. We would have funding for collecting data. With any technology we install, whether it's real time or another kind of information about the usage of the curb, where do we put the equipment? So, it would really add to our understanding of the need for commercial delivery space with this effort. I hope that's an answer.

Claudia Hirschey: Is the technology in the vehicle or in...?

MaryCatherine Snyder: We're going to have to figure it out. Right now, we're doing a sensor project in Belltown with the Urban Freight Lab energy grant that's ending. Those are like hockey puck kinds of sensors, they're in ground. That's one approach. Whether we can also figure out how to have information either in vehicles or from vehicles, whether that's an action that people could tap into that would allow us to maybe provide an easier payment option at the curb instead of some other kind of permit. Part of the grant is really to try this out and figure out what might work. The grant overall is not intended to just buy something off the shelf and install it. It's really to look into new, reasonably likely to work, emerging ideas, and see how we might apply them to curb management.

Christopher Eaves: Thank you, MaryCatherine. We do have another person. Thank you, Rachael, for your patience.

Rachael Ludwick: No, that's fine. Actually, you may have answered my question. One reason, part of why I joined the freight board, are you going to be studying how lack of designated curb space affects accessibility issues. Obviously, delivery drivers, they can't find a spot; they just park wherever. And it's often blocking a curb ramp or a bike lane, or something that someone actually needs to get around. I don't know if we're doing any comprehensive study of where that's happening, and how that could be improved.

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes. Claudia was getting at that, too. I think there's a little bit of that in this grant, but this grant is really focused on where we have commercial load zones or where we would have them. That's a designated space. But we are trying to figure out the question, though, because my perspective is-- and certainly, people do what they do, but if we provide space, maybe that's a space that they would use. And then, they're not blocking. It might take the positive intent that everybody is trying to do the right thing if spaces are provided. Deliveries have to occur, right? So how do we facilitate that? There's not one right solution that we've figured out. It's an ongoing effort.

Rachael Ludwick: Thank you.

MaryCatherine Snyder: Geri, did you have another question?

Geri Poor: Yes, thanks. I work with some drivers with concern about curbside issues where street cafes are allowed to expand onto load and unload zones because there are conflicts on major truck streets. I wondered if this would address that concern in any way?

MaryCatherine Snyder: This grant isn't really super-connected to that, but our team is also very involved in the review of street cafes and the restaurant cafes. We really try to get them to not use the load zone, or if that is the only space, because the program, itself has its own restrictions of having to be in front of the restaurant property. Then we'd move the load zone nearby. It's actually another question about major truck streets. Chris, maybe you and I could follow-up and talk more about that. That's an interesting connection and part of it.

Rachel Ludwick

Question about alternate parking and improper parking regarding delivery vehicles

Geri Poor

Major Truck street concerns regarding curbside access

Christopher Eaves: Yes. Okay.

MaryCatherine Snyder: Thanks! If this is something you all are interested in, SDOT is working on curbside management and commercial delivery, and they're trying to make the program better, even if it's not specifically endorsing or supporting certain technology, which I totally understand. There are some good questions to ask about that while we're doing this. I just wanted to see if that's something you all are interested in.

Christopher Eaves: I will step in. Ultimately, we should ask, one, are we interested; two, do we have someone with interest to write a letter. And if we do, I think I could offer an outline to help someone to write and then sign, because again, we do not have a chair. I will start with do we have interest as a freight board to support this grant?

Nigel Barron: I absolutely think we would be interested in this because the last mile is one of the things that we've been talking about for quite some time. And making sure that there is access to businesses.

Dan McKisson: I'll second that motion.

Christopher Eaves: It seems to be a vote for writing the letter of support. This would be for all to vote. Ayes? Opposed? Not hearing opposition, we will write the letter. Now we have to figure out who gets to write the letter. Does anyone want to offer themselves in collaboration with MaryCatherine?

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes. I would be happy to help. It's not a long thing. Could be a one-pager.

Geri Poor: And you need it by Wednesday evening, or Thursday?

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes, Thursday.

Geri Poor: If none of the new members want to do it, I'm happy to help with that.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Vote and second to write
letter of support

Christopher Eaves: Okay. So, we support Geri writing this letter, with the freight board behind it, and she can sign for the board. Do we have anybody who would like to support that thought?

Member: I support that thought.

Member: Second.

Christopher Eaves: Thank you. Can I hear the ayes? And nays? Hearing none, Geri, thank you very much for your willingness to serve.

Dan McKisson: Can we get a copy of the grant application sent to the board?

MaryCatherine Snyder: Oh, sure. Yes. We can do that. It's only seven pages, which you'd think would be fun because it's only seven pages. But actually, it's hard to write a lot in seven pages.

Christopher Eaves: MaryCatherine, if you would send it to me, I'll post it to the board as soon as I can.

MaryCatherine Snyder: Okay. We're finalizing it right now.

Geri Poor: And you'll send me some draft text?

CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT PRESENTATION

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes. I'll do that today, this morning. Thank you so much. I really appreciate your support. I have just a few more slides. I think this is along the lines of some of the questions that people have. We're pretty interested in coming more often to the freight board and talking about this work, since you all find last mile so interesting and important as we do. I just wanted to highlight a few things that we are working on in our curbside team. One of them is that front level policy. For a long time,

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Geri Poor agrees to write a letter of support on behalf of the SFAB for the USDOT Grant

Dan requested copy of the grant application for the SMART grant

Curbside Management Presentation

the City of Seattle and the department has had a curbside priority policy. We have been really working on updating that to propose, focus on, and accessing the critical access needs that buildings have, whether it's a residence or neighborhood commercial stores, what have you. If it's not provided on site, and if it's not on site, if it's not in the alley, then the delivery access is happening at the curb in a variety of ways. And so many things get delivered, or picked up, or distributed. So, how do we recognize that importance? We're working on that kind of language as part of the upcoming Seattle Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. Those are probably documents that you all heard about, hopefully. They're being updated right now. So, we're part of that planning effort, and working at the policy level and having the department understand and recognize the importance of delivery access when we're building out our transportation system. **I would say that there are other pinnacle curb needs that we also work on, and work to enhance: ADA, Americans with Disabilities Act, parking, accessible loading, waste staging and collection -- and I'll talk about trash in a second -- and transit layover.** We support the transit system in the City with layover spaces, where drivers have time for a break, and restroom, and whatnot, for the buses to rest. That's protocol for the transit system running. And we talked a little bit about street cafes. We have a couple hundred street cafes around the City, and how we support those while also making sure that businesses have delivery access.

As I mentioned, we talk a lot on our team about solid waste. We have a pilot project with Seattle Public Utilities. One of the efforts is to change our signs for pick up days and residential streets, so that there would be no stops for a certain time of day, like one day a week. It would be a load zone the other times. And then we have this new waste access information sign that shows trash, recycling, and composting. It highlights for people the one day for residents to leave their carts outside, and not the other days. What it does is it clears space for people walking, particularly those with limited mobility, and it provides pick up/drop off on the other days, where we know there are a lot more deliveries happening in residential areas as ecommerce continues to grow. This provides space for those in denser neighborhoods. otherwise, people are just pulling over to the curb next to the parking and running in and delivering the packages or whatnot. We're really excited about this. I think we have a couple of sites now, and we're

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Working to define the critical access needs for buildings.

(Bold added to highlight detail)

hoping that this is something we can pursue in various places around the City with SPU.

Some other urban activities and projects: We have a zero-emission pilot research project. We actually have a grant from this international organization called C40. And they are looking at how we can help look through e-cargo bike delivery options. They want to see friendly loading zones of some kind. It's really exploratory for us to find out what our business and freight partners might need, what the barriers are, what the opportunities are to consider zero emissions and lower emissions vehicles. That might be something that you all are interested in a presentation in and of itself. We are happy to follow up.

I've been highlighting this before, but a lot of our time on our team is spent with other staff at SDOT within the capital projects or the Seattle Transportation Plan in identifying and really talking about the critical building needs. Are they being met, and how do we design a smart transit lane, bike facility, multi-modal project, while also helping to meet the curb space needs for businesses in terms of delivery access. We are not generally focused on maintaining or enhancing the street parking, but we are really focused on making sure that there are loading zones for businesses and residents.

You asked about street cafes. Our department is finalizing the rules for street cafes for a permanent program, because we have been in this temporary pandemic emergency response. But we're expecting to allow for street cafes to continue with some changes with respect to design and other structural issues with the cafes. But our team is an active reviewer of those locations, and we really try to make sure that load zones are still remaining, depending on where the cafes are going. That's a really fun project to be a part of.

Those are really the highlights that I have. I'm happy to take any questions, or comments, or people who want to follow up with me. I'm happy to. Our team could come back and talk about other projects, if that is of interest.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Curbside management also is involved in:

Zero emissions and e-cargo bike delivery

Critical building needs and access for businesses and residents

Expecting to allow street cafes to continue

Rachael Ludwick: I just wanted to ask, because the waste management thing, there are a couple of neighborhoods that I live near, because I heard about this program. Can you go back to your slide about that? I'm actually a little confused about that. Are we encouraging people to out their trash bins on the sidewalk? Because that's actually a problem in a lot of neighborhoods. I would hope the program was trying to improve access for drivers and we're making it hard for a person to get around.

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes. That needs clarification. The idea is that they move the carts out to the street for that day, and then they move them back into their buildings.

Rachael Ludwick: So, you're trying to encourage people to only take them out into the street

MaryCatherine Snyder: Yes. Not to have them stored. That's actually not the problem. It's just been a challenge. For an eight-unit building, it's a lot. So, we're just trying to come up with new ways and trying to educate people about where to store these. If you have suggestions for areas, feel free to talk to me, and we'll look into that. Our team really loves to talk about trash. We're really into it. So, be careful what you ask for. Any other questions or comments?

Christopher Eaves: This is Chris. I'll try and pop in for a moment. Curb side and freight end up working together a lot more often. I think that anybody who has driven will recognize that. Trying to identify the critical access and how land use operates is also part of MaryCatherine has really been working on, trying to more clearly formalize that so we don't have people circling, trying to find parking locations, having to move how many pounds of whatever on a dolly for a block and a half. This type of work really does come in handy, and I think it's under-advertised. This is the type of thing that we like to get involved with. It's not a problem until it becomes one. Then it's a really big problem. That's why we brought MaryCatherine in. I just wanted to underscore that.

MaryCatherine Snyder: Thanks, Chris. I think as a freight board, you will see SDOT projects, as well. So, I think helping all of the department understand the freight delivery needs is really helpful, because we are trying to get ahead of things and be involved

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Rachel Ludwick – waste management clarification. Carts out for the day then back into buildings.

Chris Eaves – Underscore coordination between curbside and freight

early in projects, and help build a better design, than having to come in later and have to try and fix something. It's hard to do that. the other thing I would say is we are constantly learning about, on our team, delivery needs, and how they are different for different kinds of things that are delivered. That's really helpful for us to understand the limitations and opportunities that businesses have. When I'm sitting behind a truck, I'm thinking we should put a load zone there, because we don't have one there. All right. Well, thanks so much. Geri, I will follow up with you on the letter, probably this morning or early afternoon. And again, if there are any further questions or comments, just reach out. marycatherine.snyder@seattle.gov

From chat: Snyder, MaryCatherine to everyone: 9:54 AM
Our grant deadline is Friday so we are planning to submit end of day Thursday as best we can - so that would be the deadline for us.

Christopher Eaves: Thank you, MaryCatherine. We really appreciate it. I'm hoping to get to our next presenter in just a moment, but this gives us a couple of minutes to consider the next letter of comment, which is for the Coast Guard expansion. i don't know if anybody has thoughts on that, or what they want to talk about, but I purposely made sure to bring in the person who is trying to provide that, so that we have some perspective on what we in the City have also been ... (unintelligible). I guess this is a good time for discussion, to talk about it and get our next presenter up.

Dan McKisson: Sure. So, I don't know if Jackson circulated the letter that we put together on this issue. Do you want me to talk about what's going on, or do you want me to wait for Jackson?

Christopher Eaves: I think it's good to have this discussion now.

COAST GUARD PROPOSED EXPANSION

Dan McKisson: I have a few more copies here that I can distribute throughout the room. Back in 2019, a company called TTI left Pier 46, which had been a container terminal since the 90s. Anjin was there. Anjin went bankrupt. TTI took

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Coast Guard Proposed
Expansion

Dan McKisson: Discussion
regarding impacts
associated with the CG
expansion plans

over. (unintelligible) And, part of the Terminal 5 expansion came over to Terminal 18 temporarily. The Port of Seattle leased 27 acres for (unintelligible) terminal. This is all before Covid. And then the Port of Seattle put out (unintelligible). They got several responses from different companies and got a letter from the Coast Guard that indicated that they were considering an expansion at Terminal 36, just south of Terminal 46. They are looking at possibly 17 acres. They didn't clarify if it was permanent. Flash forward to last May. The Coast Guard put out a PEIS on the facility and they had three options that they're looking at. Their first alternative was establishing a base of 53 acres of Pier 46. Option number two was Terminal 30, which is to the south (unintelligible). And another option was where they use mostly Terminal 30 instead of 36. They reached out to the Congressional delegation and other stakeholders in the maritime industry to do some of this stuff and move south without removing the high tech (unintelligible) center. (unintelligible) Not a great use for parks. They came out with their latest EIS, basically the same stuff with no changes. They addressed some of our concerns, but (unintelligible) right now, what they want to do, and we are not opposed at all to rebuilding the current facility or the terminal that they currently have. They need that very quickly, because they want to position three new polar security cutters and accommodate those ships at that terminal. They have leased 17 acres at Pier 46 on a short-term 39-month lease, so they can move their remaining ships over there temporarily and then start their work on (unintelligible)... The facility is pretty decrepit. It's pretty old, so all of the buildings need to be rebuilt (unintelligible) existing footprint. the issue is two additional berths or four more patrol cutters that, one, haven't been funded; two, haven't been built; and three, haven't been assigned. For the future, they possibly want this. We feel they can accommodate this in other ways. There was a lot of support and lobbying to get those facilities in Puget Sound and within the State. The Coast guard has doubled down on doing it all of this in Seattle. We think the best option is a fifth berth in front of their land, their undeveloped land in front of their base. They could put a fifth berth there and accommodate at least two, and maybe their four ships. As we understand it, originally there actually were six ships out of there. Since these ships are not funded, not built, not assigned, basically, they're looking to the future for possible accommodations. Right now, we think that building even in their current footprint. Looking at the Coast guard base now, one of the things is to cut out that notch on the south end and make it a straight berth. Where you see that (unintelligible), you

could -- in alternative two, there would be no berth at (unintelligible), no berths at 46. And a berth there would add (unintelligible), and then further south ...(unintelligible). So, alternative two puts a berth here, and then south down to here. To do that, they want to -- and that's the most appealing alternative, but there would be cut off storage at Pier 30 right here, up to 21 acres if they go any further south. Like I said, whatever preferred alternative is (unintelligible) on their existing footprint. They may need a little more space along here, but they survived for decades with this little strip of land access with ships on the south end of Pier 46. That's our preferred alternative. In the EIS, the extra land that they want is for parking. That's what they want it for. And laid out near four or five ships. They want to move 197 employees from the federal building down to the base. And it would increase ship and other jobs; it would increase traffic down from about 2,000 parkers a day to 4,000 parkers a day. As you all know, there has been a ton of freight going through here. That's our 519, which is called Edgar Martinez Way. That's a freight way. The little 'H' which is over here, the overpass (unintelligible). We had the Port alleviate that. Currently, they're working on the heavy haul corridor on East Marginal Way which will terminate right by the base's entrance, and then go south. That's a highly used corridor for freight for Pier 46 and Pier 30 at the south. So, in a nutshell, we're asking for support to find a solution. The Port of Seattle and the Seaport Alliance are not taking a position. They're still working on their EIS to address some of the issues in the second half of our (unintelligible). So, with that, I'd be happy to take some questions. And this letter, we want to send that out.

From chat: Thomas Noyes - WSDOT to everyone: 10:00 AM
WSDOT is also reviewing and commenting on the Coast Guard PEIS document. Thanks.

Christopher Eaves: I just did, and my apologies to you.

Member: Can you clarify who is behind this?

Dan McKisson: We have a lot of support. We have Martin Luther King Labor Council that passed a resolution and has already sent a letter. Puget Sound Ports Council, which is a maritime labor council. The AFLCIO is also submitting. And we're working on

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Thomas Noyes – WSDOT
also reviewing and
commenting

Question of additional
support

Dan notes other groups

other groups. It's just that in the Port of Seattle, we have eight container berths. If you think about the ultimate plan to take away acres from Pier 46, you eliminate 25 percent of the (unintelligible) in the Port of Seattle, which we all know with the supply issues we need that resiliency. It's so full of containers. The Port of Seattle is currently working on a lease agreement for short-term, where PC&C operated as a one-berth, 65-acre terminal, because the Coast Guard issue is hanging over the terminal, they can't get any long-term commitments from (unintelligible). They can't safely say here's what's going to happen, here's what we can lease to you over the years. With all of that freight money that has been spent on the terminals, literally two (unintelligible) away from Boston. (unintelligible) I-5 is the coastal terminal for the Ag people coming from eastern Washington. It was maxed out in 2017. It's currently being used by USDA as a pop-up site where they give subsidies to the Ag community to bring in (unintelligible) and storage until they can get put on a ship. So, all of their loads are being held back. They get to Seattle and find out that their load has been held back, with no place to put it. (unintelligible)

Christopher Eaves: Thank you, Dan. Two things: I know we're going to double-check, schedules and (unintelligible).

Dan McKisson: There are three shifts, first shift, second shift, and third shift.

Christopher Eaves: And refrigerated trucks.

Dan McKisson: Yes, refrigerated.

Christopher Eaves: Okay. I'm only bringing this in (unintelligible)....

Dan McKisson: And I just want to be clear. We fully support the rebuild of the current base. And we think they can accommodate a couple more ships. You know, they're not in port all of the time. They're out quite a bit.

Christopher Eaves: So, I see that Jackson has made his way in. I also want him to see what we are hearing, as well, on what we are to comment on. Jackson?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Hey, Chris. Thanks. And hey, everybody, it's nice to see you all, and thanks for having me. I am Jackson Koch, SDOT. I work on the development review team, so typically, we're reviewing private development, although our team does also contribute to SDOT environmental statements. I don't think we ever appeared before this board before. Did we do introductions, Chris?

Christopher Eaves: We have done introductions. (unintelligible) We do have representatives from local business, labor, ports, and the County at this point in time. So, I think we have a pretty good cross-section of individuals.

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Great. Well, it sounds like we just got through some alternatives that are being proposed for the Coast Guard base. My expertise is definitely not in shipping, so I'm not going to offer my perspective on where the berths that are proposed should go. I would definitely agree with the general sentiment that there would be a significant impact. There is meaningful impact to the Port of Seattle property. So, we've been working with the Port of Seattle and other City agencies to underscore what that impact would be and make sure that we can help the Coast Guard on their mission objectives without impacting City goals for that industrial deployment and waterfront deployment, and safe travels through downtown. All of that is kind of a way to say that I don't have a preferred alternative. The City does not have a preferred alternative at this time. So, I apologize that I can't make a firmer statement right now.

I do have a presentation that I can try to go through really quickly. I think some of it has already been covered. Then we can get to questions and you can let me know what you're thinking and what you're interested in. I'm going to share my screen really quickly. Let me know if there's an issue.

Here is the background. This is all information and the text of the EIS. We are working on increasing berth capacity to accommodate larger ice breakers. All actions require Port of Seattle property, which is one of the big takeaways, and then another big takeaway for SDOT is the increase in personnel up to about 2,000 direct Coast Guard personnel, and then more contractors, as well. We haven't talked about the alternatives.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Jackson Keenan-Koch – discussion about SDOT review of Proposed Coast Guard Expansion

City does not have a preferred alternative at this time.

Actions require Port of Seattle property. Personnel increase of approx. 2,000 people.

I think you did already, so I'm going to skip through this. But if you would like to come back and take a look at these maps

Dan McKisson: Jackson, can you go back to the first slide? The US Coast Guard wants to increase berthing capacity for modernized ships. We don't understand it as that from our EIS. There are four berths for four security (unintelligible).

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Okay. Like I said, that's not my area of expertise. That's the Coast Guard's to propose their plan for expansion. So, I'm not disagreeing with you. I'm just saying that I don't know enough to make a statement about that. And that's one of the reasons why this City doesn't have a preferred alternative at this time. We are not in a position to make a statement about the Coast Guard should be pursuing their mission with reference to the standard of the ships that they need. I recognize that that does limit the extent of the comments that I can make. That is a constraint and it is unfortunate to some extent, but that's kind of where it is. I think that the City's position right now -- and this is early, and I will continue working with other stakeholders, and I definitely want to understand more of this. So, if that's a conversation we can have, it would be valuable. That would be great. But, the situation right now is we're looking for the best way to understand and mitigate the impacts of the alternatives they are proposing. That's the extent of what I can offer right now. Like I said, if you want to try and set up a conversation where we can learn more about alternatives, I'm always happy to learn more about it. But that's the most that I am empowered to say right now. Does that make sense?

Dan McKisson: Yes. I just thought that that statement was (unintelligible)....

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Okay. I appreciate that. I think we talked through these alternatives already. The big things for me and for SDOT are these two little circles with the 'x's' in them. So, we've got one right here at Alaskan and Atlantic, and then another one right here at Alaskan and Massachusetts. These are two entry points that are proposed for all of the alternatives that I can see. This is kind of the existing configuration, but the extent of the access is much larger than what is existing. That's where the majority of SDOT's comments are on. I will keep going and we can talk a little

Jackson – two entry points proposed. This is where majority of SDOT comments are focused

bit more about these comments. PEIS does not reach a great deal of conclusions about transportation. We will have some comment about the extent of it. Alternatives two and three have a smaller area of work, and so it may have some construction, which I think is not unreasonable. And then, long-term potential traffic Alaskan Way (unintelligible), and then they found no (unintelligible) impacts. I did some digging on this and could not find a definition of 'significant' under NEPA. Environmental quality doesn't define it. That's going to be up to the agency to make that determination on their own, which means that we have less direct federal authority that we can point to and say, here's what we think is a significant impact.' That's a bit disappointing, but we welcome comments nonetheless. So, like I said, that's about the extent of their conclusion.

We can get to the assumptions. So, again, the big thing for me is they're routing nearly all of their traffic through this intersection of Alaskan and Atlantic. The rail line is right here, and access to Terminal 46 is right here. I think there was a comment that the peak for all units is close to 5,000 new and existing SLB trips, which I agree is a lot of new vehicle traffic that would largely be going through this intersection. That's their conclusion. The consultants did not perform an intersection (unintelligible), which is typically what we ask for in City of Seattle environmental aspects. Frankly, that kind of limits the value of the analysis, and we will be making that comment back to them. Bot SDOT and SDCI will make that comment back to the Coast Guard that we really need to see an intersection level analysis of how this is going to function once they're putting all of those new vehicle trips through here. They do qualify that it's only five or six days a year, but it's still the worst-case scenario, and still what we need to understand. This assumption, I think, is reasonable. I think by the time you get used to 4th Avenue traffic is sufficiently dispersed. It's not going to have an impact on surface streets just from adding a Coast Guard base. This assumption or conclusion, the roadways they studied were all the average annual daily trips. So, based on the highway capacity manual, those roads are still under their maximum average annual daily trips. But like I said, that is not the level of utility that we want to see for an EIS under the City of Seattle jurisdiction. We don't have the authority to require it. That's their federal agency. But we will be recommending the average annual capacity of the roadway is not sufficient to understand the impacts to the specific roadway. More analysis is what we want to see.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Nearly all traffic routed through Alaskan/Atlantic intersection with a rail line.

Noting 5,000 new and existing SLB trips.

Need to see intersection-level analysis, but don't have authority to require.

I will try to go faster. We got some data from Lumen Field, which is appreciated, but we did not get data from T-Mobile Park. We will be recommending to them that if it is possible to get that data, and we do think that overlapping day games with their PM peak commute hours should be studied, which is not something that's been done right now. so, we will definitely want to understand that impact more clearly. And I think we will need to talk about that soon. I think that's pretty clear. The big thing I wanted to say here: This is their average of 2,282, and then it goes up to 5,000 on the peak days. That seems to be five or six days a year, because it's when people are parking for boarding a cutter, or returning from a mission. And then, this: they're assuming a 15 percent vanpool right now. They are getting rid of this vanpool, because they're adding a great deal of surface parking to the base. So, they're getting rid of this vanpool in the after action. That's definitely not something we want to see. We don't want to see all of those people being forced to have no other option but to drive downtown in order to work. So, we will be definitely making strong comment that that is something that should be looked at more in depth.

That kind of brings us to the future condition. So, almost 3,000 personnel, 700 contractors. This is their expected vehicle trips after they get rid of the vanpool. I would say we would require a commute trip reduction plan if it wasn't a federal agency, but I will say 'not desirable.' And then, here is my previous comment that they're under the maximum daily capacity, but that's really not enough to understand the impact to the roadway network. And there is some kind of basic mitigation that they propose, going back to those two access points, they say that (unintelligible) management plan to go back to Alaskan Way, which is definitely the bare minimum that needs to be done. I don't know that they would be able to come up with that management plan without a traffic analysis, so we will be, again, pointing to that, that we really need that intersectional analysis. And then, they do bring up the potential for employees' telework. I am hopeful that if they could make some changes to that it would reduce the need for parking. We will make that comment and see what their response is.

Those are the things that I am looking at. I kind of went through that because I want you all to understand what I got from it, and what my primary interests are. What I really want to hear is what your thoughts are. What problems you want to make sure the City

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Stadium data is not complete, but it will be affected by this.

Vanpool is slated to be discontinued

Future conditions noted as well as no trip reduction plan

Hoping to find ways to reduce commute trips

is aware of, and what I can take back to -- we are talking to the Port, we are talking to SDCI, NOPCD. So, anything you want me to make sure is part of that conversation.

Dan McKisson: Thank you, Jackson. This is Dan McKisson again. Would it be possible, because I like visuals (unintelligible)?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Yes. Sure. So, here is alternative one.

Dan McKisson: So, the (unintelligible) is like three portions of that, and the smaller 26 acres are in red. (unintelligible) with slashmarks in it are actually at (unintelligible) building seven. All three have the possibility (unintelligible) of building seven, which is at (unintelligible) up middle right. I don't know why they need so much more room for it, but that's what that is. Basically, Pier 46 is (unintelligible).

Jackson Keenan-Koch: And this is the preferred alternative, this impact area.

Stanley Ryter: I've got a comment, Jackson. (unintelligible), and not always in a (unintelligible) set up. I do want to (unintelligible) to potentially (unintelligible). They're not really for transit and light rail. Maybe a new wrap-around or a shuttle bus would eliminate all of that parking.

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Yes, so the need for all of that parking is a big concern for me. As far as I understand it, it appears to be a federal requirement that they have that parking available for staff that has to report to the base. It's definitely not a City or a State requirement. We will be making that comment, so we are working with the STP folks as well as our transportation and management program, which has a lot of success in getting people out of single occupancy vehicles downtown. So, we will be making that comment, but I don't know the limits of their flexibility or if they have a TMP, or if they are required to provide parking anyway because the staff is required to report to the base. that's how the text of the PEIS reads. And I will be talking to the City law department to see if I can get a better understanding of where that requirement is coming from, and if it's a federal requirement that they have that parking.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Discussion about proposed build map.

Parking is a big concern.

Seattle Transportation Plan (STP) is looking for ways to reduce commute trips.

But Coast Guard has a requirement for all personnel to report to base. Need to better understand where requirement is coming from.

Christopher Eaves: (unintelligible) on the TMP, Transportation Management Plan; PEIS, Preliminary Environmental Impact Statement?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Yes, it's 'programmatic,' but very similar. Stepping in on this moment, the discussion was describing what others hadn't seen, and you also talked about that there was a -- it seemed like an example of our awareness of what the freight component would be, the impact of activities on the port terminals might be. So, I'm leaning in on the freight board mission, which is appointed by City Council, the Mayor, and all departments and offices in the City. The development of the goods movement and freight system and all matters related to freight and the impact that actions by the City may have upon the freight environment. I think what we're looking to do is provide that information. And again, I'm leaning towards Dan McKisson, who has more information than I -- so that we have an opportunity to hear a better perspective on what is occurring here.

Dan McKisson: Can you go through the other two so that everybody can see them, because I didn't get the visuals. It's alternative two. In alternative two, I think the first part is 13 and a half acres before you come down to where the line is at the end of the second berth. South of there is Building 7. Within that property, run by the Port of Seattle is a City of Seattle easement that the Port of Seattle still pays for. How would that work for them to acquire that from the City?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Yes, I think that that would be a comment that we made back to them. There is a City right-of-way that comes out of roughly this area. So, yes, the Port has an agreement to have access to that right-of-way right now. For the Coast Guard to acquire it, I don't think we would be able to require them to go through a street relocation process, but I think they would have to go through an eminent domain process. They don't provide any detail on what you're alluding to, or any acknowledgement that they would have to do that. But, yes, they would have to go through eminent domain to take that land from the City.

Dan McKisson: Awesome. Just a note on this one. You see the two yellow berths in front of their base. We propose just doing the one berth, the north berth, and that would

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Discussion of alternatives with focus on Alternative 2

Alt 2 - Easement or property acquisition question

Dan McKisson – noting lower impacts to T-46 with a single berth north side

have less of an impact on the south end of Pier 46. Basically, what they have currently. Now, if you did do the second berth, you have to tear off quite a bit more, not coming all the way down. And the line all the way across, that's just the parking, making an apron. Our position is no net loss of cargo space in the Port of Seattle. There is some that we could gain on the south end, let's say two to five acres in that process. You're trying to take something that the Port already has access to. Maybe we could have some work done to keep it viable for container stacks. The problem is the turf is a lot further north (unintelligible)...a lot further south. Thank you, Jackson. This would be number three.

Jackson Keenan-Koch: The way you say it, that's a helpful comment. Thank you for that. And I also wanted to call attention to Jack Perry Memorial Park. The Port will be required to find a replacement for that location. I'm not super familiar with it. If this park is condemned as part of the base expansion, the Port would need to find another place to relocate. So, that's the impact to the Port. That property, I think, is not directly acknowledged in this PEIS, but we're hoping to get that incorporated in the next round of announcements. So, alternative 3.

Dan McKisson: So, that comes to the point where at the front of their current base (unintelligible)...because you would eliminate all of that space at Pier 46. It still move the Jack Perry park. So, Chris, if I may say, why is this important. This will highly impact our Ag producers on the eastside of the mountains. It's going to limit the amount of harvest space in the move to the Port of Seattle. it's going to add a lot of trips down there into that area with the full build-out. And they also note in their PEIS that the alternatives are incompatible with the City's container shorelines, I believe, Jackson? What is that called when they admit it's not compatible with the City (unintelligible)?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Yes, the Shoreline Management Act. That is an SDCI jurisdiction. That's not directly SDOT. But yes, they do acknowledge in the PEIS that their proposal is not compatible with the requirements that go with that act. SDCI will definitely be commenting on that in some form, but I can't speak to as to what exactly the comment will be.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Jack Perry Memorial Park –
Port will be required to find
a replacement for park if
condemnation is pursued

Noting impact to agriculture
producers' ability to turn
goods at terminal

Noting shoreline
condemnation is not in line
with City goals

Dan McKisson: And then, the closest bus stop is at 1st and Edgar Martinez Way. It's all parking. What street -- is there anything inhibiting them from building parking structures?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Do you mean on the terminal, or off-site?

Dan McKisson: On the terminal.

Jackson Keenan-Koch: I don't know the answer to that question. That's something I could look into.

Dan McKisson: You can't see it in this picture, but you have also the launch pit for the tunnel. That's still owned by the State. We've been lobbying the stadiums and the Port if they could incorporate more buses and things like that where developers could use it because the first thing they're going to find is that property maybe could be used for parking. The other play in this is old Pier 48, which is north of Pier 46. That is owned by the State, also. The Seaport Alliance and the Port of Seattle has the first right of refusal.

Christopher Eaves: If I could step in here, I do see Geri's hand up. I'm noting our time, and knowing that we would want to understand what actions as a freight board we would want to be taking. So, Geri, I'd like to ask what your comment is?

Geri Poor: I was just going to say that the Port is very interested in this, and as Jackson commented about the City, we are supportive of the US Coast Guard mission, and supportive about our own mission. And this is one where it is be addressed by the Port Commission, and the Northwest Seaport Alliance managing members. I am not participating in the conversation today other than this, and there's a letter sent out that's stating that. But, thanks.

Christopher Eaves: Thank you, Geri. Thomas? You had your hand up.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Question about parking structures on-site

Geri Poor – Port is interested in a supportive of the CG mission as well as ours.

Noting a letter sent from NWSA and Port Commission.

Thomas Noyes: WSDOT has been working on the plan, and is providing comments, as well. Region Traffic has concerns about, obviously, I-5, tunnel connections, and things like that. I just wanted to offer that comment.

Christopher Eaves: In recognition of the time, and a quick turn-around on a comment letter to the Coast Guard, I think (unintelligible) ...inform the City of any concerns that there may be. It would go to whichever offices that have interest in that. Jackson, I think that would include you. The charter remains silent on who else this should be sent to. So, it could be provided as comment or information to (unintelligible). The question becomes do we want to comment, what do we want to comment, in that order. And I would like to just simply open for discussion to the board members. At this point, as a (unintelligible) representative, I'm in a funny position at this moment, too. So, I will yield to the members of the board.

Dan McKisson: I would ask the board for this letter for a no net container loss, and that supports the Coast Guard mission. Whatever we send should ask for no net loss of space, and that Pier 46 have a two berth (unintelligible). Essentially, that's what this letter says.

Christopher Eaves: Do we have other comments or information?

Howard Agnew: Yes, without knowing the full story, it just doesn't seem like the freight family should propose (unintelligible). And it would seem like this is (unintelligible).

Dan McKisson: I'm with the board on that, too. We've been working on a Congressional level and meeting with Senator Cantwell, who is big on doing (unintelligible). She's in the same position of no net loss of cargo. So, we need to come on strongly and support her position and our position on that. And then we can start working on making this work for all parties. This is a note: For every acre you lose of space, the average is 3,500 acres per year.

Christopher Eaves: And they're working to focus a question for the freight board providing information to -- and Jackson, I'm just going to point to you because you

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Thomas Noyes: WSDOT is also providing comments and is concerned about connections into the regional network.

Request for a vote for letter to Coast Guard

Howard Agnew: Without full story hard to propose a letter of support for alternatives

Dan McKisson working on a congressional level w. Cantwell who wants no net loss of cargo.

happen to have your face in this room -- to persons like Jackson. Is there a motion to support the letter or provide information or activities. And then, do we have a second in order to work on a letter, if that is the case. I believe that Dan McKisson has made a motion for that support.

Member: I'll second.

Christopher Eaves: Okay, we have a second with support for the letter. Ayes? Any nays? Geri has abstained. We have votes for progression of support. We will be sending this to our City partners, and providing information. What this comes down to is we're writing in support for the letter for this as well as any other info. Any thoughts?

Dan McKisson: This letter is pretty comprehensive, so I'm not sure about any other information you're looking for?

Christopher Eaves: Anything that would tend to offer information towards Jackson. If this letter is (unintelligible) in its consideration and the board would like to support it, and it sounds like it does, then we would write a draft of a letter of support with some of us signing off on this.

Dan McKisson: This letter is due December 2.

Christopher Eaves: December 2. My apologies. So, that would mean -- and I apologize for dragging this out. So, do we have someone who would like to write that note of support for the board?

Dan McKisson: I would be happy to, since I brought it forward.

Christopher Eaves: And do we have a second?

Member: I'll second his writing the letter.

Christopher Eaves: Ayes? Nays?

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Vote for letter

Note Geri Poor abstained

Letter from ILWU is comprehensive.

Letter Due Dec 2nd.

Rachael Ludwick: Quick question. Just as a matter of transparency, we should send the letter out in advance before it's signed, just so we understand it better, and make sure we know what we're saying. Just asking that he send it out for everyone to see, in advance.

Christopher Eaves: The letter that Dan has discussed, I had sent out during the meeting.

Rachael Ludwick: Yes. That assumes you would be sending out the exact letter.

Christopher Eaves: We will be sending out the letter.

Rachael Ludwick: Okay.

Christopher Eaves: And I continue to apologize for not getting that out.

Rachael Ludwick: Thank you.

Dan McKisson: What I think we'll do is add to that, kind of change it around to be freight board specific. Then I will send it around. I'll send it to Chris, and you can send it around.

Christopher Eaves: Will do. All right. I believe that has us in the right spot. And I apologize for borrowing an extra five minutes of the proposed agenda. What I would like to do is take about 30 seconds and discuss the 2023 freight board work plan, which is what we went through the process of (unintelligible). We will talk about that in December, so let's think about it. I suggest very strongly that Oh, Jackson. You have your hand up.

Jackson Keenan-Koch: Yes, Sorry. I just wanted to jump in quickly before you move on. Thanks again for having me. I know there are rules about who is allowed to talk to whom. I don't know all of those rules, so I don't want to tell you exactly how to navigate

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Rachel Ludwick – letter to be sent out as matter of transparency

Chris Eaves – letter sent out during meeting.

Dan McKisson letter to be board specific

Chris Eaves – proposing 2023 work agenda discussion

Jackson – if more information is desired about SDOT proposal, please contact me. Also would like to see letter

them. I'm sure that Chris does. But if you would like any more information about SDOT's perspective on this proposal, or if you want to have another meeting with me or anyone at SDOT, let me know, and I will do the best I can to facilitate that. I want to make sure that we are available to help you all. I would definitely like to see a copy of that letter whenever it's possible for me to see it. I don't know what the rules are about that. I know that there are rules about that, too. But, if it's available for me to look at, I'd love to see it so I can reflect that perspective in my comments, as well. And the last thing I will say just generally is that I share the perspective that the quantity of on-site parking is a great opportunity for modifying the proposal to reduce the impact to other entities in the area. I think that aligns really well with other City goals for the same area, of getting fewer people to drive through that intersection. Reducing the amount of parking seems like a great win-win for a lot of different goals. So, with that, thank you, and I will head out. Have a good rest of your day.

Dan McKisson: Is it possible to get that PowerPoint?

Jackson Keenan-Koch: I have to check on that. If I can share it with you, I'll send it to Chris Eaves.

Dan McKisson: (unintelligible) at the federal building on the 17th from 1:00 to 7:00 p.m., and on Friday, the 18th, from 11:30, I believe, through 4:30. You can call the Coast Guard office (unintelligible)

From chat: Eaves, Christopher to everyone: 10:48 AM
Coast guard having public meeting 17th at 1-7pm in the Federal Building Auditorium;
18th 11:30 -4:30

Christopher Eaves: Thank you. I'll finish by going abstract. The board work plan: I will note that we are in the middle of a number of planning sessions: The transportation plan, the Comprehensive Plan, Port container element subsets of that. So, I do suggest that a part of our 2023 work plan is commenting on the various plans. That is something for all to think about and consider. Everything from urban curb space to industrial land uses, to roads, the number of lanes, you name it. We can probably find something to

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Chris Eaves: Noting Board
Work plan is a very open
canvas.

do. That means that unless we have other business or comment, this meeting will adjourn.

Geri Poor: Glad to see so many people in the room. i will keep that in mind for next month, and hopefully join you there, but Chris, I wanted to reinforce the email you sent from November 4. I think everyone on the board has it in our inboxes -- about the Seattle Transportation Plan joint workshop number three. i know that Warren Aakervik and I, and the gentleman from CSR attended workshop number two, and you have invited all of us to participate in workshop number three for freight to have a voice at that meeting. All of the boards come together and other committees, so each of the modal boards, meaning bike, freight, and transit are there, and then other committees from the City are there also, giving feedback and input to the Seattle Transportation Plan. And it would be great if any of you can make that meeting. Chris Eaves' email says that it's November 15, from 4:00 to 6:00. So, I encourage you guys to find that email and sign up. Thanks. Be a voice for freight.

Howard Agnew: The one that I went to I found to be outwardly hostile to anything that involved vehicles, so I think it's important that we attend. I was pretty disheartened by the group I was with. It felt like all cars were bad, all vehicles are bad. So, I think it's important that we go there and have that voice and show up.

Geri Poor: Yes. We really need to work with the other modes and ensure that freight is visible and operates safely with them.

Christopher Eaves: Okay! Thank you very much for the reminder. I literally let it slip off my plate. As always, we appreciate your participation in this session. And I have the opportunity to (unintelligible) no matter what is going on. We're doing a December 8 meeting. I'll be pushing (unintelligible) for that. I will also see what type of distribution might be available at the walking tour of the industrial area, which is a Vision Zero focus, so we can try to understand how we best cooperate with all of the various departments. I don't have any more to add, unless others do? So, motion for closure?

Member: I so move.

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Geri Poor – STP Joint workshop 3
SFAB representation is important

Howard Agnew:
Disheartened by tone, so it's important for us to attend.

Member: Second.

Christopher Eaves: Ayes? We're adjourned!

ADJOURNMENT

SFAB 11/15/22 MEETING

Adjournment