



Summary Minutes

Agenda

- I. Welcome and Approval of October Meeting Summary
- II. What We Heard at the Open House
- III. Initial Screening of the Universe of Alternatives
- IV. Getting from 9 Alternatives to 3 – Next Level of Screening Criteria
 - a. Environmental
 - b. Traffic
 - c. Urban design
 - d. Costs
- V. Public and Closing Comments

Attendees

Design Advisory Group

- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ Dakota Chamberlain
- ✓ John Coney
- ✓ Eric Fahlman
- ✓ Grant Griffin
- ✓ Bob Holmstrom
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- ✓ Doug Lorentzen
- ✓ Jose Montaña
- ✓ Mike Smith
- ✓ Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)
- ✓ Janis Travern (alternate)

Project Team

- ✓ Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Richard Butler, Shapiro and Associates
- ✓ Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Lee Holloway, HNTB
- ✓ Kirk Jones, City of Seattle
- Andrew Laski, KPFF
- ✓ Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
- ✓ Lamar Scott, KPFF
- ✓ Peter Smith, HNTB
- ✓ Marybeth Turner, City of Seattle

Meeting Handouts

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ Design Advisory Group Contact Information
- ✓ Design Advisory Group #1 Summary Minutes – Draft
- ✓ Record of Initial Screening Meeting, October 17, 2002 [Attachment 2]
- ✓ Table 1 – Candidate Alignments [Attachment 1]
- ✓ Magnolia Bridge Initial Alternatives
- ✓ Table 2 – Alignment Evaluation [Attachment 3]
- ✓ “Survivors” of the First Screening – Remaining Viable Alternatives
- ✓ Preliminary Alternative Environmental Evaluation [Attachment 4]



I. Welcome and Approval of October Meeting Summary

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues – Facilitator

Brad welcomed the group and walked through the agenda. He explained that there was a lot of information to get through during the meeting, and that it would set the stage for the coming month's efforts to limit the field of alternatives to three. During the next month, the project team will also focus attention on the second open house (the design advisory group will preview the information at the December meeting). Brad asked the group if there were any major issues to be corrected in the summary of the first design advisory group. No issues were identified.

Conclusion: With the meeting introduction and summary approval complete, Brad introduced Sarah Brandt to summarize the results of the first project open house (October 9, 2002).

II. What We Heard at the Open House

Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues

Sarah provided a brief summary of what the project team heard at the first project open house held on October 9, 2002, at the Blaine School in Magnolia. She brought to attention three highlights from the open house:

1. The turnout and interest at the open house were much greater than expected (the project team estimates that nearly 200 people attended).
2. The project team did not hear many new ideas at the open house that had not already been brought to light during stakeholder interviews and the first design advisory group meeting. (Sarah thanked the group for the comprehensive information they have provided thus far, which made the project team feel very prepared for the open house.)
3. The project team heard from several people at the open house that they appreciated the open and transparent process that has been developed for replacing the Magnolia Bridge.

Sarah then identified key points that were emphasized repeatedly on comment forms and flipcharts during the meeting. Important factors included maintaining access to Magnolia during construction (i.e., keeping the bridge open until the new facility is operational), minimizing neighborhood impacts, and enhancing local traffic flow. Attendees were also excited about the new facility's ability to provide increased safety (both seismically and through providing better emergency access).

One of the primary project challenges mentioned included reaching consensus among many different stakeholders, and selecting a preferred alternative that will be fair to all involved (i.e., that was not unduly influenced by "not in my backyard" sentiments or by the group(s) that spoke most loudly during the process). Flipcharts repeated many of the same ideas

expressed in the comment forms, with increased emphasis placed on bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as on open space and parks issues.

Conclusion: There were no questions from the group. Brad Hoff introduced Lamar Scott to discuss the initial screening process.

III. Initial Screening of the Universe of Alternatives

Lamar Scott, KPFF

Lamar explained that on October 17, members of the project team convened to develop a “universe of alignment alternatives” and to begin the initial screening process. KPFF presented 22 different alignment ideas that they had developed, and the team identified additional possibilities at the meeting to arrive at a universe of 25 alternatives (see Attachment 1, *Table 1 – Candidate Alignments*, for a brief summary of each alternative). After identifying the universe of alternatives, the team developed fatal flaw criteria to begin the screening process. Please see Attachment 2, *Record of Meeting – October 17, 2002*, for the complete list of fatal flaw criteria.

The team then compared the universe of 25 alternatives against the fatal flaws list and eliminated alternatives that did not meet the criteria. The team also identified several assumptions to help guide the selection of “survivors” (alignments still considered viable after the first screening). These assumptions are described in Attachment 2.

Lamar then briefly described the eliminated alignments and explained the fatal flaws associated with each. Kirk Jones directed the design advisory group to a handout titled *Table 2 – Alignment Evaluation*, which summarized the evaluation (see Attachment 3). (The fatal flaws listed by number in the table are described in Attachment 2.) Group members were provided small copies of the eliminated alternatives, and larger, more detailed copies of “survivors” for closer examination.

Lamar explained that this initial screening stage is a matter of getting ideas on paper. The next step, which will occur in the coming month, is to look more closely at the survivors compared with the criteria that are developed (see section IV). Preliminary grade evaluations already indicate that some of the survivors might not work very well.

The remaining alternatives include the following:

Alignment A is essentially the existing bridge where it is currently located (reflecting the fact that the bridge must move slightly to the north or south to allow construction while keeping the existing bridge open). This alignment presents a bit of difficulty connecting to 15th Avenue and Magnolia because it would require connection to fixed points at the ends (the existing bridge endpoints), which would make it tough to quickly connect the new bridge’s ends without disrupting traffic. A second problem occurs with how to get bridge ramps down to grade on the Port property; the ramps would need to be pushed far to the east to meet grade requirements.

Alignment B relies on the same existing alignment and connection to 15th Avenue as the existing bridge, but would descend to ground level as soon as the route crosses over the tracks. The alignment then runs along the marina and waterfront, sweeps around the bluff, and by some means makes a connection to 32nd (with a structure or cut-and-fill situation).

Alignment C is not looking great after further evaluation. The route would cross the railroad, and quickly head to grade (like Alternative B). The route would then climb the bluff to Magnolia, sweeping north-to-south and connecting with the existing western endpoint. To get enough length to run up the slope into Magnolia, the alignment would have to go very far north. While these are just guesses at exact routes, it is assumed that alternative C would allow connection to a future grid in the Port/uplands property.

Alignment D would include a sweeping curve north of the existing bridge that would allow the facility to make a run up the Magnolia hill at an appropriate grade. The problem with this alignment is that it would have a good bit of impact on the tank farm, which would raise significant hazardous waste and contaminated soils issues. The alignment could be pulled further north to avoid the farm, but the further north it is pushed, the longer the bridge span must be to cross the rail yard. Alternative D will take more refinement, but would likely make the same connection on the bluff as the current bridge does.

Alignment E would connect across the rail yard further north than the existing bridge at Wheeler. Because of the grade at Wheeler, the route could run flat to get over the rail yard and then begin to climb to get to Thorndyke. This alignment has problems getting from Thorndyke down to grade-level on the Port/uplands property due to grade constraints.

Alignment F includes a couple of variations. The alignment would make a connection over the railroad at Armory, and begin to rise to Thorndyke further north than Alignment E. One advantage of this alignment is the fact that it crosses the rail yard at a narrower point than more southern alignments. [If the final alignment were built further south, the bridge would need to be thicker to meet grade requirements to get up and over the rail yard.] The project team will soon determine if Alternative F is practical traffic-wise. This alternative could become either a temporary alternative if the existing bridge must be closed to construct the new facility, or it could become the fourth access point.

Alternative G crosses the rail yard at Armory, turns south, and runs along the bluff up the hill towards the existing connection point. The problem with this alignment is it requires a long span to cross the railroad.

Alignment H is a combination of two connection points, with the first using the Galer flyover to get across 15th Avenue, running along the railroad tracks, and creating a bridge that bows to the north and connects at the location of the current bridge. Because this connection would not provide enough capacity, it would be supplemented with a second, northern crossing that would tie into Thorndyke.

Alignment I makes a connection across the railroad at 15th Avenue/Armory and ties into Magnolia at Thorndyke/Boston. The problems with this alignment are (1) it crosses the rail at its widest point, (2) from Thorndyke the grades won't allow connection to the Port property at-grade, and (3) the route must rely on other means of connecting to the marina.

Brad asked if there were any question, and if the project team was on the mark in proposing these alignments for further study.

Discussion

Coney Did you include a fatal flaw criterion that addresses a fourth access point? Why doesn't clogging of the other two access points when the third is closed count as a fatal flaw?

Holloway The fourth access point is indirectly included in other fatal flaws.

Coney What is the difference between the survivors presented on the 8.5"x11" sheets and the larger sheets that Lamar provided?

Jones If you'll notice on the smaller survivor sheets, some of the numbered alternatives are considered as parts of one final alignment option. The survivors presented in the 8.5"x11" sheets have been combined to form the final lettered options that Lamar provided on the larger sheets. Lamar mentioned grades and how they apply. Grades play a role in how long a structure is needed to get to ground level.

Holmstrom Would you be using part of the existing bridge for Alignment B?

Scott The seat of my pants guess is that we wouldn't. The existing bridge doesn't have the required useful life. We would use the existing bridge while building the new facility and still have the complexity of making a connection at flyover.

Fahlman Under Alternative D, what's the advantage of bowing the alignment to the north?

Scott The bow allows better connections in the lowlands and a better eastern connection to 15th.

Bain The bow also allows more waterfront area for various uses.

Holmstrom Have you looked at the kind of connection that Alternative E will provide to east Magnolia and the Village?

Scott No, not at this point (we've just done the fatal flaw analysis). That will be something we do in the next step.

Coney Will Alternative E allow for entry onto 15th southbound?

Jones Yes, one of the assumptions we made at the beginning was that any replacement facility would connect to 15th Avenue southbound.

- Chamberlain** In terms of Alternative F, I'm assuming if we use it, we would also create some other route to serve southern Magnolia?
- Holloway** We're not sure of that yet, but we could morph a couple of alternatives that would serve the south.
- Chamberlain** Does Alternative F serve the marina?
- Jones** No, not directly, but if the bridge were removed, you could add a surface street or system to connect and provide access to the marina.
- Scott** We'll be asking in the next step if Alternative F is feasible as a main connection. We may decide that it would be better as a supplement to another alignment.
- Fahlman** What do you mean when you say Alternative H doesn't have enough capacity?
- Scott** The Galer flyover was not designed to accommodate as much traffic as the Magnolia Bridge traffic, only a small subset of travelers (e.g., those going to the piers, marina, etc.).
- Coney** How will surface routes work in the Port's property. Does your vagueness hint that the city doesn't have an agreement with the Port?
- Chamberlain** Nope, we don't have a plan yet because we're too early in the master planning process.
- Holloway** Also, identifying the Port's plan is not our objective.
- Kenworthy** The presentations were very helpful, but it was tough to look up and down between the boards and handouts and get everything. I haven't had a chance to digest the information yet, and I would appreciate a piece that summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of each route that Lamar has just explained. It would be helpful to receive it before the next meeting so we could digest and study the information in the analysis.
- Jones** We'll have a first cut at the next level of screening available before the next meeting.
- Scott** And at this point these are my "engineering shots from the hip." I was trying to provide a narrative of each alignment, but we still have a lot of work to do.
- Kenworthy** I understand that, but because at base this is an engineering project, it would be helpful to better understand the fatal flaws that will eliminate certain options.

- Bartlett** Have you given consideration to bringing the alignment to the very top of the Magnolia bluff, but dropping it down and carrying the grade further into Magnolia (through a ditch).
- Jones** If we see that modifying the grade would work or help us, we might consider it, but we're too early in the process for that kind of detail.
- Scott** There are still many unrefined details that we'll be working on in the next month.
- Fahlman** In regards to the north/south route through the Port's property, cyclists wouldn't like a more northern facility if the north/south path were not maintained. Is the plan to maintain that bike path under these scenarios?
- Holloway** We're assuming that at least a spine road extending north/south will exist through the Port's property. Whether it's combined with bike route, we don't know.
- Fahlman** I talked to many bikers at the open house, and if the bridge facility is moved north, cyclists will want you to keep the north/south path through the Port property, as well as some form of the existing bridge's southern route (bicyclists won't like the extra distance required to use a northern crossing of the railroad).
- Jones** If the bridge is eliminated in its current location, perhaps we can create a surface road route that would serve the same area of cyclists from southern Magnolia.
- Chamberlain** I'd also like to emphasize that there is an active conversation between the Port to make sure we're all on the same page.
- Fahlman** That's good to hear.
- Jones** Yes, we're trying to keep each other on track.
- Smith** If we're just shooting from hip, it's obvious to me that some mix of Alternatives A, B, and D will be the final three that we consider. If we were to identify three choices today, those might be good. My point is that pieces of all of those alternatives might be a part of the final alignment.
- Conclusion:** With no further questions, Brad asked Lee Holloway to discuss the next level of alternatives screening that will take place.

IV. Getting from 9 Alternatives to 3 – Next Level of Screening Criteria

Lee Holloway, HNTB, Consultant Project Manager

Lee explained that the project team is now trying to establish criteria to help the project team select three final alternatives from the survivors presented at the meeting. The team has not decided that these same criteria will be used to determine a final preferred alternative. Rather, the criteria are designed to get the team from nine alternatives to three. Lee explained that the alignment drawings would be distributed to the team, who will begin applying the criteria that are developed. Project team members will probably do additional studies of these alignments, and when the team comes back together, they'll have a better idea what impacts are associated with each alignment. That's how the criteria will be used to screen down to three alternatives.

Lee stated that the key question becomes: What's important to evaluate? The project team created criteria for four different categories, including environmental, traffic, urban design, and cost issues. The idea is that the team will be able to evaluate the alternatives for each criterion and be able to sum up impacts in the right-hand column. The back page of the criteria packet summarizes the results of the four categories, which will help the team identify the top three alignments of the nine survivors. This summary page will also list major advantages and disadvantages of each alignment (see Attachment 4 for *Preliminary Alternative Environmental Evaluation*).

Conclusion: Lee introduced Richard Butler to present the environmental criteria and asked the advisory group to pay attention to whether the project team has covered what they need to cover, or has missed anything.

IV(a). Environmental

Richard Butler, Shapiro and Associates

Richard described the twelve environmental characteristics that the project team will be evaluating in the next month. He explained that the measures for evaluating impacts would be uniform for all four categories of criteria. The text provided at the end of each criteria matrix talks about how the project team will work through each assessment. Please see Attachment X, *Preliminary Alternative Environmental Evaluation*, for the list of environmental criteria and explanatory text.

Discussion

Coney Will we look at these things [like air quality] for times when one of the three access points are closed and the other two are more crowded? I would suggest that you do. If we choose an alternative without a fourth access point, then this is relevant.

Samdahl That is jumping ahead of ourselves a little. We will look at every intersection when we evaluate the final three alternatives, but at this level we will do a more general evaluation.

Jones We'll talk about it more as a project team.

- Kenworthy** What is your definition of a “community facility”? I asked last month about utilities. Does your definition of community facilities take utilities [and the cost of their relocation] into account?
- Holloway** “Community facilities” doesn’t take utilities into account. We know where utilities are located, but we don’t yet know where things like bridge pilings will be located. We recognize that utilities are important, but we’re too early to evaluate those things.
- Butler** In this context, community facilities refers to actual buildings and structures that might be used, like a park building.
- Kenworthy** Where and when will utilities be considered and evaluated?
- Holloway** When we’re trying to go from three to one alternative, and know where pilings and other facility structures will be located.
- Conclusion:** The project team will discuss whether air quality impacts associated with the closure of one of the three access points should be evaluated at this point. With no additional questions, Richard invited Don Samdahl to present criteria associated with traffic and transportation.

IV(b). Traffic

Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates

Don explained that the project team had just finished developing a traffic model based upon existing City of Seattle models and is now coming up with forecasts for 2010 and 2030. He then described the ten traffic criteria that have been developed. Please see Attachment 4, *Preliminary Alternative Environmental Evaluation*, for the list of traffic criteria and explanatory text.

Discussion

- Samdahl** We will rely on the engineering team to help us evaluate railroad impacts, for example relocating rail yard facilities.
- Holloway** Yes. For example, we may choose to build a facility between the railroad tower and rail yard, so we will need to look at how that might impact operations.
- Samdahl** Based on what I heard Eric say, we might need to split bicycle impacts into two separate issues.
- Fahlman** Yes. The north/south bicycle route through the Port now is great. It’s my understanding that the paths around the side of Magnolia and through the

waterfront parks are not used for commuting purposes (those coming from the south of Magnolia use the existing Magnolia Bridge). I would recommend evaluating two groups of cyclists: (1) those using the north/south route through the Port (or along 15th Avenue), and those coming from or through southern Magnolia.

- Samdahl** Grade is also a concern to bicyclists, which we will be looking at.
- Coney** It would be good to have a representative from the monorail on our design advisory group to help coordinate transit evaluations. There will be questions about whether feeder buses might be used in conjunction with the monorail.
- Hoff** The project team is on board with finding a monorail representative for the advisory group if the initiative passes.
- Chamberlain** Is the waterfront streetcar still being considered?
- Jones** Ethan Malone, the city's waterfront streetcar project manager, is being kept abreast.
- Coney** I would suggest an additional criterion: Alternative access (via the Port, an emergency access route, or other fourth access point). This would take into account the needs of freight, commuters, etc., and the degree to which a potential (affordable) additional access point could be provided.
- Conclusion:** The project team will split the bike evaluation criterion into two categories (one for N/S routes, the other for routes from southern Magnolia). The team will also add an "alternative access" criterion to look at, in part, the fourth access point issue. Don then invited Lesley Bain to present the urban design criteria.

IV(c). Urban Design

Lesley Bain, Weinstein Copeland Architects

Lesley explained that urban design criteria are slightly different creatures: they are less about numbers and more about being the "guardian of the qualitative" (e.g., supporting quality of life). She explained that the team would be using pie charts to symbolize impacts, rather than specific numbers. Please see Attachment 4, *Preliminary Alternative Environmental Evaluation*, for the list of urban design criteria and explanatory text.

Discussion

- Coney** I would encourage you to consider the challenge of providing undercover transfer stations for people between Metro buses and the monorail.

Conclusion: Lesley reintroduced Lee to present the suite of cost criteria.

IV(d). Costs

Lee Holloway, HNTB

Lee explained that cost is the last category that the project team will evaluate. The evaluation will be largely relative (rather than absolute, which would be too difficult at this stage). Please see Attachment 4, *Preliminary Alternative Environmental Evaluation*, for the list of cost criteria and explanatory text.

Discussion

- Chamberlain** Does the cost evaluation include the tank farm and related remediation costs? The tank farm was built in 1913, and the tanks don't have lined bottoms, so contamination is definitely an issue. Parts of the project area were also Navy property and landfill [which indicate possible hazardous waste issues].
- Holloway** Yes. It should be noted that these nine surviving alternatives attempt to avoid the tank farm due to the high cost of cleaning up that property. Whether we can accurately identify overall soil remediation costs I don't know. We will do some drilling when get to three final alternatives, which will allow us to better estimate remediation costs.
- Coney** I propose including another cost criteria that measures the cost of providing a fourth access point. There are a variety of ways a fourth access point could be provided (e.g., two separate facilities, splitting one route into a "Y" shape, etc.), and the cost for these should be factored in.
- Chamberlain** Some of the alignments go through a terminal actively used for businesses; where will costs for business displacement be recorded?
- Holloway** Those costs will be captured in the environmental mitigation portion.
- Kenworthy** I want to emphasize that it's more than just the business costs of the building structure, but also operating expenses. We need to look at tax impacts to the City. When the project potentially affects operating businesses, it can have an impact on the city's coffers. Even if we can't measure those kinds of costs this early, we need to identify the problems and keep them in mind.
- Bain** How would you think about factoring in the potential for future growth and development?
- Kenworthy** I don't know, but we do need to think about impacts. I want to make sure that they stay in the collective conscience of our group as we proceed.

- Jones** There are federal regulations that dictate how we mitigate for the displacement of businesses that will capture most costs of getting a business re-established somewhere else (which would have a negative impact on the city if the business were relocated outside of the city).
- Kenworthy** Your statement prompts a related thought for me. Moving businesses could have implications for the marine cluster economy we have established on the local waterfront. For example, City Ice and Trident Seafood are keystone companies and major employers in the Interbay area that contribute to the cluster economy. Moving a business that is part of that cluster to another location could undermine something bigger than the sum of its parts. Maybe this issues falls into the area Lesley is addressing, urban design, but it might actually be broader than that and related to regional economy. We need to look at the impacts of shutting down and moving a business that impacts the maritime cluster economy.
- Holloway** It's too early to evaluate those impacts, but we will develop that criterion later.
- Kenworthy** OK, but I do think it's important that we establish the criterion now and keep it in mind as we move forward (even if we can't accurately measure it).
- Holloway** Yes, we should keep it in mind as we pick alternatives, even if can't evaluate it, just as we should for the fourth access point.
- Kenworthy** That will be our challenge. I'm just worried that if we don't raise the issue now, a door will be shut later. Our obligation is to raise issues early on.
- Holloway** That's a good point. Maybe taking criteria off the list that we can't yet measure (like utilities) is wrong. Maybe we should keep a comprehensive list of everything we need to keep in mind as we move forward, even if it's too early to accurately measure some criteria.
- Kenworthy** Yes, I think we should develop a conceptual framework so that at an appropriate time, we can remember to evaluate criteria that we couldn't at an earlier stage.
- Conclusion:** The project team will add a criterion that addresses the cost of providing a fourth access point. The team will also consider including criteria that cannot yet be measured as a way to keep them in the collective conscience (e.g., utilities, cluster economy impacts, etc.).

V. Public and Closing Comments

Brad Hoff

Brad Hoff invited the public to contribute any thoughts or feedback. There were no comments from the audience, so Brad asked each member of the design advisory committee to comment on whether the draft criteria were comprehensive, or if the project team was missing anything.

Discussion

Fahlman From a biking perspective, yes, the criteria do cover our interests. From a global perspective, I think that the fourth access point should be considered as a separate criterion for all of the categories (it's been added to two categories, but we should study it generally, not specifically).

Holmstrom I'm impressed with this process, and think that the project team is really listening to people. I'm feeling heard, and I think others are also feeling heard. I'm grateful to be part of this process.

Lorentzen I agree with Bob, and think the presentations were great. I'd also like to reinforce the issue of emergency vehicle access. The fire station that serves eastern Magnolia is actually on the east side of 15th Avenue, so Dravus is a very important corridor to consider.

Montaño I'm impressed with the high professional standard of these presentations. Nothing has been left up in air, and I like this process very much. I see great potential as we proceed.

Kenworthy Thanks. The presentations and work you are doing are great.

Griffin I'm thinking about this project from the perspective of funding the construction and maintenance of the bridge. It's interesting for me to see lengths, sizes, etc., of the early alternatives proposed. The bridge replacement money we have couldn't cover what we're talking about here. Throwing all that together and in light of obtaining funding, it will be interesting to see how these ideas work. This is an interesting process.

Coney Because I know you've heard me about the fourth access point, I'll speak from my position as the pedestrian board chairman (which I'll hold for the next 48 hours). I hope that when we look at the bluff, marina, and railroad, we look at the plus elements of pedestrian advantages (similar to those that can be seen in Vancouver, BC). We could create a great facility and environment along the waterfront for pedestrians.

Chamberlain I'm anxious to see the next iteration of alternatives, where pieces of these nine are joined together, and to see what happens along the existing bridge alignment.

Holloway Does the Port have a problem with our team drawing a straight line through the property to represent the north/south spine of a surface road system?

- Chamberlain** Let's sit down with Mark Griffin to identify a representative road that you can use.
- Holloway** We'll set up a meeting.
- Callhoun** Thank you for making your presentations so clear. I think this is something I can take back to the people I work with to get input.
- Smith** I'm impressed with this process so far. If it continues like this, then I think we'll all come out ahead. We're on the same page so far.
- Hoff** The hard work is about to begin, and now the project team starts the heavy lifting. The next design advisory group meeting will be here [Magnolia United Church of Christ, 3555 W. McGraw] on Dec 4th from 4:00 to 6:00 PM. We will send out the work that we've done and an agenda as early as we can. Also mark your calendars for the second Open House on December 5th at the Blaine School cafeteria.
- Chamberlain** The project team is also visiting the Port Commission during public session on December 10th.
- Jones** We're confident that we'll have three final alternatives to present to the Port at that time.
- Bartlett** I'd like to support John's statement about the elevated extension on the waterfront. It seems that there are so many things to do there to make it an attraction for pedestrians, bikes, and cars. It could be a short extension, a wood pier structure like the circular drive in Long Beach, California. It would be very inexpensive and aesthetically pleasing to those living nearby.
- Jones** We could also buy people out who have property there and have minimal impact on beach.

Conclusion:

- The project team will add a criterion addressing the fourth access point to all categories.
- Holloway will set up a meeting between Seattle and the Port to develop a conceptual north/south road through the Port's property.
- The next design advisory group meeting will be at the Magnolia United Church of Christ (3555 W. McGraw) from 4:00 to 6:00 PM on December 4.
- The second open house will be held on December 6 at the Blaine School cafeteria from 5:30 to 8:30.

- The project team will be presenting during the Port Commission's public session on December 10th at 1:00 at the Port of Seattle.

With no additional comments or questions, Brad adjourned the meeting.