



## Design Advisory Group Meeting #19

Magnolia Lutheran Church

November 2, 2005, 4:00 – 5:30 PM

### Draft Summary Minutes

#### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Updates
- III. Preferred Alternative Discussion
- IV. Public Outreach Materials Review
- V. Public Comment
- VI. Adjourn

#### Attendees

---

##### Design Advisory Group

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

##### Project Team

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

#### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ *DAG #18 Summary Minutes*
- ✓ Presentation for community groups
- ✓ Revised *Comparative Impacts of Alternatives Matrix*
- ✓ Revised *Cost and Expenditures Update Fact Sheet*
- ✓ Comment Form

## I. Welcome

***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

---

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

- Project updates
- Preferred alternative discussion
- Public outreach materials review
- Public comment

Sarah asked if there were any corrections to the DAG 18 meeting minutes. Lise Kenworthy requested the following clarifying text be added to her statement on page 10 to read, “Can I ask that the minutes from today’s meeting reflect the questions Mike Smith raised about what the City and Port will do if the current bridge falls down?” The DAG members requested no further clarifications.

## II. Project Updates

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

---

Kirk Jones began by giving the group an update on the project’s progress since the last DAG meeting in October.

- The design team is finishing up the final report detailing all elements of the Rehabilitation Alternative. That report should be returned to SDOT by the end of next week and posted to the project website by Veteran’s Day.
- The environmental analysis is summarized in the *Comparative Impacts of Alternatives Matrix* that was handed out, but finalizing the report is taking a little longer than expected. There is a meeting scheduled with the City next week to discuss this, as well as other matters.
- In taking a second look at the Rehabilitation Alternative cost estimates, the preliminary findings show the cost has come down a couple million dollars from \$178 million. The team does not expect to see a significant change from the original estimate.
- The team is working on developing lifecycle costs and expects those results to be ready by November 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Revisions on the noise report were resubmitted to WSDOT. Kirk noted that the team has not heard anything back, but since the response was exactly what WSDOT asked for, he is expecting it to be approved.
- There is a meeting scheduled for November 16<sup>th</sup> with WSDOT, FHWA and the City to discuss the Cultural and Historic Resources Report, as well as to go through the *Impacts Matrix* and determine whether or not SDOT will be required to complete an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Kirk noted that the project team would be attending the following community organizations’ meetings to provide an update on the project:

- BINMIC, November 9<sup>th</sup>
- Magnolia Community Club, November 10<sup>th</sup>
- Queen Anne/Magnolia District Council, November 14<sup>th</sup>
- Queen Anne Transportation Subcommittee, November 30<sup>th</sup>
- Port Commission Meeting, Tentatively December 13<sup>th</sup> (may not be the best time if the election results in three new commissioners; will evaluate appropriateness of meeting after election)

Kirk then walked through a PowerPoint presentation that is an updated version of what was shown at the October DAG. The team is planning on presenting this latest version to the community organizations listed above. Kirk noted that he would be covering a lot of information quickly, since most of it was discussed at the last meeting, and that his goal was to begin to get some feedback from the DAG members on the usefulness of the presentation and the *Comparative Impacts of Alternatives Matrix* as the team heads into meetings with community organizations over the next month.

Kirk reviewed the presentation with the group, which contained the following topics:

- Alternatives
- Rehabilitation Alternative
- Inspections
- Environmental Analysis Results
- Cost and Schedule
- Next Steps

Questions raised in regards to the presentation were captured in the notes below.

### Discussion

**Burke:** So, this is the presentation you would show to the Port Commission?

**Jones:** Yes, with some minor changes if needed.

**Kenworthy:** You said there is a design defect over the railroad? What's the defect?

**P. Smith:** The vertical curve of the road is too short, and the stopping distance doesn't meet current design standards. The curve is so sharp that, as you are approaching, you could not see an object on the roadway.

**Burke:** That defect would be corrected under all alternatives?

**Jones:** Yes, all the new alternatives would be built to current design standards.

**Coney:** What about gribbles? Do they only attack WSDOT projects?

**Jones:** The columns on the Magnolia Bridge are under water most of the time, so there is no oxygen to support gribbles and cause deterioration.

- Kenworthy:** What is the function of the steel casing for the Rehabilitation Alternative?
- Jones:** Steel casing gives the columns extra strength and prevents corrosion.
- Kenworthy:** Is the area prone to fill liquefaction?
- P. Smith:** No, it's not fill. It is old beaches from the ice age. There are different levels of sands that are prone to liquefaction.

### III. Preferred Alternative Discussion / Public Outreach Materials Review

The group turned its attention to the *Impacts Matrix* and discussed issues needing clarification.

- Kenworthy:** So, there are three businesses that need to be relocated?
- Jones:** Yes, for Alternate D, Anthony's, Snider Petroleum and a portion of City Ice.
- Burke:** What is the difference between a business being "removed" vs. "relocated"?
- Smith:** The building where the business is located would be removed. The business would be relocated.
- Coney:** Is the Snider Company part of the tank farm?
- Jones:** No, they handle containerized petroleum products.
- Kenworthy:** If you have to relocate a business to an area that is not currently impermeable you may have a net change.
- P. Smith:** You can't assume there's no net change. This could be noted as a potential indirect problem.
- Kenworthy:** Under Alternative A you say "remove," but under Alternatives C and D you say "displaced." Would there be some effort to replace forests under Alternative A?
- P. Smith:** I don't think the word difference was intentional.
- Kenworthy:** You should make sure to use the same words for all alternatives (use "displaced" as opposed to "remove"). Are we going to have the same terminology in the fish, wildlife and habitat section?
- Jones:** Yes, we'll use the same terminology for both.

- Kenworthy:** Can you give us an example of some conditions of a shoreline permit?
- Jones:** With the Rehabilitation Alternative, for example, we may need to do some work in the water, and if there is a fish window we need to work within [a period of time when construction is allowed] as a condition of Fisheries a permit.
- Kenworthy:** Can you explain what the joint development agreement between SDOT and Seattle Parks is?
- Jones:** Yes, that's the kind of agreement FHWA requires to address impacts to city park areas and both Departments work together to minimize and mitigate any impacts.
- Coney:** Can you clarify if Alternative A would require constructing piers inside the park area?
- Jones:** If A is the preferred alternative chosen, we can start looking at how to adjust spans in the TS&L Study but would most likely at least two piers in the lower park area.
- Coney:** What would the west yard impacts be if you traded parklands with the Port?
- Jones:** There would probably be very few impacts, except for potentially a small area on the north edge.
- Coney:** Dan, if Alternative A is chosen as the preferred alternative, does that make the existing park not usable, and therefore the swap with the west yard would not happen?
- Burke:** No, not necessarily.
- Kenworthy:** What kind of sports activities could occur in the current park?
- M. Smith:** Football, baseball, etc., but there aren't official fields there.
- Jones:** Lighting could become an issue with adjacent residents.
- Kenworthy:** If you swapped park area with the west yard, what could you have there?
- Coney:** Both locations are too small for most organized sports.
- Kenworthy:** What difference would it make to have 2 or 3 columns in the park?

- Jones:** Because the park's size really only makes it appropriate for passive open space activities, it probably wouldn't matter to have the columns located there.
- Coney:** Greenbelts are an important public area.
- Jones:** Alternative A has more impact on parks than the other alternatives, but there are ways to mitigate these impacts.
- Kenworthy:** At the very beginning of this process we were introduced to the bridge as a gateway to Magnolia. These impacts talk about the public looking at the bridge, but where is the criterion for the people driving the bridge?
- P. Smith:** There's information on that in the discipline report.
- Jones:** That's a good point. Let's add something about the driver's perspective to the visual quality section on the *Impacts Matrix*.
- M. Smith:** What about public safety while the bridge is being built? What will the response time be for emergency vehicles?
- P. Smith:** This information is in the traffic report and is noted in the construction detour time section on the *Impacts Matrix*.
- Jones:** We would mitigate by having additional medical personnel and police in Magnolia.
- Coney:** Why is the construction detour time for Alternative A so high?
- Jones:** This new bridge will overlap with the old bridge from 15<sup>th</sup> Ave over to the Port property. The construction detour time accounts for the time it will take to remove the existing structure and construct the new one.
- Coney:** So, Alternative A is likely to become the preferred alternative?
- M. Smith:** The public will look at Alternative D too.
- Coney:** Alternative D is destructive to the North Bay development.
- Burke:** It's not so much destructive, it's that it disturbs the tenants. We can accommodate Alternative D with our plans.
- M. Smith:** When the bridge is under construction, that's when the at-grade access road at 23<sup>rd</sup> could be up and running. I'm just looking at this from a public safety perspective.
- Jones:** A detour plan would have to be in effect and 23<sup>rd</sup> may be a likely option.

- Coney:** Would the detour road be public right of way while in existence?
- Jones:** It would likely be a temporary easement with a temporary road. We will continue to keep in contact with the Port about these types of issues as the two projects move along so we don't hamper each other.
- Coney:** We've been saying we must have another access point to Magnolia. Traffic due to detours and closures is not tolerable for the surrounding neighborhoods. Traffic due to construction is an economic and personal disaster and probably more costly than building the bridge itself. I will try to address this at the [Queen Ann/ Magnolia] community council tonight to come up with an official position.
- Kenworthy:** Without knowing what the provision would be for emergency vehicles, how can we make a decision on an alternative?
- Jones:** We will develop a plan that requires the basic response time to Magnolia for all alternatives. There won't be a significant difference in response times between the alternatives.
- Coney:** We're not looking at the economic impact of a 14 to 21 month shut down period.
- Jones:** On the earthquake repair contract there was a \$5,000/day bonus for the contractor to get done ahead of schedule and a \$5,000 penalty for each day of delay. We looked at additional travel time and what people's time was valued at, which ended up totaling somewhere between \$45,000 - \$55,000 per day. That's how we evaluated that the \$5,000/day incentive or penalty was reasonable.
- Kenworthy:** John is raising an important point. I don't see how the *Impact Matrix* reflects how these alternatives will affect the flow of traffic on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave N. Is there a way to have some statements about that? I don't know if it's a 1-to-1 impact.
- Jones:** As far as a new bridge, between the alternatives there is no difference; there will be the same amount of traffic.
- Kenworthy:** What about during construction?
- Coney:** 15<sup>th</sup> Ave will have additional construction to consider, as well.
- Burke:** Maybe this could be addressed in the construction delay box?
- P. Smith:** With more traffic added to Dravus, we looked at the additional distance and delay and included costs for having personnel on Dravus to direct traffic.

- Coney: Last time the bridge was closed, six policeman directing traffic was not enough.
- Traven: Would the City consider a temporary monorail?
- Jones: We'll be considering all reasonable methods for moving people and vehicles during construction and are details we'll be getting into when we start in on the design of whatever alternative is chosen.
- Burke: If the Port built the north bridge before the new Magnolia Bridge, it could possibly be part of the solution.
- Jones: We'll include impacts to Dravus/15<sup>th</sup> Ave in the detour box of the *Impacts Matrix*.
- M. Smith: I just want to reiterate the idea of hooking 23<sup>rd</sup> up with the Galer flyover.
- Jones: It's a real possibility.
- Kenworthy: The fact sheet doesn't reflect this possibility.
- Jones: The fact sheet will be updated. From the design team's perspective, it looks like Alternatives A and D are floating to the top. Alternative C seems to be falling off the table. For the Rehabilitation Alternative, we would be spending just as much money as the build alternatives (plus maintenance will be more expensive). We will have lifecycle costs soon. Any new structure would be all concrete, not steel (like the Rehab Alternative).

#### IV. Public Outreach Materials Review

---

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

Kirk explained that there is a draft comment form regarding preferences on the alternatives for DAG members to review. He noted that over the next month the team would be presenting the information discussed at this DAG meeting to community groups and asking for feedback on the alternatives. Kirk stated that he would like to spend the December DAG meeting talking about specifics on preferences surrounding the preferred alternative selection and which direction the DAG would like to see the City go. He mentioned that all DAG members could feel free to call him, Cela, or Sarah with any questions or concerns. Finally, Kirk apologized about the discipline report misinformation, and stated that he is meeting with WSDOT and will continue to push to see if the reports can be made available to the DAG members.

Kenworthy: We've never seen the final Economic Impacts Report.



- Jones:** The report identifies the businesses that we need to relocate. Our goal is to try and keep them whole and maintain the cluster economy functioning in the area.
- Kenworthy:** What about the Freedom of Information Act?
- Jones:** Once it becomes finalized it can be made available to the public, but for now it's still a draft document.
- Kenworthy:** Is there an open house planned?
- Brandt:** No, not for the winter. [This changed when the project team was bumped from the Magnolia Community Club's agenda. An open house public meeting was held on November 29, 2005.]
- Jones:** If there are any other groups that would like us to come speak, please let us know.
- Brandt:** If you have additional edits to the matrix or any of the materials, please let me know.
- Kenworthy:** It seems unfortunate that the substance of the Economic Impacts Report is not reflected in the summary. I would like to see more information on this incorporated into the summary matrix.
- Jones:** We're primarily trying to get at how we might select an alternative, and between the alternatives there is not a lot of difference.

## V. Public Comment

---

No members of the public were in attendance.

**Conclusion:** With no further comment from the project team or the DAG members the meeting was adjourned.

### **Follow-Up Actions**

- ✓ Update *DAG 18 Summary Minutes* to reflect Lise Kenworthy's clarification statement
- ✓ Update *Cost and Expenditures Update* fact sheet
- ✓ Update *Comparative Impacts of Alternatives Matrix*