



Summary Minutes – Final

Agenda

- I. Welcome and Approval of February Meeting Summary
- II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?
- III. Monorail Update
- IV. Port of Seattle Master Plan Update
- 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
- ✓ Eric Schmidt
- ✓ Mike Smith
- ✓ David Spiker
- Dan Bartlett (alternate)
- ✓ Robert Foxworthy (alternate)
- ✓ Janis Traven (alternate)

Project Team

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

Meeting Handouts

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ Design Advisory Group #5 Summary Minutes – Draft
- ✓ Seattle Monorail Project Diagram of Interbay Area

I. Welcome and Approval of February Meeting Summary

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues – Facilitator

Brad welcomed the group and walked through the agenda and meeting materials. He then invited comments and corrections to the minutes from the fifth Design Advisory Group meeting (February 5, 2003). The meeting summary was approved with no further changes.

Conclusion: With the February meeting summary approved, Brad invited Kirk Jones to provide an update on the previous month's project developments.

II. What's Happened Since Our Last Meeting?

Kirk Jones, SDOT Project Manager

Kirk explained that the main events that have happened in the past month were community meetings for targeted neighborhoods in the project area. At the meetings (which present the same information each time), Kirk describes where the project team is in the process, what the EIS process entails, and the decision to carry Alternative A, B, D, and H forward. The first of these meetings was a joint briefing of the Magnolia Chamber of Commerce and Magnolia Community Club (February 13, 2003, at the Blaine School), which was attended by approximately 100 people. The audience had many questions, most surrounding Alternative B, and key points of emphasis included the significant changes in local traffic patterns and the potential environmental impacts associated with the route.

The team also held the first in a series of neighborhood meetings for residents along proposed alternatives (February 19, 2003, at the Seattle Yacht Club Outstation). The meeting was for residents along Alternative B and gave people an opportunity to see the presentation if they did not attend the February 13th briefing. There was very strong opposition developing among neighbors of Alternative B because of its location along the shoreline, and its potential to take out single-family homes, change local traffic patterns, and impact Magnolia Village. The Village doesn't handle high volumes of traffic now, and residents wonder where additional traffic generated by Alternative B would disperse (could the Village handle higher traffic volumes?).

As Kirk described in the February 13th meeting, the project team expects some of the traffic to divert up to Thorndyke or Dravus, potentially via the proposed surface road on the Port of Seattle's property. However, this doesn't change the fact that there will be significant issues if major traffic is rerouted to the Village (the diversion wouldn't be enough to significantly decrease potential impacts). Residents were also concerned about decreased property values and the impacts associated with changing a neighborhood street to a major arterial. Residents wondered if the City would compensate property owners if the value of their property dropped. Kirk has been looking into this issue, trying to determine what has been done in the past, and at this point it doesn't look like the City can offer compensation. However, Kirk is continuing to research this issue to see if there are other possibilities.

Kirk noted that the next community meeting would be held on Tuesday, March 11, at 7:00 PM at the Blaine School for residents in the vicinity of the Thorndyke and 23rd Avenue

West (those who could be impacted by the northern alignment of Alternative H). The City has sent out letters and put up posters at condos and apartment buildings to invite people to the meeting. There will be another meeting on March 19th starting at 6:30 PM at Coe Elementary School (2424 7th Avenue West, Seattle, 98119) for west Queen Anne residents and businesses along 15th Avenue/Elliott Avenue. This meeting is targeting people who would be affected by Alternative H and/or connections at the Galer Flyover.

Kirk then summarized the input the team has received from the public this month. Kirk has received approximately 20 comment forms in the mail (responses are roughly 4-to-1 against Alternative B), and a dozen or so emails (again, 4-to-1 against Alternative B). Most responders favor Alternative A or D, and a few have voiced opposition against Alternative H.

Kirk explained that he's heard back from the City attorney about the implications of the legal agreement associated with Alternative B, and reported that the attorney believes the stipulated order from the Shorelines Hearing Board (SHB) is not a fatal flaw. The more significant issue will likely be potential shoreline impacts and permitting. It's also true that Alternative B is probably the least costly of the four alignments. The City has determined that it needs to do due diligence and keep Alternative B on the table to make an educated comparison between it and the other three alternatives. Kirk has been trying to spread this message, and although people want to drop Alternative B, the City needs to quantify the related impacts of the route, which will take some time.

In terms of the basic schedule, the team is trying to get the Notice of Intent (NOI) out for review and publication. The team is working with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to nail down the schedule and, after a flurry of phone calls with the two agencies, plans to send the draft NOI with a date selected to see if the team can gain approval. If the agencies approve the NOI, the team can publicize the date and time for the public and agency scoping meetings. The date will ideally be in early April, but that is not yet confirmed.

Kirk also briefed the Seattle City Council Transportation Committee on March 4 with the same information being presented to the community. Kirk explained the decision to develop an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), described the additional time frame and schedule, and noted that the project team hoped to select a preferred alternative late next summer (as opposed to late this summer, which was the original schedule). The committee didn't have many comments, but were told that organized opposition to Alternative B was developing.

Discussion

Hoff The Council briefing was taped by TV SEA, a local cable channel, and I can find out if it will be rebroadcast if you'd like to see it. I'll find out about the rebroadcast schedule and send out an email with information.

Coney Are there any plans to hold a meeting for people on West Galer to discuss the three alternatives that would be bringing traffic up on the bluff?

- Jones** Meetings are open to the public, and are specifically targeting areas where traffic patterns could be significantly altered from what they are now. Alternatives A and D don't change traffic patterns.
- Coney** Alternative B would change traffic patterns up on Galer, and in the interest of justice, I would suggest looking into this.
- Hoff** In all honesty, we haven't heard much from residents up on the bluff, but I'll look into this.
- Conclusion:** **Brad will (1) determine if TV SEA will rebroadcast the City Council briefing and alert the project mailing list, and (2) look into setting up a neighborhood meeting for residents on the eastern end of the Magnolia Bridge. Brad suggested skipping to the monorail presentation because Mark Griffin of the Port would be running late, and introduced Bob Derry of the Seattle Popular Monorail Authority.**

III. Monorail Update

Bob Derry, Seattle Popular Monorail Authority

Bob Derry passed around handouts showing the preferred monorail route through the Interbay area and postcards for March public meetings on the project. The Seattle Popular Monorail Authority (SPMA) plans to issue a final preferred alternative on April 2nd (and wants public input at the meetings on March 17, 18, and 19). Bob then presented a flowchart that includes major milestones, many of which are related to community involvement (which is part of Bob's job). He reported that there were approximately 540 people at an earlier Ballard monorail meeting, and that the project has received a lot of scoping statements for the EIS process and on alignment and station locations.

SPMA is in the process of coming up with a guideway through the Interbay area, and at this point supports running the alignment along the center of 15th Avenue between Galer Avenue/Garfield and Dravus, past the golf course, and onto 16th Avenue. The preferred guideway would go around the Galer Flyover, and the secondary option would go over the Flyover. Because any new bridge wouldn't be higher than the existing bridge, going around or over the Flyover won't depend on decisions about the Magnolia Bridge.

SPMA is also in the process of identifying a preferred alternative for locating the operations center, and is considering the 7.5-acre triangle between Armory and Wheeler. The other property under consideration is in SODO and owned by the Seattle School District. Consultants on the monorail project are currently evaluating the Interbay site to make sure that it will work for that site.

SPMA is evaluating station locations, and wants to make sure that stations fit with wherever the new bridge is constructed. Consideration is being given to stops at Dravus, Armory, Howe, Prospect, and Mercer/Republican. So far, SPMA has identified a preferred alternate and "alternate alternates" based on community input, engineering studies, and consultation

with Metro and the City. The Dravus and Mercer/Republic locations are the preferred station locations, and there would be an additional station at Armory/Wheeler if the operations center were located there. While they've come up with a preferred alternative, all alternatives will be studied with the same intensity with the intention of maintaining the option to create additional stations in the future (for example, at Galer, Howe, and/or Prospect). At potential future stations, SPMA would physically flatten the track in those areas to allow for future station construction (a station couldn't be built where the tracks were on an incline). Regarding the Magnolia Bridge replacement, SPMA doesn't have a preferred alternative.

Discussion

- Holmstrom** There was talk of a station at Garfield. Is that option still on the table?
- Schmidt** There isn't enough room for a station where the bridge is now, though there could be a Galer station further south. We've been talking with Metro, trying to determine if people taking buses would hop off the bus and get on the monorail at this point (people going to West Seattle might jump off the bus and get on the monorail, but the further south you get, the more likely people going to downtown would stay on a bus).
- Derry** We're also looking at the cluster effect in terms of potential stations. How will Port and private master planning and development occur? These considerations impact how stations will be aligned between Dravus and Republican.
- Holmstrom** That makes sense. Thank you.
- Bain** I think Alternative H is different than the other alternatives because the Garfield piece of the bridge won't be used, so the monorail alignment wouldn't need to go over or around this area.
- Derry** Although you wouldn't be using the Garfield piece, because the bridge project isn't yet funded, that piece of the bridge would still be there and we would have to consider it and work around it when we constructed the tracks.
- Foxworthy** Do you plan to run another track up Armory?
- Derry** We don't depict the operations center on this graphic now, and we could run a track into Armory, but it would be better to have one on Wheeler also. The operations center would be above Wheeler, too.
- Foxworthy** What was your justification for moving the preferred station locations? I assumed there would be one at the end of Magnolia Bridge. Was your rationale for moving it south basically a Metro decision?

- Derry** The location doesn't make sense as a transit center at Galer because the further south you get, the fewer people would transfer to the monorail. The Galer station would need to be really high and would be in an area with no development, so now we're looking at high-speed elevators. If you move the station further south or north, you serve communities better. There would be switches on both tracks to get into the station, and a stacked car close to downtown in case there were breakdowns. Galer would put the station way up in the air, without a ton of connectivity, so it would be better to move the station south or north. There are also better slots, like the stair right-of-way up the hillside, that would provide lower Queen Anne with a better station connection.
- Foxworthy** There would be a lot of parking at Armory. Are you thinking about the area where the National Guard is located? Will you be using that property?
- Derry** We're not looking for parking at this point. We're working with Metro to develop van and bus routes to link to the monorail. We're trying to target and get more single-occupancy vehicles off of the street.
- Coney** It seems like, in this day and age, Park & Rides are not obsolete and that you should still be considering this option.
- Derry** Park & Rides are a suburban model and the monorail is an urban transit model. Park & Rides are being looked at in more suburban areas, and they are certainly being considered.
- Holloway** How will maintenance and operations work in terms of the guideways?
- Derry** There would be guideways stacked on top of each other for train maintenance, and office space for computers and security for the entire system would be located at the operations center.
- Spiker** Would an elevated structure at Armory negatively impact Alternative H?
- Schmidt** The tracks would be up above the route on westbound Wheeler street, and Alternative H would use an underpass and go under the guideway.
- Conclusion:** **With no further discussion, Brad thanked Bob for his presentation and introduced Mark Griffin to provide an update on the Port of Seattle's Master Planning process.**

III. Port of Seattle Master Plan Update

Mark Griffin, Port of Seattle

Mark provided an update on the master planning work being completed by the Port of Seattle in the Interbay area (called “Northbay” by the Port to reflect terminal 90/91 as a mix of marine and non-marine uses).

In terms of the process and timeline, the Port is in the first phase of a multi-phase process, and Mark emphasized that there would be plenty of opportunities to comment now and in the future. The Port is currently doing work to better understand the site as a landowner (e.g., geotechnical and market studies, and conversations with stakeholders about redevelopment). From this work, the Port hopes to develop a framework for the Master Planning team, which will put the plan together following the initial phase. The Port is talking as an agency about looking at uses to unify the area, but won’t step away from maritime activities.

To demonstrate the Port’s commitment to maritime business, Mark highlighted the fact that several hundred million dollars have been earmarked for Terminals 5 (T5) and T18 and explained that the seaport capital plan includes \$300 million for marine investments. He noted that the water and piers at T90/91 would remain in water-dependent and water-related uses.

Background: The Port adopted the Harbor Development Strategy (HDS) in June 2001, which looked at the seaport’s operations, including T91. The report recommended that the Port should engage in a master planning process at T91 because of changes in the marine-related business sector. For example, the chill business at the end of T91 is essentially gone, and the Port must now look for different uses for the area. In addition, the Nissan distributor that parked cars on the Port property is now gone, having shifted its business to southern California. The Port is left with 57 acres for which to find different long-term uses. A couple of options in early 2002 are no longer being considered:

- (1) The Port was looking at relocating the coast guard to T91, but this is no longer an option.
- (2) The Port was considering an interim cruise ship facility at T91, but shifted the location to T30 in mid-2002.

The HDS identified a principle elucidating the Port as a public steward, and recommended that the Port identify sustainable, long-term uses for the Interbay and T91 area.

Boundaries of “Northbay”: Mark presented a map of the Northend area where the Port will be looking at a different mix of land uses. Other nearby areas where the Port is not looking at a different mix of uses include T90/91, the greenbelt, and current tenant uses such as City Ice and Trident Seafoods. The Port will also look at how the new activities will integrate into existing land uses. The Port assumes that the pier and shoreline will remain in water-dependent uses, and that there will not be development in the greenbelt area. The Port wants to look at a range of development options, and the first phase is helping to set parameters about what should and should not be considered. These parameters will help with the master planning work.

Completed Technical Work: Technical work will identify constraints as to what can be done with the Northbay area. For example, traffic along the 15th Avenue/Elliott Avenue corridor is already congested (how much more traffic can the area handle if Northbay is developed?). The Port has completed early studies of traffic, geotechnical characteristics, the utilities network, expected new development, and environmental conditions, and has done a preliminary market assessment to help identify what might be a viable set of land uses. The Port has also done policy-oriented work to answer questions about what *should* be done (e.g., what do stakeholders, current tenants, industry groups, and the neighborhoods of Magnolia and Queen Anne think should be done?). The Port is in early discussions with the City and has been look at what's been done at similar sites.

Emerging Vision: The Port would like to use the Northbay area to help advance the region's long-term economic viability. In December, the Port created an economic development department and revised its mission statement to include the goal of creating economic vitality in the region. The Port is now evaluating how the use of real estate contributes to this effort. Components of this include how to attract jobs, generate revenue, and create new uses. The Port has struggled recently as the agency has lost some tenants, and wants to produce new revenue to support maritime and non-revenue generating activities. Again, the Port also wants to enhance the water-related environment.

The staff has pulled together the work they've completed over the last several months, and will present to the Commission several potential land use mix options. These could include Research & Development (R&D) campus space, offices, industrial uses, or limited residential uses. (The Port has decided to take a more detailed look at residential development to decide if it can be compatible with other potential uses.)

Land Use Scenarios: Land uses would be combined in 3 or 4 development scenarios to take through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process:

- (1) Status quo: no changes in zoning
- (2) Height variance (what could be done if the existing 45-foot height limit were changed?)
- (3) Commercial rezone (change portions from industrial general, IG, to industrial commercial, IC) and raise the height limit
- (4) Create a R&D campus

The Port has talked with the University of Washington about creating a R&D campus, and although it was reported that the campus will likely be in the south Lake Union area, the UW has expressed the need for approximately 4 million feet of office space. Although the Port can't accommodate the UW's current needs, there may be opportunities for future partnerships.

Summary of Technical Work to Complete: The Port will be evaluating transportation capacity and infrastructure, and must work with the monorail and Magnolia Bridge project teams to identify the best ways to integrate their plans. This necessitates a strong working relationship with the City. The Port must also look at Elliott Avenue congestion, and must address the impacts of bringing new developments to the area. The Port must also improve access to the site from the north and south, and from Queen Anne (east) and Magnolia

(west). Transit will be a key part of this equation, and the Port will coordinate with the Magnolia Bridge team, the monorail, the potential waterfront extension of the trolley northward, Sound Transit's commuter line extension, and Metro.

The Port will complete additional geotechnical work on utilities and environmental conditions as part of the master planning phase. Given that this area is largely on fill, buildings will need to be supported by pilings. Also, the utilities in this area are somewhat archaic. Groundwater and soil testing in these areas will also be completed.

Next Steps: The Port expects to wrap up the first phase this month, and hopes to get the Commission to sign off on work completed so far and issue a Request for Qualifications for the master planning team. As part of the process, there will be extensive community outreach to help determine what the best plan is for the area. The Port expects to begin the SEPA process in the second quarter of this year.

Finally, Mark presented his contact information, encouraged people to email or call him with comments, and opened the floor for questions.

Discussion

Foxworthy Will you consider “big box” retail as a potential land use?

Griffin Not on Port property, and only inasmuch as they are complimentary to other development that we recommend. The Commission sees “big box” retail as fundamentally incompatible with the Port's mission. It could be in the mix because employers and employees will need services, but this won't be our focus.

Member of Public Are you only planning for the 57 acres?

Griffin While the entire site is 140 acres, we're only evaluating new uses in that 57-acre portion. We will be looking at how these new uses integrate across the whole study area of 140 acres, but won't look at new uses for the portion outside of the 57 acres.

Foxworthy How is the Port responsible for salmon recovery and ESA enhancement?

Griffin The Port wants to be a good steward of the environment, and will address ESA issues and compliance appropriately.

Smith I've heard that the military presence is phasing out in Interbay?

Griffin The National Guard has expressed a long-held desire to move to another, less-congested part of the City. We were looking at the “hat and boots” site, but that deal fell apart. The National Guard continues to tell us that they wish to relocate, and we're trying to help them, and would be interested in their property. There is no agreement with the National Guard to move yet, but it's our understanding that they would still like to move.

- Smith** What about the tank farm? That land can't be in good shape.
- Griffin** That is under discussion now. At this point, we plan to keep the entire area as it is. We recently terminated the agreement with the most recent operator, and the Port is in discussions trying to figure out what to do now.
- Coney** Has the Port commented on the four Magnolia Bridge alternatives? If so, what have you said?
- Griffin** Your project team has been in front of the Commission, and the Commission has commented.
- Jones** Yes, we presented to the Port on February 11th, and the Commission thanked us but did not express a preference for any alternative.
- Griffin** Yes, the Commission has commented, but has not taken a position. As we get the master planning team in place and see how the four alternatives lay out, we'll try to determine which one will be the very best for us and the community as a whole.
- Coney** Have you commented on the preferred monorail station?
- Griffin** We did send a comment letter as an agency discussing how stations could potentially impacts this site and T25. We have not stated a formal position, and I can't summarize the letter neatly. The Port is considering a range of options, and was very property-specific in its comments (e.g., how the tracks cross Salmon Bay and affect Fisherman's Terminal). We're trying to determine where the appropriate location for the station will be, and like Kirk's group, we want to work with the monorail agency to really understand how the monorail could be used to serve the site.
- Coney** It sounds like you've got until April 2 before SPMA will vote on the preferred locations, so you've got until then to make your case.
- Chamberlain** We've got a person assigned to the monorail project.
- Griffin** The master planning process will work with the monorail team to address these issues.
- Coney** You seem rather casual for a very important issue.
- Griffin** I'm not intending to be casual or to understate the importance of the monorail at all, and obviously this is a critical piece that we must make sure is serving the site appropriately. We are cognizant of inter-modal opportunities and are wrestling with the potential location of the operations yard because it would be so integral to the system on a daily and hourly basis.

- Spiker** What's the relationship between this master planning process and the one taking place at pier 46?
- Griffin** There is a relationship, but it's not all that strong because we have an existing, long-term tenant at T46. It is premature to talk in a directed way about what might be done on T46. If Hanjin relocates, we would look at how to appropriately move forward on this site. But again, we've got a long-term tenant there, and we're not looking at a mix of new land uses.
- Jones** I'm sorry that one of our Design Advisory Group members, Lise Kenworthy, isn't here. She emphasizes the issues of maintaining family-wage jobs, protecting the current businesses that are in the Interbay area, and the potential for expanding current businesses. For example, some tenants in the seafood processing industry would like to expand but don't want to plan an expansion in light of the uncertainty surrounding the area. Also, as businesses expand, this draws other supporting businesses to support, for example, the fishing industry. In your master planning effort, are you looking at those economic issues, and will you cultivate study in that area.
- Griffin** It's something we have been looking at, and we fully intend to use the base of existing uses to build and create a vibrant mix of new uses. Among those uses, we could include new industrial and marine-related uses. We're not sure how we might sort out future uses when we develop our broader mixes of land uses.
- Member of Public** Does the current bridge design create any headaches for the Port?
- Griffin** I wouldn't call them headaches. The bridge creates access for existing tenants, but if we redevelop the area in a different way, we won't need to consider the site as something to get up and over. We see the fence around the Nissan site as coming down, and we think that we can really use the site to better integrate into other neighborhoods. Because the bridge won't have to get up and over the property, the bridge can now touch down and create options. As we move forward, we can think about the area and the bridge in a different, creative way that continue access to the property and to the bluff.
- Member of Public** What does the dotted line mean, and where will the surface streets through the property go?
- Griffin** The 57-acre area doesn't have any roads, so the master planning process must look at how to lay roads on the site. The dotted line shows the need for some kind of north/south ingress/egress route, and the need for some sort of spine road. There are no roads now, and the dotted line is arbitrary, only representative in terms of the final layout of the property. The final surface road won't necessarily look like that.

- Holmstrom** As Alternative H might indicate, could there be several spine roads that might connect up to Thorndyke?
- Griffin** Yes. We'll need a road network and are open to options that will help us integrate with the bridge and the existing street grid.
- Holmstrom** Thank you, that sounds encouraging.
- Member of Public** Was the spine road once a road and now a bike trail?
- Jones** Yes, before the marina was built, there was a bike path that ran down 32nd Avenue, past Smith Cove Park, and became a two-lane country road. When the new ramps were built, it was closed off, and the trail bumped towards the bluff.
- Foxworthy** Getting back to my question about the ESA, as a public agency, doesn't the Port have to participate in a federally-recognized effort, such as the tri-county agreement, to help save salmon? If so, and this site is substantially contaminated, could there not be some opportunity to do site clean up to create credit with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS, now called NOAA Fisheries)? Given the area's history as a natural estuary, I would hate to throw the opportunity for environmental enhancement away. In light of how salmon recovery is occurring, I just wanted to throw that thought out.
- Griffin** I don't know the specifics of ESA compliance as a public agency, but I'll take that question back and try to understand it better. In regards to environmental contamination, we know that there may be hot spots based on testing and given the area's history, but the site isn't a huge dirty area that will need cleanup like a superfund site. Some cleanup will be needed, but not a ton. There will be other restoration issues, most associated with the shoreline, but the majority of the area won't have the same requirements as the west yard area. We will be looking at compliance, but what those obligations will be I don't know and can't comment on intelligently right now.
- Member of Public** Significant opposition is developing against Alternative B. How will the Port look at that opposition?
- Griffin** We will certainly take that input into account. We have stated a desire to assess all options that are viable. As we come to understand the site lay out, the Commission will get a better sense of where they should weigh in. Community input will be a major part of the master planning process, and our tracking of the bridge project will certainly play a part in what the Commission supports.
- Jones** The Commission stressed that they are considering all four alternatives to be equal, and aren't taking a position. We made the emerging community

opposition to Alternative B clear to the Commission, and they made it clear that they're not taking a position yet.

Member of Public When will the Port have a preferred stance?

Griffin I can't give you a date, but as the master planning group comes on board, transportation will be a key element, and we will work on the review process. We're talking about a matter of months, but at some point we will have enough information to make a choice about the optimal alternative.

Jones Remember, too, that the EIS won't be done until late this year. We may not even recommend a preferred alternative in the draft. If one is clearly the best option, we'll pick it as our preferred alternative. If not, we will create the draft EIS and use agency and public comments to help us pick a preferred alternative.

Griffin And the Commission will track that work.

Conclusion: **With no further discussion, Brad thanked Mark for his presentation and suggested, because the EIS process had been covered in Kirk's opening remarks, that the meeting skip to public comments. With no opposition voiced, Brad opened the floor for public comments.**

VI. Public and Closing Comments

Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues

Brad asked members of the public to state their names before providing input.

Discussion

Sue Olson What is the current status of placing Alternative B on the roadbed? Are you moving it closer to the shore? Will any of the route extend over the tidal zone? Will it be built on piles or fill?

Jones At this point, everything will be on land, above the mean high tide mark. From that line out, zoning as a conservancy area does not permit a road. From that line up, roads and residential development is allowed. We are now trying to figure out how to fit a road above the mean high tide mark between the bluff.

Art Ericson At an earlier meeting, I heard that Alternative B would shut the existing bridge during the entire construction period, while others would shut the bridge for a shorter period. Would Alternative B result in the longest shutdown of the bridge during construction?

- Jones** We heard consistently that we need to shut down the bridge for the shortest amount of time possible during construction. We plan to build as much of the new facility as possible before we tie it into the existing route and close the bridge. For example, we could do the entire north connection of Alternative H before closing the bridge. We don't think Alternative B would create any longer a closure than others.
- Hoff** That's puzzling, because I've been at all of the meetings and never heard that about Alternative B.
- Holloway** Because Alternative B only requires a tie in on the eastern end, perhaps there would actually be a less lengthy closure of the bridge under this scenario.
- Jones** At this point, we don't know how long the bridge might be closed under each scenario. That will become clearer as we lay out construction schedules.
- Vicki Loiseau** I'm concerned about buses. There is lots of traffic in the 32nd Avenue area, and I wonder if people have stood at the intersection of Clise and 32nd Ave and considered buses. Where will buses stop, go, or let people off safely?
- Holloway** We talked to Metro before the study started, and that's one of the items we will discuss with them once we get routes and traffic counts. At that time we'll go back to Metro and that will be considered.
- Roger LeGrannon** Have you given consideration to the fact that Alternative B will be a main artery with no on- or off-ramps? Where will all the traffic go once it gets to 32nd Avenue?
- Jones** Yes, you're raising an issue that we're quite aware of. We know that there will be an intersection on Port property. From that point to 32nd Avenue and Clise, all traffic will go up to that location. How can the local area handle that traffic? That's part of our traffic modeling. We were up taking counts last week in that area, and know what the volume looks like now. Can the increased traffic be handled? We don't know yet.
- Larry Loiseau** Do you have formal drawings that show how the intersection would work at 32nd Avenue and Clise?
- Jones** We don't know that yet.
- L. Loiseau** I ask as a second part of my question what kind of intersection would be there? They just put in a brand new island there.
- Jones** We are assuming some sort of signal, but we're not sure.
- George Olson** I've been doing some urban design research, and I wanted to present a newspaper article reviewing research done by the Urban Land Institute. [Mr.

Olson passed out a copied article to the Design Advisory Group.] On the backside is an editorial to the newspaper I wrote on the same subject (the impact of Alternative B on the Village). The article gears towards what urban design is favorable to an area like the Village in terms of urban mix. The article states that the area must be a pedestrian-friendly and pedestrian-oriented area, and that doesn't just mean including good crosswalks and signals, but actually having restrictions on traffic volumes. This speaks to the Village, which would be hurt by Alternative B. It would create a roadblock to a pedestrian-oriented environment. Engineers usually only worry about moving traffic faster as opposed to through narrower, more pedestrian friendly corridors.

Member of Public I've heard that Alternative B could be either 2 or 3 lanes up to Clise/32nd Avenue. I've also seen different numbers on the elevation of 32nd Avenue than the Magnolia Bridge.

Jones I think you mean the steepness, rather than elevation. The steepness of 32nd Avenue is 4.5%, while the existing bridge is a grade of 6.5%.

Member of Public Can you comment on whether there will be 2 or 3 lanes?

Holloway Right now we're thinking that there will be three lanes that run through the marina area. There would be four lanes from 15th Avenue West that would run east to the spine road on the Port property, and then we would drop to two lanes with a two-way left-hand turn lane in the area of the marina and up 32nd Ave West. That looks like it will provide enough capacity for the expected traffic volumes.

S. Olson I am concerned that there is no criterion to evaluate the relative cost impacts on residents on 32nd Avenue, at the intersection of 32nd Avenue and 33rd Avenue, and at the intersection of 32nd Avenue and Clise. Criteria were developed to account for business and transportation impacts. I feel that residents are equally important as businesses and potential impacts on business, and these impacts on residents will be forever. I request that a criterion be developed that measures relative cost impacts on local residents.

Petra Tierney I've been speaking to residents, and Magnolia has a public beach that the community really loves because it's quiet and private (not like Lincoln or Alki, which this beach will become if Alternative B is chosen). You don't seem concerned with what Magnolia will lose, but only with what the Port will gain. Have you given any consideration to this loss?

Jones We have acknowledged all along that there could be significant environmental impacts to the shoreline area under Alternative B. We know we'll be changing the beach area, and will be studying what the impacts will be, how they might be mitigated, and if they can be mitigated at all.

Member of Public Will the EIS be concerned with all who live there [on the beach]?

- Jones** Yes, the EIS will look at impacts to residents, businesses, the natural environment, the built environment, etc. We will look at all of these things for all four alignments, which will allow us to compare them.
- Marlene Taitch** Will you evaluate fisheries during the EIS process? Fisheries were evaluated when they were studying the marina.
- Jones** Yes, we will be studying fisheries.
- Butler** Yes, we are required to complete a Biological Assessment and complete a full consultation with natural resource agencies as a part of this project. All state and federal agencies will be consulted, and they have to be brought into the process by law.
- Member of Public** Who's the final authority on which alternative is selected? Is it the Design Advisory Group, the Mayor, you?
- Jones** The Design Advisory Group is purely advisory and has no decision-making authority. We will report our preferred alternative to the Mayor, and he will carry our recommendation to the Seattle City Council, who would adopt the Final EIS at the end of this process. The City would also be involved in creating the Record of Decision (ROD) document at the end of the process.
- Member of Public** Is there any kind of appeal process? As you know, there are many of us who oppose Alternative B, and we want to know where to focus our efforts to get Alignment B off the table, and limit the alternatives you're considering to three.
- Butler** An appeal under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) has to be related to challenging an underlying permit. The law allows you to challenge the adequacy of an EIS, but to do so you must challenge an associated permit itself. That would happen at a later stage. Permits wouldn't be issued until the City is actually making decisions for building permits, shoreline permits, and others. Under SEPA, the adequacy of the EIS can be appealed at the draft stage. If the document is inadequate, there is a process that allows that challenge. The appeal would be to the City hearing examiner, then to court. You can challenge the document and the substance of impacts, how impacts were analyzed, or whether the process was followed according to law. In terms of permits, you can challenge when the project moves forward. For example, in the case of this marina, the shoreline permit was challenged and went into litigation, and the Shorelines Hearing Board helped reach a settlement. So there was no challenge of the EIS, but there was a challenge of the underlying permit. You can't challenge one specific alignment until permits are being issued.
- Spiker** The Seattle Design Commission, which advises the City, also has a public review process. We have open meetings that community members can

attend, and we advise the City based on our evaluations and what we hear. That would be another track if you wanted to challenge the alternatives.

Brad And, in case you can't see David's nametag, you should know that he sits on the Seattle Design Commission.

Conclusion: **With no additional discussion, Brad reminded the advisory group that the next meeting would be April 2, 2003, at the same time and location (Seattle Yacht Club Outstation). Brad adjourned the meeting.**