



## Design Advisory Group Meeting #22

Magnolia Lutheran Church

May 3, 2006, 4:00 – 6:00 PM

### Summary Minutes

#### Agenda

---

- I. Welcome
- II. Project Updates
- III. Bridge Type
- IV. Next Steps
- V. Adjourn

#### Attendees

---

##### Design Advisory Group

- Dan Bartlett
- ✓ Dan Burke
- ✓ Fran Calhoun
- ✓ John Coney
- Grant Griffin
- ✓ Lise Kenworthy
- Doug Lorentzen
- ✓ Jose Montañó
- ✓ Mike Smith
- David Spiker
- Janis Traven
- ✓ Dan Wakefield
- Robert Foxworthy (alternate)

##### Project Team

- Lesley Bain, Weinstein A|U
- ✓ Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Gerald Dorn, HNTB
- Molly Edmonds, EnviroIssues
- ✓ Cela Fortier, City of Seattle
- Gregg Hirakawa, SDOT
- 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
- ✓ K. Wendell, KBA
- Terry Witherspoon, AMEC

Note: In addition, there were three members of the public in attendance.

#### Meeting Handouts

---

- ✓ *Agenda*
- ✓ *DAG #21 Summary Minutes*
- ✓ *Alternative A Segment Comparison*
- ✓ *Detour Concepts*
- ✓ *Cost Estimates Fact Sheet*
- ✓ *Design Constraints*
- ✓ *Design Characteristics*
- ✓ *Public Outreach Recap*

## I. Welcome

***Sarah Brandt, EnviroIssues***

---

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

- Project Updates
  - DAG 21 Action Items
  - Seattle City Council Briefing Recap
  - Alternative A
  - Cost Estimating
  - Detour Concepts
  - Port of Seattle – North Bay
- Bridge Type Concepts
  - Structure
  - Aesthetics
  - Considerations
  - DAG Feedback
- Next steps
  - Magnolia Community Club Briefing – May 11<sup>th</sup>
  - DAG 23 – June 7<sup>th</sup>
- Public comment

Sarah also reviewed the packet of materials the group received. She apologized for not sending the DAG 21 minutes prior to the meeting, and noted that she would send them out to the group the next day (May 4, 2006).

## II. Project Updates

***Kirk Jones, SDOT***

---

**DAG 21 Action Items:** Kirk Jones, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) project co-manager, began by noting a specific action item from April's DAG meeting. He had promised Judy Gibbs that he would look into the possibility of widening Emerson Street Bridge to help improve connections to Magnolia. Kirk spoke to traffic operations and structural engineers at SDOT who said the bridge could be widened, but this would cost \$6-8 million plus right of way expenses. He also noted that with the volume of traffic headed to Nickerson, it did not appear that the cost/benefit would make sense. Because of this, the project team is not going to study this option further.

### **Discussion**

**Kenworthy:** Right of way could cost as much as \$1-2 million?

**Jones:** That's correct. This is an estimate at this point. Because this option did not appear to significantly benefit traffic, we did not get into the specifics of analyzing the right of way costs.

**Wakefield:** Traffic is usually headed to the Ballard Bridge, not Nickerson Street.

**Seattle City Council Transportation Committee Briefing:** Kirk explained that the week after the April DAG meeting, the team presented to the Seattle City Council Transportation Committee. Jan Drago and Jean Godden were the councilmembers present. Kirk presented the same information to them as was presented during the April DAG. They asked questions about:

- Exchanging right of way between the Port and City
- How the wooden piles were in such good condition for being so old
- Detour costs, which are estimated at around \$8-10 million.

### **Discussion**

**Kenworthy:** Is that the cost for just the roadway?

**Jones:** That cost includes the roadway, operations, police, and payments to contractors to put detours in place and manage them.

**Coney:** Do you have a budget for that yet?

**Jones:** We are working on developing a budget.

**Coney:** We would be interested to see what you are budgeting for police, traffic control, and road construction.

**Jones:** We are basing these numbers in large part on our experience during the last bridge shutdown.

**Kenworthy:** Does that budget take into account a cruise terminal that would be adding cars?

**Jones:** No, but it did account for major redevelopment and more traffic in the area. The one thing we do know is that the traffic generated from a cruise terminal would be opposite the peak period traffic.

**Alternative A Update:** Kirk provided an update on Alternative A and the project team's recent findings. To preface, Kirk reminded the group that the mayor selected Alternative A as the preferred alternative. It is customary that, once a preferred alternative is selected, the design team look at ways to modify the alignment to create the best bridge possible, as well as minimize impacts associated with Alternative A. The news that the design team was looking at shifting the alignment closer to the existing corridor ("modified A") was published before the project team talked to the mayor's office or DAG, which was unfortunate. SDOT is still looking at Alternative A and modified A, but the two impacts that Kirk thought would be minimized by the alignment shift – on parklands and shorelines – are proving to be less significant.

Diagrams in the handout packet demonstrate that, when compared, Alternative A and modified A have nearly the same impact on the parklands because Alternative A's curve must be flattened to meet design standards. In addition, when comparing the alignments over the water, modified A covers an additional 0.45 acres of shoreline. The difference between the two in terms of impact is not great.

**Detour Concepts:** One of the detours SDOT has been exploring is to build a road along the east edge of the Port's property. SDOT and the Port are still working on that, and there is a 99% reality that it could happen. That type of detour could be used for either one of the alternatives and would use the Galer Flyover. .

Another detour possibility is to use the Galer Flyover and build a temporary ramp that would allow drivers to use portions of the existing bridge. The detour would start on the ground, use the Galer Flyover to go over Alaskan Way, pass under construction activities on the bridge, and use a temporary ramp to route traffic onto the westerly portion of the existing bridge. Another possibility is to rebuild the existing easterly on ramp to the bridge a little wider and make it available for two-way traffic. While the new ramp is being constructed, people would have to make a left turn onto the bridge off of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue W. As soon as the new ramp is built, SDOT could make that a two-way road while building the rest of the bridge over the railroad tracks. The design team is brainstorming to find ways to keep things functioning as well as possible. SDOT cannot do this kind of detour if modified A is selected.

SDOT is developing an issue paper on the pros and cons of Alternative A and modified A. Other considerations will be detour costs and the additional time and distance saved with a ramp versus a surface route to 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue W. SDOT is trying to get a decision about Alternative A or modified A as soon as possible. Quite frankly, things are leaning towards the original Alternative A.

## Discussion

**Kenworthy:** Can I make sure we have this right? The concept is you build a detour ramp before we start other construction?

**Jones:** With any temporary ramping, you build it first.

**Kenworthy:** To what extent would it shorten the time when people couldn't come into Magnolia the current way?

**Jones:** We aren't looking at shortening the detour time yet; we're just looking at all the detour possibilities.

**Kenworthy:** Does this temporary ramp concept depend on the Port choosing one of three scenarios for the holding pattern for cruise ships? There are three possible holding areas. Does this ramp concept affect any of these?

- Jones:** One holding area is the tank farm area. So far the Port has been very positive. We're hoping to get something in writing in the near future. I'm optimistic.
- M. Smith:** We'll have one more meeting when this is firmed up a little bit, right? Are you trying to fast track this?
- Jones:** Yes, we won't be making final decisions about the detour for a while. We'll move these concepts into the design phase. We'll get approximately 60% of the detour plan firmed up during this TS&L phase. We need to offer the contractor an option to see if they come up with better detour plans.
- P. Smith:** They would have a performance requirement. If they could do a better job with the detour and beat the deadline, there would be an incentive.
- Coney:** As I understand the detour road, it would not involve shutting the detour down at all through the Port, correct? That could be open the entire time?
- Jones:** Yes, it would.
- Coney:** If you don't build that road you will have to use the existing road and there will come a time when you have to connect the east to west, so there would be a total closure.
- Jones:** Not necessarily.
- Burke:** There could potentially be both, correct? Or, is there a reason not to?
- Fortier:** Cost.
- Jones:** The Port road would be functioning the entire time.
- Wakefield:** If the temporary ramps turn out to be feasible, that would mean that the Port road would be unnecessary. I see a problem with the detour ramp for bicyclists/pedestrians. You should allow the path to be unobstructed.
- Jones:** We would try to do that. Maybe this road is for both the tenants and the general public. Then there would be a gate by the north end of Trident's building, and we wouldn't have to take as much width.
- Kenworthy:** It's not clear to me where the general public traffic will go after you get to the Trident fence.
- Burke:** General traffic would carry up the east side, head up to 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue W., and then connect into Thorndyke Avenue W. Can we see a visual of this at an upcoming meeting?

**Jones:** Yes. We would like to carry a couple of options out of the TS&L Study. Once we select a bridge type and get into concept plans, construction methods, and how to tie in the detour, we can see if the contractor can come up with something new and better.

**M. Smith:** These options are much better for the south end. I'm really positive about these options.

**Fortier:** There are still a lot of details to be worked out.

**Coney:** Is there anything in current plans that constrain the width of the bicycle/pedestrian facility on the Galer Flyover?

**Jones:** No.

**Coney:** I had hopes of the flyover being able to serve a future Sound Transit station.

**Cost Estimate Validation Process.** Kirk referred to the Cost Estimate handout, which summarized the process the team went through in fall 2004. The general public requested to see the summary, but Kirk wanted to run it by the DAG first. The summary provides a general project description and list of benefits. Costs (in 2004 dollars) include surface roadways, detour costs, demolition, and construction. Because it is a more expensive section to build, SDOT doubled the cost per square foot for the long span over the railroad. The resulting graph, which accounts for inflation to time of expenditure and risks, shows that there is a 90% probability that the Magnolia Bridge Project will cost \$196 million or less. The design team will go through the same process for the TS&L study to provide a refined cost estimate.

### **Discussion**

**Kenworthy:** You might want to invert "not including inflation or other risks." People may think it's a typo.

**Coney:** Does the Alternative A cost estimate include the demolition of industrial structures?

**Jones:** Yes. We would have to disconnect Anthony's ramp for any alternative. We have included costs for moving Anthony's or replacing access.

**M. Smith:** What is the responsibility of the railroad for bridges built over their railway?

**Jones:** We have a meeting scheduled with BNSF at the end of May. In 1929, they paid for the road from the west edge of the tracks to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue W. We have a letter which states they agree to maintain and replace that roadway. We are just beginning negotiations with them, and will estimate how much that portion will cost.

**Coney:** Do you plan to use Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID) money to fund this? A bond?

**Jones:** RTID gives us a little more flexibility. One concern is that it has to be a regional facility to qualify for funding. We have to make a good case for this.

**Port Update:** Dan Burke provided a brief update of activities related to the Port. The main activity the Port is focused on is securing a zoning overlay. Mark Griffin will be at the May 11<sup>th</sup> Magnolia Community Council meeting to give an update on North Bay. The Port hopes to have that complete by the end of the year. There is a cruise ship terminal scoping meeting coming up, as well.

### Discussion

**Kenworthy:** Are you suggesting that we have to rezone for the bridge?

**Burke:** No, not for the bridge, for North Bay.

**Coney:** Can the Magnolia Community Council get the comment cards from that meeting?

**Brandt:** I can get the meeting details and comment form from Dan and send it to the group.

### III. Bridge Type

---

#### ***Jerry Dom, HNTB***

Jerry began by explaining the process for choosing a bridge type. He commented that at this phase in the project, the team is looking at bridge types for the specific alignment associated with Alternative A. Today, the team is presenting what the bridge architects brainstormed, and will collect the DAG's input and expand those ideas. Next, the design team will go through a screening process to boil the options down to three alternatives to study further. Finally, the team will go through a second screening process to narrow it down to one preferred alternative. The intent is that, with each step, the DAG will be consulted for their input.

Jerry discussed some of the constraints that must be considered when selecting a bridge type. For example, there are several buildings on the ground to avoid, and areas where vehicular access must be maintained. There is also a 20-foot clearance requirement at crossings. In addition, the entire valley is liquefiable, so SDOT will need to do ground improvements.

The bridge can be split into distinct segments and treated differently according to each section's characteristics. Segments include the east and railroad crossing, the mid-span, and the western climb up the bluff. The design team is looking at a different structure types for each section depending on various limitation. For example, the curve on the west high rise has a fairly sharp curve, which affects what type of structures work.

Jerry then described bridge design themes, as presented in a meeting handout. Characteristics can be mixed and matched, and the DAG should think about whether the bridge should be a prominent city feature visible from great distances (a “signature” bridge), or money is better spent making the facility attractive to those who will use it. In order facilitate discussion, the bridge architect provided four bridge type themes.

1. Baseline:
  - Circular columns
  - Rectangular piers
  - Straight constant spans
  - Cleans up the current design
2. Historic:
  - Cost increases with more decorative, detailed design
3. Maritime:
  - Could be reflected in railings, piers, etc.
4. Progressive:
  - Modern, futuristic, fits well with haunched, concrete box

Jerry noted that there is some incentive to make longer spans to minimize ground improvements and foundations.

### **Discussion**

**Kenworthy:** Are we one of many groups providing input? What about the Seattle Design Commission?

**Jones:** You are a key group with input. The Design Commission will also have the chance to provide input.

**P. Smith:** The Design Commission did choose Alternative C, which is not what was selected.

**Kenworthy:** Are there style names we could attach to these graphics?

**Dorn:** No, not necessarily. These themes are a reflection of what the bridge architects have brainstormed. They are primarily for inspiration to get your feedback. We want to know if it’s important to include a certain feature, etc.

**Brenda Osterhaug (member of the public):** I’m concerned that all of our region’s projects are going up in cost, and putting some of these more expensive options on the table early could set up unrealistic expectations. The public will want it once they see it, and then we’ll have to scale back. I worry about setting higher expectations than necessary.

**Jones:** We were a little concerned about that, too. We feel we have some money to do some nice design work, but funding is of course limited. The question is should we scale this back, or should we try to mix and match the most important features?



- Montaño:** Many of these are just cosmetic add-ons that won't affect the quality of the bridge. Everything is just toothpaste.
- Coney:** What about considering a transit stop? We are now out of the monorail era and into the bus rapid transit (BRT) era. Is there any consideration to a mid-span transit stop? Has the Port considered a need for that?
- Burke:** The thinking we've done is to focus on the ground. We would need to see if it makes sense.
- Jones:** We have to keep the existing bus stop. We will have to work it into the plan.
- Kenworthy:** It would be helpful to have labels on the types of structures.
- Montaño:** The sketch with the cable-stay bridge makes a lot of sense because it limits the foundation work.
- Jones:** Also consider the bridge in its new location and what will be around 15, 20, or 30 years from now. I was on the design team for the West Seattle Bridge, and politicians pushed to design a cable-stayed bridge, but the engineers said it was not the right structure for its location. For example, when you leave town on the ferry, the Alaskan Way Viaduct disappears. Where do you spend your money on this bridge? Do we want to put money into it to be seen from a long distance that may be covered up with new development over the years?
- Dorn:** Also, what kind of view do the people who live on the bluff want to see looking out?
- Kenworthy:** Will you be generating graphics with new development and profiles?
- Jones:** Yes, we could work with the Port on this. As we talk about different bridge types, think about how we can best use the money available.
- Dorn:** Three-dimension renderings using photos of the actual site would be used once we get through the first screening process.
- Kenworthy:** Even to get to that point, it would be helpful to get some more graphics now.
- Burke:** How do we make our input? Will you go back and narrow it to three designs?
- Jones:** We will still have quite a few concepts we'll be considering the next time we meet. If you have thoughts or ideas, please email them and we will pass them onto the design team.

- Kenworthy:** Can we get more explanation on the maritime lighting fixtures?
- Dorn:** I'm not a lighting person. The idea is that these themes would provide inspiration to see if there are any special or specific features the design team should focus on.
- M. Smith:** There is going to be a lot of light in this area in the next 20 years, so maybe the bridge light needs to be downplayed. Playing down the lighting fixtures might be important for sight lines from north to south.
- Coney:** I would advise Magnolia to think about how they want the gateway to their community to look and opportunities to incorporate art – a gateway iconic structure.
- Kenworthy:** We are talking about a water-dependent community. It doesn't have to be hokey, but I think we should look at a maritime theme. This is a great opportunity. The texture of ropes on the Galer Flyover really works.
- Wakefield:** Seattle Fisherman's Memorial is a great example of public art.
- Coney:** I'm concerned about taking things like decorative light and segregating it into the art. Magnolia should try to get a Magnolia art committee together.
- Fortier:** Page 10 of the DAG 21 meeting minutes talks about the local artist selected. It provides some background information her. She's been hired by SDOT.
- Kenworthy:** I'd like to request we don't spin off into another group to discuss art.
- Coney:** New and old buildings will cross the bridge's horizontal plain. Maybe art money needs to be spent on a gateway.
- Kenworthy:** This is a maritime area of the port, which has a maritime function.
- Osterhaug:** What is the difference in cost between the bridge types? Can you give us a ballpark baseline for costs for each theme since it's actually a different bridge structure?
- Dorn:** We haven't done any cost estimates yet, but my estimates would be:
- Baseline: \$195 million
  - Progressive (haunched structures): 10-20% more than Baseline
  - Arch: 100% more
  - Maritime (overhead cable structure): 100% more
- These are just historical assumptions.
- P. Smith:** We plan on going through the cost estimation process again once design is more detailed. We will do this later in the summer once we have selected the three best bridge types.

**Kenworthy:** We don't feel like we have much information to give you feedback on. Can you put together some more information with labels and types of design in a format we can fax comments to you on?

## IV. Next Steps

---

### **Discussion**

**M. Smith:** Keep it simple on May 11<sup>th</sup> at the Magnolia Community Council Meeting. Don't get into the design detail. Talk about the detour progress, particularly your ideas about the temporary ramps.

**Jones:** We might use the Baseline design to talk about the three different kinds of structures in a general sense.

## V. Public Comment

---

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

### **Action Items:**

- Sarah Brandt will send the DAG 21 Meeting summary to the group for comment before May 10<sup>th</sup>.
- Dan Burke will provide details of the Port's public meeting on the cruise terminal to Sarah Brandt, who will share the information with the DAG.
- The next DAG meeting will be on June 7th from 4:00 to 5:30 pm at the Magnolia Lutheran Church (2414 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue W, Seattle).