

## Meeting Notes

### Lenora to BST Project City/WSDOT Permitting Coordination Meeting Notes

**Meeting Date:** September 26, 2007

**Attendees:** Sandy Gurkewitz, John Baggs, Alec Williamson, Kathy Fendt, Jesse Halsted, Paul Lacy, Gwen McCullough, Sepehr Sobhani, Dewitt Jensen, Angela Freudenstein, Carl Kassebaum

**cc:** Kelly Jones, Karen Stagner, Kate Stenberg

---

#### Meeting-Defined Action Items:

- Sandy and John will research the City MUP process related to use of the Muscatel property for project staging including:
  - Ascertain the status and timeline of ordinances drafted to revise the City Code to allow longer than 6-months for construction staging.
  - Determine whether successive MUPs can be issued thereby allowing sufficient time to complete construction.
  - Determine if separately prepared SEPA checklist (rather than full project NEPA FONSI followed by SEPA adoption) only for the Muscatel property would be adequate to initiate and complete the DPD permitting process.
- Sandy and John will review and edit the table titled “City of Seattle Permits for the Lenora to BST Project” and provide to Carl for inclusion in the table.
- The Project Permit Team will research the need to consult with either or both the Design Review Commission and Landmarks Board for work to remove and upgrade the guardrails as well as for new project light illumination.
- Sandy will report back regarding status of the draft Project Construction Permit (PCP) ordinance to identify estimated time for implementation.
- Sandy will determine who at the City will be the technical review coordinator on this project.
- John and Sandy will research the City needs for full sized drawings at the 30% design submittal and coordinate with Paul.
- Carl will work with Paul to identify the form and structure of an interim geotechnical submittal (report) relating to utility plans and impacts. This would address both electrical and drainage utilities. Carl will work with Sandy to schedule a meeting with the appropriate City and Project staff (including

SPU) to present the interim report and to secure feedback regarding design and permitting issues.

- John and Sandy will evaluate whether a “checklist” of items/issues to be included in the 60% submittals can be prepared as part of the City’s 30% plan review.
- Carl will work with Sandy to schedule, develop agendas, and identify appropriate City and Project staff to attend the next two meetings.
- Alec and Paul will work with John to schedule AWW Program-wide permit-related policy meetings. This will include meeting schedule, topics to be addressed, and identification of appropriate staff to attend.

---

### **Detailed Meeting Notes**

**Meeting Goal:** Define the processes which the City and Project will mutually use to develop and provide timely permit information to the City resulting in the timely issuance of City permits.

**Introduction:** The meeting introduction focused on the stated meeting goal. All subsequent discussions focused on process rather than the details of any issue. This is the starting meeting to establish procedures to support the resolution of identified issues of concern. Future meetings will be tailored to address specific issues in detail.

### **Agenda Topics and Discussion:**

1. Overview description of the Project and key WSDOT project design development steps

*Paul presented an overview description of the project including the project schedule. Specific issues discussed included:*

- *Need for haul roads, especially on the west side of the project, is not known at this time.*
- *False work needed to do construction work on the west side pilings is also unknown. It may be possible to do much of the work from the viaduct surface.*
- *A fence of some sort will be included to protect any debris from falling of the railroad tracks. This fence will be located inside the right-of-way.*
- *A short section of Blanchard Street just to the east of the viaduct may be proposed to be closed and used as a staging area. Dewitt will be evaluating the design feasibility and need to use this Street section.*

2. Role of the project permitting team to coordinate internal and external (City) information development

*Kathy reiterated the role of the project permitting team. A major aspect of the team’s work in obtaining permits involves coordinating the development and exchange of information between the City and Project.*

3. Identification and discussion of City permits likely to be required  
*Carl presented a table titled “City of Seattle Permits for the Lenora to BST Project” that identified the City permits potentially applicable to this project. The table also identified triggers which would cause the identified permit to be required.*

*Discussion topics of the table included:*

- *Separate Street Use permit for the Blanchard Staging area, if proposed, would not be required. This activity would be included as part of the overall street use permit to be issued for the Project.*
  - *Noise variance will be required.*
  - *An Agreement (not a City Permit) between the City or Market Public Development Authority (PDA) and WSDOT will be required for the temporary use of the public parking area located under the Viaduct.*
  - *Permit (MUP) coverage of the proposed construction staging on the Muscatel property (See Action Items above for details).*
4. City confirmation of permits and issuance mechanisms  
*Sandy presented two tables titled “City Permit Process for AWW Moving Forward Projects” and “SDOT Permit Process for AWW Moving Forward Projects”.*  
*Discussion topics included:*
- *What is meant by “Pre-Application Meetings” - The group discussed that only specific types of permits actually require pre-application meetings, but that pre-application meetings are valuable regardless of whether they are required. Agreement was reached that for purposes of the SDOT street use permit, this meeting and subsequent meetings can be considered a pre-application meeting process. It was noted that a formal pre-application meeting will be needed for the DPD permitting processes (temporary use permit). This DPD meeting will likely need to be scheduled in late January 2008. It was agreed that how and when to do this meeting would be a topic of discussion in one of the upcoming meetings.*
  - *Landmarks Board (Department of Neighborhoods) and Design Review Commission (See Action Items above) processes were briefly discussed.*
  - *Project Construction Permit (PCP) draft ordinance (See Action Items above) The group discussed that there would be no difference in submittals needed whether the City issues construction types of approvals via one PCP or via individual permits (street use, dewatering, etc).*
5. Procedures to link/integrate the Project design development steps and City permit review processes  
*Carl provided brief overview of what this item means to him. Specifically, it appears that there are few substantive technical issues of concern but many process issues of concern. Assuming this remains true, the dominant overall issue becomes scheduling and timing to develop needed information pieces. The*

*greatest overall project risk is the large costs incurred as result of construction delay.*

*If City and Project processes including information transfer can be preplanned and aligned, there is significant potential to take care of many of these process issues as we go rather than dealing with them at the end. The group discussed and agreed that the best opportunity to positively impact overall schedule is for the City and project to identify the major issues of concern and substantially resolve them prior to and as part of the 60% submittal. Issues delayed until the 90% submittal will have strong potential to cause delay.*

*Subsequent discussions included the following:*

- Alec indicated that a well-defined Project Description is the key to defining needed permits and to resolve issues of concern. The sooner the detailed description can be prepared, the sooner the permitting processes can be defined and implemented.*
- Alec indicated that subsurface issues are the major driver for this project to accomplish the project description.*
- Paul suggested that when the geotechnical information is analyzed that an interim submittal relating to utility plans be developed and submitted to the City for input and review. (See Action Items above.)*
- Alec suggested that the same thing should be done for Stormwater.*
- The 30% plan set is for Geometric Design purposes and hence will miss a lot of the critical detail needed for City permitting. However, much of this information, including draft specifications, should be provided as part of the 60% submittal process. Carl asked if the City could generate, as part of its 30% review process, a “checklist” of items which would need to be provided with the 60% submittal process. John and Sandy will evaluate how this could work (See Action Items above).*
- Paul asked why full sized drawings need to be submitted as part of the 30% submittals. WSDOT is able to submit them, but wanted to understand why they are needed, especially considering the cost to prepare them. After discussion, John and Sandy indicated they may not be needed and that they will determine the need for these drawings and coordinate directly with Paul. Sepehr indicated that an option would be for the Project to provide electronic PDF files which the City could then print at any size they needed.*

## 6. Technical Issues

*Carl introduced an example of an issue which will need to be addressed in future discussions: Use of WSDOT versus City Standard Specifications. What matters is that agreement be reached earlier rather than later regarding specifications to use due to the large potential for time delay.*

*Alec provided some guidance including:*

- Whichever entity has ownership/operates the activity will have its Standard Specifications applied. For example, drainage will be governed and operated*

*by SPU; therefore, City specs will be used. However, the bridge deck resurfacing, which is operated by WSDOT, will use WSDOT specs.*

*This and other issues will be the subject of future meetings to identify processes and individuals to resolve.*

7. Future Meetings

*Decision was made to pursue two types of future meetings: 1) AWV Program-wide City/WSDOT policy issues relating to all the moving forward projects, and 2) Ongoing Lenora to BST Project meetings.*

- *Paul and Alec will work with John to develop the scope and meeting agenda for the Project-wide policy meetings. John suggested that the first meeting address WSDOT/City permitting strategy and that all the moving forward project engineers attend.*
- *Carl will work with Sandy to schedule the next two Project meetings:*
  - *The first meeting will be the week of October 8 – 12 and one of the topics to be covered will be presentation and discussions of the 30% submittals to key City staff reviewers.*
  - *The second meeting will be approximately one month later (week of November 10-14), Carl to work with City and design team to develop agenda.*