

**Alaskan Way Viaduct Stakeholder Advisory Committee
December 18, 2008, 4 – 7:30 p.m.
Seattle City Hall, Bertha Landes Room
Agenda**

	Time	Topic	Presenter	Materials
1.	4:00 to 4:10 p.m.	Welcome, Introductions and Overview of Meeting	Dave Dye, Deputy Secretary Washington State Department of Transportation	
2.	4:10 to 4:30 p.m.	Report Out of Public Forum and Bored Tunnel Briefing	Ron Paananen, Washington State Department of Transportation Bob Powers, Seattle Department of Transportation	
3.	4:30 to 5:15 p.m.	Technical Evaluation Follow-up on Questions Raised by Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members	Jim Parsons, Independent Project Manager Randy McCourt, Independent Project Manager	Presentation Handout
BREAK				
4.	5:30 to 7:15 p.m.	Summary of What the Agencies have Heard from Stakeholder Advisory Committee Final Feedback from Committee	Dave Dye Harold Taniguchi, King County Department of Transportation Grace Crunican, Seattle Department of Transportation	Handout
5.	7:15 to 7:30 p.m.	Action Items and Adjournment	Dave Dye	

December 8, 2008

**Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
Stakeholder Advisory Committee – December 8, 2008
Briefing Summary**

Agenda Item #1: Welcome, Introductions, and Overview of Meeting

Grace Crunican, Seattle Department of Transportation Director, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and Interagency Working Group (IWG) members and thanked them for attending. The purpose of the briefing was to answer more in-depth questions that resulted from the Dec. 4 SAC meeting. That meeting focused on central waterfront evaluation results related to Guiding Principles 3 and 4 (Economics and the waterfront).

Seattle Channel was in attendance to record the briefing. Videos of previous Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings can be found at www.seattlechannel.org/issues/viaduct.asp

Grace asked the members of the SAC and the IWG to introduce themselves and the group or agency they represent.

Stakeholder Advisory Committee attendees:

- Warren Aakervik, Interbay/BINMIC
- Carol Binder, Pike Place Market
- Mahlon Clements, Ballard/Fremont
- John Coney, Queen Anne
- Bob Donegan, Seattle Historic Waterfront Coalition
- Dave Freiboth, King County Labor Council
- Gene Hogle, Working Families for an Elevated Solution
- Mary Hurley, Ballard/Fremont
- Rob Johnson, Transportation Choices Coalition
- Mary McCumber, Futurewise
- Mike O'Brien, Sierra Club
- Vlad Outstimovich, West Seattle
- John Pehrson, Belltown
- Peter Philips, Seattle Marine Business Coalition
- Susan Ranf, Sports Stadiums
- Rob Sexton, Downtown Seattle Association
- Pete Spalding, West Seattle
- Todd Vogel, Allied Arts
- Tayloe Washburn, Seattle Chamber of Commerce

Interagency Working Group attendees:

- Geri Poor, Port of Seattle
- Barbara Wright, King County Public Health

Agencies and Staff announced in attendance:

- Grace Crunican, SDOT Director
- David Dye, WSDOT Deputy Secretary
- Harold Taniguchi, KCDOT Director
- Ron Paananen, WSDOT Urban Corridors Deputy Administrator
- Ron Posthuma, KCDOT Assistant Director
- Robert Powers, SDOT Deputy Director
- Jim Parsons, Parametrix, Independent Project Manager
- Ralph Iboshi, KPFF, Independent Project Management Team
- Randy McCourt, DKS, Independent Project Management Team

Agenda Item #2: Feedback from committee.

After introductions, Grace began with a request for feedback from SAC members. She asked them to state what they would like or not like to see in the hybrid scenarios, which will package together the best elements from the previous eight scenarios. The following is a summary of each SAC member's comments.

Taylor Washburn, Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce:

- Introduced a surface/subsurface hybrid scenario for evaluation. The surface road would be two or three lanes. The subsurface road would be a bored tunnel or a longer lidded trench.
- Excess surface street capacity should be used at an appropriate level.
- Make changes to I-5 as soon as possible.

David Freiboth, King County Labor Council:

- Labor Council has not endorsed Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface proposal.
- Need options that honor diverse groups' needs.

Rob Johnson, Transportation Choices Coalition:

- Believes we are moving in the right direction.
- Has outstanding concerns about cost, transit service, construction timelines.

Rob Sexton, Downtown Seattle Association:

- Completing the I-5 building blocks is paramount.
- Believes in all of the transit investments that we can do.
- Need to replace at least one-third of the parking removed along the waterfront.
- Mercer Street must be modified between Elliott and I-5. Have to provide adequate access to the north end of the bay.
- Strongly urges that a surface solution be included in the hybrid scenarios. Leans toward the Alaskan Way/Western Avenue couplet option.
- A subsurface option should move forward as well. The traffic model analysis says a surface option can work, but what if we're wrong?
- Would need adequate construction mitigation if a lidded trench or a cut-and-cover tunnel move forward.

- Despite the vision for the integrated elevated option, there are concerns about its economic vitality.

Bob Donegan, Seattle Historic Waterfront Coalition:

- Frustrated by a lack of complete data on the eight scenarios. Hopes committee members get to see the details on the hybrid scenarios. Data for the hybrid scenarios should be independently confirmed.
- Most important factor is whether waterfront businesses survive construction.
- Maintaining capacity is important for growth. We need ways to get around.
- Mitigation and parking matter a lot.
- Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface alternative looks attractive. A bored tunnel subsurface option would be less disruptive.

Vlad Oustimovitch, West Seattle:

- Supports the lowest cost alternative. However, the way cost is evaluated is important.
- A bored tunnel is at the higher end in terms of cost, but he believes the estimated cost is grossly inflated.
- West Seattle people work in different areas around city. Where they work is not in their control. We must respond to those concerns.
- West Seattle also needs access to emergency services, such as Harborview Hospital.
- Supports further evaluation of Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface hybrid.
- A throughput option needs to be an essential piece of any hybrid scenario. A surface option will not provide adequate service for people in West Seattle.

Susan Ranf, Sports Stadiums:

- Agrees that a hybrid option similar to Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface is needed.
- Need to better understand how event traffic impacts commuter traffic.
- Concerned about a lack of Pioneer Square representation on the SAC.

John Pehrson, Belltown:

- The current viaduct bifurcates and blights the Belltown neighborhood. Opposed to a new elevated structure.
- If a bored tunnel is affordable, it would provide the best environment in the Belltown neighborhood.
- The surface street scenarios have great potential with some challenges. Need to mitigate heavier surface traffic.
- The lidded trench and cut-and-cover tunnel options have generally positive characteristics.

Gene Høglund, Working Families for an Elevated Solution:

- Concerned about the cost of a bored tunnel. Also concerned about the grades, ventilation, and escape routes required for such a structure.
- Does not believe waterfront tunnels are valid options due to their construction impacts.
- Supports both elevated options because they would connect Ballard and Magnolia to West Seattle and points south. Their cost is low compared to the tunnels.

- Thinks we have not adequately incorporated traffic volumes from peak event and cruise ship passenger traffic into our evaluation of the scenarios.

Mary McCumber, Futurewise:

- Interested in Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface proposal.
- Surface and transit building blocks have merit.
- I-5 improvements are critical.
- Supports tolling to reduce demand and raise revenue for transportation improvements.
- Open to considering additional highway capacity. Some interest in a bored tunnel, but is not supportive of elevated options.

Mike O'Brien, Sierra Club:

- The bored tunnel option needs to be reworked to allow the viaduct to come down in 2012.
- The integrated elevated option is a creative idea with fatal flaws. Should not be carried forward.
- The high levels of transportation demand management used in Scenario A should be carried forward. Such policies can be tweaked over time.
- Must invest in transit.
- Wants some version of surface and transit to move forward. Shares concerns about the Alaskan Way/Western Avenue couplet, but defers to experts about what works best.
- Opposes building a bored tunnel along with a surface option. We should not assume that a surface option will not work by itself. Instead, we should set checkpoints or milestones for deciding whether a bored tunnel is necessary.

Peter Philips, Seattle Marine Business Coalition:

- Disappointed that a retrofit of the existing viaduct was not considered. Still believes it is the best option.
- WSDOT needs to ensure that the viaduct has the maintenance it requires, so we can take the time to decide properly how it should be replaced.
- The maritime industrial sector is dependent on throughput capacity and minimizing construction impacts.
- Wants the integrated elevated option to move forward. It has been as vetted as any other scenario.
- A surface option is not viable, unless it is shown that capacity would be maintained and construction impacts would be minimal.

Carol Binder, Pike Place Market:

- The market supports looking at a surface/subsurface option. Supports subsurface because throughput is important.
- Does not support the Alaskan Way/Western Avenue couplet. It would fundamentally change the market.
- The market has never supported an elevated option.

Todd Vogel, Allied Arts:

- A sustainable city must be denser – make walking and biking preferred modes.
- Need to reconnect the waterfront.
- Need to protect surface streets from large traffic volumes – need to invest in transit and transportation demand management.
- Elevated options exact too high a price for mobility.
- Any surface option should have a plan to reduce the level of traffic itself.
- One option should be subsurface – quick way to remove cars and improve urban fabric.

John Coney, Uptown/Queen Anne:

- Surface plus transit gives us the most opportunity to reknit the street grid between Uptown and South Lake Union.
- It is important that Mercer Street and Denny Way work well in any solution.
- Cost is a paramount element.
- Fears that we are moving to reconcentrate traffic along Alaskan Way. Spread the traffic out – use the grid.
- Start planning for more substantial transit in West Seattle.
- It is important to maintain the Elliott and Western Avenue connections to SR 99.
- Favors a surface plus transit plus I-5 option. Also favors a tunnel solution.

Mahlon Clements, Ballard/Fremont:

- A surface plus transit option is a prudent way to go. People will adapt. The struggle is freight mobility.
- In the surface street options, consider ways to better support industry.
- Open to a lidded trench option, but it is critical that it serves manufacturing. Impacts from a lidded trench could hurt the historical waterfront.
- A bored tunnel seems more like throughput for vehicles than for freight.

Pete Spalding, West Seattle:

- West Seattle needs access to the downtown business district. Remember, however, that not everyone goes downtown.
- Increasing transit options from West Seattle is a must. This means not making everybody go downtown to make a transit connection.
- Need to limit construction disruptions.
- Suggests including a bored tunnel, an integrated elevated structure and Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface proposal among the hybrid scenarios.

Warren Aakervik, Interbay/BINMIC:

- Need to remember that the majority of viaduct traffic is through traffic.
- Still has not heard how he will get his business's diesel oil through the viaduct corridor. The ability to move hazardous materials is also missing from Mr. Washburn's surface/subsurface hybrid.
- An economic analysis of the maritime industry needs to be added to the scenario evaluation process.

- Absent the viaduct, the most logical corridor for freight would be using I-5 to Mercer Street, but the city's streetcar plans would compromise that route.

Agenda Item #3: Discussion of measures presented and prepared for Dec. 4.

Grace Crunican continued the discussion with questions related to the economic evaluation presented at the Dec. 4 SAC meeting. She introduced Terry Moore of ECONorthwest, who was responsible for the economic evaluation study presented to the SAC. Jim Hebert (Hebert Research), though not a member of the project team, was present at the request of several SAC members to discuss his 2006 economic evaluation of the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement project. Grace opened the floor to questions.

Terry and Jim began the discussion with a comparison of their economic evaluation approaches. While the two studies had some similarities, Terry's report used the estimated change in travel times to estimate how businesses would react, while Jim's earlier report looked at comparable projects and used a probability sample of 400 businesses.

Question – If you can not use the viaduct to reach a business, and go someplace closer instead, is that a net economic loss?

Answer (Jim – Hebert Research) – Some areas would gain, and some areas would lose. Economic activity would be pushed out further north, south or across Lake Washington. Some will go away.

Answer (Terry - ECONorthwest) – Our model uses a larger area. It does not estimate distributional impacts.

Comment – The two-way Mercer Street project would worsen traffic. The city also plans to take a lane away on Nickerson Street. These effects are not accounted for in the economic model. You also left out the effects of cruise passenger traffic.

Response (Terry - ECONorthwest) – We did not leave out the effect of cruise passenger traffic. We used a regional model, and that traffic is included within the numbers generated by the model.

Question – I understand that travel time differences have an economic cost, but different vehicles have different costs per hour. How do we understand those differentials in the model?

Answer (Terry - ECONorthwest) – Our model is driven off of travel time changes. Those changes are entered into an economic model that includes different industries, such as freight.

Question – In Terry's model, the baseline is that the viaduct is gone and we have created a minimal alternative route. You then add the other building blocks included in each scenario, and the travel demand model assumes how they work. Jim's evaluation used three cities with similar construction and then took those case studies to businesses to ask how they would be impacted. Is this a fair characterization of the differences between the two analyses?

Answer (Terry - ECONorthwest) – Our model also assumed that trips still get made. They may just get made in a different way.

Answer (Jim – Hebert Research) – I did throw out one of my comparative samples – Boston's Big Dig – because mitigation included in that project meant there wasn't an economic impact.

Question – In your sample of 400 businesses, what input did you take to the businesses?

Answer (Jim – Hebert Research) – We took to the 400 businesses the two scenarios presented by WSDOT – a partial closure of the viaduct during construction and a complete closure of the viaduct during construction. For each business, we asked how those scenarios would affect their ability to retain employees and affect their retail business.

Question – Is it your conclusion that a lack of throughput in a viaduct replacement would increase urban sprawl?

Answer (Jim – Hebert Research) – Yes. Many of the outlying areas would look at such a situation as an economic upside for them.

Agenda Item #4: Action Items and Next Meeting Agenda

Grace thanked everyone for being at the briefing. The next SAC meeting is set for Dec. 11.

December 11, 2008

Alaskan Way Viaduct
Stakeholder Advisory Committee – Dec. 11, 2008
Meeting Summary

Agenda Item #1 – Welcome, Introductions and Overview of Meeting

King County Department of Transportation Assistant Director Ron Posthuma welcomed Stakeholder Advisory Committee members and the public to the meeting. After introductions and housekeeping items, he reminded attendees about the Public Forum being held at 5 p.m. on Dec. 15 at Town Hall and the Dec. 18 Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting that will be held at 4 p.m., in the Bertha Landes room at City Hall. He noted the evening marked an important milestone in the process, with the unveiling of two hybrid scenarios. In addition to presenting the new scenarios, representatives of the three agencies wanted to explain the thinking behind them. They want to gather feedback from committee members about the hybrids and the direction of the process, which is nearing its end.

Meeting attendance was as follows:

Stakeholder Advisory Committee attendees:

- Jeff Altman, Northwest County
- John Coney, Uptown/Queen Anne
- Bob Donegan, Seattle Historic Waterfront Coalition
- Kathy Fletcher, People for Puget Sound
- David Freiboth, King County Labor Council
- Gene Hoglund, Working Families for an Elevated Solution
- Mary Hurley, Ballard/Fremont
- Rob Johnson, Transportation Choices Coalition
- Mary McCumber, Futurewise
- Cary Moon, People's Waterfront Coalition
- Don Newby, Southwest County
- Mike O'Brien, Sierra Club
- John Odland, Manufacturing Industrial Council
- Jim O'Halloran, Northeast Seattle
- Vlad Oustimovitch, West Seattle
- John Pehrson, Belltown
- Peter Philips, Seattle Marine Business Coalition
- Susan Ranf, Sports stadiums
- Rob Sexton, Downtown Seattle Association
- Pete Spalding, West Seattle
- Todd Vogel, Allied Arts
- Tayloe Washburn, Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce

SAC Members not in attendance:

- Warren Aakervik, Interbay/BINMIC
- Chuck Ayers, Cascade Bicycle Club
- Carol Binder, Pike Place Market
- Mahlon Clements, Ballard/Fremont
- Earl Richardson, Southeast Seattle
- Sue Taoka, International District
- Herald Ugles, International Longshore and Warehouse Union
-

Agencies and Staff announced in attendance:

- David Dye – WSDOT Deputy Secretary
- Grace Crunican – SDOT Director
- Harold Taniguchi – KCDOT Director
- Ron Paananen – WSDOT Urban Corridors Deputy Administrator
- Ron Posthuma – KCDOT Assistant Director
- Bob Powers – SDOT Deputy Director
- Steve Pearce – SDOT Urban Mobility Plan Manager
- John White – WSDOT AWVSRP Director
- Jim Parsons – Parametrix, Independent Project Manager
- Ralph Iboshi – KPFF, Independent Project Management Team
- Randy McCourt – DKS, Independent Project Management Team

Agenda Item #2 – Scenario review – what did we learn?

Independent Project Manager Jim Parsons of Parametrix reviewed the eight scenarios, explaining what was learned about how their various components measured up against the guiding principles.

The first and sixth guiding principles (public safety, health of the environment) were not discussed in detail for this review, because earlier studies showed they were not a distinguishing factor across the scenarios.

Information on the evaluation of the eight scenarios, including the fact sheet on what was learned from evaluating them can be found at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/library-meetingmaterials.htm>

Scenario A would have fewer construction traffic mitigation impacts and a shorter construction period, and would increase property values as a result of noise reduction, open space and views. The four-lane boulevard would have a wide footprint and would place more vehicles on the waterfront than the couplet; five to six lanes at intersections would create longer pedestrian connections to the waterfront. Like other scenarios, the total cost of Scenario A would exceed the state’s commitment of \$2.8 billion. The SR 99 elements could be constructed within that budget, but additional resources would be required for I-5, surface streets and transit.

For **Scenario B**, investments in I-5 would improve vehicle throughput and maintain today's travel times. Travel times would increase on SR 99 through the central waterfront. A high level of bus and streetcar investment would exceed mobility needs. Like Scenario A, it would have a shorter construction period and fewer construction traffic mitigation impacts, and would increase property and land values due to noise reduction, open space and views. It would also create longer pedestrian connections to the waterfront. The SR 99 component of Scenario B could be constructed within the state's \$2.8 billion funding commitment, but additional resources would be required to fund other elements.

The one-way couplet in **Scenario C** would be the most effective surface alternative for moving vehicles through the waterfront. Investments in I-5 would improve vehicle throughput and maintain today's travel times, though travel times would increase on the SR 99 corridor through the central waterfront. Increased transit would significantly contribute to mobility needs. As in other surface options, Scenario C would have fewer construction traffic mitigation impacts and a shorter construction period. It would have shorter pedestrian connections and a narrower footprint than a four-lane Alaskan Way Boulevard, though it would affect the character of Western Avenue between Yesler Way and Pike Street. The SR 99 component of Scenario C could be constructed within the state's \$2.8 billion commitment, but additional resources would be required for other elements.

Scenario D would most closely resemble current traffic patterns in the SR 99 corridor. The elevated structure would provide a bypass connection through downtown Seattle, with connections to Elliott/Western and Aurora. Travel times for trips through the central waterfront would be closer to current times than the surface scenarios. Flammables or hazardous materials would be allowed on the structure during non-peak periods. Scenario D would have greater construction effects and thus higher mitigation costs; it would take two to three years longer to build than a surface scenario. The structure would have view, shading, noise and open space effects on the waterfront. The SR 99 components of Scenario D could be constructed within the state's \$2.8 billion commitment, but additional resources would be required for other elements.

Scenario E, along with scenarios D and G, would most closely resemble current traffic patterns on the SR 99 corridor. The elevated structure would provide a bypass connection through downtown Seattle, with connections to Elliott/Western and Aurora. Travel times for trips through the central waterfront would be closer to current times than the surface scenarios. Flammables and hazardous materials would be allowed on the structure during non-peak periods. The construction impacts of Scenario E would be slightly greater than those of Scenario D. There are concerns about the viability of the commercial development under the highway structure. Scenario E would have more view and shading effects on the waterfront than the independent elevated structure. Noise levels at the east-west streets would be similar to the existing viaduct, but quieter at mid-block locations. This scenario has the most acres of open space, but that space is of a lower quality than that of other scenarios; there are concerns about accessibility and safety. The 40-foot

promenade on the waterfront would be the smallest of all of the scenarios, and its use for multiple purposes would compromise its quality as open space. Scenario E would also divide the historic waterfront from downtown and Pioneer Square. Its cost would exceed the state's \$2.8 billion commitment.

Scenario F would provide a SR 99 bypass through downtown, but would not include Elliott and Western avenues; traffic on those streets would use a surface couplet to access the waterfront. It is expected that flammable and hazardous materials would not be allowed in the bored tunnel. The tunnel's performance could be enhanced by other improvements to the system, such as I-5 improvements and demand management strategies. The scenario would have the lowest transit investment, and thus the fewest transit riders. Scenario F would require the longest construction time, but the current viaduct could remain in place during construction. Disruptions to the waterfront would be similar to those in Scenario C. There would be an increase in property and land values as a result of noise reduction, open space and views. The couplet in Scenario F would have a narrower footprint and shorter pedestrian connections than the four-lane Alaskan Way Boulevard. The SR 99 component of Scenario F would exceed the state's \$2.8 billion commitment; alternative construction techniques could possibly reduce costs by several hundred million dollars, and save at least two years in the schedule.

Scenario G would have a similar transportation performance as D and E. It is expected that flammables and hazardous materials would not be allowed in the cut and cover tunnel. Construction disruptions on the waterfront would be most significant with Scenario G, taking two to three years longer than surface and transit scenarios. The cut and cover tunnel would have the highest construction risk. There would be an increase in property and land values as a result of noise reduction, open space and views. Scenario G would include approximately 76 feet of open space directly adjacent to the waterfront; with SR 99 under Elliott and Western avenues, the urban environment and connectivity with Belltown would be improved. The north/south portals of the tunnel would restrict pedestrian movements. The west wall of the tunnel would serve as the new seawall. The SR 99 component of Scenario G would exceed the state's \$2.8 billion commitment.

Scenario H, as configured, would not provide significant bypass capacity. If lengthened to provide adequate bypass, costs would approach those of a cut and cover tunnel. Travel times in the SR 99 corridor would be similar to surface scenarios, but could be improved by removing signalized intersections in the north. It is expected that flammables and hazardous materials would not be allowed in the lidded trench. Construction disruptions would be similar to those of a cut and cover tunnel, taking two to three years longer than surface and transit scenarios. Open space, pedestrian crossings and views would be similar to the surface boulevard, but noise levels would be slightly higher. The north/south portals of the tunnel would restrict pedestrian movements. The SR 99 component of Scenario H would exceed the state's \$2.8 billion commitment.

Question – Is it accurate to say that \$2.8 billion is the point at which these scenarios cost too much?

Answer – *That number is an important marker as it relates to the SR 99 elements.*

Question – Was cost used as a way to eliminate some elements?

Answer – It was a consideration.

Question – Can you please break down the funding equation?

Answer – The \$2.8 billion number stemmed from the September 2006 options. That number became a policy level commitment for the state, though in actuality there was a \$2.4 billion placeholder with \$400 million in additional funding that could be used for either the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement or SR 520. That \$400 million was later shifted to SR 520, but the state's commitment remains.

Question – Does the project include any federal money?

Answer – There is about \$235 million available, but most of it will go toward replacing the southern mile of the viaduct.

Question – So that leaves about \$2.2 billion in funding generated in the state?

Answer – Yes, mostly through the gas tax.

Jim then gave an overview of the two hybrid scenarios. The hybrids combine the best elements from the previous eight scenarios, including improvements to I-5, surface streets, transit, and demand management.

A copy of the presentation and fact sheets on the two hybrid scenarios can be found at: <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/library-meetingmaterials.htm>

The I-5/surface/transit hybrid alternative is primarily a combination of the three previous surface boulevard options based on what performed well in the evaluation:

- Includes two one-way boulevards on Alaskan Way and Western Avenue each with three lanes of traffic.
- Increases open space on the waterfront for pedestrians, and offers urban design benefits.
- Accommodates a similar number of trips as other options when additional improvements are made to the transportation system, such as adding transit service hours and improving I-5 through downtown.
- Moves the same amount of people and goods but with some of the trips made differently.

The other hybrid alternative chosen, is the SR 99 elevated bypass:

- Includes two independent bridge structures with two lanes in each direction.
- Preserves mobility on the SR 99 corridor as a bypass of downtown, and maintains Elliott/Western connections.
- Maintains travel times for freight and vehicle trips within the city of Seattle.
- Offers the lowest cost of the bypass scenarios.

Question – Is there already funding for I-5 maintenance, or is that future funding?

Answer – There is \$115 million in future funding. It depends on what the legislature chooses to do.

Question – How much funding is included for the streetcar?

Answer – The First Avenue streetcar would cost approximately \$130 million.

Question – Neither of these solutions are acceptable for freight. What specifically is included in here to help keep trucks moving?

Answer – I-5 is the most significant freight corridor in the region, and it would be improved.

Question – Have you taken into account that many more trucks will be needed due to increased travel times?

Answer – There will be some localized impacts – for example, on trips between SODO and Interbay – but from a regional standpoint, these improvements would address freight issues.

Question – Is there a rule of thumb for how much time a single stoplight adds to travel times?

Answer – About twenty seconds to one minute per signalized intersection as compared to a route without traffic signals, such as a limited access facility.

Question – A large portion of economic growth in the region is occurring north of downtown, like at South Lake Union. How are people in West Seattle going to get to those jobs?

Answer – Travel times would increase for those trips with a surface option, but there would be more access points to South Lake Union and Seattle Center.

Comment – We need travel time numbers for the new scenarios for trips between West Seattle and South Lake Union.

Harold Taniguchi introduced Gov. Christine Gregoire, Mayor Greg Nickels and King County Executive Ron Sims who addressed committee members. The three executives had just been briefed on the project. All three thanked committee members, agency leaders and staff for their work on the project. They stressed the importance of reaching a timely decision and moving forward to replace the viaduct.

The group then returned to Q&A with Jim Parsons

Question – How does the surface scenario address ferry traffic?

Answer – The ferry system is undergoing major changes. They're looking at a reservation system and other long-range planning tools that could alter the ferry terminal's effects on traffic. Most significantly, these changes could result in lower vehicle demand at Colman Dock.

Question – Did you look at omitting the least productive elements of the scenarios to reduce costs?

Answer – Yes.

Question – Can you explain how one-way traffic will move near the aquarium?

Answer – *At the north end we begin to see some loss in efficiency. We'll be looking at adding connections to Western Avenue. The whole configuration from Union Street north needs to be studied further.*

Question – Would the extension of Pike St. be where the hillclimb is now?

Answer – *Yes, but we're looking at several possible extensions.*

Question – Is the underpass at Aurora/Mercer four or six lanes?

Answer – *It is six lanes in both scenarios.*

Comment – The bypass hybrid lacks sufficient east-west connections across Aurora. Those connections are vital to the functioning of Denny and Mercer, which are both at capacity. Also, I don't see a connection between the South Lake Union streetcar line and the central line. Finally, I think West Seattle is getting the short end of the stick.

WSDOT Deputy Director David Dye, KCDOT Director Harold Taniguchi and SDOT Director Grace Crunican explained their thoughts on the hybridization process. They agreed the hybrids were a good compromise and further refinement is necessary.

Agenda Item #3 – Feedback from Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Taylor Washburn, Seattle Chamber of Commerce:

- The hybrid alternatives shown are not likely to achieve success.
- The surface and transit option has many good components, but will not meet all of our needs or be adopted by the Legislature.
- The elevated scenario also has some positives, but I don't think it will garner enough support to move forward.
- SR 99 is part of an interdependent state system; it's one of three north-south corridors in the region and it's an essential route for moving goods.
- Added travel time means added cost for Boeing and other manufacturers.
- The key is making a wise long-term investment; a bored tunnel in combination with surface, transit, and I-5 elements is the right choice.
- It would be a major policy error to simply go with the cheapest option.
- We should use local improvement districts and regional tolling to fund the project, and it should be funded in phases.
- Three absent SAC members – Sue Taoka, Carol Binder and Earl Richardson – have told me they support the surface, transit, and bored tunnel alternative.

David Freiboth, King County Labor Council:

- Between these two options I prefer the elevated, but if we only move these two forward I fear we'll have a political meltdown.
- These two options do not meet my expectations.

- We have a chance to reconnect to our waterfront; we do not want to build another Kingdome, which was demolished 20 years after it was built on the cheap.
- The politicians need to be willing to compromise.

Mike O'Brien, Sierra Club:

- I'm excited that the surface/transit option is still on the table, and hope it makes it through the Legislature.
- Either option will provide jobs.
- It would be easy for either option to fail, due to politics.

Gene Hoglund, Working Families for an Elevated Solution:

- I'm happy to see the elevated structure is still on the table.
- The SR 99 corridor is critical.
- The tunnel options all have problems.
- The bored tunnel would not connect to Ballard, would not serve the cruise ship terminal; it would also cause pollution, slow traffic and could be unsafe due to its location in the middle of a fault line.
- The surface option would destroy the city.

Peter Philips, Seattle Marine Business Coalition:

- East-west connections would be affected more than the models show.
- We do not have to take the viaduct down, but we will because some people want to.
- I do not like these two options.
- I prefer the Integrated Elevated and bored tunnel plans.
- Frank Chopp was very responsive to our criticisms of his plans, and actually made adjustments based on our feedback.
- If we go with a surface and transit option, the bored tunnel has to come first.

Todd Vogel, Allied Arts:

- I see three main concerns emerging: surface traffic impact on bicycle and pedestrian access, the movement of freight traffic, and movement through the city.
- I would like to see information for traffic flows at each street in each of the hybrids.
- Is it correct that there are nine lanes on Jackson Street in the surface scenario? If so, that worries me.
- I do not like the idea of a fifth lane on Second and Fourth avenues.
- I would like more information about the lid connecting Steinbrueck Park to the waterfront.
- I would like to see travel times for freight in the hybrids.
- I would like to see how much money is available for transit with each option.
- I would like more details on the demand management element – I think the price system is an excellent way of controlling demand.
- Develop the surface/transit option and discard the elevated option.
- Keep the sub-surface option alive.
- I favor the use of Local Improvement District funding.

- Please protect the quality of our streets and look at how we can change transportation behavior in the city.

John Coney, Uptown/Queen Anne:

- Most homeowners do not understand the debt they owe downtown, which contributes a great deal to the tax base. A better downtown creates a better tax base
- I do not favor a freeway on the waterfront. We need a 21st century solution.
- The elevated option is based on 20th century values.
- The usage of cars, and the number of trips people are taking, is changing.
- We need a mode shift to transit.
- Pier 91 is served by a good transit corridor that the waterfront streetcar would help.
- The Western/Battery street intersection has a turn that would be difficult to navigate.
- I support the continued study of a bored tunnel.

Jeff Altman:

- Of the two options, I prefer surface/transit.
- I disagree with the removal of the four park and rides.
- The surface, transit, I-5, and bored tunnel solution is my favorite.
- I'm happy to see the Integrated Elevated off the table.
- Something people may have missed in the Gehl report: The waterfront promenade could be too wide to be a good "people space."
- The comment about it being unsafe to build a tunnel on a fault line is nonsense, as evidenced by the continued survival of the BART tunnel in San Francisco.

Pete Spalding, West Seattle:

- I have major concerns about connecting to West Seattle.
- There are too many stoplights in the surface/transit option.
- We need more transit to West Seattle.
- RapidRide on Delridge is not an adequate solution by itself.
- Not everyone is going downtown – you need to consider the need for bypass.
- I'd like to see the continued study of a bored tunnel.

John Odland, Manufacturing Industrial Council:

- I came in with an open mind.
- Capacity and minimal construction disruption are my top priorities.
- Those of us around the table have a great deal in common. Trucks and bicyclists share a mutual fear of one another.
- Please remember that freight cannot be consolidated into transit.
- The number of trucks on the road will increase as a result of longer travel times.
- I support neither option being moved forward because they do not adequately address the needs of freight.
- The potential of a bored tunnel is exciting, and I support it moving forward.
- Tunnel costs so far have not been substantiated.

Bob Donegan, Seattle Historic Waterfront Coalition:

- The waterfront to this point has neither supported nor opposed any option; today we convened and agreed to support a bored tunnel.
- The options presented tonight do not meet our needs. Both options would put us out of business.
- I would like to know what happened today that led to the removal of a bored tunnel from consideration.
- I would like analysis for all three options (bored tunnel included). I am interested in traffic data, pedestrian counts, transit, parking, the environment, freight times, noise and open space.
- I would like to see a tolling analysis done that illustrates the impacts of tolling on downtown.

Cary Moon, People’s Waterfront Coalition:

- This has been a good process that should be used as a template by other cities.
- I favor the I-5/surface/transit option because it has the lowest cost, is flexible and would be the best option for businesses. It also solves mobility and access issues for vehicles and freight.
- I think freight, waterfront, market, neighborhood and bicycle access need to be studied further.
- I would like to see the I-5/surface/transit option implemented fully, while we continue studying a tunnel.
- I am open to a tunnel later, but not before we determine if it is needed.

Mary McCumber, Futurewise:

- We need to connect the city to the waterfront.
- This is a time of change for transportation.
- We need to move forward quickly with the I-5/surface/transit option.
- I support the I-5 and traffic management elements.
- I believe transportation pricing manages demand.
- We do not need to decide on a tunnel right now; we have the flexibility to choose to do that later.

Don Newby, Southwest County:

- I came in unbiased; I believe strongly in regional transportation.
- I and those I represent support the surface, transit, I-5, and bored tunnel option.
- Boeing is a transient company, with workers frequently being transferred throughout the region – thus we need to maintain good connectivity.
- We made a mistake putting the convention center above I-5.
- Traffic displaced from SR 99 will impact I-5.
- We need to make transit improvements.
- We’re double-counting transit riders in our analysis, since most people commute both ways via the same mode.
- I like the bored tunnel and consider it safe.
- My major concern is north-south movement.

- We've not accounted for the impacts of the future extension of SR 509 to I-5; this will bring more traffic on SR 99.

Jim O'Halloran, Northeast Seattle:

- North Seattle has a smaller stake than some interests at this table.
- I do not want to see an elevated.
- I like a bored tunnel, and I like the surface, transit, I-5 and bored tunnel plan.
- We need to preserve flexibility.

Mary Hurley, Ballard/Fremont:

- I came in biased on behalf of Ballard.
- Ballard wants a retrofit or an elevated.
- We have not come up with an adequate solution.
- I like the Integrated Elevated, and echo Bob's points about the bored tunnel.
- We need to meet with tunnel experts.
- We need an ad hoc committee of committee members to help shepherd this process going forward.

John Pehrson, Belltown:

- Of the two, I prefer the I-5/surface/transit option.
- On the elevated option, from Virginia to Battery Street Tunnel, is that a retrofit or new structure?
- There are many unanswered questions about the area around Virginia Street.
- Can some of us meet with you soon to discuss our issues?

Kathy Fletcher, People for Puget Sound:

- Of the two, I prefer the I-5/surface/transit option.
- Flexibility is important.
- We should still look into a tunnel.
- All options should be carried out in a way that promotes the health of Puget Sound.
- I use the viaduct all the time, but I'm ready to try something new.

Rob Johnson, Transportation Choices Coalition:

- I have learned a great deal from this process.
- We need to preserve the option of the waterfront without the viaduct.
- The I-5/surface/transit option can be a long-term solution.
- I support regional tolling.

Rob Sexton, Downtown Seattle Association:

- I do not support an elevated because it is irresponsible.
- We need to reconnect downtown to the waterfront.
- I support the I-5/surface/transit, but I am concerned about freight.
- The solution is to phase funding, like the state did with I-405.
- Do not make this decision solely based on cost.
- Keep the bored tunnel on the table and eliminate the elevated option.

Vlad Oustimovich, West Seattle:

- Most people at the table agree on how to move forward.
- The two alternatives you've presented are ideological opposites.
- The bored tunnel is the least obtrusive bypass option.
- Transit is key.

Susan Ranf, Sports Stadiums:

- We need to keep the bored tunnel on the table and eliminate the elevated option.
- I agree with the surface, transit, I-5, and bored tunnel plan, but the tunnel should be a top priority – it cannot wait until later.
- We need to build infrastructure now to attract and maintain businesses.

Agenda Item #4 – Action items and next meeting agenda

Harold thanked SAC members and reminded them about the public forum at 5 p.m. on Monday, Dec. 15 at Town Hall, and the next committee meeting, on Thursday, Dec. 18 at 4 p.m. in the Bertha Landes Room. He said that input is being heard and appreciated, and that members are offering valuable feedback. The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

December 18, 2008

**Alaskan Way Viaduct Stakeholder Advisory Committee
December 18, 2008, 4 – 7:30 p.m.
Seattle City Hall, Bertha Landes Room
Agenda**

	Time	Topic	Presenter	Materials
1.	4:00 to 4:10 p.m.	Welcome, Introductions and Overview of Meeting	Dave Dye, Deputy Secretary Washington State Department of Transportation	
2.	4:10 to 4:30 p.m.	Report Out of Public Forum and Bored Tunnel Briefing	Ron Paananen, Washington State Department of Transportation Bob Powers, Seattle Department of Transportation	
3.	4:30 to 5:15 p.m.	Technical Evaluation Follow-up on Questions Raised by Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members	Jim Parsons, Independent Project Manager Randy McCourt, Independent Project Manager	Presentation Handout
BREAK				
4.	5:30 to 7:15 p.m.	Summary of What the Agencies have Heard from Stakeholder Advisory Committee Final Feedback from Committee	Dave Dye Harold Taniguchi, King County Department of Transportation Grace Crunican, Seattle Department of Transportation	Handout
5.	7:15 to 7:30 p.m.	Action Items and Adjournment	Dave Dye	