



Meeting Summary
SR 520 Legislative Workgroup - Westside Subgroup Meeting #3
Tuesday, November 10, 2009
9 a.m. to noon
University of Washington Waterfront Activities Center

Attendees:

In attendance:

- Representative Scott White, 43rd District, Subgroup Chair
- Speaker Frank Chopp, 43rd District
- Representative Jamie Pedersen, 43rd District

- Representative Larry Springer, 45th District
- Senator Ken Jacobsen, 46th District
- Senator Dan Swecker, 20th District

Not in attendance:

- Senator Ed Murray, 43rd District

Welcome and introductions (Rep. White)

Rep. White, Westside Subgroup chair, welcomed the group and reviewed the meeting agenda. He said that the focus of the subgroup's work today would be to discuss specific considerations about the westside options in order to share them with the full Workgroup at the November 17 meeting.

Design elements review of Options A, K, L, A+ and M (Barbara Gilliland, David Dye, Julie Meredith, Dave Warner)

Barbara Gilliland, Workgroup Administrator, invited David Dye, WSDOT Deputy Secretary, Julie Meredith, SR 520 Program Director and Dave Warner, SR 520 Westside Project Manager to the presenter's table to be available for questions. Ms. Gilliland then presented a matrix of considerations that outlined the westside issue areas the workgroup had identified throughout this process. During the discussion, Ms. Gilliland introduced each issue with a brief overview of previous discussions and presentations. The issue areas included the following:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ▪ Bascule bridge crossing over the Montlake Cut. | ▪ Transit connectivity. |
| ▪ Immersed tube tunnel or sequential excavation method tunnel crossing under the Montlake Cut. | ▪ West approach profile. |
| ▪ Arboretum. | ▪ Portage Bay Bridge. |
| ▪ Capacity on Montlake Boulevard. | ▪ Environmental documentation and permitting. |
| | ▪ Cost. |

Ms. Gilliland noted new westside options [comparison charts](#) and the [cost maps](#) presented at the November 5 Working Session were included in the members' meeting materials to

supplement their discussion. The comparison charts included data about cost, design, traffic operations and environmental and construction impacts for the five westside design options (A, K, L, A+ and M). She noted that at the last workgroup meeting, Mr. Dye had reminded the group that over the long life of this project, the motto had been “integral to and inseparable from,” meaning that there are specific design elements that have been agreed upon by the communities. Ms. Gilliland stated that as the group walks through this discussion, it is important to remember what has been agreed to with the communities in and surrounding the SR 520 corridor. She also noted the group is past the point where they can mix and match features from the different design options. She would like the group to focus on each option as a whole.

Throughout the discussion, meeting support staff filled out the [matrix](#) to capture the group’s key considerations for each of the issue areas.

Bascule bridge crossing over the Montlake Cut:

QUESTION: Please explain the operations of the bascule bridge in the different options. (Rep. White)

RESPONSE: *Based on what we heard at the last subgroup meeting, WSDOT is coordinating with the Northwest Region Operations Center to submit a proposal to the US Coast Guard about changing the bridge openings on Husky game days and other off-peak hours. We would essentially extend the period to match the peak travel times. (Julie Meredith)*

RESPONSE: *The bridge currently opens during off-peak hours and is the source of traffic back-ups on Montlake Boulevard. During the midday period the bridge opens roughly twice a day every day throughout the year. The maximum openings are between June to August, where the bridge can open up to eight times a day. Each of the options are affected by these openings. The travel times that you will see most affected are the local buses traveling northbound to the Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street intersection.*

In options K, L and M there is a benefit for the buses traveling from the SR 520 corridor because they do not need to travel over the Montlake Bridge. You will not see as much of a time savings with Option L because traffic still has to cross a drawbridge. Compared to the No Build alternative, we did see a benefit for Option A. (Michael Horntvedt)

QUESTION: Looking at the budget page for a second bascule bridge, the cost would be around \$81 million? (Rep. White)

RESPONSE: *Yes, for Option A. However, in Option L, it would be more. (Julie Meredith)*

QUESTION: Looking at the data sheet, please explain how the travel times are less with a second bascule bridge in Option A? (Rep. Springer)

RESPONSE: *It is referring to the off-peak bridge openings. There are more lanes over the Montlake Cut. Capacity is greater, so the travel times are improved when the bridge is down. (Michael Horntvedt)*

QUESTION: So it's a capacity issue? (Rep. Springer)

RESPONSE: Yes, that's correct. (Michael Horntvedt)

QUESTION: Do we have data that would make a comparison of the traffic flow and the time saved by Option K in the tunnel when you are not impacted by bridge openings versus Option A with the second bascule bridge? (Rep. Springer)

RESPONSE: Yes, those figures are in the [data sheet](#) under the transit section – local peak travel times. (Michael Horntvedt)

COMMENT: This may be a good point to put in the matrix. Yes, one of the lower cost options is to build a second Montlake Bridge. There could be some different travel time savings between the options. There have been some concerns expressed about delays when the Montlake Bridge is open. (Rep. White)

QUESTION: Are there local impacts that would occur with or without this option [Option A] included in your data between the different options? (Sen. Swecker)

REPOSE: It depends on if you are talking about transportation or natural and built environmental effects because in Option A, WSDOT would acquire two homes for the bascule bridge. The bascule bridge costs \$81 million. It does improve travel times but it does open so in off-peak periods there is a disadvantage. In Option L, the second bascule bridge crosses over the Montlake Cut but would cost about \$300 million. It would be one of the largest bascule bridges in the world, so it would have significant visual effect as noted by the neighborhoods. (Julie Meredith)

COMMENT: Visual and cost impacts to the community are two important items to consider. (Sen. Swecker)

Immersed tube tunnel or sequential excavation method tunnel crossing under the Montlake Cut:

QUESTION: Is there anything that WSDOT would like to add to the conversation that the group had at the last meeting about the tunneling method for Option M? Anything specific to community impacts or the amount of fill that would need to be removed? (Barbara Gilliland)

RESPONSE: Yes. At the last meeting, Don Forbes and the expert review panel highlighted the quantities of excavation for the construction of Option K and M. It would be significantly more than in Option A or Option A+ Hybrid. (Julie Meredith)

QUESTION: I'm concerned about the environmental impacts from the standpoint of permissibility and the cost of mitigation pertaining to these design options. Do we have any information on this? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: Currently, we have more information on Option K. The resource agencies spoke to you about some of the issues they had with all the options. They talked about the challenges of permitting Option K. We would have similar challenges with Option M. We would need to excavate pits on the north and south side of the Cut and then conduct open

dredging of the Cut to install the tube. These are all effects that we have not analyzed in the supplemental draft environmental impact statement. In order for us to discuss this with the resource agencies, it would take about six months. (Julie Meredith)

QUESTION: Is there any discussion of the mitigation on Option M? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *Not on Option M. We have not furthered those discussions because the option is still at a conceptual level. (Julie Meredith)*

COMMENT: I'd like point out a few things about the tunnel. I'm concerned about the construction viability and the uncertainty associated with the environmental impacts. On the other hand, I would like to consider the benefits to the immediate communities who have worked on this option. (Rep. White)

QUESTION: You mentioned a six month delay of the environmental impact statement if we pick Option M. Under any scenario, would funding for any of the options be available between now and six months later? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *We have not completed the finance plan. (Julie Meredith)*

COMMENT: There would probably be time. The financing would not be ready immediately especially if the state operating budget is under a \$2 billion budget deficit. (Spkr. Chopp)

QUESTION: Could you put litigation under all the options? I've suggested this to Rep. White and others. There should be a negotiation between the impacted communities, WSDOT and the Governor's office. Without this, the likelihood of litigation on every option is pretty high. We've made a lot of progress to get to Option M and meet the criteria for this process in terms of cost, etc. and I would encourage further negotiations. I've been through a lot of freeway fights over the years and litigation is almost always a factor unless there are negotiations with the communities to solve the community concerns. It could cause some real problems in terms of meeting deadlines and financing. The communities directly impacted have been working hard. I've talked to Rep. White about this and hope that we can move forward with negotiations. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *Yes. We have been in dialogue about this; I have been waiting for a response from the Option M group. I know that WSDOT would be happy to participate. With respect to today, I think we can put litigation in the "other" category under all options. (Rep. White)*

RESPONSE: *The issue of the schedule is critical. One of the things we need to do is take action on the environmental process without delay. The floating bridge and necessary landings are tied to this environmental document and WSDOT will be moving forward to have the replacement bridge in place by 2014. Some action has to be taken and ideally we will take the action that is the preferred option for the westside interchange. We have got to make a decision so that we can get the floating bridge into place. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: I hear what you are saying but if you go down that path it is still likely for significant litigation that will delay the process. I'm asking everyone to keep coming to reason on this issue and keep negotiations going with the communities impacted. It could be a quicksand situation that delays the project. There has been a lot of progress, for

example Option K has been modified by the community to become Option M. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *WSDOT and the Governor's office have been engaged with the communities for a long time trying to come to a consensus about a westside design option. The last couple of years we have not come to a full consensus. We are hopeful that this process will result in one option so we can move forward in the next legislative session. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: I appreciate the Speaker's comments. We need to continue in this process and on this matrix. I'd like to highlight this discussion about litigation and community concerns and we can continue discussions at the next full Workgroup meeting on November 17. We have a charge as directed by the legislation. If we choose to sway from that then we would need to make that decision as a whole group. (Rep. White)

Arboretum:

QUESTION: Does the A+ Hybrid have more impacts than Option A in the Arboretum? (Sen. Jacobsen)

RESPONSE: *The base Option A in the SDEIS does not include the Arboretum ramps. There is a suboption that includes the ramps. The A+ Hybrid includes the ramps, but the supporters of that option have not yet reached a consensus. There will be further discussions as we move forward. (Julie Meredith)*

QUESTION: What are the overall traffic and environmental impacts of the ramps? (Barbara Gilliland)

RESPONSE: *In Option A, without the ramps, trips through the Arboretum decrease. When the ramps are in, there is an increase in trips through the Arboretum. (Julie Meredith)*

RESPONSE: *When you add the ramps back in, the volumes would be very similar to if there was no project. It doesn't really add traffic through the Arboretum but keeps it about the same as if we did not complete the project. (Michael Horntvedt)*

QUESTION: What are the environmental impacts to the Arboretum? (Rep. White)

RESPONSE: *There is less than 0.1 acres of additional wetland fill as a result of the ramps. (Dave Warner)*

QUESTION: Can WSDOT speak to the impacts to the Arboretum from Options K and M? (Barbara Gilliland)

REPNSE: *Option K, which has a connection to the Arboretum, has the most increased trips through the Arboretum, approximately 400 more trips than the No Build. Option M, while still not completely defined, would have a similar amount of trips as Option K. (Julie Meredith)*

QUESTION: Are there other environmental issues? (Barbara Gilliland)

RESPONSE: *Option K has the most environmental effects among the options. It has the most fill and wetland impacts. These are shown on your data sheet. I'd like to point out*

that the analysis is not available for Option M because the group has not come to a consensus on the width of some of the ramps. We are in ongoing discussions with the proponents. (Julie Meredith)

Capacity on Montlake Boulevard:

QUESTION: I understand that increasing the capacity on Montlake Boulevard increases throughput. I'd like to know by how much. Is there data included in these sheets about this? (Rep. Springer)

RESPONSE: *Look at the [data sheet](#) provided where the transit travel times are listed. That is best data to make the comparison. If you compare the No Build to Option A base, the travel time difference is the benefit of the expansion of Montlake Boulevard and the addition of a second bridge. (Michael Horntvedt)*

COMMENT: It is important to revisit the purpose and need statement for the project and understand what we are trying to accomplish. The goal is to replace the floating bridge and landing structures due to safety issues and to provide transit and HOV travel time advantages. As the conversation on Montlake continues, it is really about making that transit connection up to the University of Washington Sound Transit station as stated in legislation. I understand the community concerns, but expanding Montlake Boulevard to improve local traffic operations is not a stated goal of this project. (David Dye)

QUESTION: On the data sheet, Options K and M have more capacity than Option A, but trips will take longer to cross the Montlake Cut? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *The number you see represents the number of people that would like to cross the Montlake Cut during that time period. However, the longer travel time is indicative of the congestion. The travel time is longer because there is more traffic that is there but it cannot get through the congestion. The key intersections in the area could not handle the increased congestion of more vehicles. (Michael Horntvedt)*

QUESTION: I don't understand how you can increase the capacity but it takes longer to get through the area? If the congestion is bad, will people choose different routes and clog up other arterials? (Spkr. Chopp)

COMMENT: Is it important to clarify between capacity and demand? (Rep. White)

RESPONSE: *It is important to clarify. The demand is the number of vehicles that would like to use the corridor. So you have added capacity across the Cut, but the capacity at the key intersections at Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street intersection cannot handle the number of people who want to use this intersection. This results in congestion on Montlake Boulevard and a longer travel time. We have been working with the Option M group modifying this intersection to facilitate this movement. (Michael Horntvedt)*

QUESTION: This is a real problem. Do people just sort of give up and therefore there is less demand? Do people give up because there is more congestion with Option A than in Option K? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *There is a travel time benefit for some of the options. People will continue to take the trips that they take today or in the No Build option. Some of the trips will not use the Montlake corridor. (Michael Horntvedt)*

QUESTION: So the trips just go somewhere else? Does this mean that there will be more trips on the University Bridge? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *No. The trips that are occurring with No Build are the same trips that are occurring in Option A or Option K. In the No Build, people are choosing to take other routes. They continue to do that in Option A or A+ Hybrid. With Option K or L, when you add capacity across the Cut you will get congestion. People will still sit through it because it is still better than the No Build. Compared to No Build there is still an improvement with all the options. (Michael Horntvedt)*

COMMENT: The 45th street corridor is atrocious. I'm concerned about adding more traffic to this street. There are also land use decisions that the City of Seattle has made that will come into play here. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *Option A and A+ Hybrid wouldn't increase the traffic on 45th Street. It would remain the same as it is in the No Build scenario. (Michael Horntvedt)*

COMMENT: Comparing to the No Build is a false comparison. You should be comparing it to other options. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *In our SDEIS analysis, we use the No Build as our baseline. (Michael Horntvedt)*

COMMENT: Before or at the next Workgroup meeting, please provide a description of the formula that is used for this analysis. Can we get this out via e-mail before the next meeting? (Rep. White)

QUESTION: I'm trying to understand how 1,600 more cars cross the Cut in Option A and how 3,000 more cross the Cut in Option L, compared to the No Build. (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *The number represents the number of vehicles that are crossing the Cut in one hour. Option L has double the amount of vehicles because people have to cross the Montlake Cut twice. The traffic volume in Options K and L are similar, but the traffic in Option K only has to cross the Cut once. (Michael Horntvedt)*

COMMENT: The data sheet says 1,600 cars cross the Montlake Cut in one hour. That number seems very high. I don't understand how that many more cars make it through in Option A. (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *In Option A, with the addition of the second crossing there is six lanes. In Option K there is four lanes on the existing and four lanes in the tunnel. In Option L, there is four on the new bascule bridge and four on the existing, plus the trips cross the Cut twice. (Dave Warner)*

QUESTION: So, the number here includes the number that crosses from the freeway bridge not just from the Montlake Cut? (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *That's correct. (Michael Horntvedt)*

COMMENT: Please provide a breakdown of the numbers between the trips crossing the Montlake Bridge opposed to the trips crossing the freeway bridge. (Rep. Pedersen)

COMMENT: I'd like to address the difference in options from a macro level. In Option K and M, you separate the freeway traffic from the local traffic. They also provide the connection to SR 520 in a separate location, which is good from a transportation perspective. The challenge is designing the efficiency of the Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street intersection to take advantage of this separation. We have not been able to do this yet. There may be a greater impact or new set of issues with creating a sort of mini interchange in this area. In Option A, all of the traffic is mixed together, which is not as desirable. (David Dye)

COMMENT: According to my constituency, the granular piece about the difference of traffic impacts on Montlake Boulevard is important. The congestion in this area is really important to the value of people's homes. The data sheet seems somewhat deceptive of this. (Rep. Pedersen)

Transit Connectivity:

COMMENT: You have heard from the transit agencies that they are in support of Option A with the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. This is primarily related to the issue of local buses getting stuck in the congestion on Montlake Boulevard. (Barbara Gilliland)

QUESTION: Is the Montlake flyer stop removed in all of the options? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *Yes. (Barbara Gilliland)*

COMMENT: It was my understanding of the legislation that there needs to be a direct connection to the planned Sound Transit station at the University of Washington. To me, Option M is the only one that does this. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *The legislation says that there must be an efficient and effective connection. It does not say direct connection to the Sound Transit light rail station. Options A and M both have a connection. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: Looking at the map of both options, Option M seems like a better choice than Option A. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *We would need to obtain the exact language of the bill to see what it says. They both have a connection to the University of Washington station. How that connection is made is different. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: I'd like to point out that the A+ Hybrid is the preferred option by King County Metro and the University of Washington. Please send the latest version of Option M to the transit agencies, King County Metro and Sound Transit, for their preliminary

review and observations. They made these statements without the latest version of Option M. (Rep. White)

COMMENT: I agree with Spkr. Chopp. Saying that both options have a connection to the Husky station is like saying that both A+ Hybrid and Option M don't meet \$4.65B. This is a true statement. One of them meets it a lot closer than the other. (Rep. Pedersen)

West Approach Profile:

QUESTION: The two options for treating stormwater is a gravity system or a pump fed system. Are both of those options technically easy to implement? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *The issue of cost is probably neutral in this discussion. It really comes down to the treatment levels that are desired for the concern of the salmon that migrate through this area. With a flat profile we will need to pump the stormwater, which limits the standard of treatment. Some of the low profiles would require a water treatment facility on Foster Island which is a concern to the Arboretum. If there is a gradual profile then we can provide treatment by gravity flow with a Montlake facility. The most visible trade-off is that you would have a higher bridge of about ten to 12 feet at one point on the profile. This is approximately at the edge of the lily pads. There are also life safety concerns from water backing up onto the roadway in a large storm event. (Dave Warner)*

QUESTION: How much water can you pump? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *The entire west approach would exceed 35 acres of treatment area, which is significant. (Dave Warner)*

COMMENT: Please provide the exact gallon amount of water that will be treated on the bridge. (Sen. Swecker)

COMMENT: I don't believe that this is a technical issue related to the pumping system. The issues are about grade spacing, the ability to remove the water from the roadway under the designed rainfall, the ability to make sure redundant systems are in place and ongoing maintenance. The department has never said that we could not construct a system. What we want to note is that with an additional ten to 12 feet of height on the approach, we can have a cheaper and simpler stormwater treatment system. (David Dye)

QUESTION: Can you preserve safety and a low profile while still getting the water through a pump system? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *Yes. (David Dye)*

QUESTION: In all the options, do you assume the west highrise is included? Can you get rid of the high profile altogether for the west approach and save money? Why do we need the higher profile? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *In Option M, there are considerations to lower the west highrise. One of the concerns raised after the draft EIS was that the Seattle Fire Department has a boat*

that needs to get under the bridge at that location. In the SDEIS, all the options maintain a 40 feet navigation passage. (Dave Warner)

QUESTION: What is the cost of relocating the fire boat and the added cost of the west highrise? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *Our considerations are much less about cost. The bigger question is that in our conversations with the Seattle Fire Department, they are not at all interested in losing the access at the west approach. We can continue this conversation. We have approached them with the idea to build a new fire station on the south side of SR 520 and they are still not interested. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: I'd like to see the cost analysis. For a \$4.65 billion project, I would encourage all potential cost saving options to be evaluated. (Spkr. Chopp)

COMMENT: Mike Grady has just informed me that there is a 40 feet clearance on both side of I-90. We can confirm this. (David Dye)

Portage Bay Bridge:

COMMENT: Option M has six lanes across Portage Bay. Option A has seven lanes. The legislation calls for six lanes. (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *In this area, there is an on-ramp and off-ramp. The delta from the six lanes versus the seven lanes is a stretch of less than 800 feet between those two ramps that is defined as the seventh lane. You are really just talking about an 800 feet stretch that allows for an auxiliary lane. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: Provide specific language in the legislation for the lane configuration on SR 520. (Rep. White)

QUESTION: Is there a difference in impacts between the options with the six versus seven lanes? (Barbara Gilliland)

COMMENT: If you ask the communities, they will say yes. The communities that are directly adjacent to SR 520 have a big concern about the number of lanes that will be constructed, whether it is six lanes or seven lanes. This may also lead to litigation threats down the road. Let's be realistic about this. (Spkr. Chopp)

QUESTION: What are the differences in construction impacts for the Portage Bay Bridge between the options? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *Virtually none. We will get more formal information back to you. (David Dye)*

QUESTION: What is the cost estimate for retrofitting the current Portage Bay Bridge for safety concerns? (Spkr. Chopp)

RESPONSE: *It depends on what the retrofit involves. There is the substructure with hollow core piles. Essentially, we would build a new bridge underneath the existing. The*

next piece is if you retrofit the top of the bridge or not. The cost would be 75 percent of a new equivalent four lane bridge, including the upper deck. We will get a breakdown of the costs for each different type of retrofit for the Portage Bay Bridge. (David Dye)

Environmental and Permitting:

Rep. White invited Mike Grady, representative of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to comment.

COMMENT: The communities have worked in good faith to come up with plans that lessen the environmental impacts of some of the options. It is important to keep the dialogue going with the community to try and work toward an overall solution for the impacts. The boat section is a good example of this. The communities received feedback that the boat section was costly and had significant environmental impacts, so they came up with Option M. I'm asking again to keep up these negotiations. On this issue alone, a lot of progress has been made with the communities. The changes from Option K to Option M have got us close to the objective of the project. (Spkr. Chopp)

COMMENT: In terms of the tunnel, we say that we have addressed all the concerns, but I fear that we have not done this for all the parties involved. (Sen. Swecker)

COMMENT: Our [NOAA] responsibility right now is under NEPA, but eventually we will undertake an Endangered Species Act consultation with WSDOT. In addition to these acts, we have a secretarial order that requires us to consult with the tribes. We have and will be doing that along with our sister agency FHWA. There are many key aspects that we look at to weigh these options, including migration for fish, navigation, stormwater treatment, mitigation for construction and loss of habitat, to name a few. We have also been working with WSDOT regarding the potential impacts to our science center buildings. We have not been asked to formally review Option M, but I want to highlight a few concerns. There will be significant challenges for permitting because the top of the tunnel is at the bottom of the Montlake Cut. This can limit navigation access. Construction of the tunnel will pose significant environmental impacts such as loss of habitat, fishing access for tribal nations, fish migration, and stormwater. My point is that, why would we choose this option when we have other options on the table that are less environmentally damaging. I would lean towards options A and L. (Mike Grady)

COMMENT: The environmental impacts of the designs seem great. We would want to know if there is even a possibility of getting approval on some of the options before moving forward. (Rep. White)

QUESTION: How much longer will NOAA be in Montlake? When will NOAA be moving to Newport, Oregon? (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *The ships will be moving soon, but the Science Center near Montlake will be staying. (Mike Grady)*

COMMENT: Please rank the environmental impacts according to option. (Sen. Jacobsen)

QUESTION: If the retrofit option is being evaluated in the SDEIS, why would any alternative be permitted if a retrofit is possible? (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *It is my understanding that we are analyzing all of the options in the SDEIS. (Mike Grady)*

RESPONSE: *Retrofitting these structures requires much of the same activities if we were building a new bridge. We would be replacing the hollow columns by adding another column and building another structure underneath so there are very similar impacts. The question is are we retrofitting to four or six lanes? (Julie Meredith)*

QUESTION: What is the difference in cost between retrofitting and building a six lane structure? (Rep. Pedersen)

COMMENT: I want to address the height of the west approach. The water quality standards that FHWA and WSDOT are required to use are different than state water quality standards. They are far more restrictive. Lowering the height of the west approach will make it more costly and more difficult to meet the biological standards, which makes it difficult to move through the ESA consultation. (Mike Grady)

QUESTION: What is difficult about moving and treating water? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *One of the issues is moving the water landward and creating a facility that will treat the water and meet the biological standard. (Mike Grady)*

COMMENT: I would like to add permitting feasibility as a consideration across all the options. (Rep. White)

Costs:

COMMENT: While we're looking at ways to reduce costs, I'm interested in the different approaches to retrofitting that would address the safety concerns. (Rep. Pedersen)

COMMENT: I want to note that we have two options that are within the \$4.65 billion cost. Those are Option A and A+ Hybrid. (Barbara Gilliland)

QUESTION: [Referencing the A+ Hybrid cost map] Is \$4.663 billion more than \$4.65 billion? The sales tax deferral seems to bring the cost of the project down to \$4.3 billion. How does WSDOT view that dollar amount? (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *The cost estimate is what is shown as \$4.663 billion. The way that it is paid for is to defer part of it as sales tax and pay for it over time. The physical project construction cost is less. It is not additive. The sales tax is included in the \$4.65 billion. The sales tax cost has been included in all of the cost estimate numbers. (David Dye)*

COMMENT: This group should look at what could be removed to bring the cost to \$4.65 billion. (Rep. White)

QUESTION: Is it possible to replace the functionality of the flyer stop at some other location, for example on the Eastside, somewhere that is not as spaced constrained as Montlake? (Rep. Pedersen)

RESPONSE: *Yes. That is the current plan of Metro and Sound Transit. We'll pull a summary together on how this works. From an operating standpoint, there is a cost associated with this. (Dave Dye)*

Finance Follow-up (Member Discussion)

COMMENT: Please provide a legend that defines all of the tolling scenarios. (Rep. Pedersen)

QUESTION: After we make these recommendations, what happens if we don't get the necessary votes in Olympia to move forward with the project? (Sen. Jacobsen)

RESPONSE: *The floating bridge section and necessary landings have already been authorized by legislative actions, so we will be moving forward with the bridge replacement. We are operating under a budget that allows for some continued design and early right of way purchase for the eastside. (David Dye)*

QUESTION: When do all the funding decisions have to be made to fund the entire project? (Barbara Gilliland)

RESPONSE: *When we lay out the cash flow needs to have the new bridge open by 2014 and corridor in 2016, we need to confirm the additional sources of funding in the 2011-2013 timeframe depending on the contracting packages. The 2011 session is the critical period. We need to come up with a finance plan then or we will not meet our schedule milestones. (David Dye)*

QUESTION: If Option K is selected as the preferred alternative, would you issue the contracts on that option, even if we didn't get the tax votes? Or would we have to fall back on a cheaper option? (Sen. Jacobsen)

RESPONSE: *It would be speculative. That would depend on the phasing and staging of the project based on available funding. The level of design of each part of the corridor would also affect the order of construction. For example, the Eastside project's design is more advanced than the west side design. We have so far agreed about design for the floating bridge, landings, and the Eastside project. There is the potential that with approved funding sources, one side of the lake could be constructed and one side could not. (David Dye)*

QUESTION: Since there is an earthquake risk for Portage Bay, would you deal with it first? (Sen. Jacobsen)

RESPONSE: *The team needs to complete an earthquake risk assessment to determine if the structure is vulnerable in different areas. There are too many variables to answer this question. Safety is a major driver. (David Dye)*

QUESTION: What if we do not get consensus on either side of the bridge or if there is no extra funding available, can we still do any part of the project? Is it possible to build the floating bridge and connect to the existing infrastructure? (Sen. Swecker)

RESPONSE: *Yes, enough money is currently available to replace the floating bridge section of the project. The decision was made to do just that. The environmental document for the westside is inseparable from our ability to build the new floating bridge. We will have to take some action as a result of the SDEIS to move forward with any construction. (David Dye)*

Key observations Overview (Barbara Gilliland)

Ms. Gilliland noted that the group will take today's issues and report to the full Workgroup about the design and financing options. At the next Workgroup meeting on November 17, the workgroup will begin developing the recommendations.

She reviewed how the public could provide comments on the recommendations report. There will be three ways for commenting on the recommendations. This will include an online comment form, a public hearing hosted by the Seattle City Council, and a town hall meeting hosted by the workgroup on the evening of November 24

Rep. White thanked the staff for all the information and materials that have been shared and presented. He also mentioned that although the Westside Subgroup has developed a toolbox of possible solutions, the full Workgroup may come up with other options.

Next Steps/Action items (Barbara Gilliland):

- Confusion, clarification needed about lanes across the cut and how they are used to calculate trips between the different options (White, Pedersen).
- Find exact language in the legislation that says the new 520 will have efficient or direct (wording here is point in question) access to transit at the UW (Chopp).
- Send Option M to the transit agencies to garner their opinion (White).
- Breakdown of cost of the stormwater treatment facility and how it relates to the profile of the bridge and the technology necessary to pump and treat water (Swecker).
- Share a legend with the Workgroup defining what each tolling "scenario" means (i.e., scenario 7, etc, shared at the last meeting) (Pedersen).