

WS Transportation Coalition Meeting Minutes, Thursday, July 23, 2015
Neighborhood House Highpoint Center, 6400 Sylvan Way SW, Seattle, WA 98126

6:30-6:35 Co-chair Amanda Kay Helmick called the meeting to order, initiated introductions (see Attendees list below), and introduced guests from the Port of Seattle for tonight's meeting: George Blomberg and Bari Bookout, and Sally del Fierro. Congratulations to Marci on her appointment to Transit Advisory Committee

Ms. Bookout started speaking about the Port's Terminal 5 re-development plan, and was repeatedly interrupted by Ms. Davis regarding noise and residential issues, until Co-chair Linde reminded her that this is a transportation-oriented coalition, and to both hold her questions until the presenter finished, and limit them to WSTC's concerns. Throughout the meeting, Ms. Bookout and Mr. Blomberg were peppered and interrupted with questions by frustrated Admiral District residents, and WSTC members had to intervene to help the speakers move forward.

Bookout: the Port is historically an economic driver for the region, providing good-paying jobs and sizeable revenues, and wants to continue helping drive economic vitality. It has lost market share, however, due to:

(a) a large proportion of outdated Seattle dock facilities, where containers must be trucked between docks & rail yards, slowing load-unload operations and raising costs for ships & terminal operators,

(b) investments in and construction of more modern, dock-to-rail facilities by other ports, from Prince Rupert (B.C.) to Oakland and Long Beach (San Pedro), CA, and

(c) aggressive pricing by competitors,

(d) environment-friendly asks, such as running shipboard operations using shoreside electric power, that's expensive, most ships aren't equipped to do, & shippers don't want to invest in installing. Prince Rupert gives point system for greener vessels.

Port is installing shore power infrastructure, shipping hates shore power, also see in-port clean fuel standard as burden. Cruise lines better – deal w/Interbay marine emissions; Oregon soon; good downstream impacts.

Port has not lost local cargo. It has lost discretionary cargo to points E, N & S. Efficient movement is important – there no on-dock rail at T46 T18 & T30. All cargo ship-to-truck-to-rail yards – more expensive for ship lines, that want on-dock rail. Also, Port saddled w/requirements for quiet zones, and community conversations. Canadian RRs price aggressively to get discretionary cargo.

Wild card: container ship capacities have more than doubled in the past 10 years, and the Port cannot handle the biggest now at sea – Tripe E vessels carry 18,000 containers (TEUs), 193' beam & 51-foot draft, vs. pre- & early 2000s Post-Panamax vessels at 8,000 TEUs, 136' beam & 49-foot draft. Cruise ships have likewise grown, from Vista Class 106' beam, 26' draft & 1916 passengers, to Oasis Class, at 198' beam, 30' draft & 5400 passengers. Ships go to ports with the right dock, crane & container transfer infrastructure to handle them.

Port is not expanding, it's re-designing T5, investing to handle biggest ships.

WSTC questions:

- Did economy downturn 2008 also lose Port business? A: Yes.
- Why T5 – underused, w/ noisy trains, across from Admiral residential areas uphill – when two other deep berths available?

- A: Port saw opportunity to upgrade & handle bigger ships on T5. Terminals 18 & 25 on Harb Is handle current, smaller-sized ships, and water depth is 45', would have to dredge 10' instead of T5 E Waterway – 50', only needs 5' dredge.
Smaller T46 at max capacity now, can't take any more big ships. That & other docks require more time-consuming & expensive container movement from ship to truck to rail. T5 is ship to rail.
- Previous tenant didn't do upgrades – Port leases to operators, doesn't operate docks itself. Port saw opportunity to handle bigger ships -- \$250 million to upgrade, improve docks, add bigger cranes, dredge from 50 to 55 from.
- Port has gone ahead w/ T5 design, even as it still needs a tenant for terminal
- Why focus on Triple E? A: In future, no more small ships, only big & bigger in the Asia & Europe trade. We'll lose if can't handle them. Unhealthy Seattle-Tacoma competition, stealing cargo from one another, racing to bottom, operators on brink of going out of biz. Port Commissioners 2014 moved to make changes, incl. asking Fed Maritime Commission to approve Sea-Tac seaport alliance: keep jobs here, retain competitive gateway, invest strategically in infrastructure.
- How will sharing w/ Tacoma work? A: shipping lines don't call on two close ports; Smaller, less efficient container terminals abandoned, operators do biz deals w/shipping lines. Don't know how to position volume concept; lots of variables

Transportation-specific WSTC questions:

- Where is to address additional traffic expected from T5 operations? A: Not needed. Original EIS allows traffic level handling up to 650K containers per year. Port expects Triple E truck & traffic volume will handle less than the 650K limit, using dock to rail container off- & on-loading. No radical changes expected.
- Why you think there won't be a change if you're moving more off a ship? A: quantities even out even w/fluctuations of container #s. May have few big ships, many small, same
- North Admiral visitors: Use SEPA as tool to inform development process; original T5 design was worse; why not do EIS now to study air dispersion & pollution, noise abatement, light, model traffic, erosion, etc. – why move us to DPD, why not Port do it? We added comments to DNS in March, heard nothing, went to DPD w/ same comments. Why does Port get expedited process DPD? Let's work together
- As Port has developed T5 plan, it has engaged w/community & city, invested in mitigating transport infrastructure – Low bridge overpass to T5 separates truck from other traffic; also invested to widen high bridge; to build tunnel; grade separation for T46 from RR traffic, just opened private roadway to E Marginal. Port investing to straighten messy Chelan and SR99 intersection; also needs signal improvement
- WSTC-WS dream – because of how on-ramps designed to WS bridge, can we re-align/design to not pack the single lanes? The City has committed to a WS to study (WS Bridget Transportation Corridor), and assembling a stakeholder group. Who else is in conversation w/ Port on this corridor? A: Port conversing w/ City, Tom Rasmussen is pulling corridor project together, SDOT lead.
- Is Port looking at potential traffic impact w/ its own plus WS growth in freight & commuter traffic? There's significant rail, so how to upgrade rail? Also, if expect

T5 redevelopment to grow capacity over 650K, shouldn't Port anticipate this & do study now?

- A: No study at this time. A lot of growth depends on inter-modal rail – 60% moving intermodal rail now, & Port is collaborating w/local & other agencies. Last time doubled T5 capacity to 650K & acreage, but reduced air pollution w/ clean truck program (EPA req. .01 sulfur fuel) site is 2x more productive. Problem for N. Admiral: Terminals operate at night; rail trains made up, huge snakes move into queues,
- Port: Difficult to do a traffic study now, operator will know when ops exceed 650K, if operator presents plan that exceeds 650K, then environmental review., w/ 150K fewer truck miles a year. New dock-rail will have positive air quality impact.
- N. Admiral complain about noise pollution. A: Best if we could eliminate intersection horns. T5 overpass eliminates grade crossings, gets terminal traffic out of intersection, but can't eliminate horns at that intersection. Pigeon Pt. folks associate train horn noise w/T5, but trains are heading down W Marginal, sounding horns at numerous curb cuts. Those are BNSF not Port trains. We could install crossing arms, started discussion w/ BNSF, but then bells ring every time arms come down.
- What comments can citizens make to DPD to address horn noise? A: Make public comments; no T5 work will affect trains noise. Go to DPD website, T5. Start process – begin w/environmental analysis.

General questions, suggestions:

- WSTC suggestions: use vacant portion of T5 for WS transportation purposes, water taxi, interim transit center? A: we're optimistic there's a tenant interested in this unique opportunity terminal that works better than most others. For other acreage, Port is pursuing revenue-generating opportunities; area W of intermodal rail yard, make proposal
- Upgrading dock area: how to get rid of dredged dirt? A: 29K cu yd, clean sediment transferred by barge to rail to landf

WSTC action items:

- Need Move Seattle planning money amendment. NO way to make WS Bridge Transportation Corridor more efficient, or add more car capacity. Problem: Dedicated bus lane takes away car capacity; but more buses w/o dedicated lane exacerbates congestion
- Lander St. overpass from Port of Seattle perspective: it was looking at other possibilities than Lander; quick WSTC map check indicates no other possible E-W route (confirmed June 30 on background by SDOT)
- Joe Szilagyi put up a web poll on MS: as of June 30, about 33% in WS will vote for, 33% against, 33% undecided. Suggestion to take hard copies of poll in person to West Fest, Farmers Market, etc. Amanda volunteered Action Committee, & asked for other volunteers.

8:05: Fauntleroy & Avalon 0500-0540 – surge every 30 min, 15 cars as backed up from Avalon into turn lane, backup to Rudy’s, plus 116, 119 hung up, and backup even ‘til 10 am; – turn lane to be removed by Blvd Proj. Same in evening – 4:10-5:40 pm – same surging. Whatever analysts say, they’re wrong. Only one through lane; also bicycle light at Oregon.

What can we do?

- Pub Disclosure Request ?to be filed by Amanda Ray, & Mark J –
- Waterfront – AK Way-Promenade-Overlook Walk – Draft EIS based on 60% design / 08-12-15 is comment deadline. Difficulty getting detail & discuss access from S side (Spokane / N end of Stadiums / WS). They were in mode of stadiums to Belltown; focus on separate tunnel from surface traffic issues. Describe baseline effects, & then project:
- ? prioritize the main corridor? Baseline = no viaduct & seawall completed (no? tunnel), 100K vehicles on AK Way. Adding their design = moderate improvement – how much tfc? Not holistic. Plan essentially covers Atlantic-Dearborn to Columbia, 6 lanes, decision near Atlantic – either take Dearborn exit or tunnel) off 99 to AK Way off ramp, N on AK Way, 2 lanes N & transit lane to Colman Dock, and explosive mess at Columbia. Buses up Columbia to 3rd, C Line on AK Way. From north AK Way to Colman. Cap Hill trolley to connect w/SLUT (same track size)
- Comment on HALA -- when ?
- Philosophy: make area less desirable for cars, and add more desirable transit
- Concentrate on waterfront – inbound-outbound
- Need holistic planning – comp Plan
- Marty – Port & T5 comments
- DPD Admiral Nbrhd Assoc., Alki Comm Council, E Admiral Neighbors – WSTC supports – Marty – do an EIS ; We believe Port is leaning on internal envelope so not need to pursue additional study, externalities since 1994 have dramatically changed and warrant additional study.

Draft of comments from WSTC: Marty chair, plus Larry W, Tom Linde; Larry W, Deb Barker, Chris Bast, Chas R, Victoria

8:40 Meeting adjourned

Attendees

Amanda K Helmick	Co-chair	Tom Linde	Co-chair
Chris Bast	Board	Marci Carpenter	Board
Ray Krueger	Board	Michael Taylor-Judd	Board
Martin Westerman	Board	Larry Wymer	Board
Mark Jacobs	Board	Jon Wright	Board

Port of Seattle:

George Blomberg, Sr. Enviro. Program Mgr.
Sally del Fierro, Comm. Engagement, Pub. Affairs

Bari Bookout, Dir. Seaport Strategy

Victoria Nelson

Mark Kaler, Gatewood

Bert Patrick

Chas Redmond

Eugene Wong, N. Admiral

Katie Bucy

Greg Gantman, Beach Dr.

Thomas Noyes, Morgan Jn

Norman Sauer, Alaska Jn

Patricia Davis, Admiral

Henry Lee, Admiral

Nancy Leff, Admiral

Mark Taylor, Morgan