

October 17, 2023 Meeting - Seattle Freight Advisory Board

Topics covered included: Question of merged meetings; Seattle Transportation Plan (STP); Previous SFAB Presentations – updates

This meeting was held: October 17, 2023, 9:00-10:20 a.m., via Webex and in the Boards and Commissions Room, City Hall

Board Members: Dan Kelly, Stanley Ryter, Howard Agnew, Nigel Barron, Geri Poor, Dan Gatchet, Dan McKisson, Herb Krohn, Wayland Robert

Public: Ryan Packer, Eugene Wasserman, Warren Aakervik, Luke, Tyler Blackwell, Chris, Eric Wright, Gerhard Kratchvil, Thomas Noyes, Erin Goodman, Call-in User 2; Call-in User 3; Elsa Brown

Staff: Christopher Eaves, Cass Magnuski

Attending: 24

INTRODUCTIONS

Dan Kelly: Thank you, Chris. I want to thank everyone for being here. Welcome to the October 17 meeting of the Seattle Freight Advisory Board. You should have the minutes in your in-basket. We're going to postpone approving those until our regular meeting in November, if everyone is agreeable to that. As far as announcements, it may be appropriate now for the new board members to introduce themselves, and talk a little bit about their interest in the freight advisory board.

Wayland Robert: My name is Wayland Robert, I work as a licensed deck hand on U.S. flagships. I'm a member of the Sailor's Union of the Pacific. My experience, prior to working on ships, is mostly working for elected officials. I worked for Congressman Derek Kilmer, Representative Brian Blake for many years, served on the Rural Coastal Washington and chair of the Natural Resource and Agricultural Committee; done a lot of advocacy work in the Legislature; also on the nonprofit side. My interest in the freight advisory board is particularly just for the relevance of my union in the Seattle area. If freight can't go, it's pretty hard for a ship to come into the Port of Seattle. And

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

ACTION ITEMS:

Meeting opening

Introductions

September Minutes
approval postponed.

New board member
introductions

Wayland Robert
Introduction

the industrial land is critical to my job, as well. At the end of the day, I'm here to provide a labor voice with some of my other siblings to serve on this board and work with business here to protect our industrial/maritime framework. Thanks for having me.

Dan Kelly: Great! Welcome to the board. Thanks so much. Herb Krohn online?

Herb Krohn: Hi. I'm entering the parking garage right now, so I should be over there in just a moment or so. I'm Herb Krohn. I am a railroad worker on Union Pacific. I'm a conductor, brake person, switch person. I've been the State legislative director since mid-2012, and worked in Olympia during session, advocating on rail transportation safety issues. And my interest in this board is the expeditiously safe movement of freight through the City. There seems to be a belief here among people that things just appear on the shelves through use of a transporter or something like that, and we need to make sure that freight can move through our City efficiently and safely. And I'm very happy to be among you. Thank you.

Dan Kelly: Great. Appreciate that, Herb. For my part, as far as announcements go, I just want to make sure that the board is aware that the pedestrian modal board has reached out to look to have some discussions regarding Resolution 382087. If anyone has interest in engaging with them on that topic, I am happy to include you. Currently on the list is Dan McKisson and myself. Fair enough, Chris?

Christopher Eaves: Yes.

Dan Kelly: So just let Christopher Eaves or myself know if you're interested, and when we put that together, make sure that the board is aware. Moving on, we will look for any public comments. Chris, do you want to go online first?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Christopher Eaves: Yes. I don't have anyone in the room for public comment. I'm opening it up for online, if anyone has a public comment.

Dan Kelly: Would anyone in the room like to make a public comment? No? Great! We'll move onto our next item, which is the proposed merging of our November and December meetings.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Herb Krohn
Introduction

Dan Kelly
Pedestrian Advisory Board is interested in discussing Resolution 382087 – Dan Kelly and Dan McKisson can respond

Public Comment
None

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER SFAB MEETINGS PROPOSED MERGE FOR HOLIDAYS

Christopher Eaves: I'll hop in for a moment and say that typically, the November and December meetings fall very close to holidays. In the past, we have merged those two meetings to the first Tuesday in December. This year, it will be December 5. The question is does the board have interest in merging the two meetings.

Dan Kelly: Chris, I haven't done this before. Does this have to be something done in a motion?

Christopher Eaves: Yes.

Dan Kelly: Okay. For the purpose of discussion, I will make a motion that we merge the November and December meetings to December 5.

Geri Poor: I'll second that!

Dan Kelly: Okay. Any discussion on that? If not, I'll call the question. All in favor? Any opposed? We've got our merged meeting.

Christopher Eaves: I will adjust calendars and make the announcement. Thank you very much!

Dan Kelly: Outstanding. Well, next item up is the main purpose for our meeting today. That's to discuss the draft Seattle Transportation Plan (STP). My understanding is that comments are due by this next Monday. So, we're moving into a work session with the board here.

Christopher Eaves: Let me catch you up on a couple of items. Geri Poor showed interest in the discussion. In terms of the Seattle Transportation Plan, the comments are due this coming Monday at close of business. Information has been sent out to board members regarding the freight element of this seven-page document, as well as a letter from the Seattle Planning Commission, describing some of their high-level meetings. At this point in time, it should be open to the board to try and highlight what is going on, what your views are, and thoughts. Eric Wright also let me know that he is under a time constraint. He will leave the meeting earlier. Dan McKisson also has a time constraint. We should let them go first and second. So, Eric, if you are available?

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Nov/Dec Meetings – Motion to have a single special meeting 12/5 and cancel regular Nov/Dec meetings to improve attendance.

STP discussion/work session

Chris Eaves
Seattle Planning
Commission letter

Asking Eric Wright and Dan McKisson be allowed to speak first because of constrained schedules

SEATTLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (STP) WORK SESSION

Eric Wright: First, I want to apologize to everyone. I've been a bit absent as of late. I attend these meetings on my own time as volunteer service, and I have had no personal time. I've been working. So, I apologize for that. Chris, thank you for sending out the documentation. I did make a point to go through all of it, as I try to do with everything you send out, and I keep abreast of what's going on. I have a lot of concerns about the freight elements in particular, and the plan overall. I don't see where it accomplishes its primary goal of being a master unifying plan in any way, shape, or form. It seems to contradict itself repeatedly and regularly in different places. It seems to be open-ended enough that really you can go in any direction you want with what is said in that document. There are some good things about it in its notation about the critical nature of freight. And at the same time, there are a lot of bad things about it, in my opinion, where the document is calling for the restriction of movement of freight, or the movement of freight under more expensive means of transportation. There are a couple of specific segments in the document that talk about (unintelligible), but provide no metric for what that means. There is also an enormous amount of conversation about the use of e-bikes for delivery services. And I can tell you, as a person who spends 70 percent of their professional life trying to figure out what it costs to get something from point A to point B, and how to do it most efficiently, e-bikes are not that. They are not going to be an efficient means of delivery from a cost standpoint. Moreover, we have strong rules and regulations in the State array through LNI about environmental exposure around heat and cold. We do get hot in the summertime here, and we get cold in the wintertime here. And you're talking about people who would be exposed permanently as part of their job. It's just a bad idea. I don't need to go down the rabbit hole. It's just a bad idea. That is compounded with -- they want to create a bike lending library to allow people to try this technology out. There seems to be some underlying motivations that I don't quite understand, for the amount of time that we spend talking about that topic, in particular. I would also call attention to even deeper down in the document there is a metric, and I apologize for not having the page number right in front of me. But there is a metric regarding road repair and maintenance. The metric calls for road repair and maintenance on major streets only, to help support freight. But freight moves on streets other than just major streets. All of the streets need to be in good repair in order to keep freight moving effectively. I appreciate the comments that Herb Krohn made early on. There is this perception that freight just appears on our shelves through some sort of transporter-type device. I

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Eric Wright:

Comments/views regarding
STP

recently had the opportunity to attend several conferences, one of them in which there was an enormous amount of conversation about automation and AI, and different things appearing in the freight world. This document addresses none of those industry trends. Additionally, and lastly, it does address the inevitable change in economics that will happen over the life expectancy of this document. There is no conversation or contemplation of what it means when interest rates change, what that means for bonds or levies, how these things will be funded. It is completely open-ended. There are metrics that are TBD. It's not ready to go. If I were a more brash man, I might say that it is buffalo chips. It's not worth the paper that it was printed on, if it was going to be printed. And I think we need to be really, really thoughtful, but also forceful in the way that we respond to it, and note that as such. So, those are my comments.

Dan Kelly: Great, Eric. Thanks so much. Any questions for Eric Wright before we move on to Dan McKisson?

Geri Poor: I have a clarifying question before you move on to Dan. That was a really compelling statement, and you shared a lot of information, and I understand that you have to leave. I hope that you are able to put those comments in writing form so that anyone who is working on combining input into a letter can have access to those. That would be really great.

Eric Wright: I will get those sent out today.

Dan Kelly: Thanks so much. If there is nothing else, let's move on to Mr. McKisson.

Dan McKisson: Thank you, Chair Kelly. Thank you, Eric. I have bike and trike deliveries in my notes, too, because it's highly labor-intensive. I would second that, too, so thank you for your comments. On a broader scale, I think that what this document doesn't do is define what freight does for the State. And one of the things it really does in pedestrian modes and bicycle modes, and other wheeled modes is isn't doesn't provide jobs. Transit and freight provide jobs for a lot of people who don't go to college, and they can make a family-wage income by doing these jobs, as opposed to moving tech workers or business workers out of the City, which pedestrian and traffic does. So, I think that should be highlighted a little bit better this time. Good jobs are created by the freight industry. The other thing is they use 'freight and goods,' so we need to define exactly what we're talking about. When you're delivering groceries or packages to a home, that needs to be defined better. And then, in the overall document, you

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Geri Poor clarifying
Question

Dan Kelly
Comments/views regarding
STP

really need to highlight this better in there. Mostly, I'm just talking about the freight part of it. The other thing is, it talks about transitioning to electric vehicles. I think it talks about other sustainable fuels, but in F27, I think it says, 'transitioning to e-vehicles.' Well, we have hydrogen coming on board for heavy-duty vehicles that can be used in the ports, mainly, trucks, possibly. I think we shouldn't just limit it to electric; plus there is the electrical grid, if we do go electric. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Dan Kelly: Great. Any questions for Mr. McKisson?

Geri Poor: I'm sorry my hand is up, but I'm not going to mess with it. I'm going to ask the same of Dan McKisson, unless he is volunteering to write the letter.

Christopher Eaves: This is Chris. I'm trying to take notes down at the same time, for whomever writes the letter. Seeing that's the case, I will also try to correct my very bad spelling, since I've had to type it. Some of that will be available in short order.

Dan Kelly: Great. We want to make sure to give Mr. Wright and Mr. McKisson the opportunity, with their schedule to hop in. I will open up to any other board members that have any comments. And then, what we would like to do is look to see if there is any interest from any board members in being the person to put these thoughts together and draft a letter of response by this Monday. I'll open it up to any other board members. We'll go online first. Anyone online who would like to make some comments?

Nigel Barron: I was just going to say that I have a lot of similar notes to Eric's and Dan's. I mean, honestly, it seems like the Seattle Planning Commission letter that we got summarized a lot of my concerns relative to defining terms for freight and mobility, explaining the economic impact. I think that we all should also look pretty closely at pages nine and ten, I think it was. In the letter that the planning commission wrote, it highlighted a lot of those things. That is really my only comment on this. It's sort of overlapping everything I had.

Dan Kelly: Okay. Anyone else online? Geri, are you working your way here?

Geri Poor: Yes. I put some comments into the document that Chris has set up for us. I cannot speak to those right now because of where I am, but if I'm there in ten minutes, I would be happy to walk through my comments.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Geri Poor – request info in text form

Chris Eaves – taking notes

Nigel Barron

Comments similar to Eric W and Dan McK. Also, Seattle Planning Commission highlighted a number of concerns.

Christopher Eaves: In reference to that, I have it up. It's rather extensive, and it would be helpful if you were the one speaking to it.

Dan Kelly: Perhaps, Geri, what will do, is wait for you to show up here, and then we'll bring that up and give you the opportunity to walk through that, if you'd like.

Geri Poor: Thanks.

Dan Kelly: Anyone else online for the board? Okay, we'll move into the room.

Stanley Ryter: I share very similar comments with board members McKisson and Wright.

Christopher Eaves: I can pull up page nine and ten that Nigel mentioned. I'm trying to put that up. There we go. So, the top of page nine. I'm going to read it out. Conciseness, deemphasize transition to electric for the city-wide transportation network. It also focuses on 'that these strategies for electrification should prioritize charging for underserved, low-income, and BIPOC communities.' I think more directly, access to daily essential needs. That speaks to the comment that Nigel was speaking about, economic development, how the STP can build wealth in its (unintelligible), freight mobility. This speaks to the board's charter, integrate (unintelligible) and address conflicts, (unintelligible) corridors to combine freight and transit, and reversing the right-of-way for (unintelligible), also (unintelligible) at their final destinations. Nigel, did I mischaracterize anything?

Nigel Barron: No. In fact, I would say that the next page about parking management strategies ties into a lot of what we've saying about that last mile stuff. I can't remember the name of the lady who comes to the meetings that has been concerned about loading and unloading zones at buildings downtown, as well. So, I think this all plays into that, as well. That next one: 'Continuous for the benefit of additional parking management strategies.'

Christopher Eaves: That would be Megan Kruse.

Nigel Barron: Yes.

Stanley Ryter
Very similar comments to
McKisson and Wright

Chris Eaves
Noting page 9 in Seattle
Planning Commission
referenced by Nigel Baron

Nigel Barron
Discussion regarding parking
management

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Stanley Ryter
Comments

60 Key moves and criteria for each mode. But difficulty understanding how to score these in relation to each other. There are different influences and metrics and unsure how these build on each other.

Also the project list is from the 2016 Freight Master Plan

Chris Eaves
Project list needs to be included in the new transportation document to be eligible for grant programs

Stanley Ryter: I've got a few comments. When I look at this, I have a little more empathy for the director, directionless to get anybody and everybody to contribute to this plan. And then, you end up with a summary of 20 pages. It's really a work in progress. I read 'Implementing the Key Moves,' and I see just in the freight section there are 60 key moves that you would take to score a project. So, there are 60 things from page four to F10. Safety key moves, equity key moves, sustainability key moves, mobility key moves, livability key moves, maintenance and modernization key moves. And all of that goes just into the freight section. You can just imagine -- I didn't look at the pedestrian section; I didn't look at the bike section. But all of these people have these 60 criteria. And then, when you go to implement a project along a corridor, you're going to have the freight people weighing in, the bike people, the transit folks, the pedestrian folks. And yes, we share a common vision, but how do you score that project, and how do you get the elements into those projects to really make it go. And I say this from my experience. I am at the point in my career where I'm taking peoples' visions and trying to turn them into projects. I'm looking at this, and thinking, well, if I were to suggest a project, I would read all of these and say, well, this really helps F38 and F41 and 56. I know that sounds good, but then, everybody else is doing the same thing. And then it comes back down to different influence, aside from the metrics that you're trying to create with a document like this. And I'm not sure how all of these things build up, and when you pick a project and you execute the project, that you've picked and executed the correct project. I'm looking at the freight project list. It's from the 2016 master plan, the 2023 program report. This one could be updated to see what we have done. The project description really needs to have words that connect back to what the goals are. So, for me, it's all good stuff, but it needs one more step: How do we score these projects, and how do we figure out that we're getting the right project, not just for freight, but for the entire transportation plan. And I think the planning commission documents that were passed around mentions some of that, too. But I just wanted to make those comments today.

Christopher Eaves: I will likely speak, and this is just a detail, on the project list. That project list comes from the 2016 Freight Master Plan. You have them all because they were completed. Part of the freight program -- I know this can only be for the federal grants associated with freight requires a project list that rolls from City to region, to State. That's why that list exists right now. there are only one or two new projects there. And since it was years before these strategies were sent, it will need to be linked to what you're describing, but it's two different (unintelligible), so I will highlight that.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Stanley Ryter: Yes, and ultimately, this builds up to do you have a reasonable grant application? How does your project help freight, help equity, help inclusions, help the pedestrian. It all goes together, and there needs to be some -- that word To Be Determined almost needs to be determined.

Dan Kelly: As for myself, the only additional comment, and you can add this into the notes, there, Chris. I believe that I have to look back at past meetings that we had. I think when they brought up the transportation plan, the freight had asked for more direct outreach to the business community for their comments. And I don't know, it's not clear to me that that has happened, how they engaged with the business community.

Christopher Eaves: Okay. Thank you.

Geri Poor: Am I the last one here?

Dan Kelly: Yes, Geri. We're kind of holding to see if you were going to make it into the building here.

Geri Poor: I'm getting out of my automobile here. Chris, can you pull up the document and I can speak through my screen here? I'd like to start before we get to those details, comments, by saying I think our letter can find some points of agreement and combine some things that are important in the freight plan. I believe that it's important that the City, as a whole, works towards decarbonization. I believe that it's in freight's interest to reduce the number of single occupant vehicles on the streets and highways. I think it would be great if our letter could acknowledge the points of agreement. I would look to the board to care if what I said is all shared among us, or if there are others also. And then, I think it would be great if our letter could emphasize what we want, in addition to pointing out where the existing plan is short. I've looked at that project list. Let me also say, as a full-time employee at the Port of Seattle, I have reviewed this on the Port's behalf, and we have a lot of detailed comments. But I think the freight board letter can serve us well if we focus on projects and policies that are important, and adding any things that are missing. so, that's my second point, after we emphasize what are a few good points, and then second, be specific. And then, Chris, can I speak to the notes I pasted in?

Stanley Ryter – The metrics TBG – To Be Determined needs to be determined

Dan Kelly
Freight Board asked for more direct input from the business community for comments, but it is not clear this happened.

Geri Poor
There are points of commonality – decarbonization, SOV reduction,

Would be great to emphasize what we want as a board.

Focus on projects and policies and then be specific

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Geri Poor
The 2016 FMP had an economic vibrancy goal, but the STP doesn't.

Urban goods has some highly visible plans and policies but MICs are not called out and described

There are key differences between urban goods movement and industrial/import/export freight

Question is how do MICs fit in Seattle's economy

Christopher Eaves: Yes, if I've got them up properly. There we go. Geri's comments are in blue. There's an economic vibrancy goal.

Geri Poor: In the freight plan that this is replacing, there was economic vibrancy as a goal, and in the City's Comprehensive Plan, there was also that, but in this STP, the goals don't include an economic vibrancy. Some of the key actions speak to that, but I am suggesting that it is important, and represents the business interests that Dan was just speaking to.

And then, if you scroll down, Chris? I think we have highlighted how the urban goods and delivery has some very highly visible proposals and plans and policies and actions, but the MICs, themselves, are not called out and described as much. There are references, but I think we have all said that treatments in the MICs need to be unique, to recognize the large vehicles moving around the MICs.

Christopher Eaves: Are there goals after this?

Geri Poor: Yes. And these are things that are in the Port's letter, so our board doesn't need to review them, but I just wanted to share with folks some of the ways that our staff has reviewed it. I don't think I need to speak to each of those, Chris.

Christopher Eaves: I'm scrolling down until I see the next blue.

Geri Poor: Okay, so those were on the main plan. And then, in the freight element here, that Chris has gotten to sync what you folks have made, that freight is important to people and the need for freight is growing as the regional transportation plan says. And yet, and I think it was Eric Wright's point that said urban goods deliveries differ from the movement of international cargo. Maritime and manufacturing industrial projects, which may have to move on the large trucks. So, that's the point at the bottom of that screen.

More words than the board needs, but how do both MICs fit in the City's economy. Please scroll again, Chris. The point that major truck streets are important in that they are corralling the trucks off of other streets. So, an important part of City planning is knowing where you want these big vehicles to be so that they don't go elsewhere. And then, here is where I spoke to various projects that are important to my employer, so I

don't know how those will line up for the board, but those are some that we think are important.

And then, programs in addition to policies. I have a point that is similar to what Dan McKisson said, that it doesn't seem like they're hearing from the businesses and drayage drivers and TNC drivers. And it's important to find workable solutions across modes. And then for data, and I think somebody already made this point, that there are not clear tie backs to data and performance metrics. **Then, for project lists early on, there was an assumption that a single STP would be able to prioritize among the different modes, and this plan falls short of that. And if that's going to happen in phase 4 or phase 5 of the plan, we need to be engaged in that. And the performance metrics points to the same comment I made under data. So those are some things that we might want to comment on.**

I think I'll stand down now.

Dan McKisson: Thank you. I just want to make another comment on single-occupancy vehicles. I think Geri brought it up. The less we have on the road, the better it is for freight to be able to move through and have less congestion. And I don't see how this document gets people into that. There was just an article that was put out that during Covid that the people who had to take transit still took transit, because there was no other option. Are we going to get the tech executives onto a train or bus instead of driving single-occupancy vehicles, which they don't need. There are certain occupations that need them. An electrician needs to bring his tools; and plumber need to bring his tools. But these other people, I don't see any explanation of how we're going to attract people to get out of their cars. And I think that's pretty important. It just says let's build it and they will come, but I don't see it happening.

Christopher Eaves: I think we have a little bit of time to engage in some public comment. Eugene, I see your hand up.

Eugene Wasserman: We've been writing a letter and going over stuff, so I thought I'd tell you what the North Seattle Industrial Association feels about this. We think this whole project is incomplete. It never should have been released to the public in this format. It's very disorganized and it's hard to follow. So, we think they should take it back and produce another draft, and then do another draft EIS. It's hard to go through. It's a not well done document. We had trouble just finding things in one section. We want a map where we can see where all of the modes share the same streets, and

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Programs – similar to Dan McKisson – doesn't seem like business and drayage/TNC drivers are being polled.
Project lists (CE Note – bold added for emphasis).

Dan McKisson – The fewer SOV's on the road, the lower congestion. This helps professions that need to be in vehicles. i.e. electricians and plumbers who need a variety of tools

But don't see an explanation of how we're moving people out of cars

Eugene Wasserman:
NSIA considers the document incomplete and difficult to follow. Should have another round of review and EIS

what that implies. We have asked for that for probably 15 years now. We can go to the freight board and a lot of other people, and we never see that. So, we're not happy about that. We feel that a lot of good work that I participated in, and the freight board people did -- Warren Aakervik did; Geri Poor did on different parts of the Seattle Freight Master Plan, and now moves forward into this plan. And we're wondering why that's not there. It's like they're trying to start from scratch on this stuff. We also feel that the whole (unintelligible) should be economic development or whatever term people want to use, but there's not economic development in this. It sounds like a plan that you would get from a (unintelligible), where you're putting roads out, walkways, and things like that. But not where people are running businesses. There's no section for downtown. As other people pointed out, on the MICs. So, we just have a lot of problems with it. I just think they need to do more work on it, and they need to put more resources into it. Instead, they have a staff who, when they started this, didn't have the knowledge and resources. Now, they're actually getting that knowledge, but they put this out before it was ready. We don't understand why this came out before the Seattle Comprehensive Plan draft came out. It's supposed to be based on that, and they assure us that it is, but I don't really believe them. There's a different group writing that plan, and those groups never coalesce around things by accident. So, we just think it needs a lot more work. There is also a concern that the City doesn't follow its Comprehensive Plan. Around Route 40, where we were writing letters to say that this doesn't meet what the Comprehensive Plan says, and they go, well, we don't have to listen to it. Anyhow, this needs a lot more work. And we don't understand who in the City is in charge of the Comprehensive Plan, it's an SDOT plan, but I never hear them mention or discuss this at all. And we're also concerned -- there's a part on how to reduce carbon stuff that was released, but we have no idea where that plan came from, why it was being done, and how it goes with sustainability. So, the Mayor promised us and SDOT, a one-Seattle approach where we would all be involved in this during the development of these plans. And until recently, we have not, and that's why you get this mishmash of these issues that should have been dealt with months ago.

So, while we're not happy with the plan itself, we think that if things work out (unintelligible). Right now, we don't think that it's ready for prime time and we're wasting a lot of energy on things that are not ready for prime time. It's a waste of our time. In the last two months, we have seen the staff pay more attention to our issues than they have in prior years, since they didn't know what they were when they were hired. We are looking forward to the Comprehensive Plan when it comes out.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

A history of work is being lost.

No downtown section

No MIC information

Don't understand why this was put out before the Comprehensive Plan

Route 40 concerns – may not meet comp plan.

Question about carbon reduction and how that specific plan came to be

We think this can be developed but is not ready right now for prime time.

Dan Kelly: Thank you, Eugene. Appreciate that. Anybody else have their hand raised online?

Eric Wright: My apologies. I'm going to have to leave the meeting in just a few minutes. But I wanted to just offer some final thoughts. I like a lot of the comments that have been said in the room. I think there's a lot of very thoughtful comments that have been said. I agree with the comments around decarbonization, however I think that in the process of looking at how to accomplish those types of goals, this thing needs to be 1) less prescriptive, because the technology that is grabbing the headlines today may not be the best technology that comes around five or ten years from now; 2) it probably should be done through the lens of the lifecycle of what's happening in the logistics supply chain, as opposed to a direct planning commission or a direct whatever. I think that is something that is really missing from the conversation right now. What will happen at the end of the life of these new technologies and how will the City work with disposing of them? Are we setting ourselves up for future failure? We really need to cover that question. And the last thing I would like to point out is it occurred to me as everybody was talking and providing their perspective is that the one thing that this document lacks is vision. It's a document in search of glasses. It doesn't have a positive vision for the future. For a City that is built on technology companies and has a very deep history of trade, the best thing that we can do is e-bikes. It seems like this was put together with a bunch of people putting in their input, but there was nothing at the top saying this is where we should be going as a City. Tell me how we get there. Those are my final thoughts. I appreciate everybody's time today, and comments.

From Chat: from Howard Agnew to everyone: 9:49 AM
A thought on reducing single occupancy vehicles: Unfortunately it seems some employers are opposing or resisting telecommute options for jobs that can be accomplished remotely.

Dan Kelly: Great. Thank you, Eric. Anyone else online? Any public comments?

Christopher Eaves: I don't see hands up online.

Dan Kelly: Any public comments that people would like to make? No?

Eugene Wasserman: I have a comment.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Eric Wright

Many thoughtful
comments- believe

1. Things need to be less proscriptive
2. Viewed through lifecycle lenses

Are we setting ourselves up
for future failure.

Document have a positive
vision for the future –
technology or trade.

Would like to see how we
develop a vision and how
we get there

Howard Agnew

A thought on reducing
single occupancy
vehicles: Unfortunately it
seems some employers are
opposing or resisting
telecommute options for
jobs that can be
accomplished remotely.

Dan Kelly: Eugene, go ahead.

Eugene Wasserman: I just want to say when I made my public comments about the plan, the amount of expertise on the freight board to help with the plan, and the lack of involvement by the freight board shows you what is really wrong with this plan. There are people in this room -- and I'm not an expert on this plan, so it may include me -- but the experts who have done this work have met very few times with you, and they come with a list of things they'd like to discuss with you. They make quick presentations; you make some comments. They didn't solicit you as a group to work on this over the last two or three years, and that, to me, wraps up their problem. They didn't go to the people who actually do this stuff. They talked among themselves and people they know, and that's a waste of valuable talent that's in this room.

Dan Kelly: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Christopher Eaves: I don't see other hands up.

Geri Poor: Would it be appropriate to spend five minutes -- some of us in the room have in front of us the freight and goods element that has the list on it, and I wonder if we could suggest projects that are especially important that we would like to prioritize for SDOT to move forward on?

Christopher Eaves: This follows the format of North Central South on that project list.

Geri Poor: I'm not going to walk through each one and read it. Perhaps members of the board could look at the ones on the first page, the ones that stand out, the bridges, Ballard and -- the bridge projects are important.

Stanley Ryter: I second that. Bridge projects are deeply important. Each of the bridges have (unintelligible) deficiencies or functionally obsolete deficiencies.

Geri Poor: I think number three is speaking to the potential of closure at Holgate, which is a grant planning project.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Eugene Wasserman
The valuable talent in the SFAB has not been tapped, and it is a waste

Project Prioritization
Discussion

Consideration made that
the work would be complex
and require its own
workshop.

Christopher Eaves: This is Chris. Item three is not directly speaking to a closure of Holgate, but is considering whether or not a grade separation. It was again, a 2016 project at a specific location.

Geri Poor: I think four and five are also important to the viaducts over (unintelligible) Yard. Do people favor that?

Herb Krohn: If I could speak to those two projects, numbers four and five, those are not only issues related to freight mobility. Those are issues directly related to the safety of railroad workers underneath those bridges. Big pieces of concrete are coming down, falling underneath that bridge under the walkways right below it. This is to prevent someone from getting hit. Eventually, someone may get seriously injured from the concrete breaking loose and falling down on somebody who is working underneath that bridge.

Dan Kelly: Geri, just to clarify, the intent to go through an identify, do you think it would be part of the letter that we have for the 23rd. Should we identify the priorities for the projects?

Geri Poor: I would propose, yes, that we do that for the top three to five, or so, to be able to say that this is what we want. It looks like all the way down to 30, the way I'm reading it. Are there others in the BINMIC area? Maybe it's too fast to do this, but you might consider the ones in the BINMICs to call out.

Stanley Ryter: The tricky part is we are creating a transportation plan, and we've got this lens of all of these things that are supposedly important: safety, equity, sustainability, livability, maintenance and modernization. We have to filter all of that, and say, okay, this is really the best project because of this, and then it comes back down to modal prioritization, right? It's a huge prioritization project. But there is a lot of merit in all 70 of these. That would almost take a workshop of some kind.

Geri Poor: Yes.

Dan Kelly: I just want to see if that was the direction we were headed.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Project Prioritization
Discussion

Herb Krohn- Projects 4 and
5 have rail implications

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Dan Gatchet: I going to jump in. I don't think we can start picking these projects without some basis or criteria. You're asking to rank all of these projects and pick out the most worthy, and to me, that's just a gut feel, or peoples' personal opinions versus some systematic ranking of these projects.

Geri Poor: I agree. It's ambitious. I will back off.

Dan Kelly: I understand. Thank you, Dan.

Christopher Eaves: Perhaps we may be able to find context. The freight plan has different sizes of projects, and in these last seven years, three have been opportunities to help advance work to finish a project. They were prioritized by opportunity, quite frankly, and then by costs to be borne. I don't know that these projects have in common. They were offered as alternatives to freight and goods movement. So, yes it would be a huge effort. i don't know that we have ever performed that as a City or Port. So, what you're seeing are projects that are available, capital projects with pretty heavy price tags. I'm only trying to provide context to say why this is here. And I think it would be difficult in the remaining half hour to set up a context of STP (unintelligible).

Dan Gatchet: Yes, I'm just going to share that a few years ago, I was on the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board, and one of our main objectives was taking out the most worthy project, and there are different criteria, raking, scoring, and you had almost all of the modes, cities, counties involved in it. So, 1) the list was finalized and given to the Legislature for funding if everyone supported it. But there is a lot of effort that goes into making that list to submit to the Legislature. It's the same thing here, I think. All of these projects, at least the ones I looked at, seem worthy. I don't know a lot about them, but trying to pick number nine over number 17, or something like that, then it becomes a personality or who is advocating for that. And then, you don't get a consensus when you want to submit it, and people are going to feel like, well, this guy had that support, and she had that support, and they were able to get their projects moved up on the list, versus a systematic way of ranking them. We definitely can't do it in a half hour. I doubt if we could do it by Monday, either.

Dan Kelly: I suggest we take this away as an action item as we move forward to find a way to be able to communicate those prioritizations to the group.

Project Prioritization
Discussion

Project Prioritization
Discussion

Consideration made that
the work would be complex
and require its own
workshop.

Dan Kelly – Lets take this as
an action item

CE Note – Bold added for
emphasis

Herb Krohn: The numbers on the rest of the 60-some projects, was that some type of prioritization at that point in time?

Christopher Eaves: No. It was literally numbered from north to south on a map. There was no rhyme or reason, other than that we had a number of them.

Herb Krohn: Geographic. Thank you.

Dan Gatchet: I was going to chime in a second time. Maybe the recommendation would be to set up a way to rank these. If they're serious about taking the best freight projects that we have, and it would be similar to what we did at the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board, where you have all of the modes and by representative, and try to find out what the key criteria are for these projects and then rank them. Maybe that would be our recommendation.

Christopher Eaves: You all were saying that on page three of the Planning Commission's letter, they had two bullets. **It says, explicit goals, performance measures, targets, and clarifying the prioritization, framework and implementation strategy. It seems like this discussion is beginning to parallel that.**

Stanley Ryter: Yes. So that's really how STP plans work, to come up with performance measurement targets, implementation, and prioritization framework (unintelligible). They provide the framework and then we push it into the framework.

Christopher Eaves: Yes. I think that we've already looked at the freight board's charter for the advisory board to counsel, and the departments within the City, providing expertise and information that would not normally be had. At a transportation plan level, the document draft STP seeks to generate a prioritization, such that has been discussed here. The Planning Commission put this in, and I'm going well into supposition at this point, and I think we would want to back away as a public board as a discussion.

Dan Kelly: So, certainly, that would be noted in our letter, the freight board's input regarding the Seattle Transportation Plan, echoing what the Planning Commission has

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Herb Krohn – What is the significance of the projects numbers?

Chris Eaves – no significance assigned - geographic

Chris Eaves
Planning Commission asked for information the SFAB is paralleling
CE Note – bold added for emphasis

Dan Kelly – Need to note this in SFAB letter

brought up. And I think that's been brought up by a couple of different people in the comments today, as well. Right?

Christopher Eaves: Yes. Nigel Barron brought that up.

Dan Kelly: So, I think what I would like to do now, and we can probably talk about this, since everyone has had the opportunity to be heard, I think we should see if maybe there is a board member who would like to be able to put some of these thoughts together into a draft letter response to this. I don't know if there is anyone who has the time, the bandwidth, to be able to put that together? Any volunteers? Anyone online? Dan Gatchet, with your experience there, is that something you would be willing to take on for us?

Dan Gatchet: This needs to be done by Monday?

Dan Kelly: That's correct.

Dan Gatchet: I'm actually on vacation down south in California. I don't know if I am going to have enough time between now and Sunday, to get it done.

Christopher Eaves: I can provide support, but it needs to be a board member.

Dan Kelly: So, what we'll do in the interest of time, is I will go ahead and be that person at this point. I'll lean on other board members with the notes that Christopher Eaves has put together and see if we can't get something drafted out to the groups by Thursday or early Friday for consideration.

Geri Poor: We really appreciate your taking this on.

Dan Kelly: You betcha.

Christopher Eaves: We need to put that to a vote for the draft and then we send it.

Dan Kelly: Okay. So, the proposal is that the Seattle Freight Advisory Board will draft a letter of response. Do we need to put a timeframe in there? That we have to have it drafted and before the board by this Friday for consideration and vote.

Geri Poor: Based on the comments that we heard today.

Dan Kelly: Based on the comments provided today., and any other comments that would be added. Christopher Eaves will wordsmith that for us.

Christopher Eaves: I will provide support to you for that.

Dan Kelly: You will provide support to us for that. So that's the motion I propose. Is there a second?

Stanley Ryter: Second.

Dan Kelly: We've got a second. Any discussion?

Geri Poor: I'm happy to help with an outline, if you like.

Dan Kelly: Oh, we'll be talking, for sure. Excellent. All right. I'll call the question. All in favor? Any opposed? Motion carries. We will move on to our next item, then. Previous freight advisory board presentation updates.

PREVIOUS FREIGHT ADVISORY BOARD PRESENTATION UPDATES

Christopher Eaves: I had ambitiously hoped to find information on the projects. All of them are in process. There's a Reconnect South Park that is out for proposal. Actually, the proposal is out for review. it will be sent to Port of Seattle. this is the effort to reconnect the South Park community from SR 99 disruption. I have been told that the Georgetown to Downtown Safety Project is still in design. They're working through all of the comments that were provided. I have had no information on 15th Avenue NW, which was a project that included a median at 15th Avenue at Market. i have been remiss in connecting with the Aurora and 99 for updates. And I have sent comment on to the 130th Street Safety Project, which we saw last month. It is in its preliminary stages of design. I will note, too, that it is referenced in the STP, that once the transportation plan work is completed, the Streets Illustrated document, which is the standards for roadway design and build will be updated. And as an FYI, internally they are already working to update the work sheet, which we use to evaluate projects and bring them into better modes. This is a lot of different things. A lot of things we talked about this year. They are all continuing. I don't have good updates, other than to say

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Dan Kelly to take on development of letter with support from Chris Eaves notes

Previous Freight Advisory Board Presentation Updates

Few updates on past projects

Streets Illustrated document is to be updated after STP is finalized

they are still in design, and I can provide output and get better information, hopefully at this upcoming meeting, which is December 5. That is what I have on this.

Dan Kelly: Okay. Any questions or comments for Chris Eaves from the board on that topic? Anybody online raise their hand for that? Anybody in the room?

Thomas Noyes: Just to chime in, (unintelligible)

Dan Kelly: Would you like to come out so we can get you closer to the mic for Cass Magnuski?

Thomas Noyes: Hi. Thomas Noyes, WSDOT. I'm the liaison from WSDOT to this committee. Obviously, I'm not a board member. But I just wanted to chime in. In the City, SDOT had an internal agency workshop last week. They're working on (unintelligible)... kind of divided into five segments. So, last week we had an internal series of workshops to look at some alternative cross-sections for each segment. There are five segments total. So, up to, potentially 18 cross-section concepts. And they are going to be taking some time to digest all these things from the workshop, but I suspect probably late this year or early next year, they might be ready to come back to the board to give a briefing, probably in January from what those are. I think there are questions in terms of the system. The regional corridor that they've broken up into five segments, and their next stage, as I understand it, is to go out to the public with these concepts, ideas, alternatives, three per segment. But it doesn't sound like they're going to go to the next step to look at how do these concepts work together at a corridor level. We have some questions and concerns about that, but I just wanted to chime in on that. It may be a discussion for the December meeting, but from WSDOT's perspective. Early next year, we are going to be initiating the I-5 Master Plan (unintelligible) I-5 lid (unintelligible). There is actually some study finding the City and WSDOT working together downtown ramp configurations and how they might be reconfigured as part of this whole I-5 Master Plan effort. I suspect that early next year, we might want to come to give a briefing on the I-5 Master Plan. Because that is of great significance to Seattle. They are working on an RFQ for a general engineering consultant to be hired sometime this fall. I believe that should be done by December for them to start work on the master plan.

Dan Kelly: Appreciate that very much. Thank you.

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Thomas Noyes (WSDOT)
Revive I-5 work would like
to come in and speak in
early 2024

Geri Poor: I would like to put forward to the board, just for those of us interested in the downtown Seattle Link extension, there's a public (unintelligible) being held, I think, on Thursday, October 25, which will be looking at what the West Seattle extension is. And that goes from the Lander station out to the West Seattle Junction as it passes through the Duwamish MIC. It will be of interest to us. I know there's an expectation to build an overpass on Lander between 4th and 6th to decrease the amount of time that traffic has stopped on Lander. It makes an interesting ride.

Dan Kelly: For sure. So, I'm going to try to tie this up so we can pull out item seven. Are there any questions or comments that the board has for Christopher Eaves, regarding those projects before we move on to closing public comment? I don't think there are any more, but just before we make that transition now for any closing public comment. I see a hand raised in the room.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tyler Blackwell: Tyler Blackwell, SODO BIA. I just wanted to touch on that, Geri. Sound Transit will also be meeting in November with the SODO BIA, for maybe more direct outreach with the freight community, the business community in the industrial district, with regard to the West Seattle Link extension. The details have not been finalized yet, but I can share them with Chris Eaves when they become available.

Dan Kelly: So, no other public comment in the room, I assume. Right? Any hands raised online for any closing public comment?

Christopher Eaves: I don't see any.

Dan Kelly: Great. A lot of good information shared today, and we'll let the board, maybe go around online, and then in the room for any final comments. Before we do that, Chris, for December, do you mind recapping for the December agenda.

DECEMBER AGENDA

Christopher Eaves: I still need to build the December agenda. Among the action items are talking to the group that is beginning to describe future funding efforts, meaning the end of the levy in 2024, trying to understand what, if anything, is proposed

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

Geri Poor
Public meeting October 25th
regarding WSBLE light rail
extension

Public Comment

Tyler Blackwell (SODO BIA)

Sound Transit will also meet
in November with SODO BIA
for direct outreach with
freight community, business
community in industrial
district. Will finalize and
send info to Chris Eaves for
distribution.

to move forward in the budget. I also probably would want to see in the STP meeting if Radcliffe Dacanay would be available for the December meeting to see where we are.

Dan Kelly: Okay. Perfect. Thanks. So, we'll ask any board online to see if they have any final comments before we adjourn? Or announcements? Any hands? We'll look to the room. Show your hands if you have any announcements to make? Seeing none, we'll move to adjourn. All in favor? Any opposed? Appreciate everyone's time and comments today. Thanks so much!

ADJOURNMENT

SFAB 10/17/23 MEETING

December Agenda – Future Funding effort ahead of End of Levy – potentially for January 2024

Adjournment