

## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 4:44 PM  
**To:** Gray, Moira; Gray, Amy  
**Subject:** FW: Flume Table  
**Attachments:** MOA flume table 4.9.2020.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hallie is still working w/ scl and parks on who is doing what on the flume propert. Lots of detail need to be added!

---

**From:** OBrien, Hallie <Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2020 3:54 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Flume Table

Hi Beverly,

I am sending the attached table to discuss at our 4:00 meeting today,

thank you,

Hallie O'Brien

## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2020 11:16 AM  
**To:** Sheldon, Elizabeth; Steel, Angela  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira; Gray, Amy  
**Subject:** FW: Update on Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

This is great news!

---

**From:** Croll, Timothy <Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2020 11:12 AM  
**To:** Jenkins, Michael <Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov>; Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>; Kinast, Valerie <Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Goldberg, DavidW <DavidW.Goldberg@seattle.gov>; OBrien, Hallie <Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov>; Sheffer, Andy <Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov>; Griffith, Emily <Emily.Griffith@seattle.gov>; Lotfi, Danyal <Danyal.Lotfi@seattle.gov>; Meraz-Caron, Ruth <Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Update on Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

Colleagues:

I wanted to bring you up to date on some developments of the flume proposal, prior to our preparation meeting on Wednesday morning.

City Light General Manager/CEO Debra Smith has decided that City Light will fund the budget shortfall on SDOT's flume trail project which is \$1,283,000. This is in addition to City Light's previous commitments of \$185,000 for the shortfall for Parks' OLA, the \$480,000 for soil removal and fresh gravel, and of course the provision of the property (all contingent on the granting of the vacation, of course.)

So in summary, the various department contributions are:

Parks: existing budget authority and staff time = \$400,000  
SDOT: existing budget authority = \$400,000  
SCL: \$1,903,000 in existing budget authority + \$1,854,000 in property = a total contribution of \$3,757,000

Note that the project as it is presently conceived is fully funded by existing sources. No part of the base project is contingent on additional Council appropriation or securing outside grants, though such grants could usefully support enhanced amenities.

Hopefully this will put to rest any concerns about the completeness or the certainty of the proposal.

I look forward to our further discussions on Wednesday morning.

Tim



## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Sent:** Friday, August 7, 2020 12:09 PM  
**To:** Croll, Timothy; Meraz-Caron, Ruth  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira; Jenkins, Michael  
**Subject:** Diagonal Way vacation follow-up

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good morning. Here are a couple of items related to the Diagonal Way vacation.

**Response to Comments:** every vacation is circulated broadly for review by city departments, utilities, outside agencies and the public. This step in the review is important to identify a range of code, policy and design issues that must be addressed. As anticipated, your unusual proposal has not identified much that must be addressed. However, we still need you to respond to each comment so that the comment and your response can be included in the SDOT recommendation to the City Council. This practice ensures that all comments have been provided to you and you have reviewed or addressed each issue. Your response should be simple and brief similar to responding to EIS comments. If any agency noted no impacts or no comment all you would need to respond is “comment acknowledged” or something similar. With any comment that identified an issue or question, you should respond with how the issue was resolved or how you responded. This would include how you responded to any direction from the Design Commission when they have completed their review. This response to comments should be forwarded to me as a complete package when the review process is largely complete and we are preparing for City Council review. Let me know if you have questions about this.

**Public Benefit Proposal:** As we move forward to Design Commission review of the public benefit proposal I wanted to reiterate my concern that SCL’s public benefit proposal needs to be enhanced. The vacation policies anticipate that the vacation public benefit be provided at the same time as the development is completed. The policies do not indicate that a step toward a future public benefit constitutes a public benefit. SCL should provide a public space that is safe, usable, and meets community needs and priorities as its vacation obligation. Lighting, water, and signage at a minimum should be a part of the SCL package.

Working with other City departments to enhance an existing public benefit is a fantastic way to provide much more to the community but we need the right basis to build on. In the current budget climate I am concerned with the financial commitment that City departments can provide at this time. At the last Design Commission meeting the Commission was very focused on the design elements and the work of Parks in particular. I have shared with the

Design Commission a request that as a Step 1 in the review of the public benefit proposal the Commission focus on what SCL has committed to provide and whether that is adequate as a vacation public benefit. A Step 2 of the discussion could include the timing and financial commitment that other departments can make at this time. This is not a three department CIP project but is an SCL vacation proposal and then a collaborative effort for other City departments to enhance, maintain, and program the SCL initial public benefit.

We have talked about this a lot over that last couple of years as SCL has considered the vacation at Diagonal Way but I wanted you to anticipate that this is what I will be sharing at the Design Commission discussions on the public benefit.

Thank you.

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Partap, Trevor](#); [OBrien, Hallie](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Reminder Input needed on Diagonal Way S street vacation for Seattle City Light project  
**Date:** Monday, July 13, 2020 2:11:34 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[image007.jpg](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

Hi Trevor. Hope you are doing well. Moira shared your comments with me and wanted to put you in touch with Hallie O'Brien about SCL project and SDOT's role in a trail at the Flume Site.

SCL has been working with SDOT and Parks for about 2 years at least trying to establish a partnership to develop an off lease area and a bike/ped trail at the Flume property in Georgetown. Since SCL is seeking a vacation they are obligated to provide a public benefit and right now they propose to convey a portion of the Flume property to Parks for the off-leash area and a portion to SDOT for development of the bike/ped trail connection. SCL proposed to provide the property with a clean surface and fencing. The obligation to design, develop, and maintain would be with Parks for their piece and with SDOT for the trail.

This proposal was pre-Covid impacts and pre West Seattle Bridge issues. We are at a point where we need to determine what SDOT can provide. The public benefit needs to coordinate with the vacation and the SCL work and cannot occur too far in the future.

I have included Hallie on this email and hope she can provide an update on the work she is doing on this. Thanks!

---

**From:** Gray, Moira <Moira.Gray@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 1:45 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Reminder Input needed on Diagonal Way S street vacation for Seattle City Light project

Comment from Trevor on pb trail maintenance and possibility of new sidewalk at Diagonal

Moira Gray

SDOT, Street Use

O: 206.684.8272

---

**From:** Partap, Trevor <[Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov](mailto:Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 1:01 PM

**To:** Gray, Moira <[Moira.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Moira.Gray@seattle.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: Reminder Input needed on Diagonal Way S street vacation for Seattle City Light project

Moira,

The Pavement Engineering team doesn't have any issues with this proposed vacation, given that it is a dead end street and we are not impacting any adjacent property owners (I'm not sure what other utilities may be in that street, but I'll let the utilities chime in). What is the possibility of building a sidewalk on the north side of Industrial Way S (the portion that will remain public).

My only issue is with the trail in the public benefit package and figuring out O&M responsibilities, what does that look like?

Thanks,

Trev

---

**From:** Byers, Susan <[Susan.Byers@seattle.gov](mailto:Susan.Byers@seattle.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 12:06 PM

**To:** Partap, Trevor <[Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov](mailto:Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: Reminder Input needed on Diagonal Way S street vacation for Seattle City Light project

Trevor,

Would you take the lead on this!

Susan Byers, PE

[Seattle Department of Transportation](#)

O: 206-684-5311 | M: 206-941-9650

[susan.byers@seattle.gov](mailto:susan.byers@seattle.gov)

---

**From:** Gray, Moira <[Moira.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Moira.Gray@seattle.gov)>

**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2020 10:47 AM

**To:** Gray, Moira <[Moira.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Moira.Gray@seattle.gov)>

**Cc:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>

**Subject:** Reminder Input needed on Diagonal Way S street vacation for Seattle City Light project

Reminder: your input is important for evaluating this proposal.

SDOT has received a street vacation petition from Seattle City Light (SCL) to vacate a portion of Diagonal Way S west of 4<sup>th</sup> Ave S, in the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing & Industrial Center area. The vacation would support improvements SCL is proposing to its storage yard that is currently under permit in the right-of-way and improve access between the yard and the SCL South Service Center.

For required public benefit, SCL proposes improving property in Georgetown (known as the Flume parcel) for off-leash and multi-use trail purposes. Include comments on the vacation at Diagonal and the public benefit in Georgetown.

**Your review is important in the evaluation of the proposed street vacation. Please notify SDOT Street Vacations if you are no longer a reviewer.**

**Please comment on:**

- How the vacation & subsequent development of the site impacts your activities or functions,
- Issues of concern,
- Public benefit proposal,
- Provide suggested conditions if the vacation is granted.

**How to comment:**

Please provide comments to me in order for us to better coordinate information with the applicant. Summary information is attached to this email and below is a link to the full application:

[Clerk File 314451](#)

Agency comments must include name, title and organization.

Bluebeam reviewers: access project information in Bluebeam session: 432-603-425

Comments become part of the official public record and are included in the SDOT recommendation to the City Council.

Thank you!

Moira Gray  
Street Vacation Coordinator, Street Use  
City of Seattle [Department of Transportation](#)  
O: 206.684.8272 | [moira.gray@seattle.gov](mailto:moira.gray@seattle.gov)





**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Croll, Timothy](#); [Anindita Mitra](#); [Meraz-Caron, Ruth](#); [Nevins, Chip](#); [Goldberg, DavidW](#); [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Kinast, Valerie](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#); [Gray, Amy](#)  
**Subject:** Next steps for SCL's Diagonal Way vacation petition  
**Date:** Friday, October 04, 2019 10:56:49 AM

---

Good morning everyone. I think SCL did a great job yesterday on presenting the capital project to the Design Commission and introducing the proposed vacation. I believe this completes the pre-vacation activities. I would like to confirm that DON has accepted the Community Engagement Plan and did not ask for any additional information.

The discussion yesterday was a preview of the questions we can expect from the Design Commission and other reviewers about the budget, planning, design and timing of the park. I believe that SCL should support the design and community work to select a design as part of the public benefit package. Then Parks and other city agencies can develop a phasing and implementation strategy. The material that SCL submits as part of the vacation petition should be clear about what SCL is proposing to do and should begin to respond to the early direction the Design Commission provided yesterday.

For the petition:

1. Petition form: there is a specific petition that must be used. Moira Gray (cc'd here) will prepare the petition form. This includes a legal description of the ROW proposed for vacation, the name of the owner, and a space for signature by the SCL Superintendent. Please contact Moira about the petition form and the fee.
2. \$6,5000: the filing fee is \$6,5000, please contact Moira about setting up a fund for payment of the fee.
3. Supporting material: follow the vacation checklist and provide responses to each of the items on the checklist. We may want to meet when you have a draft and review everything before you formally submit.

Thanks!

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Croll, Timothy](#); [Meraz-Caron, Ruth](#); [Anindita Mitra](#)  
**Cc:** [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Kinast, Valerie](#); [Gray, Moira](#); [Gray, Amy](#); [Steel, Angela](#); [Friedman, Danielle](#); [Whitson, Lish](#)  
**Subject:** Pre-petition activities for SCL proposed vacation at Diagonal Way  
**Date:** Friday, August 09, 2019 10:42:51 AM

---

Good morning everyone. I wanted to check in on the pre-petition work for SCL's proposed vacation at Diagonal Way.

**Feasibility meeting:** this meeting was held and some issues were identified

1. SCL's activities on site can be accommodated with a permit so SCL needs to clearly articulate a compelling reason why a permit is not adequate and why a vacation is necessary
2. Provide a clearer picture of what will happen on the site, how the ROW will be used, and why the ROW is necessary
3. Develop a no-vacation alternative, if the vacation isn't feasible how will SCL meet its programmatic needs
4. Public benefit, the public benefit needs to be a current benefit that has real value to the public. Providing property to Parks for a future park doesn't meet the criteria. I believe SCL needs to actually plan, design, and develop the property proposed to provide a public benefit.

**Community Engagement Plan:** SCL has developed a plan with DON and has been engaged with the community on the early work. It will be important for the community to have a voice in the proposed public benefit. As of the end of July, SCL has not provided documentation to DON regarding the community work. This does need to be completed before SDOT can accept a vacation petition.

**Early review by Design Commission:** prep meetings have been held and SCL is scheduled to present to the Design Commission on October 6. The prep meetings have raised some of the same questions about the use of the site and the necessity for a vacation. There were also questions regarding the public benefit and what SCL was proposing to provide.

These are just my notes on the progress on the pre-petition activities but I wanted to make sure we all had the same information. Does SCL have an idea when SDOT will receive the petition and supporting documentation? Thanks

**From:** [Jenkins, Michael](#)  
**To:** [Croll, Timothy](#); [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#); [Gray, Amy](#); [OBrien, Hallie](#); [Whitson, Lish](#); [Nevins, Chip](#); [Sheffer, Andy](#); [Meraz-Caron, Ruth](#); [Curtin, Jim](#); [Goldberg, DavidW](#); [Lotfi, Danyal](#); [DeBoer, Tom](#); [Kinast, Valerie](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Still needs SCL application fee!  
**Date:** Thursday, April 16, 2020 4:27:37 PM

---

Hey Tim:

Just a quick note on the next step for Commission review. The next commission review will look at both the Public Trust phase of the vacation review concurrent with the 30% or concept phase review of the capital facility proposal located at Diagonal. We typically schedule that concurrent review after the petition has been introduced and circulated to City departments, with comments received by Beverly. That way the commission can hear about the issues that were raised with the vacation review by other departments and how those issues are being addressed.

At the first review we typically don't focus in on the public benefit package. However, given the complexity of that package and the interdepartmental efforts needed to achieve the public's expectations (and the commissions) about the proposed open space, some high level discussion is appropriate. The starting place for that high level overview concerning public benefits could very well be any MOA's developed between the department on deliverables for the public benefit package.

M

---

**From:** Croll, Timothy <Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2020 3:42 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira <Moira.Gray@seattle.gov>; Gray, Amy <Amy.Gray@seattle.gov>; Jenkins, Michael <Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov>; OBrien, Hallie <Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov>; Whitson, Lish <Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov>; Nevins, Chip <Chip.Nevins@seattle.gov>; Sheffer, Andy <Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov>; Meraz-Caron, Ruth <Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov>; Curtin, Jim <Jim.Curtin@seattle.gov>; Goldberg, DavidW <DavidW.Goldberg@seattle.gov>; Lotfi, Danyal <Danyal.Lotfi@seattle.gov>; DeBoer, Tom <Tom.DeBoer@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Still needs SCL application fee!

Beverly:

Thanks for your email. We understand that the review of the petition cannot start until the funds are transmitted to SDOT. My colleague Ruth is working with City Light Accounting to get that done. As is true for many activities these days, the work from home regime has been a bit of an impediment to this.

In terms of schedule, the hope that City Light shares with our partner departments is that the review will provide smoothly, but obviously that cannot happen until the application (including payment) is complete. We have taken longer than we first

expected to get the petition in; the schedule will obviously have to reflect the time necessary to do the review, even if that means that it may not be complete by 3Q. Ultimately, because the vacation must be approved by the Council, any schedule we would include on the petition would be our best guess or, more precisely, our request.

On the subject of schedule, I have a question about the first step. Once the petition is complete, you mention that it will be introduced to the City Council. Is that the same or similar to an ordinance or resolution being introduced on the referral calendar? Is the required action for its introduction just the approval of the referral calendar by the full Council, or is some specific action by the Transportation and Utilities Committee needed to complete its introduction? Of course, I am thinking about the degree to which COVID-19 is impacting Council's regular business in a way that might preclude you or the Design Commission from even starting a consideration of the petition.

What I remember being explained to me is that there are two steps to the review, whenever it starts. The first of these includes an interdepartmental review and a first Design Commission meeting focusing on public trust issues. It is our hope that once the petition is complete and introduced this first step can proceed.

The second step would be the public benefit. While it remains City Light's belief that the initial project as outlined in the submitted petition/MOA would result in a useable, beneficial amenity for the community that was also appropriately scaled for the size of the Diagonal Ave vacation. Nevertheless, we are aware that the project concept has continued to evolve with the benefit of Parks and SDOT investigations, including some of the components that you mention. City Light is in ongoing discussions about the project definition and the respective contributions – financial and otherwise – by the various departments. We are confident that this will all be clarified within a reasonably short period of time, leading to a final executed MOA.

You had some additional comments about the change of the property's jurisdiction from City Light to Parks and SDOT. I am most familiar with many previous (non-street vacation related) property transfers from City Light to Parks or SPU. These were all accomplished with just an ordinance; no deeds were apparently involved probably because the City as a whole remained the property owner. However, I cannot claim extensive experience in this area and will coordinate with City Light, Parks and SDOT real property staff and the City Attorney's Office to confirm the best technical approach. Your suggestion of including in the MOA which department is responsible for surveying, legal descriptions, the ordinance or other document preparation is a good one.

Beverly, this has been a long and interesting journey and it is clear that it will continue that way for awhile still. City Light appreciates the advice and support that you and Michael Jenkins and your respective staffs have offered to date. I look forward to our continuing conversations. We remain confident that in the end this will be a great success for all participating departments and the community.

TIMOTHY CROLL  
SEATTLE CITY LIGHT

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 16, 2020 1:41 PM

**To:** Croll, Timothy <[Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov](mailto:Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov)>; Meraz-Caron, Ruth <[Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov](mailto:Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov)>

**Cc:** Gray, Moira <[Moira.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Moira.Gray@seattle.gov)>; Gray, Amy <[Amy.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Amy.Gray@seattle.gov)>; Jenkins, Michael <[Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov](mailto:Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov)>; O'Brien, Hallie <[Hallie.O'Brien@seattle.gov](mailto:Hallie.O'Brien@seattle.gov)>; Whitson, Lish <[Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov](mailto:Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov)>; Nevins, Chip <[Chip.Nevins@seattle.gov](mailto:Chip.Nevins@seattle.gov)>; Sheffer, Andy <[Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov](mailto:Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov)>

**Subject:** Still needs SCL application fee!

Hi Tim. We are ready to proceed with the introduction of the Diagonal Way vacation but we cannot forward this to the City Council until SCL has paid the \$6500 filing fee. Since this is April 16, I anticipate the earliest this could be introduced would be May 4<sup>th</sup>. This does call into question some of the timing assumptions in the petition submittal. This includes that the date on the submittal is "January 2020" and the discussion of SCL deeding property to SDOT and Parks in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 2020 following Council approval. As we have discussed, much of the review will be straightforward as there is no significant development to review and no EIS, Design Review or other regulatory procedures that are time consuming. Much of the vacation review can be quick.

But there are still important issues to resolve concerning the proposed public benefit. SCL proposes to convey property to SDOT and Parks and provide a clean surface of 6 inches of gravel and fencing. SDOT and Parks are then responsible for working with the community, the design process, and paying for all other Phase 2 amenities to create a really welcoming and safe public space. I believe SCL should go further to develop a public space with real value to the community. I am particularly concerned that there will not be water or lighting provided in the space.

The draft MOA provided does need additional detail about the obligations of SCL, SDOT, and Parks. SCL talks about a transfer of property but I am assuming you will be conveying a deed. The MOA should be clear on what property interest is being conveyed and who will be responsible for things such as surveying, legal descriptions, preparing the deeds, and the ordinance process.

I just wanted to make sure you were aware we had not received the application fee and highlight my concerns about the schedule given the important items that need to be discussed and resolved. Thank you.

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Croll, Timothy](#); [Anindita Mitra](#); [Meraz-Caron, Ruth](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#); [Gray, Amy](#)  
**Subject:** SCL meeting next week  
**Date:** Friday, May 17, 2019 2:22:22 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.jpg](#)

---

Hello everyone. I have accepted Michael's meeting request for next Tuesday and will attend if possible. I have 3 items at Transportation Committee at 2pm and sometimes get pulled away for questions or meeting prep.

In case I don't make it, I do want to highlight the 2 areas of concern I have previously identified for Tim and Anindita.

1. Necessity for vacation rather than continuing w/ a permit: the Street Vacation Policies specify in Section 3, J, 5 "In circumstances where a street use permit can accommodate the uses indicated by the petitioner, a permit is preferred, and a vacation will generally not be granted." SCL will need to provide a clear and compelling reason why continuing to use the ROW with a street use permit is no longer adequate.
2. Provision of public benefit: the Policies require the every vacation proposal include a public benefit proposal. My concern is that the SCL proposal establishes a first step towards a public benefit that then requires that Parks or someone else fund and develop the site into useable space that would constitute a public benefit. I believe more will be required from SCL to make sure that a true public benefit can be developed at the same time as the vacation occurs. In addition, I believe there will be some reservations about the proposed public benefit site. It is clear there is community support for this and that is of critical importance. But it is a site that will not have active residential or commercial development on most of the frontage and it is a long and narrow site. The site will be difficult to program and provide for active uses and eyes on the site. What other options has SCL considered for the public benefit? Has the work on the Community Engagement Plan identified that this is what the community wants to see?

An essential public facility such as SCL is obviously in a different position than a private developer but these important questions will still need work and discussion.

Anindita, I know you have had additional questions for me that I haven't been able to respond to yet. Perhaps we can get together next week and go over your questions on the draft petition submittal?

Thanks!



**BEVERLY BARNETT** | Strategic Advisor / [Seattle Department of Transportation](#) |

Street Use & Urban Forestry Division | 206-684-7564 (Tel)

**From:** [Anindita Mitra](#)  
**To:** [Barnett, Beverly](#); [Croll, Timothy](#); [Meraz-Caron, Ruth](#)  
**Cc:** [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Kinast, Valerie](#); [Gray, Moira](#); [Gray, Amy](#); [Steel, Angela](#); [Friedman, Danielle](#); [Whitson, Lish](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Pre-petition activities for SCL proposed vacation at Diagonal Way  
**Date:** Friday, August 09, 2019 11:05:22 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

**CAUTION: External Email**

Thank you Beverly. We wanted to let you all know that we were waiting on and have received letters of support from key neighboring properties. We have had our community outreach report edited. When staff returns on Monday, the summary document with all the requested supporting document will be submitted to SCL for approval. Once we receive that approval, the document will be sent to DON, SDOT and the SDC.



On 8/9/19, 10:42 AM, "Barnett, Beverly" <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)> wrote:

Good morning everyone. I wanted to check in on the pre-petition work for SCL's proposed vacation at Diagonal Way.

**Feasibility meeting:** this meeting was held and some issues were identified

1. SCL's activities on site can be accommodated with a permit so SCL needs to clearly articulate a compelling reason why a permit is not adequate and why a vacation is necessary
2. Provide a clearer picture of what will happen on the site, how the ROW will used, and why the ROW is necessary
3. Develop a no-vacation alternative, if the vacation isn't feasible how will SCL meet its programmatic needs
4. Public benefit, the public benefit needs to be a current benefit that has real value to the public. Providing property to Parks for a future park doesn't meet the criteria. I believe SCL needs to actually plan, design, and develop the property proposed to provide a public benefit.

**Community Engagement Plan:** SCL has developed a plan with DON and has been engaged with the community on the early work. It will be important for the community to have a voice in the proposed public benefit. As of the end of July, SCL has not provided documentation to DON regarding the community work. This does need to be completed before SDOT can accept

a vacation petition.

**Early review by Design Commission:** prep meetings have been held and SCL is scheduled to present to the Design Commission on October 6. The prep meetings have raised some of the same questions about the use of the site and the necessity for a vacation. There were also questions regarding the public benefit and what SCL was proposing to provide.

These are just my notes on the progress on the pre-petition activities but I wanted to make sure we all had the same information. Does SCL have an idea when SDOT will receive the petition and supporting documentation? Thanks



## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 6, 2020 1:51 PM  
**To:** Gray, Moira  
**Cc:** Gray, Amy  
**Subject:** FW: SCL vacation costs

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

For the scl file

---

**From:** Kinast, Valerie <Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 6, 2020 1:25 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>; Jenkins, Michael <Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov>; Whitson, Lish <Lish.Whitson@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SCL vacation costs

Hi all,

I wanted to get a sense of the cost to bring water to the site. Got this info from parks project development via OPCD planner.

Cost to bring water to the site and potable water (doggie faucet) **\$90,000 for domestic water to the site, \$15,000 for drinking fountain and piping to it**

2) Cost to bring sanitary sewer to site for water fountain **\$250,000 for sanitary to site,**

3) Cost to install trees (along path and a few internal to the OLA) **\$6,000 for 10 trees**

4) Cost to install pedestrian scale lighting (along the path) **\$100,000 for new service/distribution controls/cabinet, 5 ped. lights**

5) and install irrigation - (unsure if you "irrigate" the OLA or just needed to establish trees) **\$65,000 for irrigation**

Valerie Kinast  
Seattle Design Commission  
O: 206.233-7911 Cell: (206) 349-1617  
[Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov](mailto:Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov)

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Kinast, Valerie](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#)  
**Subject:** SDC discussion of SCL proposed vacation  
**Date:** Friday, July 17, 2020 2:41:09 PM

---

Hello. I wanted to follow up with you on one concern I had following the July 2 SDC discussion of the vacation proposed by SCL. As always, the SDC had a great discussion and even though the meeting was virtual it was still an engaging and thoughtful meeting.

Looking back on the discussion I can say it felt like the commission was discussing a multi-department CIP project and not a vacation proposal from SCL. From the vacation perspective I think it is important that the city first establishes the an appropriate public benefit from SCL. Once that is established we can look at how to enhance the SCL public benefit obligation by the work being done by Parks and SDOT.

Given the current circumstances I think a baseline is important so that the community has a safe and useable public benefit timed to open when the vacation work is completed. Adding amenities over time as SDOT and Parks can secure funding can enhance the area but the community should have a real public benefit space from the beginning.

I think some further conversations about the SCL initial obligation and then the timing and commitment from Parks and SDOT would be great.

Thank you!

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Sheldon, Elizabeth](#); [Steel, Angela](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#); [Gray, Amy](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Update on Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)  
**Date:** Monday, August 17, 2020 11:16:13 AM

---

This is great news!

---

**From:** Croll, Timothy <Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2020 11:12 AM  
**To:** Jenkins, Michael <Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov>; Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>; Kinast, Valerie <Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Goldberg, DavidW <DavidW.Goldberg@seattle.gov>; OBrien, Hallie <Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov>; Sheffer, Andy <Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov>; Griffith, Emily <Emily.Griffith@seattle.gov>; Lotfi, Danyal <Danyal.Lotfi@seattle.gov>; Meraz-Caron, Ruth <Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Update on Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

Colleagues:

I wanted to bring you up to date on some developments of the flume proposal, prior to our preparation meeting on Wednesday morning.

City Light General Manager/CEO Debra Smith has decided that City Light will fund the budget shortfall on SDOT's flume trail project which is \$1,283,000. This is in addition to City Light's previous commitments of \$185,000 for the shortfall for Parks' OLA, the \$480,000 for soil removal and fresh gravel, and of course the provision of the property (all contingent on the granting of the vacation, of course.)

So in summary, the various department contributions are:

Parks: existing budget authority and staff time = \$400,000  
SDOT: existing budget authority = \$400,000  
SCL: \$1,903,000 in existing budget authority + \$1,854,000 in property = a total contribution of \$3,757,000

Note that the project as it is presently conceived is fully funded by existing sources. No part of the base project is contingent on additional Council appropriation or securing outside grants, though such grants could usefully support enhanced amenities.

Hopefully this will put to rest any concerns about the completeness or the certainty of the proposal.

I look forward to our further discussions on Wednesday morning.

Tim  
206-963-5074

**From:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**To:** [Croll, Timothy](#); [OBrien, Hallie](#); [Roberts, Tonnie](#); [Jacobs, Max](#); [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Whitson, Lish](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#)  
**Subject:** Diagonal Way planning meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 07, 2021 12:09:47 PM

---

Good morning to all! We are getting closer to our public hearing and discussion on the SCL Diagonal Way vacation at the TUC on July 21. I am working to finalize the SDOT recommendation and have edits from Tim, Michael and Lish. I don't have anything from SDOT or Parks and if you have any comments I will need the edits by tomorrow. Tim is also working to finalize the powerpoint for our presentation and will need any final comments this week as well.

I think it would be good to meet next week and make sure we are organized on the presentation. There is a lot to cover and we will need to be crisp and to the point. At committee it is easy to just keep talking to try to convey everything but we will need to focus. We will need to figure out who will be at the table to present and who will be available to answer questions. The committee will want the list of presenters the week before the meeting when we forward the recommendation and the powerpoint.

The meeting:

1. Introductions
2. Intro from Lish
3. Comments from Beverly, I will go over what we plan to present
4. Powerpoint presentation, SCL (I believe Tim) will go over the powerpoint and the this is the main portion of the presentation
5. SDOT & Parks will go over the public benefit trail and OLA
6. Design Commission can add about public benefit, design, or community engagement
7. Beverly & Lish may have comments on public benefit or issue resolution that haven't been covered
8. Respond to question
9. Public hearing
10. Next steps, generally the committees don't hold and public hearing and

vote in the same meeting, its possible but the likely vote is Aug 4. SCL should be prepared for questions on the other related land use legislation.

Aside from the powerpoint which can be 10 to 15 minutes, the rest of us will have maybe 3 minutes to cover info. We all need to think about the key points we want to share w/ the committee.

I will be sending a meeting invite to prep and organize for committee. Be sure to send edits on the recommendation to me and the powerpoint to Tim.

Thanks!

## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Croll, Timothy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2020 11:26 AM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira; Meraz-Caron, Ruth  
**Subject:** Diagonal Ave Vacation  
**Attachments:** MOA\_Georgetown Steam Plant Flume - signed.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Beverly:

I thought that it would be good to check in with you and Moira to confirm what you still need from SCL in order for you to move forward with sending the Clerk File to the Council. Based on my notes from our Sept 14 discussion, here are the following updates and/or questions (apologies if my memory/notes did not retain everything that you outlined for me at that time):

1. We already transmitted to Moira SCL's responses for all the agency/department comments except those of the Seattle Design Commission
2. We have completed (but not yet transmitted) our responses to the SDC's comments on the Public Trust Review. We will develop responses to the SDC's comments on the Public Benefit when they are finalized by the SDC. Then we will transmit the combined SCL responses to all SDC comments at that time.
3. SCL, SDOT and SPR have executed the MOA for the flume development and this is attached to this email.
4. You mentioned that we would need to provide you with some exhibits for the Clerk File
  - a. My understanding that this would include a diagram of the vacation site and a diagram of the public benefit/flume site. Could you please confirm that?
  - b. For the vacation site should that be merely an outline of the property parcels, or should it show the SPU infrastructure, or should it include an aerial photo, or should we have several different version of the diagram to cover all of those bases? What about a vicinity map?
  - c. For the public benefit site, should it be more of a property boundary diagram(s), or more a plan view of the redevelopment, or a vicinity map or several of the above?
5. Is there anything else that we should be providing? For instance, I think I remember you mentioning that we should provide the power point for the Council discussion, but is that something that needs to be provided when the Clerk File is transmitted or could that be provided later?

Is there anything else that I should be working on? We are eager to do whatever we can to allow you to move this forward smoothly and expeditiously: is there a target date that I should be trying to meet?

Thanks and please let me know if you have any questions at this point.

Tim

**From:** [Croll, Timothy](#)  
**To:** [Barnett, Beverly](#)  
**Cc:** [Gray, Moira](#); [Kinast, Valerie](#); [Jacobs, Max](#); [OBrien, Hallie](#); [Curtin, Jim](#); [Jenkins, Michael](#); [Griffith, Emily](#); [Sheffer, Andy](#); [Dewald, Monica](#)  
**Subject:** RE: SCL Diagonal vacation  
**Date:** Friday, December 11, 2020 1:24:56 PM

---

Beverly:

Thanks for the update. See my notes **below**.

I look forward to participating in the follow up steps you listed for after the holidays.

Tim

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 11, 2020 9:06 AM  
**To:** Croll, Timothy <Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov>; Jacobs, Max <Max.Jacobs@seattle.gov>; OBrien, Hallie <Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov>; Curtin, Jim <Jim.Curtin@seattle.gov>; Jenkins, Michael <Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira <Moira.Gray@seattle.gov>; Kinast, Valerie <Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** SCL Diagonal vacation

Good morning to all. I hope you are doing well. I am working on the SDOT vacation recommendation for the Diagonal Way vacation and we are still on the planned schedule for a February review by the Transportation & Utility Committee. I wanted to check in on a couple of things.

1. Budget impacts on Flume property: now that the budget is complete is there clarity on the funding and timing of the bike/ped trail? Are there any impacts to Parks on planning or developing its piece? I want to make sure I describe the timing and the certainty of funding accurately in the recommendation. Are there any design changes or has the design or the public review progressed and should be included? **I defer to SDOT and SPR to respond to these questions.**
2. Timing of other legislation: we have discussed moving forward with work on the other legislation related to the Flume property at or near when the Council will review the vacation. I will want to describe these accurately in the recommendation and I know you are working on an exhibit that shows all the easements and dimensions. Other legislation includes:
  - a. SCL to Boeing **Actually this would be SCL to King County (Boeing's landlord). It would be an easement to resolve an encroachment.**
  - b. SCL to SPU. **Correct- a Partial Transfer of Jurisdiction to authorize the ongoing presence of SPU's storm drain in the flume property.**
  - c. SCL to Parks and
  - d. SCL to SDOT **Both correct.**

After the holidays I will get the recommendation finished and share it for your review

and comments. We will want to get together to work on a powerpoint presentation. We will also want to talk about the briefings for the committee and the district rep. Lastly, we should begin to think about engaging the community in participating in the public hearing.

Please let me know if there are any changes I should address. Thank you all!



## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 26, 2020 3:49 PM  
**To:** OBrien, Hallie; Partap, Trevor  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira; Curtin, Jim  
**Subject:** RE: Confirmation on SDOT's commitment to Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Great, thank your for the update.

---

**From:** OBrien, Hallie <Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 26, 2020 3:12 PM  
**To:** Partap, Trevor <Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov>; Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira <Moira.Gray@seattle.gov>; Curtin, Jim <Jim.Curtin@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Confirmation on SDOT's commitment to Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

Hi Beverly,

SDOT has earmarked 400K for the construction of this project in 2023, this is in the current MOA draft for SCL to fund the remaining portion of the Flume trail (~1.2 million)

I have let Tim and SPR know that this funding is at risk and unsecure, especially considering the upcoming budget shortfalls.

Jim has confirmed with SCL that we are comfortable with the 400K contribution.  
Jim will also be in conversations with Sam Z about this project's budget and timeline,

Let me know if you would like me to set up some time to go over this plan more in detail, or if you have more questions.

Thank you,



Hallie O'Brien  
Associate Transportation Planner  
City of Seattle, [Department of Transportation](#)  
O: 206-727-3581 | M: 206-379-4387 | [hallie.obrien@seattle.gov](mailto:hallie.obrien@seattle.gov)  
[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

*I am currently telecommuting as part of the local COVID-19 response. My typical work hours are between 9AM and 5:30PM, during which time I am available via cell phone (425-770-8160), email and skype.*

---

**From:** Partap, Trevor <[Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov](mailto:Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 26, 2020 10:50 AM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>; OBrien, Hallie <[Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov](mailto:Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov)>  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira <[Moira.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Moira.Gray@seattle.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Confirmation on SDOT's commitment to Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

Beverly,

The SDOT contributions to this project is coming from the BMP, I assume (i.e. MOD does not have any funding commitments toward this project).

Thanks,  
Trev

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 26, 2020 10:47 AM  
**To:** OBrien, Hallie <[Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov](mailto:Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov)>; Partap, Trevor <[Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov](mailto:Trevor.Partap@seattle.gov)>  
**Cc:** Gray, Moira <[Moira.Gray@seattle.gov](mailto:Moira.Gray@seattle.gov)>  
**Subject:** Confirmation on SDOT's commitment to Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

Good morning! I would like to confirm whether SDOT is comfortable with an anticipated \$400,000 obligation for our share of the work at the Flume property and whether the money is secure and committed to this work. SCL has indicated that they believe the SDOT money is fixed.

What is the status of the MOA that would define the obligations of Parks, SDOT and SCL?

This project will be going back to the Design Commission in September and there will be questions about whether the funding for the work by Parks and SDOT will be available to do the work next year. I want to make sure that the information provided to the Design Commission is accurate so that their action to support the vacation does not include vacation conditions that SDOT may struggle to meet.

Please let me know. thanks

---

**From:** Croll, Timothy <[Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov](mailto:Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2020 11:12 AM  
**To:** Jenkins, Michael <[Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov](mailto:Michael.Jenkins@seattle.gov)>; Barnett, Beverly <[Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov](mailto:Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov)>; Kinast, Valerie <[Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov](mailto:Valerie.Kinast@seattle.gov)>  
**Cc:** Goldberg, DavidW <[DavidW.Goldberg@seattle.gov](mailto:DavidW.Goldberg@seattle.gov)>; OBrien, Hallie <[Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov](mailto:Hallie.OBrien@seattle.gov)>; Sheffer, Andy <[Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov](mailto:Andy.Sheffer@seattle.gov)>; Griffith, Emily <[Emily.Griffith@seattle.gov](mailto:Emily.Griffith@seattle.gov)>; Lotfi, Danyal <[Danyal.Lotfi@seattle.gov](mailto:Danyal.Lotfi@seattle.gov)>; Meraz-Caron, Ruth <[Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov](mailto:Ruth.Meraz-Caron@seattle.gov)>  
**Subject:** Update on Diagonal Street Vacation Public Benefit (Flume)

Colleagues:

I wanted to bring you up to date on some developments of the flume proposal, prior to our preparation meeting on Wednesday morning.

City Light General Manager/CEO Debra Smith has decided that City Light will fund the budget shortfall on SDOT's flume trail project which is \$1,283,000. This is in addition to City Light's previous

commitments of \$185,000 for the shortfall for Parks' OLA, the \$480,000 for soil removal and fresh gravel, and of course the provision of the property (all contingent on the granting of the vacation, of course.)

So in summary, the various department contributions are:

Parks: existing budget authority and staff time = \$400,000

SDOT: existing budget authority = \$400,000

SCL: \$1,903,000 in existing budget authority + \$1,854,000 in property = a total contribution of \$3,757,000

Note that the project as it is presently conceived is fully funded by existing sources. No part of the base project is contingent on additional Council appropriation or securing outside grants, though such grants could usefully support enhanced amenities.

Hopefully this will put to rest any concerns about the completeness or the certainty of the proposal.

I look forward to our further discussions on Wednesday morning.

Tim

206-963-5074

## Gray, Moira

---

**From:** Barnett, Beverly  
**Sent:** Friday, September 11, 2020 11:48 AM  
**To:** Larsen, Shauna; Gray, Moira; Gray, Amy; OBrien, Hallie; Curtin, Jim  
**Subject:** FW: Timeline for street vacation/property transfers for flume  
**Attachments:** Street vacation legislation timeline.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi Shauna. We are working with SCL on its proposed vacation at Diagonal Way. The project was recommended by the Design Commission and that is that last major piece of the review. We still need to complete an MOA between SCL, SDOT, and Parks on the proposed public benefit obligations. After that we will be ready to schedule at Transportation Committee for the public hearing and vote.

I cautioned SCL that December can be difficult but we still may be able to do December. SCL anticipated a Jan/Feb public hearing in their schedule but do anticipate forwarding supporting legislation even before approval of the vacation.

As its public benefit obligation SCL will be conveying some property to Parks for an off-leash area and some property to SDOT for a bike/ped trail. The transactions also require dealing with an encroachment by Boeing into the area proposed for Parks and a SPU agreement on some SPU infrastructure. Its all a bit complicated.

For Jim and Hallie, if the property is conveyed to SDOT for the trail connection early next year are we prepared to accept it even if we don't plan the improvements until 2023?

Thanks

---

**From:** Croll, Timothy <Timothy.Croll@seattle.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 11, 2020 10:50 AM  
**To:** Barnett, Beverly <Beverly.Barnett@seattle.gov>  
**Subject:** Timeline for street vacation/property transfers for flume

Beverly:

Following up on the planning meeting we had with Max, Stephen and Patrick, and now that the Design Commission has approved the public benefit proposal, I have put together a possible schedule for all of the different moving parts to implement the vacation/flume property exchanges.

The attached chart is my attempt to sequence the different parts in a schedule that is aggressively pursues the amenity for the community, but is still reasonable. The SDOT/street vacation parts are

highlighted in yellow. I would appreciate it if you could look this over and let me know if it makes sense to you.

Our City Council liaison person has meetings pretty much every other week with Toby Thaler for scheduling City Light-related legislation. She intends to discuss the scheduling of the initial property action ordinances (item #2 on the attached) for December with him. She also mentioned that she would touch base with Shauna Larsen, SDOT's Council liaison, because of the linkage of the property actions and the street vacation.

I will probably set up a time to video call with you in a few days to hear your thoughts about this schedule, if that is OK.

Thanks.

Tim Croll