

## Meeting Agenda & Summary

Meeting Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #5  
 Meeting Date: November 9, 2022  
 Meeting Time: 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.  
 Meeting Objective: To discuss results of Level 2 analyses, part 1 of 2.

### Attendance

<u>CAG Members</u>		<u>Project Team:</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allan Giffen	<input type="checkbox"/> Janet Pope	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angie Thomson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charles Adkins	<input type="checkbox"/> Jena Pantano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beth Bartz
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Stansfield	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Gordon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Widstrand
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colton Davis	<input type="checkbox"/> John Edgar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jaclyn Gault
<input type="checkbox"/> Eldon Luo	<input type="checkbox"/> Kent McDaniel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessa Gardner
<input type="checkbox"/> Emmanuel Garcia	<input type="checkbox"/> Laura Akers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Juan Calaf
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erik Nielsen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luis Burbano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lauryn Douglas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gauhar Serikbayeva	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Misha Lujan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Martha Russell
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jane Westling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Coelho	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miranda Redinger
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sione K. Phillips	

### Agenda

Time	Topic
5:30 p.m.	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>
5:35 p.m.	<b>Schedule update</b>
5:40 p.m.	<b>Summary of September ELG meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction provided by ELG</li> <li>• CAG reflections</li> </ul>
5:50 p.m.	<b>Level 2 results overview</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria prioritized by CAG</li> <li>• Evaluation criteria</li> </ul>
5:55 p.m.	<b>Level 2 station area results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everett Station</li> <li>• I-5/Broadway Alignment</li> <li>• SR526/Evergreen</li> <li>• Southwest Everett Industrial Center</li> <li>• SR99/Airport Road – <b><i>moved to next meeting</i></b></li> </ul>
7:25 p.m.	<b>Next steps</b>
7:30 p.m.	<b>Adjourn</b>

## Materials

- Everett Link Extension PPT presentation

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome and introductions

The fifth Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting began with the Sound Transit project team sharing the agenda and meeting objectives. CAG members were asked to provide a brief introduction, including their name and what perspective they bring to the group.

### Summary of September ELG meeting

Eric Widstrand, North Corridor Development Director, reviewed the project schedule and shared updates since the last CAG meeting in July 2022 where the EVLE team introduced two alignment options that could be studied in Level 2 based on comments received during the Early Scoping comment period. At a meeting in September, the ELG provided direction to not include the I-5 and SR 99 alignments in the Level 2 evaluation.

ELG members conveyed that these alignments:

- Were inconsistent with the representative alignment in the voter-approved Sound Transit 3 funding package
- Would not serve important areas of the community, including the largest employment center in the region and some historically underserved populations
- Did not provide enough positive tradeoffs to be worth not serving all station areas along the representative alignment

The ELG noted concerns about equity, gentrification and displacement, and committed to continuing to address these issues. Eric also informed CAG members that the video of the ELG meeting is available online.

### Questions and comments from CAG

**Comment:** One CAG member shared that people who are not “in the know” are confused about the decision by the ELG. He continued that he has heard negative feedback from his community about the representative alignment and wondered if there is a better way to share the ELG’s reasoning with the public.

**Question:** One CAG member asked if there were CAG recommended alternatives that were accepted by the ELG.

**Answer:** Eric shared that generally the ELG direction at the end of Level 1 confirmed the CAG recommendations. The ELG direction differed from CAG recommendations on a couple of alternatives, including at Everett Station area and a few OMF North site alternatives.

**Question:** A CAG member asked why the I-5 and SR 99 alignments were not included for further study, while other station alternatives previously dismissed came back into consideration. They were concerned about how the information was presented on the new alignments and that the approach did not seem balanced.

**Answer:** Eric shared that the ELG did not feel the I-5 and SR 99 alignments scored as highly as the representative alignment. They felt it was essential to serve the SW Everett Industrial center and the Casino Road community at Evergreen and SR 526. He offered to discuss concerns with any CAG members following the meeting.

## Level 2 results overview

Jaclyn Gault, Community Engagement Specialist, shared the areas to be covered during the meeting, including Everett Station, the I-5/Broadway alignment, SR526 Evergreen, and SW Everett Industrial; the next CAG meeting would cover the OMF North and remaining station locations.

She continued by outlining the work completed in Level 2, specifically:

- Use of more detailed criteria to evaluate alternatives
- Refinements to route, station and OMF locations
- Two and three-dimensional station design concepts

Jaclyn reviewed what Sound Transit has heard are community priorities and how that tied into the evaluation criteria. She shared some of the criteria that were evaluated and what was measured for rating each of the alternatives including: station access, transit connectivity, displacements, and equitable access.

### Questions and comments from CAG

**Question:** One CAG member asked when the CAG will discuss future improvements necessary to provide access to the light rail stations.

**Answer:** Martha Russell, EVLE Project Manager, responded that in the future Sound Transit will coordinate access planning with each local jurisdiction. Miranda Redinger, EVLE Senior Project Manager, added that community outreach will be part of that planning process, including workshops and other ways we hope to involve the CAG members.

**Question:** Another CAG member asked if Sound Transit is meeting and collaborating with other city and county departments such as Snohomish Health District or Economic Development departments in Everett and Lynnwood.

**Answer:** Martha responded that Sound Transit is already working closely with the cities and county and reaching out to others to make sure planning for the new stations is closely coordinated. CAG members were encouraged to share any connections they had to relevant local groups.

**Question:** Have these entities mentioned any specific plans to head off issues of concern, like displacement?

**Answer:** Miranda confirmed that Sound Transit is working with the jurisdictions on policies and regulations that could address issues, like anti-displacement strategies. Jaclyn added that we are also talking to local community organizations and how we can work with them and build capacity and connections.

## Level 2 station area results

Martha shared the alternatives for Everett Station, the I-5/Broadway Alignment, SR526/Evergreen, and Southwest Everett Industrial Center. Martha also shared the criteria used to evaluate each alternative, such as general station access, bike and pedestrian connections, transit connections, potential impacts to businesses and residents, specifically historically underserved communities. CAG members reviewed annotated maps of station alternatives and preliminary 3D concepts for station alternatives to help get a better understanding of size and scale of station options.

### Everett Station

Martha reviewed the evaluation findings for the three station alternatives at Everett Station.

**Question:** One CAG member asked why the location of EVT-C has moved a block south.

**Answer:** There are engineering challenges with the station spanning Pacific Avenue, so it was moved south to 32<sup>nd</sup> St.

**Question:** A CAG member noted that EVT-A is more difficult to walk or bike directly to but is easier to access by local bus routes. They asked if there would be additional local bus stops around EVT-C or EVT-D?

**Answer:** Yes, and potential transit integration assumptions are included later in the presentation.

**Question:** A CAG member asked about potential displacement of the Compass Health building near EVT-D.

**Answer:** Compass Health is on the west side of Broadway and the route is currently on the east side, so we don't expect to need that property according to current designs.

**Comment:** A CAG member shared a concern that bus riders may be discouraged from connecting with EVT-C and EVT-D because it would require multiple bus connections.

**Answer:** Sound Transit is working with local transit providers to create direct connections with local bus routes whenever possible. Bus connections to stations are critical and are being treated as such.

**Question:** Why does EVT-A (the closest station to I-5) have the lowest compatibility with future extensions?

**Answer:** The current design of fitting the station between Smith Street and the freight rail tracks means that future track would need somehow to cross the Pacific Avenue bridge, and this would present more of an engineering challenge when extending the route in the future.

**Question:** Is there a precedent for building a light rail station away from a transit hub like Everett Station?

**Answer:** Yes, we do have stations built a block away from other transit at the International District Station and King Street Station.

### I-5/Broadway Alignment

Martha reviewed the evaluation findings for the two alignment alternatives connecting the Evergreen/SR 526 station area and Everett Station.

There were no questions or comments from the CAG regarding the I-5 and Broadway alignment alternatives.

### SR 526/Evergreen Way

Martha reviewed the evaluation findings for the five station alternatives at the SR 526/Evergreen station area. A few refinements were made to the alternatives in this station area since Level 1 evaluation:

- Neither the CAG nor the ELG supported continued study of the alignments along Casino Road that were studied in Level 1. For Level 2, only alternatives along SR 526 were studied.
- After Level 1, the ELG initially did not want to continue studying station EGN-B; however, after further study of engineering challenges with the crossing of SR 526, ELG members supported continuing that option for study in Level 2 evaluation.
- After Level 1, after conversations internally and with the City, EGN-E was moved from the north side of Casino Road to the south side of the road to avoid some potential property acquisitions.

**Question:** Would EGN-A or EGN-B utilize the existing pedestrian bridge or displace it?

**Answer:** Both station concepts assume replacing the bridge.

**Question:** Can the EGN-D station location be paired with the alignment for EGN-E traveling west?

**Answer:** No, because the curves of the track have to be a minimum distance from the station so that the train can enter on a straightaway. The track for D is already assumed to have the minimum distance of curves to station.

**Question:** A CAG member lives in this station area and thinks EGN-D is the best alternative but has concerns about displacement. Is there a way to measure exactly what the displacement tradeoff is for each station alternative? For example, if 10 homes or families are displaced, how do you compare that to the number of people served by a station in that area?

**Answer:** It is difficult to quantify the tradeoffs of displacement in that way. We have tried to quantify the burdens and benefits in the best way we can, by measuring the potential direct displacements due to property acquisitions needed for the project and the community destinations and historically underserved communities served by each alternative. The criteria are not weighted, and we rely on the CAG and the public comments we receive to understand the priorities of the community to help answer this type of tradeoff question. The team encouraged this group to look through the evaluation and identify if there is more information that would be useful for them to make their recommendations.

**Question:** Which community assets would be displaced at EGN-D and EGN-E?

**Answer:** At this level of design, the alignment is close to South Everett Community Church along the north side of Casino Road, a KinderCare, and another church on the other side of the road. If these alignments move forward, more engineering work will allow us to confirm potential effects/impacts to these community destinations. The nearby Fred Meyer is far from EGN-D.

**Question:** One CAG member asked Sound Transit to clarify why EGN-B is a current option if it was not recommended by the ELG in April?

**Answer:** Because of the complexity of crossing SR 526 for the alternatives on the south side of SR 526, discussions with ELG members resulted in continuing the alternative for study in this round of evaluation in order to maintain an option that might have fewer challenges with the crossing. This was an area where the CAG and ELG recommendations were different and ultimately all options were brought forward for continued study.

**Question:** The CAG member asked a follow-up question of why the I-5 and SR-99 alignments were removed by the ELG, suggesting that you could use the same reasoning that studying more options would be useful.

**Answer:** Jaclyn and Eric W will follow up with the CAG member to describe the process in more detail. Overall, the ELG determined that there were issues with the I-5 and SR-99 alignments that made them undesirable to study further.

**Question:** Would the pedestrian bridge be integrated with EGN-B?

**Answer:** EGN-A and EGN-B would be compatible with a pedestrian bridge across SR 526.

### Southwest Everett Industrial Center

Martha reviewed the evaluation findings for the three station alternatives at the Southwest Everett Industrial Center station area.

**Comment:** One CAG member remarked that SWI-C is the most desirable due to proximity to the airport. They also noted that SWI-A seems closer to Boeing, but it's only close to one Boeing entrance and most employees would need to take a shuttle across the very large campus. Therefore, A's proximity to Boeing is less of an advantage.

**Comment:** One CAG member commented that they felt that there was an inconsistency with how the tradeoffs were being shared, that it was a disadvantage that a shuttle would be required for SWI-C but the need for a shuttle at SWI-A was not mentioned.

**Response:** Sound Transit staff clarified that shuttles would be necessary for all of the alternatives in this station area and that is not noted as a disadvantage in the evaluation.

**Question:** Has Sound Transit conducted any type of study with the employees on who would ride light rail if the station was at SWI-A? The assumption is that location would encourage Boeing employees to ride it more, but they are skeptical of that assumption. It would be great to see more information about potential ridership here.

**Answer:** Sound Transit has been in communication with Boeing to understand existing employee travel patterns. Sound Transit's ridership forecasts at this early stage of planning focus on total project riders and do not show differentiation among station alternatives.

**Comment:** One CAG member highlighted the finding that SWI-B was a natural connection point for both Swift buses and local buses.

**Comment:** A CAG member noted that they support SWI-C due to the longer-term plans for expansion of Paine Field.

**Question:** Would Sound Transit staff share the slides so they can be reviewed with more time in greater detail?

**Answer:** Yes, they will be shared along with the video of the presentation after the meeting.

**Comment:** Another CAG member felt that based on the ratings around 2040 Population and Jobs, SWI-B and SWI-C do not do a great job of serving the job center in SW Everett and noted the spread of the job center and restrictions around developing things like transit-oriented development make it difficult to serve the whole area without strong local transit connections.

**Question:** Could the future jobs and population numbers be separated?

**Answer:** One of the challenges around job measurements in this area is that we do not have access to employment information because the census suppresses employment data when a single employer is a high proportion of the jobs in an area. The jobs evaluation here has some qualitative aspects because we do not have exact numbers.

**Question:** Since this station area is one of the primary reasons the ELG did not want to look at other alignments, has Sound Transit thought about how to encourage ridership in this area since it will be challenging to serve such a spread-out area?

**Answer:** That is a focus of Sound Transit's work and we will continue to talk about how to encourage use of the system as the project advances.

**Comment:** One CAG member responded that the focus should be on making public transit work better for people who are already relying on it.

**Comment:** One CAG member commented that if Boeing is not providing information, the 2040 jobs information may be misleading since there is an assumption that employees will ride and we cannot confirm that at this time. They also noted that he is a frequent cyclist through this area and SWI-C can be connected by the park.

### SR 99/Airport Road

The group decided to move the discussion around SR 99/Airport Road to the next meeting due to lack of time at this meeting.

### **Next Steps**

Jaclyn covered the schedule next steps including the upcoming meeting in early January and shared that we have a public scoping comment period in January and will look to them to help share that information.