

Meeting Overview

Subject: Everett Extension Elected Leadership Group (ELG) Meeting 3

Date: April 19, 2022

Time: 3 p.m.-5 p.m.

Location: Zoom

Attendees: See list at page 1.

Handouts:

- Everett Link Extension Station Area PPT presentation
- Summary tables of technical analyses and feedback from the CAG and the public

Meeting Purpose

- To review feedback from the public and community advisory group (CAG) on route and station alternatives and alignments; to discuss and advance route and station alternatives and alignments forward into Level 2 scoping.

Summary

Welcome and introductions

Sound Transit Deputy CEO Kimberley Farley welcomed the ELG, noting at today's meeting the ELG will be making recommendations on which Level 1 alternatives into Level 2 analysis. Deputy CEO Farley emphasized the importance of looking at all options for stations and alignments in this early phase of the project and seeing how they perform based on technical and public feedback, as well as on cost and schedule efficiency. Deputy CEO Farley spoke to new alternatives being considered from early scoping and noted these new alternatives would come to the advisory groups later this year once more analysis has been done.

ELG co-chairs offered opening remarks on the project. Snohomish County Executive Dave Somers commented that the County has been conducting initial planning around station locations in unincorporated urban growth areas (UGAs). Executive Somers remarked that future station areas provide opportunities to look towards future growth in UGAs. Everett Mayor Cassie Franklin remarked on her excitement to narrow station options and learn about how stations perform against technical criteria, as well as creating opportunities and positive impacts for communities. Mayor Franklin also noted the importance of light rail service to major job centers in Everett. ELG members representing Lynnwood, Everett, Snohomish County, and WSDOT then introduced themselves.

Introduction to public feedback and Community Advisory Group recommendations

Acting North Corridor Director Sandra Fann gave a brief overview of the planning process. At this ELG meeting, members will recommend alternatives to continue studying in Level 2 analysis, which will occur in the second half of this year. Following today's meeting, the project team will provide an update on alternatives for study in Level 2 to Sound Transit's System Expansion Committee. Level 2 analysis concludes with scoping, and then ELG members will make a recommendation on a preferred alternative and other alternatives to study in environmental analysis.

Government and Community Relations Manager Erik Ashlie-Vinke explained that the technical analysis for each station alternative was completed by the project team with input from the Interagency Group (IAG). He also showed tables that captured public feedback on station alternatives and CAG recommendations. Public

feedback was captured as more support, mixed support, or less support, and the CAG made recommendations to either advance for further study or to no longer study.

Discussion guide

The project team explained that the ELG will discuss each station alternative, route alignment and OMF North alternative. The project team noted that in most places advancing the representative project alignment and stations provides an important basis of comparison throughout alternatives development. The project team also noted that all preliminary locally favored options were recommended by the CAG for further study. For each station area, the ELG will come to an agreement regarding which alternatives to move forward into Level 2 analysis.

ELG discussion by station area

West Alderwood

For West Alderwood, the project team presented CAG recommendations alongside technical findings and public feedback. The CAG recommendations were consistent with the technical findings and public feedback. Alternatives B, D, and F were recommended for further study, while alternatives A, C, and E were not recommended for further analysis due to poor technical performance, negative public feedback, and impacts to surrounding businesses. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on West Alderwood from the ELG:

Councilmember Shannon Sessions commented that this was an example of agreement between all the parties. Much like the public and CAG, the City of Lynnwood likes alternatives D, F, then B. Alternative B is preferred over alternative A because it has less impact on mall property. Councilmember Stephanie Wright agreed with Sessions on D, F and B as alternatives to move forward. Mayor Christine Frizzell concurred with the Councilmembers.

Executive Somers asked if alternative B was close enough to alternative A to be consistent with the ST3 representative project location or if alternative A needed to be included for comparison purposes.

- The project team responded that alternative B was close enough to serve as a point of comparison to the representative project station location and it would be acceptable to not carry alternative A (the representative station and alignment) forward.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for West Alderwood are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis.

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
ALD-A	X	X
ALD-B	✓	✓
ALD-C	X	X
ALD-D	✓	✓
ALD-E	X	X
ALD-F	✓	✓

Ash Way

For Ash Way, the project team presented CAG recommendations, once again alongside of technical analysis and public feedback (the project team continued to present the rest of the station area findings in this way for the rest of the meeting and this summary will be referred to as “analysis of the stations” throughout the rest of this document). The CAG recommended continuing to study alternatives A and D, noting the value of continued analysis of an alternative east of I-5 (alternative D) as a comparison to other design options. The public and CAG feedback for alternative D emphasized the importance of pedestrian improvements as well as rezoning for transit-oriented development (TOD) in the area. Neither the CAG nor the public recommended continuing to study alternatives B and C. The CAG voiced a desire to avoid impacts on housing and other developments as much as possible. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on Ash Way from the ELG:

Councilmember Wright disagreed with CAG, questioning the justification to build over the freeway, from the west side to alternative D on the east side, if it would be the only station on the other side of I-5. She would rather spend project budget on the SR 99/Airport Road provisional station than on building the Ash Way station on the other side of I-5.

- The project team responded that the comparative cost between alternatives A and D are similar, and that at this point cost is not a major differentiator between stations and alignments on the east and west sides of I-5.

Councilmember Sessions voiced her support for alternative D, describing future development opportunities afforded by the station location on the east side of I-5. Sessions remains optimistic for positive development opportunities in the future.

Executive Somers stated that Snohomish County favors alternative D, but also recommends alternatives A and B. Alternative D is close to the Interurban Trail, creates flexibility for alignment options to reach Mariner, has lower acquisition costs (due to more available public right-of-way), and does not disrupt the existing park-and-ride. Somers noted significant issues with getting riders over I-5, as 164th Street SW is already very congested with traffic bound for the freeway on-ramps.

Mayor Frizzell noted her concerns about crowding and displacement with alternatives located on the west side of I-5. Her first choice would be alternative D, then alternative A.

WSDOT Assistant Secretary Julie Meredith commented that the legislature has allocated \$20 million for the design of a bridge in the Ash Way area. This funding would not cover the entire cost of a bridge, but it is worth considering when looking at alternatives.

Mayor Franklin commented that the consensus seems to be that alternative C should not be considered further. She recommended continuing to study options on both sides of the freeway, suggesting that parts of alternative B could be incorporated into alternative A.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked if there are any significant differences between alternatives A and B, especially when it comes to impacts on the surrounding area and cost.

- The project team responded that alternative B is more expensive because the alignment would likely impact a large apartment building.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for Ash Way are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis.

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
ASH-A	✓	✓
ASH-B	X	X
ASH-C	X	X
ASH-D	✓	✓

Mariner

For Mariner, the project team presented analysis of the stations. The CAG recommended continuing to study alternatives A, B, and D, not recommending alternative C due to greater technical challenges including potential impacts to existing development and distance from the park-and-ride and urban center. The CAG emphasized the importance of selecting an alternative that is in line with long-term plans for future housing and land use around the area. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on Mariner from the ELG:

Executive Somers commented that Snohomish County staff analysis favored alternative D, and that alternative C should be kept for comparison. Both alternatives C and D have greater potential for redevelopment and a more direct alignment.

Mayor Frizzell asked whether an Ash Way station on the east side of I-5 was considered when the alignments were originally developed. She also asked about the cost of building an alignment that crosses the freeway.

- The project team responded that they looked at the east side of I-5 for a station location at Mariner in the screening stage but it did not warrant further study. There are multiple locations to cross I-5 between Ash Way and Mariner. All station alternatives are compatible with route alternatives on either side of I-5.

Executive Somers and Mayor Franklin both voiced strong concerns about impacts alternatives A and B would have on congestion along 128th Street and I-5. They both suggested keeping alternatives C and D for comparison. Mayor Franklin further noted that alternatives B and D were seen as good options from the City of Everett's perspective.

Councilmember Zarlingo echoed Mayor Franklin's comments about traffic impacts and noted that the alignment shown on the map can be modified. He reminded the group that there is flexibility on the exact station location and track alignments and noted that alternative A is the representative alignment.

Councilmember Wright reflected that it seemed like the group wanted to eliminate alternative C but keep alternatives A and B to study with Swift BRT integration. She would be in favor of affirming the CAG recommendations and advancing alternatives A, B, and D for further study.

Councilmember Zarlingo also concurred with keeping alternatives A and B for further study. Mayor Franklin noted that alternative B performed the best in several technical areas, while alternative D is the County's preliminary locally favored option. Mayor Franklin noted that she would like to keep alternative B for further study, and had no opinion on alternatives A and C.

Executive Somers reiterated his concerns for traffic impacts on 128th Street but acknowledged the need to study Swift integration. He noted that other alignments and/or improvements can potentially alleviate traffic difficulties.

Councilmember Wright suggested retaining alternative A for comparison with other alternatives.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for Mariner are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
MAR-A	✓	✓
MAR-B	✓	✓
MAR-C	X	X
MAR-D	✓	✓

SR 99/Airport Road

The project team presented analysis of the stations for SR 99/Airport Road. CAG recommendation was consistent with the technical analysis and public feedback to keep alternatives A and B and no longer study alternative C. Alternative C presented numerous technical challenges. Alternative B presented concerns about pedestrians crossing Evergreen Way, which would require infrastructure improvements for increased safety. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on SR 99/Airport Road from the ELG:

Mayor Franklin agreed with the CAG recommendation that alternatives A and B should continue to be studied. Alternative C is not viable due to difficulties with transit integration.

Executive Somers strongly concurred with Mayor Franklin in keeping alternatives A and B. He explained that Snohomish County is looking at ways to support funding for this provisional station, potentially exploring a public-private partnership to support station construction.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for SR 99/Airport Road are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
AIR-A	✓	✓
AIR-B	✓	✓
AIR-C	X	X

Southwest Everett Industrial Center

The project team presented analysis of the stations for Southwest Everett Industrial Center. For this station area, the CAG recommended continuing to study all three options. Alternatives A and B had more potential in the technical analysis, and public feedback was mixed on all three station alternatives. The CAG wanted to continue studying alternative C because it is closest to Paine Field (understanding that it would still require a shuttle transfer), has potential for future development, and has connections to existing transit, despite mixed technical analysis and public support. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on Southwest Everett Industrial Center from the ELG:

Mayor Frizzell asked for more clarity on the mixed feedback from the public.

- The project team responded that public feedback was split in support of and opposition to continuing to study each of the station alternatives. Both the CAG and the public want to know more about access to Boeing and Paine Field as well as pedestrian improvements.

Executive Somers supported carrying all three alternatives forward and noted the unique challenges of the area. The station area contains the Paine Field terminal as well as a manufacturing center, both of which will need integration with other transit services.

Mayor Franklin strongly supported alternative A, emphasizing that it would not only serve the city's largest manufacturing center but also the city's most diverse neighborhood with a population that is majority people of color. Alternatives B and C would not serve the diverse population while alternative A could serve both jobs and residents. For all alternatives, access to Paine Field would require a shuttle because of its considerable distance from the terminal. She strongly advocated for alternative A, then alternative B if another alternative needs to be considered, with strong opposition to alternative C.

Councilmember Wright expressed a desire to retain all three alternatives but would at least like to continue studying potential station alternatives A and C.

Executive Somers agreed with Mayor Franklin about the strengths of alternative A and found it useful to have alternatives to compare.

Several of the ELG members asked if station alternatives need to be geographically separated for environmental review.

- The project team responded that there are different considerations and tradeoffs between various alternatives beyond just geographical separation, such as how alternative B is better for Swift BRT connections while alternative C is closer to the airport.

Mayor Franklin commented that any station would require a shuttle to Paine Field and that light rail alignments should serve working and residential communities. She reiterated her support for keeping alternatives A and B, as alternative C may be a false promise to the community.

Councilmember Zarlingo commented that alternative B has better transit connections and asked if there were any significant environmental differences between B and C.

- The project team responded that both alternatives B and C performed similarly with regard to potential environmental impacts.

Mayor Franklin concurred with retaining alternative B as a comparison for transit connectivity.

Councilmember Wright noted that she would like to continue studying C to be able to explain challenges with direct terminal service to the public.

Mayor Nancy Backus suggested continuing to study alternatives A and B because they have the most potential. She was not in favor of continuing to study alternative C when it has technical challenges.

Councilmember Sessions voiced her strong support of alternatives A and B, noting both make more sense than C.

Executive Somers noted that the strong points of alternative A will likely win out during additional study but was in favor of carrying all three forward.

Mayor Franklin reiterated her strong concerns about alternative C: it does not serve a residential community, has poor airport access and walkability, and does not serve the largest job center in Snohomish County.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for Southwest Everett Industrial Center are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
SWI-A	✓	✓
SWI-B	✓	✓
SWI-C	✓	✓

Southwest Everett Industrial Center to SR 526/Evergreen alignments

In this section, the project team noted that each of these alignments can be paired with each of the station alternatives at Southwest Everett Industrial Center, and there is flexibility to make design changes at the SR 526/Evergreen Way station area based on which of these alignments move forward. The CAG recommendations were consistent with the technical feedback, but public feedback was more mixed. The public did not support either alignment on Casino Road, and feedback was mixed on the alignments along SR 526. The CAG recommended retaining the purple and pink alignments on the north and south sides of SR 526. The CAG did not recommend advancing any Casino Road options due to significant community impacts. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on SWI to SR 526/Evergreen alignments from ELG:

Mayor Franklin agreed with the CAG recommendations and supported the pink and purple alignments. She did not support any alignment going down Casino Road due to negative impacts on the surrounding community.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for the SWI to SR 526/Evergreen alignments are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

Alignment Alternatives	CAG	ELG
pink	✓	✓
purple	✓	✓
blue	✗	✗
green	✗	✗

SR 526/Evergreen

The project team presented analysis of the stations for SR 526/Evergreen. The CAG recommended alternatives A and B advance for further study, consistent with the technical analysis. They did not recommend continuing to study alternative C due to less public support and greater construction challenges. The CAG also recommended continuing to study alternatives D and E because of transit access and TOD potential, though public support for both these alternatives was generally negative. The project team prefaced this station area by noting that it may involve a short alignment on Casino Road depending on the station location, since the alignments on Casino Road were removed and alignment connections would need to be redesigned. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on SR 526/Evergreen from ELG:

Mayor Franklin commented that alternative A is a challenging station location and does not best serve the community. She supported continuing to study alternatives C, D, and E, noting the displacement concerns with alternative B, which is on an area valued by the community.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked why the CAG did not support alternative C, and was unclear about the difference between alternatives C and E.

- The project team responded by saying that there were many similarities between alternative C and E regarding access, but that alternative E was closer to low-income populations and populations of color as well as forecasted population and job growth areas, which was a driver for the CAG recommendation

Mayor Franklin noted that alternatives C and E support transit connections and stated that it would still be challenging to develop new pedestrian and transit connections at the intersection. She reiterated that alternatives C, D, and E should continue to be studied and alternatives A and B should no longer be studied.

- The project team responded that alternative A is the representative station and has comparatively lower costs, so the ELG might consider advancing that alternative for comparison.

Councilmember Zarlingo ranked alternative C as his least preferred option but noted it should be kept for comparison.

- The project team clarified that there is more work to do to understand potential impacts on businesses and properties. There are also important guideway considerations to reach a station on the other side of Evergreen Way, and challenges with reaching the south side of SR 526.

Mayor Franklin replied that it makes sense to look at alternatives A, C, and E and not include alternatives B and D.

Councilmember Zarlingo agreed with keeping alternative A for the representative alignment, while commenting that alternatives C and E would be most functional and potentially have the least negative impact.

WSDOT Assistant Secretary Meredith was in support of keeping alternative A to understand the tradeoffs with other alignments.

- The project team noted that it may also be helpful to include an alternative on the west side of Evergreen Way to provide options when refining designs for crossing over SR 526.

Mayor Franklin replied that if we need to keep an option on the west side of Evergreen Way, then it should be D and not B. But then we are studying four options and not narrowing down much.

- The team clarified that it is okay to study four options in this area. The team also noted that a station location at alternative C may impact the Casino Road business area similar to alternative B due to the alignment structure needing to run in that area.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for SR 526/Evergreen are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
EGN-A	✓	✓
EGN-B	✓	X
EGN-C	X	✓
EGN-D	✓	✓
EGN-E	✓	✓

Everett Station

The project team presented analysis of the stations for Everett Station. The CAG recommendations were consistent with technical analysis and public feedback. The CAG recommended continuing to study alternatives A, B, and C, noting that B and C were very similar. The CAG did not recommend alternative D due to potential impacts to downtown Everett and that alternative C would serve the same purpose. The CAG noted that there are planned improvements around alternative C to realize the City’s vision to bring people to downtown Everett. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on Everett Station from the ELG:

Mayor Franklin strongly recommended continuing to study alternative D, explaining the merit in siting a station nearer to the heart of downtown Everett. She noted that alternatives B and C have similarities to D and expressed concern about impacts to business and development along Broadway. She supported not moving forward alternative B but looking at how to take the advantages of B and apply them to alternative C.

Councilmember Wright concurred with Mayor Franklin regarding the connection between alternative D and the downtown core.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for Everett Station are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

Station Alternatives	CAG	ELG
EVT-A	✓	✓
EVT-B	✓	✗
EVT-C	✓	✓
EVT-D	✗	✓

OMF North

The project team presented analysis of the OMF North locations. The CAG recommended advancing alternatives B-1 and B-2, as well as alternatives D and E, in line with the technical analysis. The CAG noted the potential for job displacements at alternative D and environmental considerations at alternative E. The CAG did not recommend continuing to study alternatives A and C because of numerous technical challenges and the potential for high business displacements. Alternatives F and G were considered as contingency sites to support a potential I-5 and/or SR 99 alignment. The project team then opened discussion with the ELG members.

Comments on OMF North from the ELG:

Executive Somers shared a strong preference for alternatives B-1 and B-2 because of their cost benefits and fewer job impacts. Alternatives C, D, and E would impact both industry and development opportunities, while alternative G would be expensive to build due to real estate costs along I-5.

Mayor Franklin expressed concerns about alternatives B-1 and B-2, including potential displacement of businesses and jobs that support the specialized aerospace industries in the area. She suggested alternative E was the best location for an OMF, followed by alternatives F and G. She commented that while the OMF provides jobs, they are not at the same level as Everett’s major industrial job centers.

Councilmember Wright recommended dropping alternative D from further study and adding alternative F to support potential TOD and a provisional station.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked about any technical challenges with locating a station close to an OMF.

- The project team responded that a station area in close proximity to an OMF could reduce or limit the potential for future TOD but would likely not have technical challenges. Alternative F would have the highest impacts to underserved communities due to the presence of a mobile home park. Alternative F has no impacts to environmental resources.

Mayor Franklin advocated for noting concerns as part of the recommendation to continue to study alternatives B-1 and B2 regarding business displacement and impact to Everett's industrial growth center. This was noted in the recommendation documentation.

Executive Somers was in favor of retaining alternatives B-1 and B-2, highlighting that the OMF is essential to the rest of the system and needs to be built as soon as possible.

Councilmember Wright asked if Mayor Franklin felt they needed to remove alternatives B-1 and B-2 or if there was a preference between the two. Mayor Franklin responded that she would need to confer with the City of Everett planning team to understand their preference between alternatives B-1 and B-2. Although she strongly opposes alternatives B-1 and B-2, she is willing to keep them for further study to achieve group consensus.

- The project team added that one of the key technical issues that will be looked at in Level 2 is how the OMF connects to mainline track and keeping both B-1 and B-2 will help understand tradeoffs of the different locations.

Deputy Executive Director for Capital Projects Karen Kitsis commented that there are no ideal options for OMF sites and appreciated the ELG members trying to narrow options and understand the impacts of different alternatives.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked how the size of the OMF North would compare to other OMFs in the Link light rail system.

- The project team responded that OMF North includes more heavy-duty maintenance than OMF East and has capacity for 152 vehicles. For comparison, the future OMF South will have capacity to store 144 vehicles.
- The project team reminded the ELG that the FTA may keep some options on the table to ensure a broad range of alternatives are considered going into Level 2 analysis.

The ELG and CAG recommendations for OMF North are summarized in the table below – a checkmark represents an alternative that was recommended for Level 2 analysis, while an “x” mark represents an alternative that was not recommended for Level 2 analysis:

OMF Site Alternatives	CAG	ELG
<i>Site A: SR 526 & <u>Hardeson Rd</u></i>	X	X
<i>Site B-1: SR 526 & 16th Ave</i>	✓	✓
<i>Site B-2: 76th St SW & 16th Ave</i>	✓	✓
<i>Site C: Airport Rd & SR 526</i>	X	X
<i>Site D: Airport Rd & 94th St SW</i>	✓	X
<i>Site E: Airport Rd & 100th St SW</i>	✓	✓
<i>Site F: SR 99 & Gibson Rd</i>	?	✓
<i>Site G: I-5 & 164th St*</i>	?	X

Other comments from the ELG

Executive Somers mentioned that he strongly opposes an I-5 light rail alignment, noting that the alignment out to the Southwest Everett Industrial Center was represented in the ST3 package that voters approved in 2016. Somers mentioned that both Sound Transit and the Puget Sound Regional Council have a goal to connect centers, and Southwest Everett is an important industrial center that needs to be served. It also provides service to communities and allows for TOD opportunities.

Mayor Franklin strongly advocated for serving the Southwest Everett Industrial Center, which serves the large job center and connects to an economically challenged area in need of transit service.

Councilmember Zarlingo noted that the group should be aware of public perception that the main goal of the project is to get to downtown Everett and there is a desire for faster delivery of light rail to the Everett community. This group needs to raise awareness of the project goals to connect communities and job centers and foster redevelopment, and not just focus on time and cost.

- The project team added that more information on the possibility of an I-5 alignment will be brought up later in the summer.

Next steps

The project team concluded the meeting by explaining the next steps in the alternatives analysis schedule this summer. In May, the project team will give an update to the Sound Transit Board’s System Expansion Committee on alternatives to be advanced for further study in Level 2 analysis.

The team noted that the ELG is halfway through the initial planning process, the hard work starts now on what moves forward with much more difficult decisions ahead of them.

Meeting Attendees

Elected Leadership Group

- Stephanie Wright – Snohomish County Councilmember, District 3
- Ben Zarlino – City of Everett Councilmember, District 5
- Shannon Sessions – City of Lynnwood Councilmember
- Cassie Franklin – Everett Mayor
- Christine Frizzell – Lynnwood Mayor
- Nancy Backus – Sound Transit Non-Subarea Board member representative, Auburn Mayor
- Julie Meredith – WSDOT Assistant Secretary Dave Somers – Snohomish County Executive

Sound Transit

- Kimberly Farley, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
- Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Government and Community Relations Manager for the North Corridor
- Sandra Fann, Acting North Corridor Development Director
- Don Billen, Executive Director for Planning
- Miranda Redinger, Senior Project Manager
- Lauryn Douglas, Senior Project Manager
- Martha Russell, Project Manager
- Karen Kitsis, Deputy Executive Director for Capital Projects
- Paul Danielson, Kimley-Horn
- Kyle Keahey, Kimley-Horn
- Melissa DuMond, Kimley-Horn
- Angie Thomson, EnviroIssues, Facilitator
- Sean Long, EnviroIssues, Notetaker