

Meeting Agenda & Summary

Meeting Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #2
 Meeting Date: February 24, 2022
 Meeting Time: 5:00 – 7:30 p.m.
 Meeting Location: Zoom meeting

Meeting Purpose: To review route and station alternatives and preliminary evaluation results; to discuss potential sites for the Operations and Maintenance Facility North.

Attendance:

<u>Project Team:</u>		<u>CAG Members</u>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angie Thomson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jaclyn Gault	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allan Giffen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jena Pantano
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beth Bartz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Evans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cathryn Cole	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Gordon
<input type="checkbox"/> Brianne Overton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kyle Keahey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charles Adkins	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Edgar
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Candice Plendl	<input type="checkbox"/> Laura Treadway	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Stansfield	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jose Mariscal-Cruz
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Daniel Harris	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lauryn Douglas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colton Davis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kent McDaniel
<input type="checkbox"/> Derek Newbauer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Martha Russell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eldon Luo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Laura Akers
<input type="checkbox"/> Dorry Funaki	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Melissa DuMond	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emmanuel Garcia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luis Burbano
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Widstrand	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miranda Redinger	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erik Nielsen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Misha Lujan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erik Ashlie-Vinke	<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Danielson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gauhar Serikbayeva	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Coelho
<input type="checkbox"/> Hannah Litzenberger	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandra Fann	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jane Westling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sione K. Phillips
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Janet Pope	

Materials:

- Everett Link Extension PPT presentation

Action Items:

Action	Assignment
Review station and OMF alternatives and respond to survey	CAG members

Agenda:

Time	Topic
5:00 p.m.	Welcome and introductions
5:05 pm	Follow up from meeting #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule overview • CAG meetings 1, 2, and 3 • Materials sent
5:10 pm	Early scoping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of comments and questions received

Time	Topic
5:25 pm	Analyzing alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of technical analysis and criteria
5:40 p.m. (including break)	Community advisory group reflections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group activity to identify community values, concerns, and questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ South Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ West Alderwood ▪ Ash Way ▪ Mariner ▪ SR 99/Airport Road • North Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SW Everett Industrial ▪ SR 526/Evergreen ▪ Everett Station
6:40 p.m.	Report back from small groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual report out from each group
7:00 p.m.	Operations and Maintenance Facility North <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding key features and trade-offs of each site
7:25 p.m.	Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials to follow
7:30 p.m.	Adjourn

Meeting Summary

Follow up from meeting #1

The second Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting kicked off with the Sound Transit project team sharing the agenda, meeting objective and schedule review. The team ran through the meeting expectations and a follow up from CAG meeting #1. A full round of introductions was not included due to time; instead, team members briefly introduced themselves prior to speaking. The team summarized events of the December meeting, reviewed objectives of Meeting #2 and how this conversation will prepare the CAG for Meeting #3 in March when they will give their recommendations for which alternatives should and should not move forward for study. The team reminded the CAG of hardcopy materials and reviewed the project schedule.

Early scoping

Sound Transit provided a summary of comments and questions heard from the early scoping outreach period held in fall 2021, which included events such as the online participation site and online public webinars.

Analyzing alternatives

The project team shared with the CAG how alternatives were analyzed, reviewing the following:

- Development of criteria and measures
 - The team explained the technical evaluation process.
 - The team discussed the criteria used in Level 1 evaluation and how the resulting analysis helps everyone understand advantages, disadvantages and trade-offs for each alternative.

- Technical analysis
 - The team shared an example of the detailed tables that show a range of ratings comparing the alternatives.
 - It was noted that analysis is mostly based on existing conditions and growth projections but did consider some improvements planned by local jurisdictions.
 - The technical analysis, community input and CAG recommendations will be brought before the Elected Leadership Group (ELG) for their consideration prior to their recommendations on which alternatives to move forward into Level 2, which will be shared with the Sound Transit Board.

The team shared a few reminders regarding analysis prior to the small breakout groups:

- The team recognized the challenges in analyzing existing conditions to determine station locations when conditions will change over time.
- CAG members were reminded once station locations are determined, it is likely that local government and transit partners will adjust their plans to better serve and support these locations.
- Tradeoffs will be considered and discussed during the small breakout groups.

Community advisory group reflections

Two breakout groups were established. The South Group discussed the West Alderwood, Ash Way, Mariner and SR-99/Airport Road alternatives in a separate breakout room while the North Group discussed SW Everett Industrial, SR-526/Evergreen and Everett Station. The breakout group activity utilized Miro Boards, an online whiteboard tool, to display maps of each station location that allowed facilitators to post sticky-notes and comments around the map during group discussion. The project team shared “the story” of each station, which reviews the alternatives’ tradeoffs.

Comments received for each alternative are summarized below.

South Group

West Alderwood

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for West Alderwood. Overarching comments referenced the need for light rail to be quicker than a bus or a car so the public will actively choose light rail over other options. Light rail should be convenient for people in Everett to take transit to the mall and vice versa. Importance placed on most convenient connections to other modes of transit and to shopping districts. The area experiences heavy traffic, which will be made worse by construction. A station angled to the west may not make sense when most developments are central or east [on the map shown].

ALD-A

- May look ideal regarding proximity to development; however, ALD-A appears to be too complex.
- Looks difficult to navigate.
- A big mix of existing property owners and development; disruptive.

ALD-B

- Has potential to serve the mall and surrounding areas.

ALD-C

- Is on public land; however, it is on top of the existing Interurban Trail.
- Concern if the Interurban Trail will need to exist underneath an elevated platform, may not be a pleasant interaction.
- Concern if Interurban Trail will need to be moved if route is at-grade.
- Too far to serve the mall.
- Least intrusive to existing properties.

ALD-D

- Has transit connections and connections to overall shopping districts.
- Has potential to serve the mall and surrounding areas.

- In favor due to proximity to H-Mart.

ALD-E

- Could be convenient for residents living in new housing being built at old high school location.
- Too far out from commercial center and other housing.

ALD-F

- Has potential to serve the mall and surrounding areas.
- In favor due to proximity to H-Mart.

Ash Way

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for Ash Way. General consensus was preference for ASH-A, ASH-B, or ASH-C; whichever would be the least disruptive. Members expressed concern over elevated stations adding to the overall hassle/accessibility of multiple up-and-downs to traverse. General questions below followed by station location specific comments:

- Traffic on 164th is bad throughout the day. Is there a difference between ASH-A, ASH-B or ASH-C in terms of improving traffic flow?
- A: We will not know more until further analysis is complete, but the County will also be looking at traffic flow through upcoming planning efforts. Would there be a dedicated pedestrian bridge built if ASH-D was selected?
 - A: That has been proposed; however, that solution isn't tied to just ASH-D.
- Are these stations elevated or at-grade?
 - A: Currently, they are shown as elevated; however, we are early in design and this may change.

ASH-A

- Easier walk to and from local bus routes compared to ASH-D.

ASH-B

- Easier walk to and from local bus routes compared to ASH-D.

ASH-C

- Easier walk to and from local bus routes compared to ASH-D.

ASH-D

- Inaccessible to people who live to the west [on the map shown] who take local transit.
- Difficult to consider walking the distance to/from the existing park-and-ride, which could deter ridership.
- A pedestrian overpass will be necessary.

Mariner

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for Mariner. There was general concern regarding the available space and tight turns. Members highlighted the sensitivity around impacts to the only grocery store serving the area (Safeway on 128th). Preference for the station that avoids displacement of residences. General questions include:

- Would lanes be taken out of (removed on) 128th?

MAR-A

- Most convenient due to proximity to commercial areas, Sno-Isle Library, Mariner High School, and connections to Swift Green line.
- Avoids displacement of current residences; maintains existing housing.

MAR-B

- Avoids displacement of current residences; maintains existing housing.

MAR-C

- Impacts existing affordable housing.
- CAG member is aware of Comcast building with satellites on 900 block of 132nd, which could potentially be an issue.

MAR-D

- Impacts the Safeway store, which is the only grocery store serving the entire area.

- Impacts existing affordable housing.

SR 99/Airport Rd

CAG members were reminded that this provisional station is currently funded for planning but not final design or construction. Members expressed a preference for a location that minimizes disruption and maximizes transit connections. The area can get congested and there are a lot of low-income housing and apartments in the area. A CAG member suggested running parallel to Airport Road as close to SR 99 as possible. Questions included:

- What is the rationale for AIR-C since it seems the farthest out from everything?
 - A: When looking at possibilities, we wanted to provide multiple options for comparison. One factor we considered was large parcels of land.
- Is this a station without parking?
 - A: Correct.

AIR-A

- Least impact/disruption.
- There is a collection of industrial workplaces; would be convenient for workers.

AIR-B

- Has a few more businesses than AIR-A, therefore slightly more disruptive than choosing AIR-A.

AIR-C

- Most disruptive without much benefit.
- Too far to be considered convenient for the area.
- Impacts housing, shopping, and restaurants.

North Group

SW Everett Industrial Center

CAG members reviewed the SW Everett Industrial Center. General station area comments (and related answers) included:

- The City of Everett strongly supported including the SW Everett Industrial Center, and the “westward swing,” in the ST3 plan for serving the area and access to Boeing.
- Questions related to how pedestrians would cross SR 526
 - A: For this Level 1 analysis, we assumed a pedestrian bridge over SR526.
- Follow-up question: Do we know the cost of that pedestrian bridge?
 - A: We have not looked at costs for the ped bridge yet.
- What’s the distance between the station locations?
 - A: Between A & B is 0.6 miles, between B & C is 0.35 miles.
- CAG member who works for Boeing explained the company has many internal shuttles to move employees around the large campus; SWI-A’s close proximity isn’t top priority since Boeing’s internal shuttles will have to connect to the future station anyway.
- Industrial zoning and noise footprint in the station area makes for little opportunity for residential development.
- Questions about property acquisitions; “How much property will you need, and is there limited availability of property?”
 - A: As we do more design work over the next number of years, we will be able to pinpoint more exactly where we will put the station and route. Generally, we plan and design for how much space we need to operate and maintain the system safely.
- Will route alignments be elevated?
 - A: Currently, we’re assuming elevated tracks through this area, but we will keep looking into this as planning and engineering progresses to see if there’s anywhere we could be at-grade.

Station area feedback included the following:

SWI-A

- Closest to residential development with historically underserved populations.
- Concerns related to residential displacement along Casino Road.
- Better existing pedestrian connections.
- Most challenging to connect to local and existing Swift buses.
- Concerns about proximity to the highway.
- Concerns about the possibility of Boeing leaving in the future.
- Concerns about lack of space for parking.

SWI-B

- Further from residential development with historically underserved populations (~.5 miles away).
- Easiest/best connection to local and existing Swift buses.
- Potential for future development.
- Lower land acquisition costs.

SWI-C

- Closest to Paine Field.
- Closest to local transit connections.
- Further from residential development with historically underserved populations (~.5 miles away).
- Best potential for future development.
- Lower land acquisition costs.
- Close to 100th St SW connecting it well to the neighborhood without cutting through Kasch Park.
- Close to a current underpass below Airport Road providing new options to connect a station to the airport.

SWI pink route

- Pink seemed to be the most supported route alignment.

SWI purple route

- Purple route alternative makes the most sense for many, citing costs, limited residential displacement and limited noise pollution for residents.
- Question re: whether ST would need to acquire property, and whether it would cut into apartments.
 - A: We will need to acquire right-of-way and property, but we're still too early in the planning work to know details of where and to what extent.

SWI blue route and SWI green route

- More TOD potential to have route alignment here.
- More potential for residential displacement of lower income communities and renters.

Evergreen/526

CAG members reviewed the Evergreen / SR 526 station area and related route and station alternatives. Generally speaking, CAG members were mostly supportive of the EVG purple route and EVG-B or EVG-C. General station area comments included:

- Station area has limited pedestrian/bike access for crossing SR 526 (CAG member listed 5th Ave and Interurban Trail as the only crossings; there is also Evergreen Way and a ped/bike bridge to the west).
- Question confirming there will be no additional parking. ST confirmed there is no parking included for this station.
- Some expressed a preference for an alignment that gets Everett Link opened in the quickest time.

Station area feedback included the following:

EGN-A

- Less TOD potential.
- Less nearby residential on the north side of SR 526.

EGN-B

- EVG-B is a great choice (and supported by most CAG members).
- Overpass over 526 between EVG A & EVG B for the best pedestrian/bike access in station area.

- There is a crossing light so folks coming from the east can cross easily.
- Access for high density of renters.
- Being on the west side of Evergreen is a plus.
- Greater walkability.
- There is a need to conduct a survey of businesses to garner input.

EGN-C

- Greater walkability.
- Higher density of residents and renters.

EGN-D

- Potential for residential displacement with the green route alternative down Casino Road
- Noise and safety concerns for neighboring residents.
- More TOD potential.
- Close to Swift bus stations.

EGN-E

- Potential for residential displacement with the blue route alternative down Casino Road.
- Noise and safety concerns for neighboring residents.
- More TOD potential.

Everett

CAG members reviewed the Everett Station area and related route and station alternatives. CAG members tended to agree that EVT-B and EVT-C were preferred. General station area comments included:

- Questions about how route alignments head north from Evergreen/526 to Everett Station.
 - A: We're considering alignments up I-5 and also up Broadway. The route alternatives meet before coming into this station area. We can get to any station in EVT from any station at EGN.
- One CAG member mentioned potential for ridership between Pacific Ave in Everett and Casino Road that we could be missing. One other member agreed that there seems to be a "missing spot" that should be considered around Lowell Road and 52nd between the Evergreen and Everett stations. However they know there is not an additional station in this area in the project.
- Everett Station District Alliance conducted a convergence study - it can be found here: <https://www.everettstationdistrict.com/convergence-study>.

Station area feedback included the following:

EVT-A

- Too far from the downtown core.
- Accessibility issues.

EVT-B

- Greater walkability.
- Supports greatest ridership potential.
- TOD potential.
- Possible impacts to freight-oriented business (McDougall).

EVT-C

- City of Everett's preliminary locally-favored option because it:
 - Serves downtown Everett best.
 - Serves "redevelopment lands" best.
 - ~.25 miles from existing Everett Station.
 - Supports Metro Everett Plan.
- Greater walkability.
- Supports greatest ridership potential.
- Would be great if the area around the station could be rezoned for dense residential.
- TOD potential.

- Possible impacts to freight-oriented business (McDougall).

EVT-D

- Furthest from Everett Station.
- Light rail will provide opportunity to low-income property owners to be able to build generational wealth due to home value appreciation and gives another commuting option. Preferred for one CAG member.
- Large impact on Broadway traffic.

Report back from small groups

After a brief break from small groups, the South group breakout room re-joined with the main group. Facilitators provided a high-level report out of the small group discussions.

Operations and Maintenance Facility North

CAG members reviewed the OMF North alternatives. The project team discussed the need for an OMF and details on the facility requirements. There are eight (8) site options currently being studied for the facility. The project team detailed the criteria and tradeoffs of each location.

There was general group support for an OMF North located at Airport Rd & 100th ('Site E'); however, there is concern for potential environmental impacts in that area. Other general concerns revolved around access to Kasch Park, which provides park amenities as well as the Community Transit bus barn and Mukilteo School District school bus park. Questions included:

- How do the OMF locations impact potential ridership, especially if the closest employers to the station are displaced?
 - This is a potential tradeoff. It is a question we need to ask and consider as we further study these sites.
- If an I-5 alternative will be considered, are there options for the OMF somewhere north?
 - A: We have not looked at that. Any extension would require an OMF, so we would need to find a location for that option.

SR 526 & Hardeson Rd ('Site A')

- Topography would be a challenge.
- Traffic is horrible in this area, especially due to large number of Amazon and FedEx trucks.
- **SR 526 & 16th Ave and 75th St & 16th Ave ('Sites B1 and B2')**
- Traffic is horrible in this area, especially due to large number of Amazon and FedEx trucks.

Airport Rd & SR 526 ('Site C')

- This area could wipe out opportunities for transit oriented development.
- Prime real estate for growth of the area.
- Question: How would access to Kasch Park be maintained or routed?
 - A: We would likely need to re-align Casino Road and Kasch Park to maintain access.

Airport Rd & 94th St SW ('Site D')

- Boeing offices are in this area.
- Prime real estate for growth of the area.

Airport Rd & 100th St SW ('Site E')

- Contains critical environmental areas (wetlands).
- Low profile and fewer potential displacements for businesses and people.
- Might be more optimal regarding potential station locations.

SR 99 & Gibson Rd ('Site F')

- Highest displacement impacts, especially with mobile home park.
- Not zoned for industrial uses like the other options.
- Hard to justify this location when you have better options further north. **I-5 & 164th St ('Site G')**
- Cost of this land will be high. Not zoned for industrial and impacts development potential.

- Other options further north seem better.
- How would trains cross I-5?
 - A: Would require additional track to cross I-5.

Next steps

The project team reviewed what follow-up information to expect and asked CAG members to submit comments on the survey to be sent out by the team. The survey mirrors the one in the public participation site launched on March 14. CAG members were reminded to please review materials between meetings and be prepared to make a recommendation at CAG Meeting #3.

Meeting Questions and Followup Responses

CAG members asked the following questions during the meeting, including questions asked during the breakout groups (also included above). Answers provided by the project team at the meeting are included below.

Question/Comment from CAG Member	Response/Followup
Question regarding a station at Everett Mall (concept suggested during early scoping) right off the freeway: because the Everett Mall is already served by Everett Transit, does Sound Transit need to work something out with the City of Everett so we can consider Everett Mall as a possible light rail pick up and drop off station? The only transit I see anywhere close to the mall is Everett Transit buses.	In terms of a station at Everett Mall as an alternative, that is one of the things we would report back to you on as we review early scoping suggestions. Sound Transit does work closely with the local transit agencies and that would be something we could discuss with agencies as we plan for any potential future changes to local service.
We also need to consider what would happen if the mall gets redeveloped if it gets turned into something else other than a shopping center.	Great point. Other future development possibilities could be discussed.
To clarify, these concepts came to Sound Transit through a public survey and some other means?	We received comments that included these suggestions during the early scoping period through a variety of forms including the online participation site, webinars, and emails
(When reviewing evaluation of stations and alignments rating tables) Will these data sheets be available to the advisory group? Are we supposed to be making a recommendation in the next meeting? If so, these would be helpful.	Part of what we're doing tonight is to try and understand what level of information the CAG wants to make an informed decision. For this meeting, we will be a little more high-level and focus on discussing tradeoffs identified during the analysis. We have the rating tables available if this is interesting to the CAG in preparation for the March meeting.
Question on the different criterion: are they all weighed equally? Are they listed according to priority?	We did not weight the criteria in our analysis. We're anticipating various groups will prioritize different criterion when making their recommendations.
Based on the map, which one is the representative alignment?	The pink line. The representative station location is labeled A while the representative alignment is in pink for each station area.

Tentative Future Meeting Schedule*All meetings proposed*

	Date	Time	Topics
Meeting #3	March 24, 2022	5:30 – 7:30 pm	Level 1 results and recommendations for ELG on alternatives to advance for further study in Level 2
Meeting #4	June 2022	TBD	Station area design and planning
Meeting #5	Sept 2022	TBD	Level 2 analysis of alternatives and preview of scoping materials
Meeting #6	Nov 2022	TBD	Review scoping feedback and recommendations to ELG on preferred alternatives