

Meeting Agenda & Summary

Meeting Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #3
 Meeting Date: March 24, 2022
 Meeting Time: 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
 Meeting Location: Zoom meeting

Meeting Purpose: To provide recommendations to the Elected Leadership Group regarding routes, stations and OMF North alternatives for continued study.

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

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:30 p.m.	Welcome and introductions
5:40 p.m.	Follow-up from Meeting #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule update Online open house open until April 3rd Supporting materials
5:45 p.m.	Discussion guide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating guidelines Discussion format Considerations for alternatives to study further
5:50 p.m.	CAG Discussion on Station and Route Alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level 1 evaluation results Public feedback CAG feedback from meeting #2 CAG recommendations for Level 2
7:05 p.m.	CAG Discussion on OMF North Alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level 1 evaluation results Public feedback CAG feedback from meeting #2 CAG recommendations for Level 2
7:20 p.m.	Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAG recommendations and feedback process CAG meeting #4 Other upcoming meetings
7:30 p.m.	Adjourn

Materials

- Everett Link Extension PPT presentation
- Recommendations table

Meeting Summary

Welcome and introductions

The third Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting kicked off 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 key interest or unique perspective they bring to the group, followed by Sound Transit team introductions.

Follow up from meeting #2

The project team reviewed outcomes from meeting #2 regarding high-level findings and trade-offs for each station area and OMF North location. Additional information on the technical analysis and public feedback was distributed to CAG members by email after meeting #2.

Eric Widstrand was introduced as the new North Corridor Development Director. Eric reviewed the schedule and gave an update on alternatives suggested during early scoping, acknowledging that Sound Transit has heard comments regarding studying additional alternatives. These suggested alternatives are under review to determine if they meet the criteria to be studied in Level 2. CAG members were reminded that the focus of this meeting is on existing Level 1 alternatives; however, recommendations made by the CAG at this meeting do not preclude new alternatives suggested from early scoping from being studied.

- When will we hear a decision about the I-5 alternative?
 - We are still forming next steps and timeline for that evaluation. It will be something we work through over the next several months. We will make these alignment decisions once we do an initial evaluation to determine which options to include in the Level 2 analysis.
- Will there be a comment opportunity for the CAG or the public on an I-5/99 alignment decision?
 - That's something we are still trying to figure out, how that fits into future opportunities, but we will make sure we keep you informed of if and when there is a chance to comment.

CAG discussion on station and route alternatives

The project team reminded CAG members of their role in representing their communities. The team went over the discussion format and the need to keep more than one alternative at each station area. The CAG spent 10 – 15 minutes per station area and on the OMF North locations to discuss which alternatives to recommend moving forward into Level 2 evaluation and which to not study further, with focus on the *why* behind each recommendation.

A draft recommendations table was shared, which included a summary of the technical analysis, public feedback (per early scoping and current participate.online site feedback to date) and CAG feedback (from meeting #2 and the follow-up survey). The recommendations table was prepopulated with this information and highlighted as follows:

- Alternatives highlighted green in the draft table were alternatives with more potential/more support.
- Alternatives highlighted orange showed greater challenges/less support.
- Alternatives highlighted blue showed mixed performance/mixed support.

Due to limited timing, the project team confirmed recommendations highlighted green or orange and focused on prioritizing discussion on alternatives highlighted blue (mixed performance/mixed support).

West Alderwood

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for West Alderwood. On the recommendations table **ALD-D, ALD-F, ALD-B** were highlighted green, **ALD-A** was highlighted blue, and **ALD-C and ALD-E** were highlighted orange. Discussion centered on whether **ALD-A** should be studied further or removed from further study, noting that there may be a benefit to continuing **ALD-A** for further study since it is part of the representative alignment.

Comments included:

- Several CAG members agreed that **ALD-A** could be removed from further study due to challenges surrounding property impacts.
- **ALD-A**, though preferred over **ALD-C** and **ALD-E**, runs through so many challenges (others in agreement).
- **ALD-A** compared to **ALD-B**, **ALD-D** and **ALD-F** does not provide any advantages.
- **ALD-B** is preferred over **ALD-A** (others in agreement).
- Deciding on alternatives to further study, the CAG should be willing to narrow down as much as possible so more details can be included in the study. Propose dropping **ALD-A**, resulting in three moving forward from the six alternatives.

Questions on West Alderwood included:

- Why was **ALD-A** included as a possible station location?
 - A: This station was the ST3 representative station location that was used for cost estimating purposes. Sound Transit is now finding that the diagonal alignment of **ALD-A** is challenging, and **ALD-B** is performing better than **ALD-A** and is in a close location. In this situation, it is okay to drop the representative alignment from further study in favor of a similar option.
- Would the I-5 alignment change these options?
 - A: Looking at an alternative alignment along I-5 would not impact station locations in West Alderwood.

Final CAG recommendation for West Alderwood:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- **ALD-B**
- **ALD-D**
- **ALD-F**

Not recommended to advance:

- **ALD-A**
- **ALD-C**
- **ALD-E**

Ash Way

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for Ash Way. **ASH-A** was highlighted green while **ASH-B**, **ASH-C** and **ASH-D** were highlighted blue. The Sound Transit team shared that **ASH-D** is the preliminary locally favored option by Snohomish County due to planned infrastructure improvements that would enhance the performance of **ASH-D**, though those improvements may also improve performance of other station options. The County also favored an alignment on the east side of I-5, which could roughly be the same cost as a west side alignment, providing reason to keep studying an east side station location option. The CAG discussed which additional station locations should move forward for further study.

Comments included:

- It would be helpful to understand the purpose of the station areas because each would serve a different function within the system.
- **ASH-B** and **ASH-C** are very similar and not much different than **ASH-A** except for impacts to the Park and Ride lot.
- With additional context, in favor of keeping **ASH-D** knowing it may not increase cost. Main concern was crossing the interstate (others in agreement).
- In favor of eliminating options **ASH-B** and **ASH-C** (others in agreement) due to their similarity to **ASH-A**.
- **ASH-B** would impact existing mixed-use and multi-family housing.

Questions on Ash Way included:

- Can you elaborate on the County's infrastructure improvements to support **ASH-D**?
 - A: [The project team shared a map of Ash Way with improvements planned by Snohomish County] These improvements were identified through an East-West High-Capacity Transit Access Study performed by the

County. It is important to know that these are planned but not currently funded. They would increase the watershed, which is why they improve performance of station locations on both sides of the interstate.

- Between **ASH-A**, **ASH-B**, and **ASH-C**, is there one that is more environmentally sensitive with marsh areas in the area?
 - A: We did not see that in the technical analysis.

Final CAG Recommendation for Ash Way:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- **ASH-A**
- **ASH-D**

Not recommended to advance:

- **ASH-B**
- **ASH-C**

Mariner

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for Mariner. **MAR-A**, **MAR-B**, and **MAR-D** were highlighted green and **MAR-C** highlighted orange. The project team shared the County has planned infrastructure that would improve performance of station alternatives.

Comments included:

- In favor of taking **MAR-C** off the table based on overall lack of support.
- **MAR-B** would make sense if the OMF was located on Site F on Highway-99 instead of **MAR-A** since you'll be on the south side of 128th and it would be easier to get to OMF Site F but if that's not a favored site for the OMF then **MAR-A** and **MAR-D** are the two best for the Mariner area (others in agreement).
- Coming from a person who has accessibility needs, preference for **MAR-A** and **MAR-D**.

Questions on Mariner included:

- There are a lot of industrial and residential spaces that will be changed, what is Sound Transit's and the County's future vision for the area and how it will be a benefit for residents and commuters?
 - A: The County is currently doing a station sub-area plan for the area, so it is an opportunity outside of the Sound Transit process for people to weigh in on their vision for the future. In addition, the work done by the Sno-Isle Library in the Mariner Community Campus Plan has provided feedback about the community's vision for the area.

Final CAG Recommendation for Mariner:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- **MAR-A**
- **MAR-B**
- **MAR-D**

Not recommended to advance:

- **MAR-C**

SR 99/Airport Rd

CAG members reviewed station location alternatives for SR99 and Airport Road. **AIR-A** and **AIR-B** were highlighted green while **AIR-C** in orange due to its major challenges.

Comments included:

- Agree with no longer continuing to study **AIR-C** (others in agreement).
- Recommend not advancing **AIR-B** and **AIR-C**. Concern for **AIR-B** is that commuters would have to cross Evergreen Way and traffic is fast and dangerous. Include safety improvements and keep those with disabilities in mind for the study if **AIR-B** moves forward.

Final CAG Recommendation for SR 99/Airport Rd:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- AIR-A
- AIR-B

Not recommended to advance:

- AIR-C

SW Everett Industrial Center - stations

CAG members reviewed the SW Everett Industrial Center station alternatives, separate from alignment alternatives. **SWI-A** and **SWI-B** were highlighted green while **SWI-C** in blue. The project team acknowledged that comments surrounding future development in the area were heard and clarified that the area is a designated industrial area, so potential future transit-oriented development would focus predominantly on jobs. The project team also reiterated that none of the alternatives would be walkable to the Paine Field passenger terminal; the closest, **SWI-C**, is about .8 miles away.

Comments included:

- Preference for **SWI-C** due to proximity to Paine Field and Boeing Access gate.
- All three options would require shuttle services. Other considerations, such as ability for parking and other infrastructure, is more important to consider. Strong favor of keeping **SWI-C** on the table.
- Advocate keeping **SWI-C**, more promise in comparison to **SWI-A**, where possible residential displacement along Casino Road is a big concern. (*Note from ST project team: technical analysis showed that SWI-A does not have more potential for direct residential displacements than other station alternatives.*)
- **SWI-A** caters too much to Boeing employees. If they're a major factor in where this station is, and if they were ever to leave the area, **SWI-A** wouldn't make sense anymore. It also seems to have challenges with connecting to local and Swift buses.
- **SWI-C** is more practical than the other options. As a bicycle commuter, this option would be much easier.
- **SWI-B** and **SWI-C** should remain on the table because they have the most potential to not displace industrial facilities. **SWI-B** would be the optimal choice if we can partner with other agencies, plus it has the best connection to Kasch Park.
- It may be nice to keep all options if none of them are truly walkable to the next transit station; it would be good to study with partner agencies to see which of the three would be better in terms of an additional bus station.
- The advantage of **SWI-A** is that it is closest to residential areas of Casino Road. Casino Road does not get a station, yet it has high-density housing. Casino Road will be bracketed with a station on either end with the line running through or behind it, but the residents themselves do not get a station. It's frustrating to live somewhere and have light rail but not have a station near you.
- Support for continuing to study **SWI-B** and **SWI-C** and mixed support regarding **SWI-A**. Due to outstanding questions and desire for more information, recommend including **SWI-A** for further study as well.

Final CAG Recommendation for SW Everett Industrial Center (stations):

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- SWI-A
- SWI-B
- SWI-C

Not recommended to advance:

- none

SW Everett Industrial Center - alignments

CAG members reviewed the SW Everett Industrial Center alignments. In the recommendations table, alternatives along the north side of SR 526 (pink) and south side of SR 526 (purple) were highlighted green while alignments north of Casino Road (blue) and center running along Casino Road (green) were highlighted in orange. The project team reminded the CAG that any of the alignments can connect to any of the SW Everett Industrial Center stations. Regarding the Evergreen Way/526

station areas, connections are possible via the purple alignment (south side of SR 526) for any station alternatives south of 526 or along Casino Rd.

Comments included:

- Agree with the proposed plan.
- Preference for the purple alignment.

Final CAG Recommendation for SW Everett Industrial Center (alignments):

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- **SWI-Pink**
- **SWI-Purple**

Not recommended to advance:

- **SWI-Blue**
- **SWI-Green**

SR 526/Evergreen Way

CAG members reviewed the SR 526/Evergreen Way station area and related route and station alternatives. **EGN-A, EGN-B, EGN-E** were highlighted green. **EGN-E** was highlighted blue. **EGN-C** and **EGN-D** were highlighted in orange. The project team reminded members that further study can be done on options D and E to see what it looks like to connect them to the purple route alternative. The route may have to run down Casino Road for a short time to connect to the station.

Comments included:

- Strongly recommend **EGN-D** should be continued for further study. It has greatest potential for connecting to existing transit, and if the blue and green alignments are no longer being studied along Casino Road, then impact is not tied to that station. There may still be some impacts, but even the purple alignment is going to impact residences on SR 526. If you can get closer to Evergreen Way and serve **EGN-D** with the purple alignment, it would line up best with the existing Swift Blue line (others in agreement).
- Comparing graphics sent (Ratings tables), **EGN-E** was higher performing for transit connection potential, would need to clarify if there is indeed high TOD potential.
- There are a lot of upsides to **EGN-E** including community assets, transit integration, projected 2040 population growth, etc.
- It is difficult to separate the station from alignment. If we consider the purple route, what is the difference between **EGN-E** and **EGN-C**? **EGN-E** would have advantages for the blue alignment. If you select the purple route, **EGN-C** makes the most sense.
- Mentioning 2040 population and job growth projections, I see absolutely no difference between **EGN-E** and **EGN-D** because they are so close to each other.
- In favor of keeping **EGN-A, EGN-B, EGN-E** and **EGN-D** as mentioned; there are similarities that can be discussed further.
- We should stay on the west side because it is closer to more populated areas. North of 526, a big development is already happening. **EGN-E** and **EGN-C** would be dangerous for pedestrian crossing because of traffic across multiple lanes.
- I do not like **EGN-A, EGN-B,** and **EGN-C**. As a person with a disability who utilizes a motorized chair, it is too complicated to cross over Evergreen Way. From an accessibility lens, preference for **EGN-D** and **EGN-E**, especially with Fred Meyer.
- In favor of no longer continuing to study **EGN-C**.

Questions on SR 526/Evergreen Way included:

- What are the appreciable differences between **EGN-E** and **EGN-D** for those more familiar with the area?
 - A: Distance is a bit further than it might seem. One of the technical differences between **EGN-C** and **EGN-E**, it may be more challenging to cross back over 526. Between those two and **EGN-D** is the crossing of Evergreen Way. **EGN-D** is more accessible to a more densely populated area.

Final CAG Recommendation for SR 526/Evergreen:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- EGN-A
- EGN-B
- EGN-D
- EGN-E

Not recommended to advance:

- EGN-C

Everett

CAG members reviewed the Everett Station area and related route and station alternatives. **EVT-A, EVT-B, EVT-C** were highlighted in green while **EVT-D** was highlighted in blue.

Comments included:

- **EVT-D** should be removed; it is too far from transit and impacts businesses (others in agreement).
- The land around the Everett Station has some vacant buildings that may be City or County owned. It seems like there is more potential for TOD with **EVT-A, EVT-B, EVT-C** rather than **EVT-D**, which is already all business, the arena and condos. Broadway is a main throughfare; it would be disruptive to Broadway.
- In favor of no longer continuing to study **EVT-D** and **EVT-A**, with **EVT-D** being far from Everett Station and **EVT-A** being far from downtown (others in agreement).
- **EVT-D** and **EVT-B** can both be eliminated. **EVT-D** would be very disruptive and there are very good reasons that the City of Everett supports **EVT-C**. **EVT-B** can be eliminated due to its similarity to **EVT-C**. There are no real benefits that **EVT-B** has that **EVT-C** does not.
- Before we completely eliminate **EVT-D**, it's important to remember that one of the goals of transit is to take people to the downtown core. **EVT-D** is the closest to the downtown core, which is a destination. If there are plans for **EVT-C** to serve the downtown core, then it is okay to no longer study **EVT-D**.
- The Everett Metro Plan supports **EVT-C** by giving it an elevated crossway to serve downtown.
 - There are plans for bus routes on McDougall that will feed light rail to downtown.
 - Metro Everett Plan: <https://www.everettwa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7724/Metro-Everett-Draft-Action-Strategy-Report-PDF>

Final CAG Recommendation for Everett Station:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- EVT-A
- EVT-B
- EVT-C

Not recommended to advance:

- EVT -D

OMF North Alternatives

CAG members reviewed the OMF North alternatives. **Site B-1, Site B-2, Site E** were highlighted green; **Site D** highlighted blue; and **Site A, Site C, Site F** and **Site G** in orange. The project team shared additional information, such as **Site A** having challenging topography that may make it difficult to connect the site to the main track route. **Site A** also has likely impacts to wetlands and streams, as well as potential to displace jobs. **Site C** has the highest property costs due to the need to realign Casino Road and has likely impacts to wetlands. **Site F** has mixed technical performance due to potential impacts to historically underserved communities; however, no environmental resources have been identified on the site. **Site G** has difficult topography, is zoned Urban Center and would displace Walmart and another fairly large employer. **Site D** is on airport property and is fairly flat; it does not contain many environmental resources but includes a large office building and could potentially displace more than 2,000 employees.

Comments included:

- Support for eliminating **Site A**, **Site C**, **Site F**, and **Site G**.
- Suggest removing **Site D**, lots of jobs would be displaced (others in agreement).
- **Site D** should continue to be studied, despite the impacts to jobs in case **Site E** has too many environmental impacts (others in agreement).
- Thinking of an OMF to support an I-5 alignment, keep **Site G**.
- Similarly, if Evergreen Way is looked at as an option, **Site F** would be good to keep.
- **Site F** is the worst due to impacts on the mobile home park.

Questions asked about the OMF North Alternatives included:

- Will **Site E** affect the other two proposed station sites for light rail on Airport Road?
 - A: With any OMF options, we can figure where the station goes. They don't preclude each other but need further study to understand cost and performance.
- If we stay with the I-5 alignment, which one of these makes more sense if there was a spur to an OMF?
 - A: We haven't looked at that. We'd want the OMF to be within a half mile (.5) from the light rail track, so that is a consideration.

Final CAG Recommendation for OMF North:

Recommend to advance to Level 2:

- **Site B-1: SR 526 & 16th Ave**
- **Site B-2: 76th St SW & 16th Ave**
- **Site D: Airport Rd & 94th St SW**
- **Site E: Airport Rd & 100th St SW**

Not recommended to advance:

- **Site A: SR 526 & Hardeson Rd**
- **Site C: Airport Rd & SR 526**

Not recommended to advance for existing Level 1 alternatives; however, consider as a contingency option to support potential I-5, SR 99, or SR 99/Evergreen alignments:

- **Site F: SR 99 & Gibson Rd**
- **Site G: I-5 & 164th St**

Next steps

A summary of the CAG discussion will be finalized into a recommendations table to be shared with the Elected Leadership Group for their meeting on April 19. The ELG will make their own recommendations, which will also be shared with the CAG. The Sound Transit Board will be briefed on the CAG and ELG recommendations to advance to Level 2. The next CAG meeting is planned for June and will include an overview of station area components and planning.