

Meeting Overview

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #6
 Date: January 4, 2022
 Time: 5:00 - 7:00 p.m.
 Location: Zoom
 Objective: To discuss results of Level 2 analyses, part 2 of 2.

Attendance

<u>CAG Members</u>		<u>Project Team:</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allan Giffen	<input checked="" 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"/> Eric Widstrand
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christine Stansfield	<input type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Gordon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jaclyn Gault
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colton Davis	<input type="checkbox"/> John Edgar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessa Gardner
<input type="checkbox"/> Eldon Luo	<input type="checkbox"/> Kent McDaniel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lauryn Douglas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emmanuel Garcia	<input type="checkbox"/> Laura Akers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Miranda Redinger
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erik Nielsen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luis Burbano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Danielson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gauhar Serikbayeva	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Misha Lujan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Jane Westling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Coelho	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sione K. Phillips	

Agenda

Time	Topic
5:00 p.m.	Welcome and introductions
5:05 p.m.	Schedule update and meeting objectives
5:10 p.m.	Level 2 station area results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR 99/Airport Road • Mariner • Ash Way • West Alderwood • OMF North
6:40 p.m.	Comparative cost estimates
6:55 p.m.	Next steps
7:00 p.m.	Adjourn

Materials:

- Everett Link Extension Community Advisory Group Meeting 6 PowerPoint (distributed in advance)

Summary

Welcome and introductions

The sixth Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting began with the Sound Transit project team sharing the agenda, a brief schedule update and meeting objectives. Eric Widstrand, North Corridor Development Director, reminded the CAG that we are currently nearing the end of the alternatives development process. Starting January 23rd, there will be an opportunity for public feedback during a formal scoping period. Scoping is an opportunity for the public, Tribes, and agencies to submit formal comments on the scope of environmental review. In early 2023, the CAG and Elected Leadership Group (ELG) will form recommendations to the ST Board to inform the identification of a preferred and other alternatives to evaluate for environmental review.

Level 2 station area results

Miranda Redinger, Senior Project Manager, shared findings for each of the station and alignment alternatives, including SR 99/Airport Road, Mariner, Ash Way, and West Alderwood. She also shared the criteria used to evaluate each alternative, such as general station access, bike and pedestrian connections, transit connections, impacts to businesses, proximity to historically underserved communities and future growth, and equity. CAG members reviewed annotated maps of different station alignments and draft 3D station concepts for several of the current station alternatives.

SR 99/Airport Road

Question: The ratings table includes a line for non-project traffic elements. Can you describe what those are for AIR-A?

Answer: The non-project traffic elements measure the potential effect of construction and operation of the light rail facility on the existing roadways. Building stations naturally changes traffic circulation patterns. We will evaluate traffic effects in the vicinity of each station in more detail in the Environmental Impact Statement, the next step of this process.

Question: Have any local jurisdictions expressed a preference between AIR-A and AIR-B?

Answer: No preference has been shared at this time.

Question: Would the existing Swift bus stops be relocated to accommodate the light rail station?

Answer: Some stops will remain in the same location, but the Swift Blue Line could relocate.

Question: Does the station chosen at this location have effects on other station alternatives to the south? It looks as though AIR-B would only work well with one of the Mariner alternatives.

Answer: Any station area alternative can be connected to any other, so a decision at this station location will not affect station alternatives to the south.

Question: We know this is a provisional station (at SR 99/Airport), but could we decide to build this station instead of the SR 526/Evergreen Station?

Answer: Voters approved funding for the Sound Transit 3 package in 2016, which determined the representative project, including approximate route, mode, number and general locations of stations, and inclusion of an operations and maintenance facility. This station was identified as provisional in the representative project and it would be more complicated to change this designation, or switch it to another station area, than a recommendation from the CAG.

Question: The maps designate areas as 'potential future use'. Can you describe what that means?

Answer: These station concepts assume full parcels that may need to be acquired, even if the full property would not be needed for the station layout. Once construction is finished, there is the possibility that the space could be used by Sound Transit for transit-oriented development, surplus for affordable housing by a private developer or other uses.

Mariner

Question: For station alternative MAR-D, how many neighborhoods are within in a half-mile radius of the station location?

Answer: A half-mile radius around MAR-D doesn't reach all the way to neighborhoods on 128th Street SW, but the station alternative is well connected to transit.

Comment: MAR-D seems like the least walkable for students at Mariner HS and the middle school.

Question: Is it possible that after the CAG and ELG make their recommendations, a hybrid may emerge with station locations moving to different footprints?

Answer: Yes, there may be further refinements to station locations and layouts.

Question: Is it possible that the alignment for MAR-D could be moved to the south side of 128th Street SW?

Answer: It is possible that the MAR-D alignment could be on the south side of 128th but this may require changes to station orientation and other features.

Question: MAR-D was the favored alternative by Snohomish County, but the ratings for MAR-B are higher. Has Snohomish County changed their opinion?

Answer: Sound Transit is not aware of any changes in the County's preliminary locally favored options.

Question: MAR-B rates higher than the other two alternatives. What might be a reason to not select MAR-B?

Answer: The CAG will develop a set of recommendations, so your opinion is part of the process that will define which stations are chosen for further study. The public scoping comments and the ELG recommendation will also help the ST Board determine the preferred alternative for each station area. Traffic along 128th Street SW has been noted as a concern that could influence these recommendations.

Comment: MAR-D has the most potential for future residential development, so while it may not be as walkable as MAR-A and MAR-B right now, it could be later, depending on the future use of land.

Question: Would a station location on the north or south side of 128th street affect the future parking location?

Answer: Future parking will be analyzed during the next steps of the EIS process.

Ash Way

Question: How does the ASH-A station alignment result in more residential displacement?

Answer: There are some apartment complexes north of the station that would be likely be impacted by tracks extending north.

Question: What do you mean by affordable housing?

Answer: This is defined as subsidized housing, as opposed to “naturally occurring” affordable units.

Comment: ASH-A seems more focused on the current conditions while ASH-D is more oriented towards future growth.

Response: You can recommend that both alternatives continue to be studied moving forward.

Question: As a neighbor who bikes through the area every day, the current Park-and-Ride is not being used to its full potential. Have you considered redeveloping the south end of the parking area into transit-oriented development? Alternatively, have you considered building a parking garage and utilizing the remaining area for development?

Answer: Sound Transit does not own the Park-and-Ride (WSDOT is the owner) and so redevelopment has not been considered by the team. We can discuss that idea with community partners as a future opportunity.

Question: Is there a potential pedestrian crossing over I-5 planned for this station area?

Answer: Snohomish County is studying a potential pedestrian crossing, but no final decisions have been made.

Question: Is it correct that since it is slightly below grade, is ASH-D less expensive to build compared to ASH-A, which is elevated?

Answer: There are tradeoffs in the alignment going over or under 164th Street. More details about comparative cost estimates will be shared later in the meeting.

West Alderwood

Comment: The transit-oriented development potential in this station area seems the highest of any locations along the corridor, regardless of the station alternative.

Question: The area north of ALD-F is already being developed, so it would not have as much future potential growth. Has that been included in the evaluation?

Answer: If a construction project has broken ground, it is not considered in future TOD development potential.

Question: Have you taken into consideration the high traffic volumes in the area?

Answer: That is a component of the next step of the EIS process.

Question: Do local governments have a preference among these three alternatives?

Answer: ALD-D is Lynnwood's preliminary locally favored option.

Question: How is future development determined, especially in the area north of ALD-F?

Answer: Market studies of development potential have been conducted, considering factors such as zoning, height regulations, and other elements.

Question: Was the connection to the Interurban Trail considered during evaluation of ALD-B?

Answer: Yes, bike accessibility was considered as part of the evaluation. ALD-B has accessibility issues related to the large parking lots in the area, which are an obstacle for pedestrians accessing the station.

OMF North

Lauryn Douglas, Deputy Project Director, presented the Level 2 evaluation findings for the four OMF North site alternatives.

Question: Is there data about how many employees would be displaced at these businesses?

Answer: Sound Transit received estimated data on employment numbers from the Puget Sound Regional Council database, and those numbers are reflected in the Employment Displacements evaluation criterion. Further analyses on displacements will be part of the EIS study.

Question: What is the risk of contaminated soils for OMF site alternative E?

Answer: No soil testing has been performed to date. Historical data indicates low potential for contaminated soils. Additional work on assessing contamination would be part of the EIS process, including how it could affect OMF construction.

Question: What determines the site footprints outlined on the maps?

Answer: These footprints include all the features required in an OMF but will be refined in the future. Differences in these conceptual footprints for sites are the result of natural features on the site (e.g., streams), how the site connects to the mainline tracks, or other infrastructure to consider.

Question: Where is the local post office in relationship to OMF alternative sites B-1 and B-2?

Answer: The post office is east on 80th Street SW and Hardeson Road and would not be affected by either site alternative.

Question: Are the OMF lead tracks at Site B-2 elevated or at-grade?

Answer: The tracks would be elevated coming into the facility, and there would be a transition to at-grade within the facility itself.

Question: Have local planning officials expressed any preferences regarding OMF options?

Answer: ELG members have noted concerns with business impacts associated with OMF Sites B-1 and B-2.

Comparative cost estimates

Eric Widstrand shared information on comparative cost estimates between station alternatives. CAG members were reminded that cost does not need to be a driving factor of the CAG's recommendation. These numbers are estimates based on only a 1-2% design plan and are subject to change. Cost estimates at this point are primarily driven by three factors: length of track, height of track, and right-of-way costs.

Question: What is the meaningful benefit of the Broadway alignment if there is no station in that segment?

Answer: The Broadway alignment is more direct with less curvature. It can be important to have multiple options to study so that if unforeseen problems arise with one alignment, an alternative alignment can be considered.

Question: Do these estimates have a built-in contingency percentage?

Answer: Yes, contingency is included. Sound Transit can follow up to provide more details on the actual percentages.

Question: What is the primary funding source for the project?

Answer: There are multiple sources of funding for the project, including the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and vehicle taxes. The total cost of the Everett Link project will not result in a reduction to vehicle taxes for individuals.

Question: Do these costs account for current inflation levels, i.e., costs for land acquisition, labor, and construction materials?

Answer: These costs consider inflation, but it is difficult to predict those factors over the 18-year project timeline. Factors both in and outside our control will change these estimates over time.

Question: Historically, has the Sound Transit contingency percentage been enough to cover unforeseen costs?

Answer: Sound Transit can follow up with an answer.

Next steps

Jaclyn Gault, Senior Community Engagement Specialist, described upcoming public engagement opportunities. January 23 - March 10 is the public scoping period, where the public will be able to review findings from the Level 2 analysis and provide comments, in addition to commenting on the Draft Purpose and Need and components that will be studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Please note the public scoping meetings we will have during this period:

- Virtual: February 7, 2023, 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.
- In person: February 15, 2023, 5:30 - 7:30 p.m. at Cascade High School
- Virtual: March 1, 2023, 11:30 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.

We strongly encourage CAG members to share the scoping period information with their networks, attend the in-person meeting, and invite friends and neighbors to give comments.

Question: How can CAG members best prepare for making a recommendation during our next meeting? Is there any way for us to share comments with other CAG members in advance?

Answer: Sound Transit will share a survey in advance for CAG members, then pre-populate a table of comments and responses. This table can be shared with the CAG in advance of the meeting. We could also consider developing a collaborative online board to share comments among CAG members.