

Summary

Introductions, meeting objectives and schedule update

The seventh Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting began with the Sound Transit project team sharing the agenda, a brief schedule update, a summary of the public scoping process, and a guide for the discussion process. Eric Widstrand, North Corridor Development Director, reminded the CAG that we completed the project scoping period on March 10th. At this meeting the CAG will develop recommendations for the ST Board on alternatives to evaluate for environmental review.

Input from public scoping

Jaclyn Gault, Senior Community Engagement Specialist, shared a brief summary of the public scoping process. The project team received 643 survey responses, 327 comments at the in-person meeting, 212 emails, 10 letters, and 15 voice mails. All totaled, we received 1207 comments during the public scoping period. This included comments from six agencies and two tribes, the Tulalip Tribes and the Stillaguamish Tribe. Jaclyn noted that some of the most important information we get from these comments are the reasons stations are supported or not supported, because it helps us move forward in refining station alternatives.

CAG Question: Are the stations that are part of the representative plan automatically moving forward into the next level of environmental review?

ST Response: No. At this point all station alternatives can be considered similarly.

Jaclyn continued by introducing a guide for the station area alternatives discussion. There were three main pieces of information for the advisory group to share with Sound Transit: their recommended alternatives for continued study, their preferred alternative at each station location, and their concerns or considerations for each station area.

The presentation moved to an editable recommendations table, which was partially prepopulated by information received from the CAG members in advance of the meeting. It was explained that the group would go through each station area, starting at the south and finishing with the OMF North, and review the public, agency, and Tribal feedback received for each alternative. Staff summarized which alternatives received more or less support during scoping and then CAG had the opportunity to provide their recommendation.

West Alderwood

When showing the map of this station area, Jaclyn pointed out the location of the Alderwood Community Church, noting that the team received many comments about the potential impacts to the property. Although this does not affect their recommendations because the alignment in this area is the same for all alternatives, the team wanted to note the comments received and that staff is working on possible ways to avoid or reduce potential impacts.

CAG Question: What are the key points you would like us to take to the Alderwood Church community moving forward?

ST Response: We want to emphasize that this project is in very early design stages. We have met with the church and we're continuing to evaluate design refinements that would minimize or avoid impacts

to the church property. We seek to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts whenever possible throughout the entire project area.

CAG Question: How does the feedback from the Alderwood Community Church factor into your usual process for analyzing alternatives?

ST Response: Sound Transit does try to avoid property impacts as much as we can, but with 16 miles of track that can be very difficult. It's a normal part of this process to get feedback from local residents and businesses about proposed property impacts along the route.

CAG Question: Does Sound Transit use eminent domain as a tool?

ST Response: We work with affected property owners whenever possible to purchase the properties without eminent domain and provide fair compensation for any property we need to acquire.

Summary of scoping feedback:

There are currently three station alternatives being considered at West Alderwood. Generally, public comment reflected a preference for ALD-D and ALD-F over ALD-B. ALD-D received slightly more support than ALD-F. People preferred ALD-D and ALD-F for similar reasons around access to surrounding neighborhoods and the mall, although it seems that accessibility of ALD-D to residential neighborhoods to the west was of greater value to the public. The owner of the mall property prefers the ALD-D station location.

ALD-D is the alternative preferred by the City of Lynwood. The City of Everett supports study of ALD-D and ALD-F in the EIS but does not state a preference for one alternative.

Additionally, Sound Transit heard from Alderwood Community Church during the public comment process about possible property impacts to their church. Sound Transit has been in discussion with church representatives and is considering design options to reduce or avoid impact to their property.

CAG Comments:

- Sound Transit should no longer study ALD-B and move forward with ALD-D and ALD-F, with ALD-D as the preferred alternative.
- ALD-F provides the worst connection to the Swift bus line, and it feels important to prioritize transit connections.
- I am sad to see ALD-B no longer be studied, because the people who are going to be served best by ALD-B are the people who are going to the mall or who live near the mall. Prioritizing ALD-B would help those people the most.
- The amount of land that would be developable around ALD-D would allow much more growth than the area around ALD-B, which is mostly owned by the mall.
- We should focus on where the lots that can be built in the future are; there is very little land around ALD-B. New housing is more likely to be served by ALD-D and ALD-F.
- The principles of this group relate to equity, and ALD-D and ALD-F are going to serve more historically underserved communities. With that in mind, those alternatives are more desirable options than ALD-B.

CAG recommendation for West Alderwood

- Preferred alternative: ALD-D
- Continue to study: ALD-F
- No longer continue to study: ALD-B

Ash Way

There are two station alternatives for Ash Way and both options will be studied during the EIS. Public response showed a preference for ASH-A due to the connection to the Park-and-Ride and perceived fewer property impacts. However, due to the right-of-way east of I-5, the ASH-A alignment had more property impacts than ASH-D. Community Transit shared potential ASH-A impacts to transit operations at the Park-and-Ride.

People who preferred ASH-D commented that it has strong development potential and connection to Interurban trail. Many comments expressed concerns about potential impacts to the Mill Creek Foursquare Church, impacts to the Interurban Trail, how to connect to the Park-and-Ride, and – although costs are similar between both options – people were concerned about the cost and construction challenges for ASH-D. Community Transit noted that pedestrian access across I-5 would be necessary for ASH-D. Snohomish County had identified ASH-D as their preliminary favored option during early scoping and envisioned ASH-D adding important connections to the east side of the county.

CAG Comments:

- Although both stations must be studied, I have a slight preference for ASH-D. It seems important that whichever side the station is on, there needs to be safe public access to the other side of the highway via bikes, on foot, or through other means.
- I prefer ASH-D because of the future development opportunity. ASH-D is better connected to the Interurban Trail.
- These two are both viable in some ways and they both also have deficiencies. I had slightly preferred ASH-D in the past but was surprised by the Mill Creek Church response to ASH-D during public scoping.
- I have a very strong preference for ASH-D because there is a significant anchoring bias for future light rail decisions. There is greater future development potential on the land around ASH-D compared to ASH-A. ASH-A is also surrounded by wetlands which are essential to quality of life for the community. ASH-D will ultimately serve many more people and allow a car-free community for those who live there.
- For ASH-D, pedestrian access from the existing park-and-ride location is a key consideration to the functionality of the station, whether in combination with the County-proposed project or separate. Asking users of the parking facility to use the sidewalks along Ash Way to cross the ramps to I-5 creates additional hazards and a poor customer experience. It's important to note that ASH-A will impact the operations and space available at Ash Way Park-and-Ride. In addition, the direct access ramp from I-5 may not be operable during construction. Overall, I prefer ASH-D.

CAG recommendation for Ash Way

- Preferred alternative: ASH-D
- Continue to study: ASH-A

Mariner

There are three station alternatives being considered in this area. Public responses showed a preference for MAR-A and MAR-B over MAR-D. People generally like MAR-A and B for similar reasons (closer to transit stops, residential areas, and businesses than MAR-D) and have similar concerns about each (traffic, business displacements, especially around the Safeway and small businesses on the south side of 128th). People appreciated that MAR-B had fewer potential residential displacements.

The City of Everett does not support continuing study of MAR-A and Community Transit notes that the distance from the Park-and-Ride is an issue for pedestrians both for MAR-A and MAR-B. Snohomish County and the City of Everett both support continuing study of MAR-B and MAR-D. Community Transit supports MAR-D due to the nearby Park-and-Ride transit connections.

CAG Comments:

- Safeway has been developing properties across the Puget Sound into housing and grocery so any of these alternatives will likely result in a Safeway property redevelopment.
- I am fine with removing MAR-A.

CAG Question: Do you have any idea where the parking that Sound Transit is going to develop at this station will be located? Would it likely be co-located near the existing Community Transit Park-and-Ride?

ST Response: We did not examine potential parking locations in the first phase, but this will be part of the Draft EIS analysis. We will identify potential parking areas during the upcoming process.

CAG Follow-up: Would those parking areas consist of surface parking that would displace something not currently identified on these maps?

ST Response: Surface parking may have the greatest potential impact in terms of square footage, which would affect acquisitions. Structured parking may have a greater cost. This station area is very constrained so there will be a lot of discussion about the best way to use limited space.

CAG Question: What is the difference in residential displacements between MAR-B and MAR-D?

ST Response: There was a 10 percent differential in ratings, and we had thresholds for number of people and number of households. Both locations have some potential for residential displacement. MAR-D does have a possibility of displacing more residential and low-income housing than MAR-B.

Follow-up: With that in mind, I would lean more towards MAR-B.

CAG Comments:

- MAR-A and MAR-B provide similar services to the community, so given the additional detriments of MAR-A, I would prefer MAR-B.
- I am OK with removing A. I prefer B as it is closest to the schools in the area.

CAG Question: If a residential facility is being displaced by a Sound Transit improvement, is Sound Transit responsible for mitigating the direct displacement as opposed to mitigating indirect displacement maybe 10 years later when property values go up around the station? If there is more displacement at one location, will Sound Transit mitigate that displacement?

ST Response: Direct displacement, indirect displacement, and cultural displacement are all concerns we've heard during this scoping period. We are working with all partners to talk about these issues,

including anti-displacement strategies that local governments can utilize. If a residential unit or business is directly displaced by Sound Transit, we will mitigate the displacement. Indirect displacements are much more difficult to quantify and mitigate. We are working with community groups to understand the potential for indirect displacement and work together to address it in advance. A major priority of many interested groups is maintaining affordable housing.

CAG recommendation for Mariner

- Preferred alternative: MAR-B
- Continue to study: MAR-D
- No longer continue to study: MAR-A

SR 99/Airport Road (Provisional)

Two station alternatives are being considered in this station area, and both options will be studied in the Draft EIS. The public generally preferred AIR-A, mostly due to better transit connections and connections to the north/east neighborhoods. However, some people noted that the alignment at Mariner would affect the alignment at SR 99/Airport Road, and that regardless of the alternative, crossing the busy streets here would be the primary issue to address.

The City of Everett and Snohomish County support moving both alternatives forward. Everett prefers AIR-A because of its better transit integration. The Tulalip Tribes commented on this station area, noting that both station alternatives require crossing Swamp Creek, and this stream crossing would require careful planning to avoid impacts. Sound Transit will continue consulting with the Tribes as planning continues.

CAG Comments:

- I support AIR-A as the preferred alternative. Sound Transit needs to address pedestrian access at these major barrier arterial streets.
- There is a strong need to tame the approaching streets and consider pedestrian bridges across the intersection if roads are not tamed.

CAG recommendation for SR 99/Airport Road

- Preferred alternative: AIR-A
- Continue to study: AIR-B

SW Everett Industrial Center

There are three station alternatives being considered in this area. Public comments showed a preference for SWI-C as it is closer to the airport, although all three stations will require shuttles to the airport and the Boeing campus. Support for SWI-A was a very close second because of the connections to residential areas on Casino Road and the direct connection to Boeing campus. There were some concerns about SWI-C's proximity to airport property and wetlands. People often picked SWI-B as their second choice because it was closer to whichever option they favored.

The City of Everett identified SWI-A as their preferred alternative because it would serve the nearby residential community as well as Boeing. Everett also supported continuing to study SWI-B due to its easy connections to Swift and local bus service. The City of Everett does not support continuing to study

SWI-C. Community Transit noted that SWI-A has no potential for direct connections to bus routes, meaning they would require deviations, while SWI-B is near an existing Swift station. They also note that SWI-C could connect to existing routes but would require some changes to stop locations.

CAG Comments:

- SWI-B is closer to Sno-Isle Tech Center than SWI-C.
- SWI-C is too far from Paine Field to be viable for access without shuttles, which can be provided from the other locations. Projected air traffic will not be that great for many years to justify citing a station at SWI-C. I support SWI-A as preferred alternative and eliminating SWI-C.
- I don't like SWI-A because even with a bridge, a shuttle would still be needed to get to most Boeing destinations. SWI-C would still support Boeing and would not require Sound Transit to rely on Boeing to build a pedestrian bridge. I also believe that SWI-C is the best connected to the neighborhood and bike routes nearby.
- I have no preference because I don't support any stations in this area. I encourage Sound Transit to study all possible alternatives to the Boeing deviation in South Everett. These include alignment options on and near I-5 to SR 99 with multiple station locations, community enhancements like trails and public spaces, and new bus connections. Additionally, there are particular concerns among residents of the Casino Road area regarding alignments and stations under consideration in their community due to the potential for displacement and gentrification.
- I have concerns about SWI-A due to the impacts on the Casino Road community. I would support further study of SWI-B.
- I strongly support eliminating SWI-B, I see almost no benefits to option B. There is no residential opportunity, and the location is not particularly well connected to the two neighborhoods nearby. The potential growth of Paine Field means that SWI-C is the most reasonable choice, providing some residential access and access to Boeing via shuttle.
- SWI-A would benefit residents on Casino Road. It is a high-density housing area, and this station location would be closest to that community.

CAG Question: How reasonable is it to move forward with an option that the cities and agencies don't support?

ST Response: As you know, members of the ELG are also on the Sound Transit Board of Directors and you have heard some of their opinions on station locations. The Sound Transit Board includes representatives across three counties, so any decision will require consensus among all of those people.

CAG Question: Why does the City of Everett prefer SWI-B over SWI-C?

ST Response: While the City of Everett prefers SWI-A overall, they noted a preference for SWI-B over SWI-C due to easier transit integration.

CAG Comments:

- I met with Connect Casino Road, and they have a lot of questions about other stations. They are more concerned about displacement and changing the community. Adding another station on Casino Road, such as SWI-A, is going to hit the Casino Road community twice. This is another reason that I believe SWI-C is a better option. SWI-C supports the Westmont neighborhood as well, and Westmont is a 65% minority community.

- I see no reason to continue to study SWI-B as it has no connection to any residential area, nor does it easily connect to either Boeing or the airport. I strongly support SWI-C because of its proximity to Paine Field, which is going to be of increasing importance to the community in the future. I suggest continuing to study SWI-A and SWI-C. I would be interested to know more about why Everett City Council prefers SWI-B over SWI-C.
- I am in support of SWI-C, in hopes that it will serve people not only coming from the north but also from the south as the airport expands.
- SWI-A is close to Highway 526, with no potential for direct connections to bus routes. Pedestrian connectivity is limited without significant infrastructure improvements.

CAG recommendation for SW Everett Industrial Center

- Mixed support to continue study: SWI-A, SWI-B, SWI-C

SR 526/Evergreen

Five alternatives are currently being considered in this area. There was significant public support for EGN-A and Sound Transit received letters from local businesses, community organizations, and residents, including a petition with over 300 signatures, sharing a strong preference for EGN-A. Sound Transit had several meetings with the local organization Connect Casino Road and reports that the Casino Road community understands the challenges around this option but have told Sound Transit that their desire is to study a station that could reduce impacts to their community.

Many people liked the location of EGN-B because it is in close proximity to businesses and residential areas. People also noted the development potential of the area around EGN-B. The letters and petition mentioned above noted that they did not want an option that displaced Casino Square, such as EGN-B or EGN-C, due to Casino Square's important connection to the community and the difficulty of maintaining the affordability and co-location of the businesses if they had to move. There was generally less support for EGN-C, though people who did prefer it liked that it was close to the high school.

Many people supported EGN-D because it is close to residential areas and local businesses but avoids the direct displacement of the Casino Square businesses. People noted similar benefits of EGN-E as EGN-D and liked that it requires fewer acquisitions than EGN-D.

The City of Everett said they would not oppose continuing to study EGN-A but would not recommend it as they have concerns with the station being a viable connection point for pedestrians, those with mobility impairments, bus riders and pick up and drop off riders. Additionally, the school district noted concerns about impacts of EGN-A to their property, and Community Transit noted that this station has the most challenging bus transfers.

The City of Everett supports further study of EGN-B, but they conveyed concern for the direct displacement of Casino Square and committed to working with businesses to create permanently affordable commercial space nearby if this moves forward. Community Transit notes the need for pedestrian improvements with EGN-B as well as EGN-C.

The City of Everett does not support continuing to study EGN-C or EGN-D, citing that they did not score well against the project's evaluation criteria. Community Transit notes that EGN-D and EGN-E have the

best potential transit integration. The City supports further study of EGN-E, since it avoids Casino Square and limits other property acquisitions, while still performing well against the evaluation criteria.

CAG Comments:

- I support no longer studying EGN-C at a minimum. I think being close to amenities and commercial services is important.
- I recommend eliminating EGN-A, EGN-B and EGN-C, keeping EGN-D and EGN-E for further study, with EGN-D as the preferred alternative. EGN-D has the best potential for TOD (transit-oriented development), is closer to the largest concentration of population, and integrates well with local transit.
- I strongly support EGN-A because of the feedback and support from Connect Casino Road.
- I have been in contact with the people from Connect Casino Road. They support EGN-A and believe that EGN-B and EGN-C will negatively affect the community. They did not have feedback on EGN-D, but I believe EGN-D is a good option for community access with less displacement.
- TOD opportunities are significantly constrained near EGN-A. Every walk to and from the station would be longer, a significant burden for those with mobility impairments. Transit service would worsen as buses would need to split between the station north of the freeway and the housing, shops, and jobs south of the freeway. There would be less capacity for important station access improvements and public amenities, such as sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes, and community open space, on Casino Road and Evergreen Way.
- In order to make station EGN-B work, it's imperative the City of Everett start working with business owners and the community as soon as possible to create affordable commercial space.
- TOD potential for EGN-B seems like it must be lower than EGN-D since the area around EGN-B is dominated by SR 526.
- I'm in favor of continuing with EGN-D because it is the closest to existing transit stops and offers the best option for a transit interface.

CAG Question: Is there a future opportunity for Sound Transit to tweak the route for EGN-D and avoid some of the costly acquisitions and displacement?

ST Response: We do try to avoid, minimize and mitigate displacement and acquisitions throughout the process and will look in more detail at that during the EIS. For now, our evaluation is that EGN-C, EGN-D and EGN-E have relatively similar property impacts, and they also have greater property impacts than EGN-A and EGN-B.

CAG recommendation for SR 526/Evergreen

- Continue to study: ENG-B, EGN-D, EGN-E
- Mixed support to continue study: EGN-A
- No longer continue to study: EGN-C

I-5 / Broadway Alignment

There are two alternatives being considered in this area. There were limited comments from the public but overall comments favored the I-5 alignment because it has less disruption to residential neighborhoods. There were no agency comments on these alignment options.

CAG Comment:

- I-5 alignment is preferable to Broadway.

CAG recommendation for I-5 / Broadway Alignment

- Preferred alternative: I-5 Alignment
- Continue to study: Broadway Alignment

Everett Station

Three station and three route alternatives are being considered in this station area. The public expressed a preference for EVT-A because it has the best transit connections and would be less disruptive to the surrounding community and businesses. EVT-C and EVT-D were less popular than EVT-A, but were still supported due to downtown access, TOD potential, and walkability. Some comments noted that EVT-A's distance from downtown could make the station less accessible. The Downtown Everett Association, which is a local non-profit organization, noted their preference for EVT-C or EVT-D, with a McDougall alignment.

Community Transit noted EVT-A has potential impacts to existing bus service during construction and will likely require operational changes. EVT-D could affect the planned Swift Gold line and have some impacts to travel time. EVT-C has the best transit integration, in terms of being able to serve both downtown and the existing Everett Station.

The City of Everett's scoping letter supported continuing to study all three options, and listed EVT-C and EVT-D as preferred alternatives for station locations, but with an alignment along McDougall. Sound Transit is now exploring the potential for EVT-D to be combined with a McDougall alignment based on conversations with the City of Everett and public feedback received to date.

Sound Transit is also exploring a modification of EVT-A to relocate across from the existing Everett Transit station, as further consideration has shown that it would be difficult for potential future light rail extensions to navigate around the Everett Station building and cross Hewitt Avenue. The City of Everett's comment letter lists this "modified A" location as the EVT-A location to move forward into the Draft EIS.

CAG Comments:

- I prefer EVT-C & EVT-D because of their compatibility with future extensions, community assets, transportation, land use plan, and proximity to affordable housing. It also offers TOD potential.
- I am very much in favor of EVT-D, especially with a McDougall Ave alignment. EVT-C feels like a compromise between the two and for most of the pros for EVT-C, EVT-D seems to do a lot better. Between EVT-A and EVT-D, I would choose EVT-D.
- I originally preferred EVT-A because I thought it was an area that needed this growth, but I now prefer EVT-D because of some plans around a potential development in the location of the "modified A" site. It seems like the future economic potential of EVT-D is much higher, and any displacement is already likely to happen due to Angel of the Winds Arena.

CAG Question: If EVT-A is moved to the west side of Smith Avenue, would the station move further north?

ST Response: Yes, a modified EVT-A would move about one block north.

CAG Question: Regarding the new alignment on Smith Ave for EVT-A, there is a development planned in front of the station and I'm concerned about what this would do to that development. If EVT-A moves forward, could the light rail be expanded northward in the future? And what are the specific acquisitions required for alternative EVT-D?

ST Response: We have had initial conversations with the City about a modified EVT-A and are aware of the potential housing development. We are considering potential for future expansions northward as we refine site options. EVT-D would require additional acquisitions along Broadway, which led to the consideration of the EVT-D option with a route that goes along McDougall Ave.

CAG Comment:

- EVT-C most closely aligns with what the City of Everett envisions in the Metro Everett Subarea Plan. Additionally, EVT-C is the best alternative for future redevelopment projects.

CAG recommendation for Everett Station

- Preferred alternative: EVT-D with McDougall alignment
- Continue to study: EVT-C
- No longer continue to study: EVT-A

OMF North

There are four sites currently being considered for the OMF North. Public comment showed support for Sites B1, B2 and E, because they are already zoned industrial or commercial. Job displacement was a concern stated about Sites B1 and B2, while wetland and residential impacts were a concern for Site E. There were concerns about residential displacement for Site F, and there was little public support for this option.

The City of Everett has shared concerns about the displacements of industrial businesses required at B1 and B2 and does not support further study of these alternatives. Snohomish County supports continued study of all four sites. The Tulalip Tribes shared their concerns with Site E because of wetlands and streams in the area but did not give a recommendation beyond continuing close coordination on this work.

Concerns were raised by a manufacturing company regarding Sites B1 and B2 during public comment. The facility that would be displaced by these options manufactures a large volume of specialized plastic films, including medical supplies. In the property owner's letter to Sound Transit, they estimated a very high cost and tight schedule constraints to relocate this facility, which were not considered in the Level 2 evaluation.

CAG Comments:

- I would really like to see wetlands mitigation on all the alternative sites, with a preference for Site F since it has the least potential to affect the wetlands. The environmental aspects of this project are the ones with the longest possible impact. I would suggest we potentially drop off B, and maybe E as well if the Tulalip Tribes are really concerned about the impacts.

- Considering we're on tribal land, we and Sound Transit must heed the advice and input of Tribes. Considering the Tulalip Tribes' feedback, Site E would significantly impact a salmon-bearing stream system and require extensive environmental review. I'm in favor of no longer continuing to study Site E. Wetlands are vital and mitigation could fall short if not done with due process.
 - **ST Response:** We have yet to undertake field surveys on the stream, but mapping indicates that the streams near OMF Site E are not salmon-bearing.
- Understanding the wetland mitigation tools seems pretty crucial to the decision-making for the future OMF North location.
- I think the environmental impact on the streams and wetlands will be mitigated, which makes the costs of those sites minor. The residential displacement is harder to mitigate, so that makes it a more important factor for me.

CAG recommendation for OMF North

- Continue to study: Site B (general vicinity), Site E, Site F

Next steps

Jaclyn Gault noted that she will send out the recommendations table filled out today to all CAG members and allow time for them to review and provide any final edits or clarifications before finalizing.

Looking to the next few months:

- April 25, ELG meeting (CAG recommendations will be presented)
- May 11, Sound Transit System Expansion Committee (briefing)
- June 8, Sound Transit System Expansion Committee (recommendation to the ST Board)
- June 22, Sound Transit Board meeting (action identifying alternatives for study in Draft EIS)

This is the last official CAG meeting, and we would like to thank you all for your time and for sharing your thoughts. We are looking for opportunities in the future to continue to engage with all CAG members.