

# **Meeting Overview**

Subject:	Elected Leadership Group Meeting #6
Date:	December 6, 2022
Time:	9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
Location:	Zoom
Attendees:	See list on page 7

Meeting Purpose: To discuss results of Level 2 analyses and cost estimates

# Agenda

Time	Торіс
9:00 a.m.	Welcome and introductions
9:05 a.m.	Comparative cost estimates
9:25 a.m.	<ul> <li>Level 2 results overview</li> <li>Work completed in level 2</li> <li>Evaluation criteria</li> </ul>
9:30 a.m.	Level 2 station area results <ul> <li>Everett Station</li> <li>I-5/Broadway Alignment</li> <li>SR526/Evergreen</li> <li>Southwest Everett Industrial Center</li> <li>SR99/Airport Road</li> </ul>
10:55 a.m.	Next steps
11:00 a.m.	Adjourn

# Handouts

• Everett Link Extension Elected Leadership Group Meeting 6 PowerPoint presentation (distributed in advance)

# Summary

### Welcome and introductions

The sixth Elected Leadership Group (ELG) meeting began with Angie Thomson sharing the agenda and meeting objectives. ELG members were asked to provide a brief introduction and Co-Chair Dave Somers welcomed the group.

### Schedule update

Eric Widstrand, North Corridor Development Director, reminded the ELG that we are currently nearing the end of the Level 2 evaluation process. In January, 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 Community Advisory Group (CAG) and ELG will form recommendations to the ST Board to inform the identification of a preferred and other alternatives to evaluate for environmental review. This meeting, as well as the next meeting on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, are to review the Level 2 results.

### Comparative cost estimates

Eric Widstrand shared background information on the comparative cost estimates for the station alternatives evaluated during Level 2, noting that these are based on design concepts (1-2% design). Triunity is the independent cost consultant who reviewed these estimates. For Level 2 evaluation, the comparative cost estimates for OMF North and end-to-end alignments are presented as a range of -2% to +20%.

Eric then shared cost estimate ranges for three end-to-end alignments. The 'least expensive' end-to-end alignment assumes the least expensive station/alignment option for each of the eight sections along the corridor; the most expensive end-to-end alignment assumes the most expensive station and alignment options for each section; and the representative project end-to-end alignment assumes the representative project station and alignment locations. As design work continues, Sound Transit will slowly narrow this range based on the unique risks along the corridor and design progress.

In addition to end-to-end estimates, Sound Transit prepared estimates for each of the eight sections along the alignment. For five of the eight sections, the alternatives were about the same cost. For three of the sections— Everett station area, I-5/Broadway alignment, and SR 526/Evergreen Way station area - there is a wider range of cost estimate differential between the alternatives.

#### Level 2 results overview

Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Government and Community Relations Manager, reviewed the areas of the project that would be discussed at the meeting, including Everett Station, the I-5/Broadway alignment, SR 526/Evergreen Way, SW Everett Industrial, and provisional station at SR 99/Airport Road. OMF North and the remaining station areas will be covered at the next ELG meeting in January. He reminded the group of the work completed in Level 2, specifically:

- Use of more detailed criteria to evaluate Level 2 alternatives
- Refinements to route, station and OMF locations
- Two and three-dimensional station concepts
- Primary cost estimates to compare between alternatives

### Level 2 station area results

Martha Russell, EVLE Project Manager, shared findings for each of the station and alignment alternatives, including general station access, bike and pedestrian connections, transit connections, potential impacts to residents and businesses, specifically historically underserved communities. She also shared initial draft 3D visualizations of design concepts for some station locations. Finally, Martha shared cost drivers and comparative cost estimates of the alternatives.

#### **Everett Station**

Mayor Franklin asked about the scale of the map, noting that there are significant community destinations north of the area shown on the map that would be closer to EVT-C and EVT-D. It would be helpful to label the destinations on the map to understand their significance to the community.

• ST staff replied that for the evaluation, all destinations within the ten-minute walkshed of each station alternative were included. The map scale may not capture the entire walkshed. The list of community destinations on the map will be sent to the ELG members after the meeting.





Mayor Franklin noted that if EVT-A was moved a few blocks north and slightly east, its performance might change dramatically. She also noted that despite concerns about displacement of businesses and community, EVT-C is the most promising option in terms of service to the community. She invited other members to visit the area with her and said her staff is looking into how to address displacement to businesses as the station footprint becomes more specific through the design process.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked a clarifying question about the suggestion to move option A northeast.

• Mayor Franklin clarified that a local community organization made the suggestion about moving option A northeast to better serve downtown.

Mayor Franklin stated that the ratings table demonstrates the higher performance of station options EVT-C and EVT-D, making the higher cost of those stations worth the investment.

Councilmember Peterson asked if the ratings tables indicate something that would be actively negative to a station option? He recognized that the "lower performing" alternative does not mean "a bad option" because ratings compare options against each other.

• ST staff responded, saying red ratings are not considered fatal flaws. Any fatal flaws would be clearly identified for alternatives. Since this is the third round of study of the alternatives, those with major challenges in our criteria would have been filtered out.

### I-5/Broadway

Councilmember Zarlingo asked about the benefit of the Broadway Alignment.

• ST staff responded, saying that in the early planning process, the aim was to study a range of alternatives to make sure a good alternative is selected.

### SR 526/Evergreen Way

Mayor Franklin affirmed that for her community, this is a difficult location with major roadways intersecting (SR 526, Evergreen Way, Casino Road) to serve populations and growth potential. Mayor Franklin acknowledged both the difficulty and importance of placing a station at this location, which is very busy and a vital part of the city. She noted that option A is unreasonable due to lack of transit integration possibilities and distance from communities.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked about the functionality of the existing pedestrian bridge across SR 526 between EGN-A and EGN-B. He expressed concern about earthquake safety and conflict with track lines for the current bridge.

• ST staff responded, saying that evaluation of station EGN-A and EGN-B assumed replacing the existing bridge and integrating it into station design.

Mayor Franklin acknowledged that there are no good options at this location. EGN-B may be the least impactful option but goes through an important community center. Whatever option is selected, we need to address impacts to minority populations at this location. Transit integration with EGN-A is very poor so this option is unfavorable.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked if the purple alignment could run closer to SR 526 before turning into EGN-B or EGN-C to have less impact upon the shopping center.

• ST staff responded, saying the alignment is shown as close as possible to SR 526, but still shows a potential property impact because the shopping center is also very close to 526. Due to track geometry, EGN-B can cross SR 526 further west and utilizes more of the SR-526 and Evergreen Way interchange and has potentially less impact on the community than EGN-C, which has to cross SR 526 further east and has potentially greater displacements.





Mayor Frizzell thanked the Sound Transit team for their hard work and reminded the group that they are making a decision that will impact the community for the next 50 to 100 years.

• ST staff added that as the ELG moves toward making a recommendation, it is important to identify other information that can help leaders navigate the process.

Mayor Frizzell requested a tour of the project and station areas to better understand on-the-ground conditions first-hand.

- Mayor Backus seconded this request and suggested a scheduling poll to maximize attendance, including options on a Saturday morning.
- ST staff will work with ELG members to schedule a walking tour of the corridor.

### SW Everett Industrial Center

Councilmember Zarlingo asked if SWI-A is the closest to the bus lines/existing transit options.

• ST staff responded, saying that SWI-A is the closest to existing transit as the crow flies but would require some detours for existing bus lines because it's located off of Airport Road.

Mayor Franklin pointed out the number of people that would potentially be served by SWI-A is very large –the 30,000 Boeing employees and the large historically underserved residential community with lots of affordable housing. Paine Field is very important too, but the number of people going to the airport is far less than at Boeing.

Executive Somers echoed the proximity of SWI-A to the Boeing facility and housing along Casino Road and acknowledged the need for additional shuttle service to serve the area.

Mayor Frizzell asked if it makes sense to build both SWI-A and SWI-C and wondered if it would have an adverse effect on the traffic flow.

• ST staff responded, saying that having two stations here was not part of the ST3 plan and would have cost implications. He also noted that the project has the station at SR 99/Airport Road that's not currently funded for construction.

Mayor Backus asked if SW Everett Industrial Center was a provisional station, since it was not reviewed on the cost comparison slides.

• ST staff clarified that SW Everett Industrial Center is not a provisional station, but the comparative cost estimates of all station alternatives are similar so it was not included on the summary since there is no cost trade-off at this level of analysis.

### SR 99/Airport Road

This station is funded for planning but not funded for construction.

Councilmember Zarlingo asked about the label of "potential future use", wondering if that designates land required for construction that would not be needed after construction.

• ST staff responded, affirming that ST would need to acquire that property for construction but anticipates it could be used for something else afterwards.

Executive Somers noted that this area is of great interest to the County and the ratings tables show the significant growth potential in this area. The County is interested in thinking outside of the box for how to get it fully funded.

Eric Widstrand clarified the elements of a provisional station that would need to be constructed along the alignment if full construction of the station remained unfunded, and how this was accounted for in cost estimates. The mainline track and some station components would be built even without full funding to better allow for future





construction without impacting operations. Current assumptions are that the tracks would be split to allow for a center platform.

- Executive Somers asked for cost estimates for this station in future meetings, and requested ST to consider innovative ways to secure funding to build this station with the rest of the alignment.
- Councilmember Peterson agreed with Executive Somers, saying that this area is a great place for future investment given the regional significance of the SR 99 corridor.
- ST staff added that ST is applying lessons learned from NE 130<sup>th</sup> infill station along the Lynnwood Link Extension when planning for this provisional station.

### Next steps

Erik Ashlie-Vinke presented the project schedule over the next few months, which includes another ELG meeting on January 3, 2023 and a CAG meeting on January 4. The next ELG meeting will focus on the southern three stations (Mariner, Ash Way and West Alderwood) and OMF North.

A 45-day scoping period will run from January 23 – March 10, 2023, 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. There will be an in-person event and two virtual events.

At the final ELG meeting during this project phase, the ELG will make a recommendation to the ST Board for what to move into environmental review, including a preferred alternative. The Board is expected to make their decision around June 2023.

# **Meeting Attendees**

Elected Leadership Group

- Dave Somers Snohomish County Executive
- Cassie Franklin Everett Mayor
- Christine Frizzell Lynnwood Mayor
- Nancy Backus Auburn Mayor, Sound Transit Non-Subarea Board member representative
- Strom Peterson Snohomish County Councilmember, District 3
- Ben Zarlingo City of Everett Councilmember, District 5
- Shannon Sessions City of Lynnwood Councilmember, Position 7
- Julie Meredith WSDOT Assistant Secretary

### Sound Transit

- Don Billen, Executive Director, Planning Environmental, and Project Development
- Chelsea Levy, Acting Deputy Executive Director of Capital Project Development
- Eric Widstrand, North Corridor Development Director
- Erik Ashlie-Vinke, Government and Community Relations Manager
- Martha Russell, Project Manager
- Angie Thomson, Thomson Strategic Consulting, Facilitator
- Paul Danielson, Kimley-Horn

