



**MAYOR'S ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON  
AT-GRADE RAIL CROSSINGS ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS  
Edmonds City Hall Brackett Conference Room (Third Floor)**

**August 11, 2016**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Co-Chair Nelson in the Edmonds City Hall Brackett Conference Room, 250 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, Edmonds.

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT**

*Michael Nelson, Co-Chair  
Kirk Greiner, Edmonds Resident  
Cadence Clyborne, Edmonds Resident  
Phil Lovell, Edmonds Resident  
Joy Munkers, Community Transit  
Rick Wagner, BNSF (via phone)  
Lorena Eng, WSDOT  
Jodi Mitchell, Sound Transit (via phone)*

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT**

Jim Orvis, Co-Chair  
Lynne Griffith, WSDOT – Ferries Division

**CITY STAFF PRESENT**

*Patrick Doherty, Econ. Dev & Comm. Serv. Dir.  
Phil Williams, Public Works Director  
Rob English, City Engineer  
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer  
Jeannie Dines, Recorder*

**CONSULTANTS PRESENT**

*Rick Schaefer, Tetra Tech  
Sandy Glover, Parametrix*

**OTHER GUESTS PRESENT**

*Nichole McIntosh, WSDOT-Ferries Division (via phone)*

**I. Review and approval of 07/28/16 Meeting Summary**

**TFM Lovell moved to approve the 7/28/16 meeting summary. TFM Eng seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

**II. Criterion #8 Evaluation**

Mr. Schaefer suggested the task force reach a provisional recommendation in advance of the public meeting. He distributed an updated matrix that reflects comments and ratings through the last meeting as well as a summary matrix. He also distributed an Alternatives Funding Assessment that includes bases for agency participation and grant/loan sources. Discussion followed regarding the basis for BNSF's participation, grant/loan sources, and probability of funding.

Mr. Schaefer distributed a Cost Estimate Summary of the alternatives and described data considered in the developing the estimates and project costs included in the estimates. He recalled the task force set aside Edmonds Crossing as an alternative early in the process; however, the cost of phase 1 of

that project, escalated to today's dollars and adding an emergency vehicle ramp to the west side, is in the range of some of the ferry alternatives. He suggested including Edmonds Crossing in the discussion at the next public meeting. Ms. McIntosh agreed.

Discussion followed regarding the breakwater included in the Edmonds Crossing project to address currents, project build timelines, providing a graphic at the public meeting related to project costs, EIS done for Edmonds Crossing, reasons to reconsider Edmonds Crossing, evaluating Edmonds Crossing the same as other alternatives, impacts of ferry alternatives compared to Edmonds Crossing, adding emergency access to the Edmonds Crossing project, delay in providing emergency access with Edmonds Crossing, and the State's role as lead agency in partnership with the City for any of the ferry options.

### III. Review of Level 2 Evaluation Ratings

Ms. Glover reviewed the Level 2 Screening Results Summary, highlighting projects that rated the highest to address emergency access (Midblock Overpass and Edmonds Street Overpass) and ferry alternative (Main Street Ferry Overpass 2-minimum build). Discussion followed regarding current ferry terminal conditions and percentage of on-time departures, projected increase in train and ferry traffic, WSDOT's analysis of sea level rise, providing a summary rating for each project, assigning a numeric value to ratings and/or weighting criteria, listing pros and cons of each alternative, and describing the task force's conclusions to the public.

Task force members expressed their preferences and pros/cons, concerns:

<b>TF Member</b>	<b>Pedestrian/Bicycle</b>	<b>Emergency Access</b>	<b>Ferry</b>
Lovell	<u>Midblock Overpass</u> Better solution for Sound Transit, second track, Salish Crossing, pedestrian access to senior center and west side of tracks	<u>Edmonds Street Overpass</u> Closest, provides access for emergency vehicles and pedestrians/bikes and emergency ferry load/unload, could be converted to permanent ferry access in the future	<u>1. Main Street Underpass</u> <u>2. Main Street Overpass (minimum build)</u>
Clyborne	<u>Midblock Overpass</u>	<u>Edmonds Street Overpass</u>	<u>Edmonds Crossing with emergency access</u> Prefer task force not state preference, present all options and list pros and cons
Munkers	<u>Midblock Overpass</u>	<u>Edmonds Street Overpass</u>	Issues include Edmonds' vision, cost burden on Ferries and State, less likely come to fruition. Concern with Edmonds Crossing due to distance from downtown and train
Nelson	<u>No interest</u> If building structure, want to include emergency vehicle access	<u>Edmonds Street Overpass</u>	<u>Main Street Underpass</u>

Eng	<u>Midblock Overpass</u>	<u>Edmonds Street Overpass</u>	Other Ferry needs will need to be considered
Greiner	<u>Main Street Overpass w/ elevators</u> Concern does not address emergency vehicle access	<u>Edmonds Street Overpass</u> Solves all main issues	No preference
Mitchell	<u>Midblock or Main Street Overpass</u>	<u>Dayton Street Overpass</u>	
McIntosh	<u>Do not like underpass</u> Concern with maintenance related to water and potential for riders to be trapped in a tunnel		
Wagner	<u>16-foot wide elevated overpass</u> Midblock Overpass is least desirable due to stairs/elevator	<u>16-foot wide elevated overpass</u>	

Discussion included economic impact of moving ferry terminal out of downtown, projected increase in train traffic, work at Edmonds terminal programmed for 2027, emergency ferry unloading provided by Edmonds Street Overpass, historic reasons for moving ferry terminal to Edmonds Crossing, concern task force members stating their preferences was subjective, and a preference for weighting the criteria to provide an objective rating.

It was agreed the consultant team would prepare and distribute to the task force via email an evaluation and Level 2 analysis of Edmonds Crossing with an emergency access, a numerical analysis of the ratings as well as an analysis of weighting the criteria.

#### IV. Upcoming Meetings

**August 25<sup>th</sup>** Affirm Level 2 Evaluation; Public meeting planning  
**September 8** Study documentation review  
**September 14** Public Meeting (Plaza Room)  
**September 22** Develop recommendations

#### V. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.