



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

April 28, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Co-Chair Michael Nelson in Edmonds City Hall Brackett Conference Room, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Nelson, Co-Chair
Jim Orvis, Co-Chair
Kirk Greiner, Edmonds Resident
Cadence Clyborne, Edmonds Resident
Phil Lovell, Edmonds Resident
Joy Munkers, Community Transit
Rick Wagner, BNSF (participated by phone)
Lorena Eng, WSDOT

TASK FORCE MEMBERS ABSENT

Lynne Griffith, WSDOT – Ferries Division
Jodi Mitchell, Sound Transit

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
Katie DeLeuw, EnviroIssues
Sandy Glover, Parametrix

OTHER GUESTS PRESENT

Councilmember Tom Mesaros
Nichole McIntosh, WSDOT- Ferries Division
(participated by phone)

I. Review and Approval of 4/14/16 Meeting Summary

TFM Lovell moved to approve the 4/14/16 Meeting Summary. TFM Greiner seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

II. Preparations for May 12th Public Meeting

a. Agenda and Format

Ms. DeLeuw reviewed the Community Meeting Plan including the meeting purpose, meeting format, ground rules – Q&A, presentation, room layout, stations and content, notifications, materials development schedule, key dates, and potential tough questions. She will formulate answers to questions and she invited task force members to provide additional questions. She will forward a copy of the Meeting Plan to task force members participating by phone.

Discussion followed regarding concern a 15 minute Q&A was too short, the format and intent of Q&A, who will respond to questions, anticipation there will be questions about a sense of urgency due to the May 19 train accident, a 12 minute train delay 1-2 days later, obtaining a grade crossing incident report from BNSF, evacuations that occurred through an open railcar the day the train was stopped for 3+ hours, and anticipation a question could arise that this study is unnecessary if evacuation could occur in that manner. It was agreed to:

- Expand Q&A to 20 minutes
- State before Q&A that questions are about the presentation and that there are multiple ways to communicate and ask questions

b. Level 1 Screening Process Outcomes

Mr. Schaefer advised there have been no changes made to the matrixes other than to add a second red box with an asterisk in it to signify “with challenges.” The project descriptions have been expanded on the cut sheets and the dispositions clarified to correspond with the right column of the matrix. Discussion followed regarding the difference between the red box and red box with the asterisk. Suggestions included:

- Insert header above the first four questions - “Purpose and Need” and above last three questions - “Feasibility”
- Include red box in addition to red box with the asterisk for projects under Feasibility heading
- Separate the cut sheets between projects moving forward and projects no longer being considered

It was agreed the Level 1 Screening Process Outcomes as revised could proceed to the public meeting.

c. Level 2 Evaluation Criteria

Ms. Glover reviewed revisions to the Level 2 Evaluation Criteria and task force members recommended minor changes.

d. Level 2 Alternatives Development

Mr. Schaefer explained these are working drafts, the Level 2 alternatives will not be finalized until after the public meeting. Ms. Glover referred to “Edmonds Waterfront Access Study Draft Alternatives for Level 2 (Including Crosswalk from Level 1), explaining this is a reference document that provides a short description of each alternative, connections to potential short or long term projects as well as a connection to the Level 1 title of the project. In Level 2, the project titles have been changed to be more descriptive. Mr. Schaefer advised a graphic will be created for the public meeting to illustrate how Level 1 outcomes became Level 2 alternatives.

Ms. Glover reviewed the Level 2 alternatives and project elements of each and minor revisions were suggested:

- Edmonds Street Pedestrian/Emergency Access Overpass
 - Option 1 Fire Truck
 - Option 2 Aid Car
 - Neither option clears BNSF right-of-way

- BNSF will consider projects that include footing easement requirements that impact their right-of-way but prefer clear spanning the right-of-way. Any projects should accommodate the planned second track (TFM Wagner)
 - To do: Identify existing track, proposed second track and BNSF right-of-way on aerial photograph
- Main Street Pedestrian/Limited Emergency Access Overpass
 - Option 1 – Stairs with Spiral
 - Option 2 – Stairs with Elevator
 - Option 3 – ADA Ramps
 - Could be combined with long term project
- Main Street Pedestrian/Limited Emergency Access Underpass
- Midblock Pedestrian Emergency Access Overpass
 - Option 1 – ADA Ramps
 - Concern/Issue: conflicts with plans underway to rebuild the community center on this site and displaces parking (TFM Lovell)
 - To do: Consultant obtain community center plans
 - Option 2 – Stairs and Elevators
- Dayton Street Pedestrian/Emergency Access Overpass
 - Option 1 – Fire Truck
 - Option 2 – Fire Truck
 - Option 3 – Aid Car
- Admiral Way Pedestrian/Emergency Overpass
 - Option 1 – Fire Truck
 - Removed due to impacts:
TFM Greiner moved to remove Admiral Way Pedestrian/Emergency Overpass Option 1 Fire Truck. TFM Clyborne seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.
 - Option 2 – Fire Truck
 - Option 3 – Aid Car
 - Cannot use existing 10' easement located to the south that currently contains a waterline
 - Concern/Issue: affects boat storage, emergency vehicle access is circuitous

(Ms. McIntosh discontinued her participation by phone at 11:33 a.m.)

Ms. Glover relayed the consultant team met with WSDOT to brainstorm the following alternatives. At that meeting WSDOT agreed there was a need in Edmonds and something likely would be included in their long range plan. The legislature requires on-time performance which will become increasingly difficult as the number of trains increase. She continued her review of the Level 2 Alternatives:

- Main Street Ferry Overpass 1
 - To do: Change footprint to be similar to the Underpass
- Main Street Ferry Overpass 2
 - To do: Change footprint to be similar to the Underpass
- Main Street Ferry Underpass
- Dayton Street New Ferry Terminal
 - To do: Add emergency vehicle access ramp to waterfront and relocation of the transit center

During and following the review of Level 2 Alternatives, Mr. Schaefer, Ms. Glover and Mr. Williams responded to task force members' questions and discussion ensued regarding clarifying the nature of

access on each aerial photograph, the location of emergency vehicle access in Admiral Way options, daylighting Willow Creek, potential pedestrian boardwalk across the Edmonds Marsh that could connect to Admiral Way options, amount of vehicle storage WSDOT wants, where elevation of Main Street options begins, WSDOT's preferences between the ferry options, concern Main Street options would be intrusive on the community, pros and cons of ferry options from the community's perspective, concern with time and cost required to design and construct Dayton Street New Ferry Terminal option, concern Dayton Street terminal does not address original intent and immediate need, original direction to consultant to look at various scale projects including long and short term and an alternative to Edmonds Crossing, and the crosswalk document that illustrates how some projects could be paired.

Mr. Schaefer distributed drawings of aerial structures, pedestrian ramps, etc. with the heights of waterfront buildings ghosted in the background to provide scale. He will also send the drawings electronically.

III. Next Meeting

Public meeting, May 12, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. in the Edmonds Library Plaza Room. An Outlook Invite with the meeting format will be sent to task force members. Public meeting notices will be sent out today.

It was agreed there would be no 10:00 a.m. meeting on May 12.

IV. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.