



MAYOR'S ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON AT-GRADE RAIL CROSSINGS ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

SEPTEMBER 2, 2015 9:00 – 10:30 AM
Edmonds City Hall Brackett Conference Room (Third Floor)

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 p.m. by Co-Chair Mike Nelson in the Edmonds City Hall Brackett Conference Room, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Nelson, City Council (Co-Chair)
Jim Orvis, Port of Edmonds (Co-Chair)
Kirk Greiner, Edmonds Resident
Cadence Clyborne, Edmonds Resident
Phil Lovell, Edmonds Resident
Joy Munkers, Community Transit
Rick Wagner, BNSF
Lynne Griffith, WSDOT – Ferries Division
Lorena Eng, WSDOT
Jodi Mitchell, Sound Transit

CITY STAFF PRESENT

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

OTHER GUESTS PRESENT

Patrice Hardy, Sound Transit
John Westfall, Fire District 1
Ian Sterling, WSDOT

I. Mayor's Comments and Introduction of Co-Chairs

Co-Chairs Nelson and Orvis introduced themselves and welcomed task force members and their input and expertise.

Mayor Earling welcomed task force members, and described the importance of this project to the City, citizens, community and region. He described how task force members were selected and explained the purpose is for the task force to provide its conclusions and recommendations to him. He will not attend every meeting (and he left the meeting at this time).

II. Self-Introductions of Task Force members

i. Individual Backgrounds & Key Interests in the Alternatives Analysis

Task force members introduced themselves and described their backgrounds and interest in the alternatives analysis.

III. Staff Presentation of Background Information and Q&A

Public Works Director Phil Williams briefly referenced the history of the issue including the Edmonds Crossing project, at-grade issues not addressed by Edmonds Crossing, and BNSF ownership of the railroad right-of-way. He provided a PowerPoint that described the project need due to the predicted increase in train traffic, and delays that are already a problem but will get much worse over time affecting timely delivery of emergency services, on-time loading/unloading of ferries, and increased noise pollution from train whistles at the waterfront.

He reviewed the project description provided to the legislature and a potential scope/budget. He referenced information in the notebook provided to task force members including a project need summary, aerial photo, map of railroad right-of-way, press releases, the TetraTech report regarding a train trench, and a potential schedule for the alternatives analysis. Mr. Doherty distributed a printout of the Community Services website and a list of documents regarding the Edmonds Crossing project that can be accessed from the website.

Ms. Griffith referred to the Federal Railroad Administration's recent announcement regarding the availability of \$10 million for states to improve highway-rail crossings.

Mr. Williams reported the RFQ is out and responses are due September 11. He will send task force members the PowerPoint and RFQ.

Mr. Doherty suggested establishing a webpage on the City's website dedicated to the alternatives analysis process.

Mr. Lovell provided staff a flash drive with an Excel spreadsheet listing the nine alternatives and pros and cons of each. A member requested the task force be provided Mr. Lovell's notes related to the Golds' train trench proposal.

IV. Organizational Details

i. Meetings Schedule and Location

It was agreed to schedule meetings at 10:00 a.m. the second and fourth Thursday in the Brackett Room at City Hall. The task force will initially meet twice/month; once a consultant is hired, it will likely be possible to decrease the frequency to monthly meetings. Members requested meeting notices be sent in Outlook invites. The next meeting is September 24.

ii. Study Schedule

Co-Chair Orvis relayed the entire schedule is anticipated to be 14-18 months. Mr. Williams said the consultant will assist with determining the schedule. He briefly reviewed the schedule which includes selecting a consultant, City Council approval of the consultant contract, scope and fee as well as public involvement.

Mr. Doherty relayed the funds provided by the legislature required a progress report to the Legislature by December 1. The City's original request to the Legislature was \$1.25 million; the Legislature provided \$500,000 with an indication they would look more favorably on providing additional funds based on progress.

Co-Chair Orvis suggested delaying the study schedule until a consultant is selected.

iii. How Should the Task Force Make Decisions/Recommendations?

It was agreed the goal would be consensus.

iv. Discussion of Task Force Charter, Mission and Purpose

Mr. Williams offered to prepare a mission statement for consideration at the next meeting.

v. Communications and OPMA Issues

Mr. Doherty explained, in the interest of being as transparent as possible, the City has opted to apply the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act to the task force although they do not officially apply because the task force is not a City board or commission. This requires that a quorum of the task force not communicate outside of a public meeting which includes email. Task force members can share information with each other by sending it to Mr. Doherty for distribution.

V. Request For Qualifications For Consultant Selection

i. Present RFQ Document

Mr. Williams will send the RFQ to task force members.

ii. Discuss Selection Process

Ms. Eng and Ms. Hardy volunteered to participate in consultant selection.

Mr. Williams said staff will cull the responses and send the final 2-3 RFQs to task force members participating in selection process and a list of the final 2-3 respondents to all task force members.

Closing Comments

Co-Chair Orvis explained the intent is for meetings to be as collegial and informal as possible to facilitate discussion. Members are encouraged to email Mr. Doherty if they think something has been missed, are not happy with the process, need additional information, etc. He and Co-Chair Nelson expressed their appreciation for the members' participation and commitment to this project.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 a.m.