Steering Committee
Draft - Committee Meeting Summary

November 8, 2001

The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.

Steering Committee Members Present:

- ☑ Peter Beaulieu, PSRC
- ☑ Jim Leonard, FHWA
- ☑ Brian O'Sullivan, Sound Transit
- ☑ Jonathan Freedman, U.S. EPA
- ☑ Jim Arndt, City of Kirkland
- ☑ Nancy Brennan-Dubbs, U.S. Fish & Wildlife
- ☑ Dan Drais, FTA
- ❑ Mitch Wasserman, City of Clyde Hill
- ❑ Bill Vlcek, City of Lynnwood
- ☑ Therese Swanson, WA Dept. of Ecology
- ❑ Dan Burke, Port of Seattle
- ❑ Chuck Chappell, FHWA
- ☑ Tom Gibbons, NMFS
- ☑ Greg Zimmerman, City of Renton
- ❑ Mick Monken, City of Woodinville
- ☑ Bill Barlow, Community Transit
- ☑ Terra Hegy, WA Fish & Wildlife
- ☑ Johannes Kurz, Snohomish County
- ☑ Ann Martin, King County
- ☑ Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue
- ❑ Bob Sokol, City of Kenmore
- ❑ Debra Symmonds, City of Mercer Island
- ❑ Sharon Griffin, Hunts Point
- ☑ Paul Carr, PSCAA
- ☑ Craig Stone, WSDOT
- ❑ Allyson Brooks, WA Dept. CT&E
- ❑ Jack Kennedy, U.S. Army Corps
- ☑ Bernard Van deKamp, City of Bellevue
- ☑ Leonard Newstrum, Yarrow Point
- ☑ Don Cairns, City of Redmond
- ☑ Eddie Low, City of Bothell
- ☑ John Witmer, FTA
- ❑ Seyed Safavian, City of Bothell
- ❑ Don Wickstrom, City of Kent
- ☑ Tom Fritz, City of Newcastle
- ❑ Jim Morrow, City of Tukwila
- ❑ Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit

Staff and Observers
Steve Kennedy, Sound Transit

Project Management Team

Mike Cummings, WSDOT
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
Ron Anderson, DEA
Christina Martinez, WSDOT
Nytasha Sowers, WSDOT
Craig Stone, WSDOT
Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental
Paul Bergman, PRR
Fen Hsiao, PRR

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Cummings started the meeting at 1:42 p.m.

Agenda:

- Review Areas of Consensus.
- Review/Discuss Remaining Issues.
- Make Recommendations.
- Celebrate!

Mr. Cummings noted that the Preferred Alternative Process will be added to the agenda.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the schedule for future Steering Committee meetings. He said that as of now, there are no meetings scheduled, but it will also depend on how well things go today.

Mr. Cummings gave a Schedule Update. He invited the Steering Committee to attend the Citizens Committee meeting to be held directly after the Steering Committee's in the same room.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Concurrence Point #3:

- Formal written determination by agencies with jurisdiction that the program information is adequate for the current phase of the process. Concurrence means the program may proceed to the next phase without modification.
- Agencies agree not to revisit previous concurrences unless there is substantial new information, or substantial changes have been made to the program, the environment, laws and/or regulations.
- Agencies will have the option to comment on elements of the program at the appropriate points in the process. Concurrence does not mean a permit will be issued – just that the program information for the current phase is adequate.

He said one agency has raised the concern that they want to see the responses to public comments and would like the issues flushed out before signing the concurrence form. He noted that the committee would have the responses from comments, a clear definition of the PA and any additional analysis that was done as part of the FEIS when the preliminary FEIS is released. He said this would take one concurrence point and move it further down in the process. This is not part of reinventing NEPA.

Mr. Cummings asked for the committee's feedback.

Ms. Martin asked when staff anticipates the release of the FEIS. Mr. Cummings said in February 2002.

She asked if the information and the FEIS would be sent together. Mr. Cummings said he doesn't know if they will arrive in the same packet of information, but they will be made available.

Mr. Zimmerman said the reason why the City of Renton has an issue with the process is because some program features are still under development, such as lane

balancing. He said the committee hasn't necessarily seen the final proposal on these options.

He said they are at the 3rd and final concurrence point for jurisdictions but there are still some unknowns. He said a delay on concurrency would give jurisdictions and the management team time to come up with concrete proposals. It will allow jurisdictions time to get a better idea on proposal specifics.

Ms. Swanson said she supports this idea. She said she has trouble thinking about concurrence so soon after the DEIS. She noted some issues related to HCT would come later on.

Mr. Cummings said staff is still going to ask for a consensus point today, which will define the PA.

Ms. Martin said she is concerned that agencies still feel there is not enough information available at this point and it will further delay their ability to concur. She said she understands that concurrence is approving the FEIS on a programmatic level. She asked if there would be sufficient information if they wait on concurrence. At that point will people feel comfortable? Is it really worth it to wait?

Ms. Hegy said a delay would make a difference. She said, today, this group is going to come up with a PA in order to analyze impacts. She said they may not have the desired information today, but they will have it in the future, which will help them feel more comfortable.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said she wants to wait on concurrency so the committee can review the preliminary FEIS. She said it might still be lacking information. She suggested using this time period between consensus and concurrence to work out some of these problems and to define "concurrence."

Mr. Newstrum asked if the analysis shows something surprising. If so, is their opportunity for staff to fix the problem?

Mr. Cummings said that if the committee has comments on the PEIS, they have to send them in. He said the committee has to read the information and submit their comments.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs argued that staff has to give the committee enough time to read the information.

Mr. Newstrum asked if staff could highlight, in the PEIS, the changes that took place. Mr. Cummings said the final EIS will be different and it won't look like the draft.

Ms. Martinez said staff talked about indicating changes in the margins when they present the FEIS. However, she said no words would be crossed out from the original.

Ms. Martin asked if there would be cross references to comments? Ms. Martinez said no.

Mr. Van deKamp asked what the big issues are. Lane balancing? A 3rd lane south of I-90? He asked if resource agencies would reconsider their concurrence if something

substantially new comes up? How will they make the call on whether or not the committee will revisit the issues? He said that his city (Bellevue) has decided and he would rather not delay concurrence.

Mr. Cummings said a delay in concurrence would not delay the process at all. They will just see the form later in the process. He said the program would still have a PA that will go into the FEIS.

Mr. Van deKamp asked if this would give the committee a second shot at the PA during the FEIS? Mr. Cummings said that if the PA goes out now, members still have the choice to not concur with it. He said it doesn't change the potential problem the program may run into.

Ms. Swanson said that if they're talking about new information and a decision that can be changed, what about the co-leads? She said she has seen comments and many issues that need addressing. She said some of the comments noted there is a problem with the way information has been presented. She said addressing these comments might lead to a new program alternative.

Ms. Swanson argued to give co-leads the time to take in all the comments and review them so they can find some information that will lead to a different decision come February. She said some comments say that staff hasn't described the alternatives very well.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked if the comments have noted an opposition to a supplemented DEIS. Mr. Cummings said he doesn't think so.

Mr. Kurz asked if the PA could be pieces from each alternative. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Kurz asked if the committee would be surprised by the final PA. Mr. Cummings said everything can be a surprise, but he doesn't think this will be.

Mr. Van deKamp asked that if the committee goes forward with a consensus today, signed by all members, if they're not 100 percent sure about an element, are they obligated to reconvene the group during the project level? He asked how much information they need, at this point, to make a corridor level decision?

Mr. Cummings said it's different for different people. Some will be comfortable dealing with the programmatic level and others will not. He said that some would want more information.

Mr. Van deKamp asked who has the last say on when the process is over? Mr. Cummings said the project level would begin as soon as the committees are comfortable moving forward. He said the program has to work out phasing for all elements first.

Mr. Cummings asked if the committee would like to vote on the concurrency schedule.

Mr. Kennedy asked what it will mean. Mr. Cummings said that, per the slide, it means that concurrence forms will be sent out in the last part of November and members will be asked to return forms by the middle of December or they will have

public comments and responses, some additional analysis on the PA and it will be during the same time as the issuance of the preliminary FEIS.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs noted that if the committee doesn't concur than the conflict resolution process could delay the FEIS. Mr. Cummings said that just because they go into dispute resolution it doesn't mean they couldn't publish the FEIS.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said that if an agency says there is not enough information, the program couldn't publish the FEIS. Mr. Cummings said, however, the process doesn't stop because one agency doesn't concur.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked what would happen in terms of publishing the FEIS? Mr. Cummings said they will go into dispute resolution and it could delay the publishing.

Mr. Witmer asked what the "proposal to move to coincide with the preliminary FEIS" means. Mr. Cummings said it means that staff will not send out the concurrence form right now. Instead, they will send it out the same time as the FEIS.

However, he said because Mr. Witmer's agency said it won't sign the form anyway, this doesn't apply to him. Mr. Cummings noted Mr. Witmer's agency would not concur at this point because it is obtaining legal advice.

Mr. Witmer clarified that it presents a conflict of interest.

Ms. Martin said that due to the potential for requests to reexamine the PA after the initial PA decision, the terms of what the expectations are for the PA and the status with the FEIS needs to be clearly written down. She said this needs to include more than just the February time frame, but the time frame for the PFEIS and how it will be distributed. If the agencies have issues on the PFEIS, will the co-leads be given time in which to respond before the agencies have to give concurrence? Mr. Cummings said the committee has to first decide on the issue presented by the slide.

Ms. Hegy said they don't need to see the formal PFEIS, but will be happy just to see drafts. She said they might not even need to see all parts of it but just specific chapters. She repeated that the documents do not have to be formal.

Mr. Freedman said he couldn't agree with Ms. Hegy. He asked if there is a way for staff to put the preliminary FEIS out electronically? He said that the resource agencies' job is to review the EIS and they need the opportunity to do this as they're deciding on concurrence. He said he would rather review the PFEIS in its entirety.

Mr. Kurz said staff should respond to each agency's comment on the DEIS.

Mr. Freedman said the job of the Steering Committee is to see public comment has been adequately responded to. He said they need to see more than the responses to their own comments.

Mr. Witmer said he doesn't know what they're talking about. He said the FTA would prefer they think about some of the comments raised by other agencies and tribes before selecting a PA. He said he would like some information.

Mr. Freedman asked if per the original deadlines, forms would be sent out in late November and responses due by December? Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Freedman asked if they are now talking about a 2-month delay. Mr. Cummings said yes, but staff has to first get the process owners to ok it. He said some owners have changed since the time the work first began. He said staff needs to figure out who owns it.

Members agreed to moving the concurrence point to February timeframe and issuing the concurrence forms when the preliminary FEIS is distributed.

REVIEW AREA OF CONSENSUS

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Concurrence and Concurrence Points Completed to Date:

•Consensus Point #1: Draft purpose and need
•Concurrence Point #1: Id. environ. issues and study area; p and n
•Consensus Point #2: Initial screening criteria.
•Consensus Point #3: Fatal flaw elimination.
•Consensus Point #4: Data needs for alternative evaluation.
•Consensus Point #5: Further alternatives screening.
•Consensus Point #6: Alternatives to move forward into DEIS.
•Concurrence Point #2: Alternatives to include in DEIS.
•Consensus Point #7: Decision to publish DEIS.

To Come:

•Consensus Point #8: Preferred alternative.
•Concurrence Point #3: Preferred alternative and mitigation concept.
•Consensus Point #9: Decision to publish the FEIS.

Mr. Cummings reviewed Today's Consensus Point #8 (Preferred Alternative):

- Substantial agreement (not necessarily unanimity) about a decision.
- Agreement strong enough that group will be willing to implement the decision.
- Minority opinion(s) will be recorded and disclosed in the environmental document

Mr. Cummings noted that minority votes would be forwarded to the Executive Committee.

Conditions for Support (Steering Committee Working Group):

- Minimize construction impacts on mobility and communities.
- Meet local, state and federal design guidelines and regulations.
- Develop funding strategy for inclusion in the MTP.
- Ensure community support through project level environmental review and public involvement.
- Phase projects so that TDM, transit and bottleneck improvements are made first.

Mr. Cummings asked the committee if the conditions seem reasonable. He said that among the submitted comments, some points were repeated.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs requested that the impacts on the aquatic environment be spelled out. Mr. Cummings said the details are in the handout that captured all the information from the working group.

Ms. Becklund said Ms. Martinez' email modified some language from the last meeting. She asked if everyone agrees with the modification. She said they have to commit in order to get the process rolling as the program goes into the project level. She said they need to be proactive about mitigation.

She said she hopes the committee has the chance to buy off on the language and asked if the resource staff is comfortable with the language.

Ms. Martinez said the handout is noted as a "draft" because the committee hasn't bought off on the language yet. She said another working group meeting needs to be scheduled for the buy off.

Mr. Kurz asked if the committee could buy off today.

Mr. Newstrum said this isn't possible because they requested a response and need to have more discussion.

Ms. Hegy said there is not enough time today for a necessary buy off discussion.

Mr. Cummings said the working group should continue to work on it and will probably have these issues flushed out by the time of concurrence. He advised the members to forward their comments to Ms. Martinez.

Ms. Becklund noted that the working group had discussed air quality.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Process to Reach Recommendations.

He said the outcomes of their previous meeting was taken to the Executive Committee, which felt comfortable with them. Mr. Cummings said in today's meeting, staff and the Steering Committee will try to work through the consensus items to make sure everyone is still in agreement. He said they will then be talking about the remaining issues and will be asking the committee to vote on the elements.

Something to Consider:

- Would you like to present your recommendations to the Executive Committee on November 16?
- Your thoughts?

Mr. Cummings said each member has been asked to vote yes, no or abstain. He said that abstaining means you don't have an interest in the particular element, it doesn't mean you don't care. He said abstaining is an option within the decision making process.

Mr. Freedman asked what "abstaining" means. Mr. Cummings said some agencies felt some decisions were being made outside the scope of their interests. He said they felt their interests aren't in choosing a specific transportation element but in understanding how these elements affect the environment.

Ms. Swanson said the Dept. of Ecology would be abstaining from voting on a PA and on all points that lead up to it. She said she doesn't find it to be the agency's role to weigh in on any of these decisions. She said this is a transportation alternative and her agency doesn't have jurisdiction. She said they've commented that they don't

have enough information to easily draw comparisons between the alternatives and doesn't think it's appropriate to be voting about tolls, truck climbing lanes, etc. She said the program is not an environmental project but a transportation project with environmental impacts. She said they have concerns but will be abstaining from the vote.

Mr. Beaulieu asked if none of the alternatives strike them as exceptional or unacceptable? Ms. Swanson said yes. She said they need more information and aren't currently able to make comparisons. She said no one alternative seems to be fatally flawed but Alternative 3 and 4 have the most impacts to the environment due to the increase of impervious surfaces.

Mr. Cummings asked if there is any more discussion?

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said her agency thought it would abstain, too, because of lack of information. She said she is not at a point to say which alternative she really wants to go for. However, if abstaining implies she doesn't have any concerns, than she will vote "no."

Mr. Kurz said all the agencies face the same issue of needing to see more information on some elements. He asked Ms. Swanson and Ms. Brennan-Dubbs if when they say they need more information, does it mean they need more project level information? If not, he said they should have enough information to justify a decision now.

Ms. Swanson said she has brought copies of the letter that states their decision. She said her agency is restricted to administering their environmental mandates and has stated they will work with whichever alternative is decided on, to make sure it has the least impacts to the environment. She said they would make sure the decision can be included in their regulatory framework.

Mr. Brennan-Dubbs asked if Ecology has jurisdiction?

Ms. Swanson asked why they weren't told sooner that the I-405 Corridor Program is a pilot project. She said it's not Ecology's role to decide on a PA. It is there role to look at the decision later and its impacts.

Ms. Hegy said she thinks WSDOT asked her to be on the committee because she's supposed to evaluate the impacts of what they're proposing. She said since they are voting by element, and if she knows about the element, she wants to help by voting on it. If she doesn't know about the element, she will abstain from that particular vote. She said she took a similar stance to Ms. Swanson's during the PPA, but the committee just went on ahead.

Mr. Newstrum said it is a dangerous direction to say the committee should split into two camps - transportation deciding on mobility and resource agencies on the environment. He said the program is trying to put together both parts and the committee should accept this.

Ms. Swanson said this program is focusing on transportation, not an ecology document focusing on the environmental process.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the PA Consensus Elements:
•#1- TDM Package
• #2- Transit Expansion
• #4- Arterial HOV Priority
• #5- HOV Lane on I-405 with Direct Access Ramps
• #6- Add Park and Ride Capacity to Match Demand
• #7- Add Transit Center Capacity to Match Demand
• #8 - Basic I-405 Improvements
• #12- Add Collector Distributor lanes on I-405 where needed
•#14- SR 167 / 405 Interchange improvements
• #15- Improve Connecting Freeway Capacity to I-405
• #16- Implement planned arterial improvements
• #17- Expand Capacity on North-South Arterials
• #18- Upgrade Connecting Arterial Connections to I-405
•#19– Corridor Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
• #20– Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements
• #21– Corridor Freight Enhancements

He said he wants to reaffirm the committee is ok with these elements. He asked if any members feel uncomfortable with the elements?

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs said she is not sure if the projects that have impervious surfaces belong on this list.

Mr. Cummings said they can take a vote on the consensus items as a package. He said it would be one vote for each jurisdiction at the table. He said he wants to try and get a sign-off on the whole package. If they don't have a clear majority, they will go back to the individual elements.

Fifteen (15) members voted yes to pass the package. Five (5) committee members abstained from the vote.

Ms. Hegy said Element 15 has a very general description in the workbook. "Up to 1 lane each way, up to 32 lane miles?" She said she can't say that each project adding a lot of impervious surface will be approved because they don't yet know the final design, they don't know where lanes will be located or where park-and-rides will be. She said she's concerned staff would say the committee agreed this could be built, when really they haven't researched it in detail.

Mr. Cummings said that is a project level detail. Ms. Hegy agreed.

Ms. Martin asked if consensus elements would be subject to overall conditions? Mr. Cummings said yes.

REVIEW/DISCUSS REMAINING ISSUES

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Remaining Elements:

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)
• #1a - Expanded TDM Package (Regional Pricing Through PSRC)

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT (HCT)
• #3a,3b, 3c - Fixed Guideway, Commuter Rail, or BRT
• High Capacity Transit: Study Fixed Guideway in Central Core Area

ROADWAY CAPACITY
• #9, 10, 11 - Add General Purpose Lanes Each Direction on I-405

• Lane Balance: Third Lane South of I-90
• #13 - Widen SR 167 by up to 2 lanes Each Direction
•OTHER ELEMENTS
• Preservation of BNSF Right-of-Way for Future Transportation Opps.
• Managed Lanes: Manage up to 2 Lanes Each Direction
• Managed Lanes: Utilize Tolls as a Management Tools
NON-MOTORIZED
• #19 – Long Trails for Pedestrians and Bicycles

TDM: Regional Pricing
Mr. Samdahl took over the meeting's lead to review TDM: Regional Pricing Issue:

- PSRC Pricing Task Force recommends pricing be included as part of Destination 2030
- Pricing to be used for:
  –Financing transportation infrastructure
  –Improve efficiency of transportation
- Conduct pricing demonstration program prior to 2006
- Specific pricing strategies are not prescribed

Mr. Samdahl said there was not consensus on this issue. He noted the issues are in the committee's working packet. He said the issues they will go through today are many of the same issues they reviewed last time. He said staff will first give the preliminary feedback from members' forms and will then give the committee options to consider. He noted the committee was emailed the summary of comments and preliminary votes. He said there are also copies of this information in the back of the room. He also offered the verbatim results.

Mr. Samdahl said this doesn't include the toll issue that they will be reviewing in the managed lanes discussion.

Elements of Regional Pricing:

- Region-wide congestion pricing
- Fuel Taxes
- Mileage Charges (such as a VMT fee)
- Parking Charges
- Tolls (will be discussed in the context of 'managed lanes')

Mr. Samdahl said this is mainly aimed at the regional level and it will not matter which corridor you are in.

Preliminary Feedback:
Members generally support concept:

- Could be opportunity for demonstration project.
- Identify interest in 'further study' beyond I- 405 recommendation.

Mr. Samdahl said there is general support for the pricing concept.

Regional Pricing Options to Consider:

- #1 – Support consideration of use-based pricing on I-405 as part of regional strategy. (Region should examine feasibility as part of separate study)
- #2 – I-405 Program will not make recommendation on pricing, which is appropriate for regional discussion--not at a corridor-level

Mr. Freedman asked if they've specifically removed regional pricing from the larger TDM package? He asked if this is part of Element 1. Mr. Samdahl said this issue is Element 1a, which is Expanded TDM Use-base Pricing.

Mr. Freedman asked if they would have the opportunity to vote for regional pricing and TDM separately. Mr. Samdahl said they already voted for TDM without pricing. He clarified that this vote will be to go beyond TDM and consider regional pricing.

Mr. Kurz asked what "use-base pricing on I-405" means. Mr. Samdahl said this means the program will support the region instituting a VMP charge in the region.

Ms. Becklund says she supports Option 1 because they're missing the boat if they are unwilling to consider pricing. She said regional pricing is the way the program can get the best resources from the facility. She said this is a policy issue. This project is breaking new ground and she thinks they should go with regional pricing, albeit cautiously.

Mr. Low said Ms. Becklund urged them to consider pricing for I-405 but Mr. Samdahl said this vote would be to consider pricing for the region. Mr. Samdahl said both the options infer that regional pricing will not be limited to within I-405. He said it's a matter of to what degree the program will support regional pricing.

Mr. Cummings said Option 1 will say "use-based pricing as part of region," eliminating the "I-405" part.

Mr. Newstrum said he wants Option 1 to show more support for regional pricing.

Mr. Barlow asked if either case would have an impact on the EIS? He asked if the element is just a political support statement? Mr. Samdahl said yes.

Ms. Martin said she's concerned about this aspect. She said that, clearly, the program should make a policy statement in support of pricing as a regional strategy. However, even if it's just a qualitative discussion, there needs to be some reason why the program is making the statement which is that they think this will actually have a positive affect on transportation in the I-405 corridor. Mr. Samdahl said this would be the case if the committee went with Option 1.

Mr. Cummings said they would change the wording of Option 1. He asked if the committee wants a vote on an amendment to take out the word "consideration."

Thirteen (13) members voted yes. Two (2) members voted no.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked if this would be in the FEIS. Mr. Cummings said it's a policy statement and how the program will address it in the FEIS is still uncertain.

Mr. Kurz said a policy statement only carries weight if it's supported by the Executive Committee. Mr. Cummings said this is correct.

The committee voted on support of Option 1, as amended. All voted in support.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by consensus) - Expanded TDM Program: Pricing Strategies

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Support use-based pricing as part of regional strategy."

High Capacity Transit Elements:

- Fixed Guideway
- Commuter Rail
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Preliminary Feedback:

- Members generally support BRT and continued study of fixed guideway in central core.
- Minimal support for commuter rail.
- Recent discussion of fixed-guideway transit running within I-405 alignment rather than BNSF.

Mr. Samdahl said support of BRT was almost unanimous. He said that at the Executive Committee meeting, there has been discussion regarding bullet 3. He said in Alternative 2, bullet 3 is included.

HCT Options to Consider:

- #1: Support Commuter Rail; use BNSF Alignment (Alts 1,2)
- #2: Support BRT (Alt 3); ensure sustainability within HOV system
- #3: Support Fixed Guideway:
  - Use BNSF Alignment (Alts 1,2)
  - Use I-405 Alignment *(Only analyzed in certain segments)*

Fixed Guideway Within I-405:
Recommended by City of Redmond; discussed at 10/30 Executive Committee
Issues:

- Is it a reasonable option?
- Have the impacts been captured within Alts. #1 and #2?

Fixed Guideway within I-405 Alignment:
–Alignment similar to BRT along I-405 with connections to centers.
–Portions of fixed guideway in Alternatives 1 and 2 operate within or adjacent to I-405.

- North of Canyon Park
- Newcastle area

Fixed Guideway within I-405 Performance:
–Transit performance would be consistent with results documented for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3.

Fixed Guideway within I-405 Impacts:
–Requires 10-20 feet of width for columns.
–Additional right-of-way would likely be required in several locations.
–Costs and environmental impacts have not been estimated, but would be comparable to Alt. #1 and #2.

Mr. Samdahl said staff has not looked at the impacts in detail yet

Mr. Samdahl reviewed the I-405 Fixed Guideway PA Decision Process.

I-405 Fixed Guideway Options:
Not include in PA *(BRT preferred pre 2020 strategy):*
1.Recommend ST analyze for post 2020 in it's Phase II planning
2.Not support I-405 fixed guideway

Mr. Samdahl said the central core issue would be dealt with differently.

Mr. Samdahl said they have to think about the best alignment for the stations they talked about. He said they talked about how the BNSF feeds the relationships of the stations. He said staff looked at the connections within and without I-405.

Mr. Samdahl said the issue is it right to have the stations on I-405 or do you go back and try and take the alignment down to the stations which brings you off of I-405 in order to make connections? He said they would need to revisit the question of if I-405 is the proper location for alignment.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked why the location couldn't be part of the next assessment? She said this is where it should be addressed. Why do they have to make that decision today?

Mr. Cummings said staff has tested this on the BNSF.

Mr. Kurz said these three options are not excluding the others. If you vote for one, you may still want to vote for another one. He said it is confusing delivery.

Mr. Cummings said the issue is confusing in itself. The question is how do we sort through it?

Mr. Freedman asked if the modes/concepts move around? If the group selects one, are they throwing out the other? Mr. Cummings said the modes/concepts are generally fluid.

Mr. Freedman asked if members are able to select two instead of just one? Mr. Samdahl said Options 1 and 2 are exclusive. And Options 2 and 3 provide roughly the same type of transit service but with different technology and slightly different alignments. But commuter rail could operate with Options 2 or 3. He said a combination of Option 1 and 2 is kind of like the Sensible Solutions' recommendation.

Mr. Newstrum said that if the committee looks at the data they would see the options are comparable. But if they look at the different alignments and different modes, than they will see HCT far outperforms BRT.

Mr. Beaulieu said this is the point that Bellevue has been making. He said Ms. Becklund has said that the BRT system as shown here, will just get flooded in 2020. However, after recently discovering the footprint might be diminished or inaccessible, he doesn't think the fixed guideway decisions belong in the PA recommendation.

Mr. Samdahl said that upcoming slides show that if BRT is chosen for the central core area, it could look like Option 3.

Ms. Becklund said they support it in the central core.

Mr. Barlow said they should think about what's practical in the short term. That's why they gravitated towards BRT. He said the reason why people started getting excited about the BNSF is because they want to prepare for the future. However, he said they have to move to next level and they need to include it in the 2020 plan. He said he doesn't think it's so restricted that it can't be a usable transportation corridor.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the Boeing letter addressing their concerns has been distributed? Mr. Cummings said it was one of 1600 comments.

Mr. Zimmerman argued that Boeing is more significant because they are the major economic generator in the corridor.

Mr. Bergman said there is a Boeing representative on the Citizen Committee. He said the BNSF is a very important freight mobility line in the corridor.

Mr. Kurz said some slides refer to BRT as the initial step towards HCT. He said if they are done in the same alignment, they have to shut down the system for a while. He said this is the short and medium vs. long-range scenario. He suggested that maybe HCT is something that should be part of the PA.

Mr. Samdahl said it is a long-term vs. short-term issue. He said much of the feedback they've been receiving refers to the short term.

Mr. Van deKamp said Bellevue supports BRT but is not supportive of a fixed guideway. He said they are starting to close down on particular alignments without knowing substantial information. He said they need to look at what the EIS told them. He said commuter rail performance is awful, fixed guideway is bad and the BNSF ROW is a separate issue for today. He said he doesn't want to go back and talk about the fixed guideway when they already decided BRT is good. If they start going back to this, they have to go back and look at the consensus list.

Mr. Cummings said at the last Executive Committee meeting this was brought to the table and they wanted staff to bring something back about this issue. He said the Steering Committee is the test case for this.

Mr. Cairns said Redmond supports BRT. They also want to study the length of I-405 for HCT for a long-term possibility.

Ms. Brennan-Dubbs asked if BRT could function without adding new lanes? Mr. Cummings said BRT can function without adding new lanes but it would have to go on a 3+ HOV lane and might need a buffer.

Mr. Newstrum said they don't have the data required to make decisions on HCT. What they have is a worse case evaluation but they need an engineering review. He proposed that part of the PA will get them funding for a study. He said they need to have a decision that can be put before voters around the time design starts.

Mr. Cummings asked for a vote on the options.

Mr. Beaulieu said Option 2 to support BRT should be sustainable but the footprint shouldn't foreclose additional HCT later. He said that maybe it has to be on a different line but if the ROW can't handle things anymore, even with BRT, than they have to know this.

Mr. Samdahl said this could be a very expensive condition but they can include this if they want.

Mr. Cummings asked if they want this in the center of I-405?

Mr. Beaulieu said he doesn't know.

Mr. Newstrum said if they put in BRT and buffer lanes, they can put pylons for HCT and still have it be a permeable area that cars get through during emergencies.

One (1) member voted Option 1. Fifteen (15) voted for Option 2.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 15 votes) - High Capacity Transit: BRT

Steering Committee Recommendation: "BRT is preferred High Capacity Transit strategy."

Many members said they wanted to vote more than once.

Mr. Cummings said that if they voted twice, they would be saying the program should be implementing both Option 1 and 2 in 2020.

Mr. Samdahl said their support means they will put the cost of construction into it and it will be built in the next 20 years.

Ms. Martin asked that if voting for Option 2 means they are voting for a functioning BRT system in 2020. Mr. Cummings said they are voting for what will be analyzed in the FEIS

Mr. Barlow said the group is looking for an HCT alignment.

Mr. Cummings said it would be what they are analyzing as a system in the FEIS.

Mr. Cairns asked if Mr. Cummings meant analyzing in terms of performance? Mr. Cummings said yes.

I-405 Fixed Guideway Options:

Include in PA:

1. Initial Strategy (Pre-2020)
   - BRT Convert to Fixed Guideway
     –Difficult Conversion Issues?
     –Right Decision?

   or

   - Primary North-South Strategy and no BRT
     –2nd Concurrence point revisited
     –Environmental Coverage?
     –Right Decision?

2.Post 2020 Strategy: Evaluate opportunities and limiting factors to placing fixed guideway system in 405 right of way during final EIS development. Provide information to decision makers and for use in ST Phase 2 planning.
–Technology questions and debates?
–Time and cost?

Mr. Cummings asked if everyone is ok with this? He said this can be delivered as a policy statement.

Mr. Van deKamp said their policy guidance is to not revise the long range Sound Transit vision. He said that by looking at it post-2020, the committee is essentially supporting the Sound Move vision and not revising.

Mr. Newstrum asked if these are the only two options? He said he would like it to be further analyzed before 2020. He asked why it is restricted to these options? He said it may not be good to look at things piecemeal and that most likely light rail won't work in some cases.

Mr. Cummings asked if Mr. Newstrum would like the wording amended to remove "post 2020?" Mr. Newstrum said yes.

Mr. Cummings said the wording would be removed.

Ms. Becklund said that by supporting Option 2 they are sending a strong message. She said she supports Option 2 and thinks this is the place to look at an HCT plan. She said she needs to know where the priorities are and where to invest funds.

The majority of members voted for Option 2.

Central Core HCT Concept:

- Examine more advanced high capacity transit (HCT) options for the central core.
- This work will be done in concert with Trans-Lake and Sound Transit Phase 2 studies.

Mr. Cummings asked if anyone opposes the concept description? No members opposed.

Central Core HCT Options to Consider:

- #1 – Continued study of fixed guideway in central core area in concert with Trans-Lake and Sound Transit Phase 2 studies.
- #2 – Do not recommend further study.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by consensus): Study HCT in Central Core Area

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Explore more high capacity transit (HCT) options for the 'Central Core' area."

I-405 Roadway Capacity Elements:

- No Added Lanes
- Alt. #2: Add 1 lane each direction

- Alt. #3: Add 2 lanes each direction
- Alt. #4: Add 3 lanes each direction

Note: Each would include auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes (#12)

Ms. Martin asked if they could add the words "up to" because she thinks King County is supportive of Alternative 3 as the ultimate vision for I-405. However, she said she is not sure whether this can happen within 20 years.

The majority of members agreed to add the wording.

Preliminary Feedback:

- General support for adding two lanes by local jurisdictions.
- Resource agencies concerned about environmental impacts; mitigation concept unclear.

The committee voted on the Roadway Capacity Element Options. One (1) member voted for No Added Lanes. Fourteen (14) voted for "up to" 2 lanes.

Mr. Freedman noted that his agency has brought up timing in a letter. He said he doesn't know how to vote. If other elements are completed first, he said he might vote differently.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 14 votes) – I-405 Expansion: Add up to 2 general purpose lanes

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Add up to two general purpose lanes in each direction to I-405.

Freeway Lane Balance Issue: Added Lane South of I-90:

- With two added lanes along corridor, congestion remains in south end
- Additional study (south of I-90) looked at:
  –+3 lanes
  –Auxiliary and truck climbing lanes

Preliminary Feedback:

- Jurisdictions support for added capacity south of I-90.
- Needs further study.
- Resource agencies concerned about environmental and community impacts.

Lane Balance Options:

- Option 1: Add 3rd lane from I-90 to Tukwila.
- Option 2: Do not add 3rd lane.

Note: Under Option 2, Collector/Distributor and Auxiliary lanes would be considered in appropriate locations

Mr. Newstrum asked if Option 1 would be analyzed in the FEIS? Mr. Samdahl said yes.

One (1) member voted for Option 1. Eight (8) members voted for Option 2.

Ms. Martin asked if collector-distributors and arterials were previously analyzed? Mr. Cummings said the envelope was analyzed.

FAILED ELEMENT (by 8 votes) – Lane Balance: 3rd Lane South of I-90

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Do not include 3rd lane south of I-90 in preferred alternative."

SR 167 Roadway Capacity Options:
Options:

- #1 - Support up to 2 lanes added*
- #2 - Support 1 lane added*
- #3 - Support no added lanes

*Subject to resolving environmental requirements and terminal points.

SR 167 Roadway Capacity – Preliminary Feedback:

- Local jurisdictions generally support adding up to two lanes.
- Resource agencies concerned about wetland impacts.

- Consider avoidance or mitigation measures

Ms. Martin said there is a concern among agencies that there may be wetland impacts. She said this is not the way she wants the record to go forward.

Mr. Beaulieu said there are other options being discussed. There might be other routes that will siphon some of the traffic off SR 167. He said the corridor is the entire valley width.

Mr. Newstrum said the committee should say something that notes they want to add a couple of lanes and not just wipe out wetlands. He said there are options that wouldn't do a thing. He said there needs to be more study.

Mr. Samdahl said there would be some need for improvement to tie into the redesigned interchange. He said it's a case of what they will need to do.

Eleven (11) members voted for Option 1. Three (3) members voted for No lane.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 11 votes) – SR 167 Expansion: Add up to two general purpose lanes

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Add up to two general purpose lanes in each direction to SR 167. Subject to resolving environmental requirements and terminal points."

BNSF Preservation:
BNSF is:

- Selling/sold strips of property and intends to maintain approximately 50-foot corridor
- Has long term interest in upgrading and/or relocating line perhaps in conjunction with WSDOT and high capacity transit providers

BNSF Rail Line Abandonment and Alternative Uses:

- The U.S. Surface Transportation Board:
  - Determines if BNSF could abandon the line

- If suitable to use for highways, other forms of mass transit, conservation … or recreation.
- If the Board determines the rail line is suitable, interested persons would have 180 days to negotiate with the railroad to acquire the property for public use.
- The Board cannot require the railroad to sell its property for public use.

Mr. Kurz said they should make an effort to keep the BNSF in public ownership.

Mr. Newstrum said they are selling 25 feet on each side and this would be enough room to put in HCT. He said they should talk about getting an extra 25 feet on each side.

Process to Acquire BNSF's Rail Line:
1. The WSDOT Rail Office would take the lead on acquiring the BNSF Woodinville Rail line for public use.
2. The WSDOT Rail Office would send a letter of interest and a request for a Public Use Condition to the U.S. Surface Transportation Board.

BNSF Preservation Options to Consider:
#1: Not include in PA.
#2: Include in PA:
Opportunity to set up separate study to look at future joint use and upgrading opportunities.
#3: Include in PA:
Seek to preserve property being sold for
–Core area future HCT uses
–Balance for bike-pedestrian uses that support transit and other trip reduction opportunities.
–Long trails, if part of recommendation
Preliminary Feedback:
Members generally support preservation concept:
- Need more information on impacts on potential future uses if BNSF sells strips of property.

Mr. Beaulieu asked if the staff has a cost estimate? Mr. Cummings said they have heard $300 million for the whole thing.

Mr. Newstrum asked if this is just in the core. Mr. Cummings clarified that it is the cost for the whole line.

Mr. Barlow said that as far as environmental impacts, if the line is sold off, it would be developed. He said impervious surface isn't just from transportation use, but could also be impervious no matter what it's used for. He said he doesn't think the environmental issue is as negative as it may seem.

Three (3) members voted in support of Option 2. Fourteen (14) members voted in support of Option 3.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 14 votes) – Preserve BNSF Right-of-Way for Future Transportation Opportunities

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Include preservation of BNSF for future transportation opportunities in the preferred alternative.

MANAGED LANES

Elements of Managed Lanes:

- Manage up to two lanes each direction along I-405 through access restrictions, eligibility.
- Utilize pricing (tolls) as a management tool.

Conditions for Support Managed Lanes:
1. Increase person and vehicle throughput
2. Encourage transit and HOV use
3. Maintain BRT speed and reliability
4. Avoid diversion of traffic to arterials and neighborhood streets
5. Provide possible access to long distance freight

Preliminary Feedback:

- Generally supportive of managed lane concept.
- Less support for use of tolls -- limited public support; need for regional strategy.

Options for Managed Lanes:

- #1. Should we include managed lanes in PA?
  - Yes, subject to conditions and further study*
  - No
- #2. If yes, should pricing (tolls) be part of the strategy?
  - Yes, subject to conditions and further study
  - No

**Would require 4-foot additional width each direction.*

Mr. Barlow asked if managed lanes are additional lanes. Mr. Cummings said no.

Mr. Samdahl said it has to have at least 2 lanes of GP or it's not considered a freeway.

The committee voted on the Managed Lanes Options. Twelve (13) members voted Yes for Option 1. Two (2) members voted No for Option 1.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 13 votes) – Manage up to 2 Lanes on I-405

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Manage up to two lanes each direction on I-405. Subject to conditions and further study."

Should pricing (tolls) be considered as part of the pricing?

Ten (10) members votes Yes for Option 2. Three (3) members voted No for Option 2.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 10 votes) – Utilize Tolls as a Management Tool

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Include tolls as management tool in preferred alternative."

Pedestrian and Bike Improvements – Long Trails

- Ped/Bike Element includes 2 parts:
  –I-405 Crossings (Consensus)
  –Connections- I.e. Long Trails (No consensus)
- Long Trails
  –Mostly connections and extensions of existing regional bicycle trails
  –Trail projects already planned by local agencies

Pedestrian and Bike Improvement Options:

- Option #1- Do not include long trails.
  –Trail projects would remain part of local agency plans.
- Option #2- Include long trails.

Mr. Cummings said that long trails is an element in Alternative 3 that was later removed from the PPA by the Executive Committee. However, the Steering Committee had wanted them included. Mr. Cummings asked if the Steering Committee still wants them included, because they are not currently officially included.

Mr. Samdahl said they are all in the local jurisdiction plans and all run along the corridor.

The committee voted on the Pedestrian and Bike Improvement Options. Three (3) members voted for Option 1. Seven (7) members voted for Option 2

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 7 votes) – Bike and Pedestrian Long Trails

Steering Committee Recommendation: "Include bike and pedestrian long trails."

<u>MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

Next Steps:
1. Nov. 12: Draft recommendations sent out for Steering Committee review.
2. Nov. 16: Recommendations presented to Executive Committee.
3. Conditions of support will be incorporated in concurrence letter. PMT will work with agencies to resolve conflicting or problematic conditions.
4. Nov. 27: Concurrence letters sent to agencies.
5. Dec. 14: Concurrence letters due.

Mr. Cummings asked if members from the Steering Committee would like to make a majority and minority presentation to the Executive Committee. He said staff could help them and work with them on the presentation. He said if that is the case, they might want to have a separate meeting between now and the Executive Committee meeting. He said the members chosen will be the ones presenting the recommendation.

Ms. Swanson asked if staff would help the Executive Committee remember who is on the committees? She asked if they would give the names of how people voted. Mr. Cummings said no, they will lump the members into the majority or minority groups.

Mr. Cummings said that if members want to present, they could meet later with staff to talk about details. He said he would like someone to represent the group, not necessarily speak specifically about one issue or another.

Ms. Martin suggested that rather than characterizing the minority and majority views, highlight issues that have caused some debate. She said they could describe the difficulties the resource agencies had in taking on transportation issues. She said they don't need to go down the list item by item but just characterize some of the concerns.

Mr. Cummings said the staff would convey the majority and minority positions. He said this is required.

Mr. Kurz suggested Ms. Swanson give the presentation because she abstained from voting and is therefore neutral.

Mr. Beaulieu suggested staff go ahead with the presentation but leave time for Steering Committee members to comment or add to the presentation instead of actually giving it.

Mr. Cummings said that if the committee prefers this, than it is ok, too.

Ms. Newstrum said that if staff forwards the PA, including voting numbers, to the committee within a couple of days, any member can contact staff to ask to speak on a specific issue.

Mr. Bergman said staff will take volunteers up until Tuesday and if there are none, than they will go ahead and give the presentation. He said they would leave time in the agenda for people who show up to add comments.

Mr. Cummings adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.