



Meeting Summary

Community Advisory Group : West Seattle/ Duwamish

Subject: Meeting #6 – Consolidating Feedback

Date, time: Tuesday, May 10, 2022; 5pm to 7pm

Meeting Recording: <https://youtu.be/v4-Gk2ZyZr0>

Participants

CAG members: Charlie Able Deb Barker David Bestock Willard Brown Lauren Lundberg Ella McRae M Miller Inaki Longa Lyssa Moon Nicole Perry Kim Schwarzkopf Pete Spalding Emily Strom	Facilitator / presenters:	Emily Alice Gerhart, Facilitator Leda Chahim, Sound Transit Cathal Ridge, Executive Corridor Director, Sound Transit
	Agency partners:	Chris Arkills, King County Metro Nicole Kistler, City of Seattle
	Sound Transit / Consultant Team:	Daniel Turner, Sound Transit Sloan Dawson, Sound Transit Jason Hampton, Sound Transit Maryam Hakimian, Sound Transit Consultant

Meeting Summary

Overview of Presentation Topics Cathal Ridge provided an update on community engagement and collaboration and next steps in the project process.
Consolidated Feedback from CAG Members The following abbreviations are used in this summary: Q: Question A: Answer C: Comment
Community Engagement and Collaboration Q: (Deb Barker) What occurs at the ST Board workshop and how does it differ from other types of meetings? A: (Cathal) The System Expansion Committee and the Board meet every month. This is an extra meeting, a special meeting dedicated to the project. They will learn about the project, the timeline and process, the alternatives, key differentiators, and making sure they're up to speed on all of the data that we've been sharing throughout the comment period. They won't take an action on May 20 th . It's really just to get the Board up to speed and start to hear some of the things they're interested in and what they have questions about. The actual action wouldn't be until the July timeframe.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

Q: (Deb Barker) Does ST expect to have all of the Board there? There is a lot of information to catch up on. Do you anticipate taking questions from the Board members at that time?

A: (Cathal) This is a System Expansion meeting, a subset of the Board, but other Board members are invited. We've met with many of the Board members multiple times. Many Board members have been asking questions throughout, but we are trying to get everyone to the same level.

Draft EIS Alternative Feedback

CAG members shared their feedback to the following questions:

- What are your thoughts on issues and tradeoffs between the alternatives?
- What are your thoughts on confirming or modifying the preferred alternative?

Alaska Junction/Avalon

C: (Emily Strom) I would like to propose that WSJ-3b (Tunnel 42nd Avenue) be the preferred alternative. If there will be two stations, I like having one closer to the Junction with the other one in Avalon. However, I am also open to the idea of no Avalon Station as long as there are accommodations to get bus routes and people who are walking or biking to get to either the Alaska Junction or Delridge station instead. There was some overlap in walksheds, so many people in Avalon could go to Alaska Junction or Delridge stations instead if the Avalon station is removed. I like the idea raised that if we're forfeiting a station, is there another option that funds improvements in West Seattle. Having great, safe, artful community areas to help guide people toward the stations, enhancing the stations so they're really a part of the community. I like the idea of the stations becoming hubs for the communities. I really like those ideas and if we could put funds there instead if we remove Avalon station, sounds good to me. I also like that WSJ-3b has less impact on the community. It doesn't displace the Seattle Housing Authority residences and while it does impact some businesses, it doesn't impact others that some of the other alternatives would. Less impact on residences and less on businesses. I like the TOD opportunity for WSJ-3b and I like the idea of replacement park civic space at the Alaska Junction Station. I know it's the most expensive, however I think it's important to make this investment to do the light rail right. One drawback is the construction impacts on 35th and Fauntleroy, but I think with enough time ahead, those could be lessened as much as possible. All of us West Seattle residents have been making alternative routes for the past couple years with the bridge, so lessening those impacts is important to many of us who have had so much time taken out of our schedules with these impacts from the bridge as well.

C: (Pete Spalding) I don't have a lot of comments on the Avalon and Junction stations. I would not be in favor of eliminating the Avalon station. It might be a good idea today, but we need to look at future growth. What is the growth in that area as density increases along that corridor? What will it look like 10 years from now? If we eliminate it, are we going to regret it down the road? I also worry that if we eliminate that station, it will bring additional congestion to the Delridge station because if you don't have that Avalon station and you want those transit riders to get on light rail, they're going to have to go to one of the other stations. As we're talking about all of the trials and tribulations that we've experienced with the bridge, don't forget we also had two years of construction on Delridge Way SW, so folks that live in Delridge have had a double whammy for the past two years.

C: (Nicole Perry) I don't have a whole lot on the West Seattle Junction, but the biggest thing for me is in Avalon where I get that municipal law makes it difficult for it to go away but having the golf course there. If we're going to be taking away housing in other parts of this area, there's the place for housing right there: the West Seattle golf course. It may be difficult, but at least consider it and start the gears of that process.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Lyssa Moon) I have a strong preference for the tunnel routes because the elevated routes are far too disruptive to everything on the surface from views to businesses to homes. While there is still some disruption from the construction of the tunnels, it doesn't do nearly as much damage to the businesses and homes and space on the surface as the elevated routes would.

C: (M Miller) I thought Emily did a really great job laying out the reasons for the underground station, so I concur with much of that. It needs to be underground as much as possible all the way through and I think that you see that from many of the communities whether West Seattle or Ballard or Roosevelt. That's true as we're looking into the Junction and our neighborhood where we want a long tunnel. To me it makes sense to have the station closest to the Junction. I know there are a lot of tradeoffs, but would want to hear more from those more in the know. The other piece we haven't talked about a lot: who knows if there will be an ST4, but there needs to be an understanding of what happens if it is going to get it to Burien or White Center, and that should be part of the conversation in the building of this particular station. I hear what you're saying about thinking about growth, but when you're thinking about looking at the rest of the lines and where stations are: there's one station in Capitol Hill and one station in the U District. I think having three stations this close together doesn't make sense. I want to make sure West Seattle benefits from giving up that station and not that we have poor design. If you think about the riders' experience and efficiencies. Having three stops and what that does for the train and the line, is not best for riders. I am a proponent of not having that Avalon station, but I would like to see the tradeoff being no station, long tunnel.

C: (Ella McRae) I would say the opposite of M: there should be an Avalon Station. For somebody who does transit to West Seattle every day, I think about what that trip would be for me if they take out that station. The 21 runs straight from 35th directly to the community I serve. Where would people in High Point go? What would be their closest station? It wouldn't be efficient. As someone that lived in the south end with light rail, having these huge distances, how long will it take to walk from Avalon to the Junction? That's up a hill. Cap Hill has one stop, but UW now has two. As a walker and pedestrian, I do not drive at all, there should be a stop there because it has access to the West Seattle Stadium so if you're having families coming to stadium events, this is a perfect location. For community access, that's why there should be an Avalon and as Pete mentioned, the ability to grow. Having a tunnel is pretty awesome because it doesn't interfere and is not an eyesore as we know that a lot of times seeing these towers generally affects lower income communities. I don't have a preference on either one of them. My concerns would be to make sure there's an Avalon Station and the tunnel is a lot better than an elevated.

C: (Lauren Lundberg) I don't have any particular comments on this section.

C: (Inaki Longa) For this part of the project, my preferred alternatives would be WSJ-5 and DEL-6. That would mean the medium tunnel with station on 41st Ave. I prefer those alternatives because that would have the least displacement of homes and businesses. The location of the station would be really well located within the Junction where the highest density of the neighborhood is. One thing that I like about this is the station depth is around 50 feet; this is great for accessibility. The travel time between the surface and the station platform should be acceptable. I was going back and forth about Avalon Station and scrapping this station altogether is something that should not be taken lightly. Even though the density at present is not very much, I think we should keep the station and make the density happen in the neighborhood instead. It's still a distance where from the Avalon station to downtown once the project is up and running and built, we're talking about travel time that is barely over ten minutes. It would be a lost opportunity not to build the station. My preference would be the Avalon retained cut station because that would be compatible with the medium tunnel 41st Avenue that I mentioned. Also this station would only be 30 feet under the surface. Again, the access is easy for accessibility.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Willard Brown): I am persuaded by what I've heard, but I've also all along wanted to make sure Alaska Junction has an underground tunnel. I like both underground options so I don't have a huge preference for which, but for a lot of reasons I do like the tunnel on 42nd slightly more than the other alternative. I don't like an elevated platform in the Junction. None of those options fit the community or fit the needs of the Junction. If West Seattle has a downtown, it's in the Junction and so to have this become a destination station for our community is important to me and important to the businesses there. Any way we can support that and create a hub where it's a destination as well as a conduit makes sense. With regard to Avalon, I have been for the station, I've been for saving the money, I just want to hear further discussion about what that would actually translate into. If we give up the Avalon Station, there has to be some huge benefit to Delridge and the Alaska Junction to make that palatable to me and others. Right now I'm not sure I want to give up that station. I look at the density there; I think it's already upzoned, it will only get more dense. For that reason, the ridership and usage there will increase significantly before it is constructed. If there is a way to make sure the connection between the Alaska Junction station and the Avalon station is smooth, very short distance. I just hope it can be worked out so that the Alaska Junction can be underground—that's my main point. There are a lot of things I'd like to see around the station wherever it is in the Junction: all kinds of supports and developments and the like. The connections to other modes of transportation is critical, how that happens in Avalon and the Junction is critical, but Delridge is essential to be the conduit for folks coming from south of the station, White Center, Burien, and the like to access the light rail is incredibly important. But those stations also have a role to play in regard to how they connect and get people to other parts of West Seattle.

C: (David Bestock) I don't have a lot of opinions up the hill. I'll have more opinions on Delridge. I appreciate Cathal sharing the engagement stuff, but having talked to the community liaisons from the city, I would say that doesn't feel like a victory. Their feedback that I heard was that most people they talked to, which to Ella's point are people who are going to be utilizing transit, are still not totally aware of what's going on here. So, I would say in this next phase of work, please lean on those community liaisons and talk to the communities that don't show up to the events that you offer. I'll save my opinions; I don't have strong opinions about what happens up the hill.

C: (Deb Barker) I've been a fan of undergrounding in the West Seattle Junction. I prefer the longest tunnel, it's not just a matter of convenience, but this is an urban village and it's also the largest urban village in West Seattle. If Ballard is getting underground services, West Seattle has to have their urban village be underground as well. The opportunities that are available with the long tunnel option heading up to 42nd area—there is so much opportunity there for a fantastic system that deals with the affordability component that is lacking throughout so much, and for the multimodal connections and the integration within the historic Junction, and the balance of the triangle. I am definitely and loudly a fan of long tunnels and 42nd. I have never been a fan of the Avalon area station ideas because they are just about as awkward and horribly designed as the Andover/Delridge station. You are trying to put stations in an area that is not flat and you're creating challenges for all the users by having this area not be easily accessible from the buses that stop. You get to do the mad dash in the rain or snow from 35th over to a station entrance. Avalon has always felt so awkward and so unnecessary because of the adjacency of the other two station potentials. If you can see one station area from another station area, something is dreadfully wrong.

C: (Charlie Able) I concur with much that's been said on this panel all along. I will try to not duplicate what anyone else has said. I think you've heard from so many people throughout this process, especially in the Junction and throughout the other neighborhoods, that the tunnel has been such the priority because unlike many of the other locations where Sound Transit has had aboveground service, West Seattle does not have an extra large right-of-way where you can cleanly run something at grade, it also doesn't have a large highway that you can run it next to like you see near the Northgate stations where you're combining infrastructure paths. Like Deb said, it's an urban village, it's dense, it has narrow streets and the idea of taking a large, aboveground network through that neighborhood fabric seems incredibly shortsighted. This



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

infrastructure will be here for we hope a century and the idea that we'd shortchange ourselves for anything less than a tunnel in such a dense area seems like a mistake. To M's point about expansion, the tunnel also seems like the only way for Sound Transit to reasonably talk about going further south. Again, because we don't have a very convenient right-of-way to take it at-grade, so unless you want to have a very difficult conversation with the residents of 42nd from the Junction all the way down to White Center about how they're going to have a light rail network in their backyard, it seems very infeasible. The fact that this hasn't been part of this discussion is also a mistake. Lastly, the difference between the 42nd and 41st station for either of the long tunnel options... rather than making a decision at this very early stage of design, I would strongly encourage Sound Transit to bring in the Seattle Planning Department earlier in the process than is currently planned so that they can start to develop plans around both stations and look at the zoning opportunities and TOD opportunities before a final station is selected. Doing it the other way around where you're trying to plan around a station that's already been decided rather than putting your station in the location that seems to make the most sense for the future planning of the area also seems like a mistake. For the Avalon station, all along I've been in favor of eliminating it. It would have the lowest ridership on the network, and I don't think that's simply a result of low density. It's just so close. As Deb said, if you can see the station from another neighborhood, it's too close. Light rail isn't meant to serve every block. We need to have better bus routing to accommodate those who need to make transfers. Stitching in the Junction and Delridge stations better with the existing transit network, not necessarily trying to shove a station in to accommodate existing bus routes.

Delridge

C: (Emily Strom) I like DEL-2a or DEL-2b. These are lower stations at 60 feet near 26th Ave and Dakota. I like that these connect to the tunnel options in the West Seattle Junction. These have smaller impacts on residents and businesses and it's also one of the cheaper options at \$400 million. I also like the TOD opportunities with DEL-2a and DEL-2b. I like DEL-4 for similar reasons but I worry with the higher station at 90 feet, that's quite high. I do like the integration of buses with that route.

C: (Pete Spalding) When we look at all three options, none of the three have any way to avoid totally destroying the fabric of the community they go through. It's so dense that no matter which of the options you choose, you're going to totally change the fabric of that piece of the community. For example, if the north option is chosen, you will basically wipe out the entire business district north of Andover. Either one of the south options, you run into what's referred to as constructability issues, which I'm not for sure what that means. I know that there's a lot of engineering that still has to be done to determine how far south the line has to come once it crosses the river. Once you come through there, you run into all kinds of environmental issues with the greenbelt and the blue heron colony. I'm also concerned that as either one of those lines comes across the north slope at the north end of the Pigeon Point neighborhood that, according to some of the appendices, it appears to have a number of properties taken simply for construction staging zone that then at some point afterward, would be turned into housing or kept as a maintenance facility? In today's dollars, those are million-dollar properties. Then 21st Avenue would become a maintenance road to the line. In my estimation, it makes the decision that the Sound Transit Board made three years ago to eliminate the Purple Line from consideration very short-sighted. If you take into account the escalating real estate values and the further efficiencies and cost reductions in tunneling capability, I would venture to guess that the cost differential is way closer than it was three years ago. By doing the Purple Line, the tunnel option under the Pigeon Point neighborhood, you would save so much of the fabric of the neighborhood, you would save so much of the housing stock, that to me it just makes sense. I'm also concerned that no matter which of the alternatives is chosen, I don't know that enough attention has been paid to the potential harm to Longfellow Creek. I think that needs to be looked at very closely. There are people in this neighborhood and on this call who have spent a great deal of time, effort and energy and parts of their lives improving that creek. If anything were to happen to it, it would be a terrible thing.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Nicole Perry) The thing is a mess regardless of which alternative we take for the simple fact that there's so much on the northern end of Delridge. No matter which way you come across the bridge, no matter which way you come down Delridge, it's a (excuse my French) "cluster---- from hell." Because there's so much there at the northern end of Delridge, you've got offices, small businesses, homes on Pigeon Point, it's hard to make a decision and I haven't been able to make a decision even though I live further south on Delridge. I don't know which one to choose because there's someone affected whether it's Pigeon Point or it's the mom and pop businesses on the northern end of Delridge. Honestly, I don't know which one to choose. There needs to be light rail in West Seattle and especially here on Delridge, but figuring out which one to choose, honestly I have no idea. Either way it takes away from someone that's making a living or making a home so there's no one good choice.

C: (Lyssa Moon) My biggest concern is that all of the choices we've been presented with have very clear downsides and I worry about the benefit. I'm very disappointed to see that the option to cross the Duwamish south of the Harbor Island entirely never went forward because that would avoid a lot of problems in Pigeon Point and Nucor and that cliff face and the herons. But we weren't presented that option, so we're stuck choosing between whether we want to destroy parts of the community that are mixed-use or the Andover station where we're destroying Nucor and the fire station. So, none of the options look appealing.

C: (Pete Spalding) In my comments when I was talking about the Purple Line, I think that I should point out that Nucor would not be held harmless if Purple Line was chosen because where it was slated to come across the river would be right in the middle of a parcel that Nucor owns along the river. I think it's important that I put that caveat out there that it would also impact Nucor if that line had been chosen.

C: (M Miller) I resonate with a lot of what's been said. My house and my neighborhood is going to be totally destroyed or changed if any option except for the long tunnel is chosen. If you go up Genesee elevated, that runs right through our neighborhood and depending on which station option you choose with Avalon, that displaces houses and changes the fabric of our neighborhood. If you choose cut and cover, it drives all the way through our neighborhood and with the refinements, even more so. Even talk of shutting down our street, we don't even know what displacements are going to look like in terms of numbers. It's really hard; it hits me and I'm not the only one on this call it hits or only one watching. If you're taking me out of my home and a lot of us out of our homes, do it for smart design. I want to feel good at least about what we wind up with and not that it's compromised because of funds or because the Board doesn't want to wait two more years or because we put something on the table and now we can't go back to it because it was a decision. I absolutely understand it's a process and we can't constantly be going back. Things do have to move forward and you do have to drive a train into a place it shouldn't be; it's a residential area. But I really feel strongly that it's hard for me to deal with hearing that we might need to make compromises that we're going to wind up with something we don't like. With all my other colleagues here [saying] we're not excited about any of the Delridge options is a struggle for me. Because I want to feel good about it based on whatever sacrifice, taxpayer dollars, to what's going to happen to West Seattle, to living through it. We had to deal with C Line coming through and the traffic coming through, but now have a beautiful road and I feel really good about what's there and I want the same thing for Sound Transit. With that said, I equally say I don't see an easy solution here. For me, value of station, aesthetically what it looks like, and not destroying the fabric, where it's located in terms of easy access, thinking about transfers and experience. The station is one of the things that is a value to me. While all of the stations are challenged, as we're looking at the Andover station, feel that it's extremely flawed. It's flawed because it's so far north; it's flawed because of how we see bus access. That station is really important not just for the neighborhood that it's in, but all of the folks we know are coming from south Delridge and other areas. I really thank you David for saying this, it is critical that the main users who are going to use that station have voice on what it is that they want. As Pete said, anywhere you put the station, it's really going to change the fabric of Delridge. I too wish we could still look at the Purple Line. I'd love to go back to Sound Transit to say "while I know we're at this stage of the process, I gotta feel like



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

there's something a little bit better." I know that in terms of refinements, there are refinements to that Andover station because it has design challenges, but I think Deb's comment last time was "putting lipstick on a pig" and I appreciate that because I want something solid and well done, I want good TOD. I want it to be close to where the community of Delridge is. If you take that large swath in Delridge, give them something good for what's there. I also want to call out something I'd want the Sound Transit Board to know: I feel like this area until it gets past 35th from the Duwamish/Delridge through the Avalon neighborhood is not thought of in the same way. Like "no problem to put 120 feet down there." In fact on the West Seattle blog today, someone described the cut and cover line as like "it runs along the expressway until it gets to the station", but that's not true. And we know that here, but there's a value of where the line is going and the communities it's going through from the moment it comes over the Duwamish. There are a lot of mom and pop businesses, transitional resources, we have a lot of great things happening in this area. I want to advocate for minimal disruption as can be, again a long tunnel. As we look at design line refinements, to look for refinements to minimize displacement. I know there are a lot of political pressures in all the different ways—the Port, Nucor, the golf course—and I want to make sure that things like the environmental impacts have equal voice. That's very concerning for me about where the political streams will be and what we'll wind up with at the end.

C: (Ella McRae) Pete and Ms Miller were saying it the most and it keeps being echoed: it's choosing nothing good, so is there really a choice? I can feel the passion of both of them speaking and that's two community members that have a lot more privilege than others in community and that aren't here echoing their voices and if it's hurting them that hard, I can only imagine people who aren't. Definitely for them with a long bridge if possible and any lines should be able to connect with an underground. That seems to be the theme to me: people want a tunnel through all aspects of it.

C: (Lauren Lundberg) I have no comments for this section.

C: (Inaki Longa) For the Delridge station, my favorite option is the DEL-6 which is the elevated Andover station, lower height alternative. This alternative is compatible with WSJ-5 which is the medium tunnel 41st Avenue station and the Avalon retained cut station. These alternatives combined provide substantial savings all while building stations with easy to access platforms that are closer to the ground level so with good accessibility. It is true that the elevated Andover stations places the station farther away from the population in the area but given that we expect the vast majority of the users at this station are transferring from buses, I think the most important thing here is to get the bus to rail transfer right. If we were to choose a station like this which is not in the highest density location of the neighborhood, the city needs to step in and start planning right away what the new neighborhood is going to look like and how we're going to maximize the housing possibilities in the area.

C: (Willard Brown) I was very much in support of the Purple Line a long time ago and I was crushed when it was eliminated. Since then, in looking at all the other options here, many of you have expressed exactly how I feel in that there are no good options on the table. So, I just want to talk about what my values are and what I would like to see happen as we go forward with this. I do believe that there is possibly an opportunity for taking another look at Delridge and to do a deep dive into the alternatives being as minimally disruptive as possible, providing opportunity for a station to become a catalyst for development and support for local businesses, to ensure that the health of Longfellow Creek is not negatively impacted, to look for opportunities to improve the conditions in and around Longfellow Creek, along Dakota and the golf course. With regard to how it interacts and connects with Metro, it is critical that every bus line that can take you north or take you south be connected here. The bus lines need a place to turn and to load and unload. That integration to me is essential to the success of the line. I'm hopeful that those are the values that come out of whatever is built by Sound Transit. I have hopes for the station itself to be a catalyst for investment by the city. There's so much in the way of lack of infrastructure in certain parts of Delridge and to improve the infrastructure in this area, to look at the possibilities for a mainstream grocery or things of that nature as part of the development process,



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

I'm in favor of that. What I am most concerned about though is the height of the elevated. I do not want the high elevated station. That to me is a non-starter and I think it would have tremendous negative impact on the community and disrupt the community in ways that are hard to minimize, so that is the one option I want to rule out.

C: (David Bestock) I hear a lot of folks asking to revisit the Delridge station. If that happens, we're happy to partner with you and offer our insights there. Given the options that were presented, we urge you to choose the north crossing of the Duwamish; we urge you to select the preferred Dakota Street station lower height, that's DEL-2a. Part of the reasoning there is a priority of Longfellow Creek and not running along the north side of Genesee if you're running along Genesee, but to prioritize running along the south. I think there's an opportunity to mitigate other impacts of the line by improving the health of Longfellow Creek and potentially even getting rid of the culvert that's running from the golf course under Genesee to expand salmon spawning grounds into the golf course. We've also talked for years about the possibility of alleviating the golf course of the farthest east strip of their land to make a walking and biking path which would aid the neighborhood tremendously. So given the impact of Sound Transit, that all could become a reality and provide really amazing improvements in the community. Holding Longfellow Creek paramount to all other priorities is our priority and the north crossing for environmental impacts, the critical hillside, and others. Reiterating that bus-rail integration being prioritized, for that reason the Andover station makes no sense and should not be considered. The lower height guideway is a priority. When I say us, I'm representing my organization and those we've heard from and talked to. What hasn't been talked about a lot here is improvements to safety. These are all in my comments to Sound Transit, but I'm reiterating them here. As we select a route and a station location, investing in improvements to the lighting and staircases that provide pedestrian access to that station is going to be paramount. I think people don't feel safe in those areas and we want to make them feel safe accessing transit. Those are our priorities and we're a ready partner once there is a site selected to talk about transit-oriented development. Delridge is a food desert so trying to bring more healthy food options here as well.

C: (Deb Barker) Reinstate the Purple Line for consideration. Among the many alignments initially floated by ST, the Purple Line did something that Sound Transit has rarely experienced: it had massive community support because of the following: avoided fragile habitat areas and steep slope critical areas, the Purple Line sidestepped the West Seattle bridge corridor, the Spokane Street bridge corridor, and the Port of Seattle high voltage corridor by crossing the Duwamish River in a less constrained area. The Purple Line represented true environmental justice as it prevented the destruction of dense, affordable residential neighborhoods that are occupied by first-time homeowners, people of color. It is assumed that these same residents could be subject to Sound Transit's relocation policies yet it's doubtful they'd be able to afford to return to their community. Yet the Purple Line was perceived to be too costly when the Sound Transit Board removed it from consideration in 2019. The Sound Transit Board must revisit the alignment and evaluate its cost against the current cost of excessive over-engineering, infrastructure disruption, business and residential real estate takings, and environmental justice offenses. In addition, focus on sustainable opportunities for transit-oriented development. Proposed DEL-5 and DEL-6 alignments allow for transit-oriented development that features immediate adjacency to a working steel mill. This robust business has a 24-7 schedule which includes semi-truck deliveries, train car decoupling, heat blasts, steaming geysers, and steel loading. If one wants to create TOD opportunities that are doomed to failure because no one wants to develop them, this has to be the place. Fortunately, there is DEL-2a which proposes a centrally located station area, features tracks that are large enough to offer sustainable and equitable TOD projects which include well-situated commercial uses, perhaps grocery and restaurants, that are surrounded by dense, mixed-income housing. Further, such TOD would certainly comply with the goals identified in Sound Transit's policies. Ideally DEL-2a would continue with a low SW Genesee St guideway and east of Avalon Way SW enter a tunnel portal to the West Seattle Junction.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Charlie Able) I have nothing to add. My colleagues said it better than I could.

Duwamish Crossing

C: (Emily Strom) I prefer the DUW-2 north crossing alternative as the smallest impacts to residences and the blue heron colony. However, during my last session a month ago, my small group stated that it's extremely unlikely that DUW-2 would ever happen. So, my second choice is the current Preferred Alternative, DUW-1a. While similar to DUW-1b, DUW-1a has slightly smaller potential impacts, potentially lower cost and is more direct.

C: (Pete Spalding) I would just say that the North Crossing Alternative takes away some of the environmental concerns, takes away the loss of some of the housing. The downside to the North Crossing is that you lose the entire business district from Andover north and a lot of folks don't realize how many businesses are down below the Subway and the deli. I think one of the largest daycare providers in West Seattle is located there. The crossings that go south of the bridge have all the environmental concerns with the blue heron colony and the West Duwamish greenbelt and the last point that I'll make on this one is to reemphasize that I'm not sure that Sound Transit totally knows the answer to the question of "What do you mean by constructability issues on the north slope of Pigeon Point?" There is so much that hasn't been discovered yet about where that line is going to go. From what I've heard the engineering studies that have been done don't come back very favorable. There's a good possibility that either one of the lines that run south of the bridge would have to be moved even farther south to deal with the constructability issues on that north slope. What does that then do to how those lines approach as they come across the river?

C: (Nicole Perry) There is no good option unfortunately. If you use the North Crossing Alternative, then you have to worry about Harbor Island. If you use the South Crossing Alternative and the South Edge Crossing, you have to worry about Pigeon Point. Even once it leaves those areas you have to worry about the north end of Delridge and all the construction that will be going on over there regardless of where the station is. There's so much that you have to worry about. Even though Delridge needs a station, I don't quite know how you can put a station in and not take away from one part of the neighborhood and the community.

C: (Lyssa Moon) My biggest concern is I'm not confident the project coming around the retained cut on the north of Pigeon Point is feasible. I would be willing to bet that costs will explode as unknown unknowns start being discovered regarding the terrain there. That's in addition to the environmental concerns there, so there's no way I can endorse either of the south crossings. The north crossing is problematic because it cuts through the business districts, is disruptive to Harbor Island, disruptive to Nucor, and disruptive to the fire station. I'm still not clear on why the decision was made that it has to cross Harbor Island at all rather than crossing south of Harbor Island, which seems like it would be a far better alternative.

C: (M Miller) I appreciate what Nicole just said. Similar to what my colleagues have said, I feel like I have more questions than I have answers. All the lines feel challenged. It's a difficult place that we're in. We're at 10% design, or I'm not sure what the percentage is, but Sound Transit is doing the best they can with what they know at the time and then we're making decisions. But this is concerning because we don't know enough and we need to make a decision in a way that we don't know. I cannot advocate for anything because I have more concerns. I would like more information and more specifics about how is this really going to work. I would like to know about what is actually feasible regarding the construction proposals. Is it really doable that Sound Transit is going to be able to do what they've proposed with a variety of options? So, I'm not advocating for any of them in particular. I'm just raising a similar concern that I don't know how much is feasible or what the impacts will be environmentally or to the slope, all of those other elements, I feel more unsure than I feel there's a direct path that makes sense.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Ella McRae) I don't have anything additional to say that hasn't been stated before. The north has less environmental impact.

C: (Lauren Lundberg) I represent the SODO business improvement area. We at this point cannot advocate for either of the crossings because it will permanently or temporarily—10 years of construction is permanently—take property and businesses out of SODO so we cannot come to a consensus on that. Thinking about this process and how SODO has been split in half, I attend this meeting and I have another person I work with who attends the CID/SODO CAG. We split SODO right in the middle, so you don't even see how it gets to our station. That has been a continuous conversation that we've had over the past few months. We will be living through this construction without any increase in transportation options for our neighborhood. We have no plans from either Sound Transit or Metro or the City to increase other east-west or north-south transportation. Other things to consider about the SODO neighborhood is the impact on the family-wage jobs that we have in this neighborhood and the reliance of certain businesses on maritime business, and how this will impact SODO as a whole in the SODO neighborhood. We continually want to emphasize the public safety concern throughout this entire process.

C: (Inaki Longa) I don't have much of a strong opinion on this part of the project other than that the shortest path would be my preference to make the trips as efficient as possible. As other people are mentioning, I'm also wondering about the feasibility of some of these options and how that would pan out.

C: (Willard Brown) Like so many, I'm not at all certain that the south crossings can be constructed as proposed. Therefore, I have a preference for the north crossing as disruptive as it is. But it is straightforward and it does connect quite well to SODO so it's an option that has more in the way of constructability than the other options and has much less environmental impact. The business district will suffer but it could be designed in such a way where the business district is reinforced in other areas. While dislocation is tough, there may be an option there, so I'm not ruling that out. But as far as the span goes, the north crossing makes more sense.

C: (Charlie Able) I would refer back to Deb's comments about the Purple Line crossing as seemingly a far superior methodology rather than trying to shoehorn another piece of infrastructure between a critical slope and an existing bridge that we also know potentially in 40 years is going to go back under construction. So, what does that mean for the entire corridor to have yet another piece of infrastructure in that incredibly vulnerable area? My group, East Alaska Junction, submitted a proposal back in 2019 advocating for the Purple Line and it would be wonderful to see the engineering that has gone into these options applied to that. It seems like a real shame that was never given a shake given all the cost changes that we've seen over the two years since that Level 2 Alternative was published.

C: (Deb Barker) Purple Line, thanks!

C: (Kim Schwarzkopf) For all of the lines, I am advocating for a no build alternative. I've got major concerns; most of my fellow CAG members have spoken about them. Purple Line—to study that, that's worth looking at.

Cost Savings Feedback

CAG members shared their feedback to the following question:

- What are your thoughts on the cost saving ideas?

C: (Emily Strom) I am not a huge fan of WSJ-2, the preferred Fauntleroy elevated option so I would vote to not pursue further study here. I like the tunnel with the 42nd Street station option as my preferred alternative.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Pete Spalding) I am not a fan of doing something just because it saves money. If it's not a better alternative, then why should we consider it? I think that ten years after it's built, are people going to look back and say "why in the heck did they do that?" and the person sitting next to them on the light rail train will say "well because they could save a little money, but look at what it ended up doing to us." So, I just don't think that saving money should be our focus. I realize that other areas of the line have gone over budget and it's just part of the environment in which we're living today. The escalating price of real estate has just wreaked havoc on the entire project. So, I think what Sound Transit should be encouraged to do is to pick the best option for the long term and not let solely money be the influencer of the decision that's made. Hence the reason that you should re-study the Purple Line as well.

C: (Kim Schwarzkopf) I'm still going for the no build alternative.

C: (Nicole Perry) I go in the area quite a bit. I get we're trying to save money but at the same time, all that money you're supposedly saving, if you eliminate the Avalon station, then you're also eliminating the money that can come in from all the riders from that area. So, I get saving money, but if you're giving away what money you could be getting by having the Avalon station, what's the tradeoff?

C: (Lyssa Moon) First of all, I'm not a fan of the elevated stations at all so anything about the elevated stations, I can't support. The other thing I'm running into is I'm looking at these savings numbers and I have to question how realistic they are because it feels like a lot of these savings are based on a theoretical cost that doesn't account for the explosive spike in real estate cost, the explosive spike in construction costs, and it feels like the savings would be lost in the noise of variability in the predicted cost so are we really saving? For example, with the Pigeon Point construction, that screams that it's going to be a boondoggle that ends up being a money pit that the cost of construction just keeps going up and up. So, again I'm going to agree with several other people that we need to revisit other crossing options like the Purple Line that does not have the problem with Pigeon Point or Harbor Island disruption.

C: (M Miller) I want to add in numbers that I'd like to see Sound Transit continue to look at the Purple Line. I want to call out a thank you to Sound Transit—we gave feedback that we wanted refinements and cost savings to be separated and I just wanted to say I see that clearly here. Thank you for taking that feedback, really well done. I would advocate for studying removing the Avalon station because I don't think it's smart design, not necessarily just as a cost savings. Pete—I'm with you, we should just pick the best line and I worry that's not going to happen with the Board. If we give up the Avalon station, I want it to be because we got smart design, we got a long tunnel. I don't want to give up that station without some sort of trade, but I think that is a better fit for West Seattle though I respect that not everyone has that opinion. However, I don't want to see giving up that station only tied with the retained cut and the other options. If we don't have that station, it will be a cost savings one way or another. It may not meet the affordability gap, but I do believe that should be looked at for any of the line options. I'm with everyone that I don't like the elevated stations. I am for delaying – and I understand we don't want this project to go on forever and I recognize that it's the butterfly wings, it's a wait outside of King County – I would rather wait two years to get better design than making choices here that are supposedly cost savings that are poor design and may not be a savings at the end of the day.

C: (Ella McRae) This is what's estimated and as we've seen with the price of construction and price of fuel increasing, that you shouldn't ever design to save money especially when you know the cost savings will not be the same as when you made the estimates. I am for an Avalon station because what would be the cost if there is growth, to put one in after?



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Lauren Lundberg) I don't have any specific comments.

C: (Inaki Longa) I wanted to say on the location of the Alaska Junction station, I think it's important to note that the cost savings that are associated with shifting the station depends a lot on which tunnel alternative the new shifted station is compared against. When compared against the medium tunnel alternative, the savings drop only to about \$60M. Given that and that the price is similar, I strongly favor the medium tunnel, 41st Avenue station together with the retained cut Avalon station. I might be a little contrarian here to what folks are saying about saving money or not, but I do think in this country we spend insane amounts of money on infrastructure projects, in particular on transit projects. If you compare what we pay per mile with any other country in the world, we pay insane amounts. We slow down things way too much, we customize things way too much without obvious benefits and at the end, things take decades to get built if ever. The gas prices are already crazy, the environment, we have a green emergency now. It's not something we should be waiting thirty years. Making things faster, making things cheaper, that's going to get us more, it is important. So, I think that is something to keep in mind and consider.

C: (Willard Brown) As I've said before, I don't think money or estimated costs should drive the process. I can't say whether I support any of these cost savings. I do not like the elevated Fauntleroy station period, so I don't see how I would endorse anything with regard to the option one. With the elimination of the Avalon station, I'm on the fence there, but I do think more study is necessary. If there are in fact savings in the \$60M range, then there's not savings because that would be evaporated in no time flat. I do appreciate that when this project is engineered, they will bring the finest skillsets to play here to try to get us a line that works and is efficient. That is my hope. One way to look at this in terms of refinements is to err on the side of what best suits the communities in which the system passes through and make sure they're serving the community well.

C: (Deb Barker) I do not support shifting the elevated Fauntleroy Station. Taking out a brand new fire station does not make sense and it's a larger impact, so I really do question the amount saved. It's a horrible alignment and the topography that it sets up the station area on is ridiculous as well. Obviously not in support of that. I do support eliminating the Avalon station.

C: (Charlie Able) Similar to what other people have said, I would recommend we save the money and stop studying the elevated options, whatever little cost savings that is. I strongly recommend studying the elimination of the Avalon station. Obviously, if it caused a huge drop in ridership and was hugely detrimental to the community, we would want to know that before we eliminated it, but it seems like there's no harm in studying what that could lead to in order to push for tunnel service in the Junction using those savings.

Refinement Concepts Feedback

- What are your thoughts on the refinements ideas?

C: (Emily Strom) I don't think we should pursue the refinement ideas. They shouldn't be studied further. I really liked at the third meeting, there was a goal of an integrated station area and this station would be very close to Nucor. People have already shared thoughts on that which I would second. I would like the station to be in a neighborhood hub, close for people to access and walk to. A steel mill right on the side of the station is a big impedance for people trying to reach the station so I would vote that we not move forward with this refinement idea.

C: (Pete Spalding) This is not worth exploring for three basic reasons. All of the impacts that Nucor Steel has on that whole intersection right there. You're talking traffic 24/7 at that intersection. That intersection is one of two ways to access in and out of the Pigeon Point neighborhood so you have all that Pigeon Point traffic



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

coming through there and then twice a day during the school year, all of the traffic going up to Pathfinder School. You also have to take into account you're a block from an entrance to the West Seattle Bridge. So, you have all the traffic coming down Delridge that has chosen not to be on transit, chosen not to be on light rail, has chosen to be in their single occupancy vehicle coming down Delridge to get onto the bridge. I think it would be an engineering nightmare.

C: (Kim Schwarzkopf) I'll put the no build alternative out there. I'm not in favor of either of the refinements or cost savings.

C: (Nicole Perry) The biggest issue I see in that area is having Nucor there. There's so much going on in that area with Delridge which is a busy street, with trucks going to and from Nucor. There's not really a good option for anything to be over there. We need a station in Delridge, but there's not really a good option.

C: (Lyssa Moon) I'm pretty strongly opposed to the Andover St station. Since we do need a station there, and the only options we've been presented with are bad, the Andover St station seems like the worst of the options, so I don't think a refinement on it is going to make it any better.

C: (M Miller) I echo thoughts about the Andover St station. I'd like to ask others watching this to go down there and see the site, because what Pete and others have talked about is something that I don't think has translated so well for those not in this area. I bike my kid right through that area to go to Pathfinder and what Pete described makes that station a really poor station location choice. Let's not take more time studying it. What you're discussing is potentially wiping out my whole neighborhood. I live on 32nd so hearing you would close down our whole street—if that's something you have to do because of smart design, that's one thing but that's not what we're hearing. I'd be very worried about the impact to transitional resources and what that shift of the line would do to their brand new buildings there. It's a really important resource that we have that's not easily transferred to some other location.

C: (Ella McRae) My only question is because someone just sent me an email and I'm just going to say this, I know this is light rail and there's the conflict with the city with the gondolas, somebody sent me multiple emails during this meeting concerning this from my community. If there is additional investment then there should be an investment on a more update on the evaluation of gondolas. No, I wouldn't look at any other refinements.

C: (Inaki Longa) I support both refinements. The second one makes it possible to have a lower height station which is better for accessibility and to make the whole trip more efficient and faster. I also support the pedestrian bridge and any pedestrian infrastructure in general that makes the experience for pedestrians better. The area in general is not pedestrian friendly in many ways, so any pedestrian infrastructure we can get here, I support it.

C: (Willard Brown) Pete described the entanglement there quite well: the Delridge entrance to the bridge, the Andover complex there with all the businesses and then Nucor. The Nucor trucks are extraordinarily long and they are going in and out of Nucor continuously and so having the ability to cross Delridge or Andover to get to the station, you need a bridge so the pedestrian bridge makes sense. However, the location of the station itself needs more study. It's in a vulnerable location right there, I don't like it there. It's just in the wrong place. I hope you study that further in regards to other options because having a station that close to the entrance to the West Seattle Bridge and the way traffic zooms, and also near the entrance to get to Pigeon Point. That's a bad location, period. It's just bad. It's a no go.



West Seattle and Ballard

Link Extensions

C: (Deb Barker) I've already stated my displeasure or lack of support for the station area at Andover, even Delridge. Any relocation of that doesn't help the situation. Putting in a pedestrian bridge to get pedestrians away from the semi-trucks, I'd like to see somebody try to enforce the pedestrian bridge because West Seattleites are notoriously anti-pedestrian bridge, they'd prefer the shorter route which is what I can see versus going all the way up and all the way down. I do not support any of these refinements. I do not believe they improve or abet anything about this very poor station location.

C: (Charlie Able) I agree with those comments. I wouldn't spend more time on something that seems to get quite substantial feedback from the neighborhood as being the worst option. It seems to be, to the previously named comment, lipstick on a pig.

Materials shared:

- Presentation: https://oohwsblink.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/images/AE_0036-17_WSJ_Community_Advisory_Group_Meeting_Presentation_20220510.pdf

Action items/next steps:

- Sound Transit to consolidate CAG member feedback to share with the Sound Transit Board.