Slide 1 – Introductions – 2 mins

- Thank everyone for coming, agenda, sign-in sheet, restrooms
- Introductions – County, Consultants, Edmonds

Slide 2 - Meeting Purpose – 2 mins

- Purpose of the meeting is to provide information to the residents and businesses along the proposed construction haul route about impacts during construction and to listen to concerns.
- This meeting is not so much to go into a lot of detail about the actual project, but to provide an overview to help explain construction impacts, leaving a fair amount of time for question/answer period. Like to go thru presentation and then have questions.
- Is anybody not familiar with where the park is located?
- The park lies within both unincorporated Snohomish County and City of Edmonds. Part of the haul route though lies within City of Lynnwood.
- The proposed project area is outlined in black, park boundary in purple so not doing anything upstream of this area. There are in theory 4 access points (Water, Rail, Main Trailhead located at the far eastern end of the park and the western access point for vehicles with ADA placards through coded entry gate
- I want to clarify from the beginning also that there are no long term/normal operation changes associate with this limited ADA access;

Slide 3 – Project Background – Problems Identified

- Is there anyone who has not been to the park?
- 6-foot culvert that is beneath the BNSF railroad tracks that is supposed to convey Lund’s Gulch Creek, fish, gulch sediments and provides the only legal beach access for the public
- The culvert is no longer sufficient for the amount of flow and sediments in the creek (switch to first slide).
- Additionally, when the rail embankment was constructed in late 1800s many coastal processes were interrupted, such as sediment delivery to the nearshore, natural widened creek meander was confined to 6 feet and a marsh/estuary was disconnected from the shoreline. This project seeks to address all of these issues.
Slide 4 – Project Background Solution Proposed

- A preferred alternative was selected through a public process
- Consists of installing a 5-span railroad bridge with a 100-foot opening, restoring a pre-railroad estuary for rearing habitat for juvenile Chinook and other salmonids, addressing public safety and ADA saltwater beach access, re-routing paths, relocating the portable restroom, adding a pedestrian bridge, picnic tables and benches and stream and buffer enhancement

Slide 5 – Project Background – Schedule (read from slide)

Slide 6 – Construction Activity using Haul Route (read from slide)

So Import/Export is what will account for the largest number of truck trips;

Slide 7 – Construction Haul Route – Majority of Trips (ad lib from slide)

Slide 8 – Construction Haul Route – Other Options

- During the feasibility study, as well as during initial design we considered water access, rail access, helicopter access and road access, keeping in mind all the different equipment and materials that would require hauling
- A big concern was whether the existing road could accommodate loads, widths, lengths and such, which we will discuss a bit more
- We looked at a helicopter as a possible option for bringing the bridge sections in and the crane for building the bridge in the event the access road would not be able to accommodate the width, weight and turning radius of the transport vehicle; but it proved to be prohibitively expensive partially due to insurance costs.
- We certainly considered BNSF, we have to bear in mind this is NOT their project. They have worked cooperatively with us throughout the course of this project which is amazing and they have tentatively agreed to build the bridge using their crews at our expense. This should translate into both a cost and time benefit which is also something we couldn’t have hoped for at commencement of this project.
- This is already an extremely busy route with BNSF, Sound Transit and Amtrak. As it is, BNSF will have to cease all traffic for a period of time two 8 hr. windows, or one 24-hour window (to be determined) in order to set the bridge. This translates into lost productivity for the rail purveyors, again on a project they did not and are not initiating.
- While they still may opt to bring in the crane for the bridge construction, as well as new railroad ties and rails; earthen materials not an option
- That leaves us with water vs road. We opted for using the road for 3 main reasons, Cost, Cost Recovery, and Permitting. Water access would have required construction of a temporary trestle structure on the beach to offload and load a barge and then
we have to find a place along shoreline that we can load and offload, which increases cost significantly. This temporary structure would require dismantling upon completion of the bridge so represents a non-recoverable cost

- Shoreline, nearshore, and off shore environment in Puget Sound is an area used by fish species listed under the Endangered Species Act, as well as forage fish protected by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (Pacific sand lance). Impacts from construction of a marine trestle and associated barge movement would jeopardize the ability to get the project approved.

- Federal permitting agency (Corps) has statutory requirement to determine the least environmentally damaging project alternative (LEDPA)—would not meet this requirement with the existing roadway available for transport of material.

- Other permitting agencies (WDFW, Ecology) and tribes discouraged the use of water-based construction due to the significant environmental impacts

- So permitting, cost and cost recovery led us back to the road; which gets back to CAN the road handle the activity; Our geotechnical consultant performed analysis and we determined the road could handle bringing in the bridge but could experience issues with all of the dump trucks so we will be reinforcing the road at the beginning of the project. This results in long lasting benefit to Parks and the community since used for pedestrian access and emergency and ADA access.

**Slide 9 – Construction Haul Route – Potential Impacts**

A couple of addl that didn’t make the slide, but I responded to one of your neighbors was: Long Term after construction, any changes; AND Will BNSF rail traffic increase

This slide includes the obvious immediate concerns, when we get to questions, can expand this list as needed;

**Slide 10 – Project Updates and Complaints (read from slide)**

**Slide 11 – Questions**