

## 7. Comment Summary

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

Sound Transit published the 2003 North Link Draft SEIS on November 21, 2003. The 2003 Draft SEIS was available for a 70-day public review and comment period, which ended January 30, 2004. Public comment was received in writing, including on comment forms provided by Sound Transit; by mail; and by email. Oral statements were also recorded during the following two open-house forums/public hearings:

Wednesday, January 7, 2004

Union Station, 401 S Jackson Street, Seattle

Open House: 5:00 to 8:00 PM

Public Hearing: 6:00 to 8:00 PM

Thursday, January 8, 2004

Kane Hall, University of Washington, near Campus Parkway and 15th Avenue NE in Red Square

Open House: 5:00 to 8:00 PM

Public Hearing: 6:00 to 8:00 PM

Following a request from the University of Washington to review the effects of a revised route with a station at Montlake Boulevard near Husky Stadium, Sound Transit prepared the Modified Montlake Route Addendum to the 2003 SEIS. The Addendum was issued on February 11, 2004. A 30-day public comment period was provided for the Addendum and it ended March 11, 2004. During that period, comments were accepted pertaining to the Modified Montlake Route as well as to all other University District routes to ensure that adequate comparisons could be made. The Addendum comment period also included the following public meeting:

Wednesday, February 25, 2004

Kane Hall, University of Washington

Open House: 5:00 to 7:00 PM

A formal hearing was not held, but a court reporter was available to receive oral comments.

On October 14, 2005, Sound Transit issued a second (2005) Draft SEIS to address project refinements and updates that resulted in new environmental information for the Preferred Alternative and for other North Link Alternatives. Sound Transit held a 48-day comment period. As with the 2003 Draft SEIS, Sound Transit took public comments in writing, and oral statements were also recorded during two open-house forums/public hearings that were held:

Wednesday, November 9, 2005

Lowell Elementary School

2058 Mercer Street, Seattle

Open House: 5:30 to 8:00 PM

Public Hearing: 6:00 to 8:00 PM

Thursday, November 10, 2005

University Heights Community Center

5031 University Way NE, Seattle

Open House: 5:30 to 8:00 PM

Public Hearing: 6:00 to 8:00 PM

This comment summary is based on a review of the comments received on the 2003 Draft SEIS, the Modified Montlake Route Addendum, and the 2005 Draft SEIS. Sound Transit has published the comments received and provided responses in Appendix N of this Final SEIS. This chapter reviews the comments received, common topics raised by respondents, a summary of issues identified by public agencies, and provides responses to common comments.

## **7.2 COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Sound Transit received approximately 500 comment letters or individual statements during the 2003 Draft SEIS, Modified Montlake Route Addendum, and 2005 Draft SEIS comment periods. The comments covered a wide range of issues and represented viewpoints from individuals, businesses, government agencies, institutions, and elected officials. The majority of comments were supportive of North Link, but indicated preferences or opposition to specific alternatives or facilities. Public comments largely came from individuals who live, work, or have property or business interests near the proposed project alternatives.

The majority of comments were focused on specific portions of the proposed alternatives and facilities. The major issues, listed in order of their frequency by those providing comments, were as follows:

- Proposed vent facilities in the Montlake neighborhood (about 182 letters or statements)
- Roosevelt Area alignments and stations (about 60 letters or statements)
- University area alignments and stations (about 50 letters or statements)
- Capitol Hill, First Hill and Eastlake routes and stations (about 45 letters or statements)

The remaining comments received (about 50) were more general, discussing general support or opposition to the project, other issues related to Sound Transit, or providing comment on general environmental or transportation issues.

While most of the 2003 Draft SEIS and Modified Montlake Addendum public comments were focused on the Montlake Vent, there were few such comments in the 2005 Draft SEIS public comment. With the 2005 Draft SEIS, comments were fairly evenly distributed and focused on station area decisions and environmental effects.

## **7.3 MAJOR COMMENT ISSUES BY PROJECT AREA**

The following is a brief review of the most frequently raised issues by project area.

### **7.3.1 Segment A – Northgate to University District**

#### ***Roosevelt Segment***

Of the more than 60 comments received for Segment A, most were focused on the Roosevelt area and addressed the location of the Roosevelt station and tunnel or elevated routes in the area. Most comments supported the 12th Avenue NE tunnel (Preferred Alternative), which would be in a tunnel under the Roosevelt commercial district, and they opposed the 8th Avenue NE East and West Portal alternatives, which would be elevated and adjacent to I-5. Displacement of homes and related impacts to neighborhood quality were frequently cited concerns for the 8th Avenue alternatives. Visual and noise impacts to residences adjacent to the elevated sections of these alternatives were also mentioned. The Northeast District Community Council, the Roosevelt Neighborhood Association, the Calvary Christian Assembly and the Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance were among those who supported the 12th Avenue NE tunnel and opposed the 8th Avenue NE alternatives. Supporters of the 12th Avenue NE route also mentioned that the 12th Avenue Roosevelt Station would be closer to the business district, supporting plans for the continued development and vitality of the district. There were no comments clearly in support of the 8th Avenue elevated alternatives.

A number of comments, including those submitted by Seattle Public Schools, the Greater University Chamber of Commerce, and the Neighborhood Farmers Market Alliance, opposed the 8th Avenue West Portal alternative due to potential construction-period impacts at the University Heights Community Center and the

temporary displacement of the Farmers Market. The Farmers Market Alliance also submitted a previous petition with nearly 2,000 signatures from customers of the market, opposing the use of this location for the light rail project. The Roosevelt Neighborhood Association supported the 12th Avenue alignment, and in 2005 noted concerns about spoils removal and the impacts on an interim terminus at Roosevelt.

### *Northgate*

There were few comments about Northgate route or station alternatives, and the comments received generally advocated that light rail be built all the way to Northgate without an interim terminus.

## **7.3.2 Segment B – University District to Downtown Seattle**

### *First Hill, Capitol Hill, and Eastlake*

Approximately 45 parties commented on the specific route and station alternatives for the First Hill, Capitol Hill, and Eastlake/South Lake Union areas. A number of environmental issues were raised in detail in some comments. The primary concerns in the southern end of the segment regarded the environmental effects of construction at the First Hill and the Capitol Hill stations.

General comments for this segment addressed the service to be provided at the First Hill, Capitol Hill, Eastlake and Convention Place stations. Some individuals' comments indicated First Hill was already well served by bus transit, while King County Metro's written comments (see NL 183) identified the area as being difficult to serve effectively with buses due to steep grades and traffic congestion at freeway access points. Other public comments stated that light rail to First Hill was a desirable improvement. A number of comments suggested that the North Link system would be most effective serving First Hill and Capitol Hill, and less effective serving the Eastlake/South Lake Union area. A major property owner in Eastlake stated that ridership potential in the South Lake Union area was under-predicted, writing that the Eastlake route would be important to the redevelopment of that area.

Detailed comments were provided by several parties expressing high levels of concern about construction impacts, particularly noise, on high-rise residences near the First Hill station. The comments requested additional discussion of noise impacts and mitigation in the Final SEIS, and stated that the station should not be built if the construction impacts could not be mitigated. Several parties near the Capitol Hill Station raised concerns about business impacts during construction and operation for both the Nagle and the Broadway options. These included concerns about street closures and noise and vibration during construction, and potential access and traffic impacts during operation. A party commented on Cal Anderson Park impacts due to the construction of the Nagle option. The Downtown Business Association also provided comments regarding the potential for loss of service currently provided at the Convention Place station and its effects on downtown.

In public comments on the 2005 Draft SEIS, comments focused on the decision to remove the First Hill Station from the Preferred Alternative, and to revise the Capitol Hill Station for the Preferred Alternative. Commenting parties also asked about other options for siting the Capitol Hill Station, and measures to improve connections to serve First Hill.

### *Remote Vent and Traction Power Substation Facilities*

The most frequent issue raised in public comments in 2003 was about the placement of vent facilities, which would be located south of the Ship Canal. Over half (approximately 186 of the 316 letters or statements received) voiced opposition to Montlake area vent and traction power site options presented in the 2003 Draft SEIS. Commenting parties included the Montlake Community Club, as well as Montlake area residents and business owners, St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church, and Washington State Representative Ed Murray.

The Montlake vent site options in the 2003 Draft SEIS are located south of SR 520 in the Montlake neighborhood, and are associated only with the Montlake route alternatives. Most of the comments requested that Sound Transit consider other locations that would use public land, including the nearby Montlake Playfield or the SR 520 right-of-way near the interchange with Montlake Boulevard. Impacts to neighborhood quality were the primary concern. The length of construction and noise, vibration, air quality, truck traffic, public health and safety, and the effects of the displacement of homes or a neighborhood business were frequently cited. Long-term and operational impacts were concerns, including visual change, potential

functional effects on the neighborhood, air quality, electromagnetic fields, safety, and noise and vibration impacts of the vent or train operation in the tunnel.

The greatest opposition was to Option B, which would displace three residences, followed by Option A, which would affect a church property and displace one residence. Option C, which would affect a neighborhood market, also generated opposing comments, but some comments noted that it would be less disruptive than the other two options, particularly if the market could be retained or rebuilt. Most of the comments on this topic did not indicate a preference or opposition to other stations or routes in Segment B, although many were supportive of the implementation of the overall North Link project. Some of the comments suggested that another route should be chosen if there were no other vent site options to be considered for the Montlake route.

For its Preferred Alternative, Sound Transit subsequently developed a revised plan for a vent facility near the Option C site, but refined the design that will most likely avoid displacing the market and to minimize the sizes of above ground features. Details about the Preferred Alternative vent were provided in the 2005 Draft SEIS, and public comments on the document were supportive of the new design; no comments in opposition were received.

Three parties raised concerns over the 10th Avenue E. vent site, which would be used for the West Tunnel and NE 15th Avenue NE routes. For the Preferred Alternative, Sound Transit developed a modified facility at site C, which avoided displacement of the neighborhood market. The Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council and individuals residing near the proposed vent site were among those who provided comments opposing this vent location, but they did not appear to be otherwise opposed to the alternative routes under consideration.

### ***University District***

Throughout its comments to all of the environmental documents released by Sound Transit, the University of Washington (see below under public agencies) discussed the importance of protecting its research mission. The comments raised specific concerns regarding the construction and operation of the North Link alternatives, primarily due to the potential for construction or train-generated vibration and electromagnetic fields to interfere with the University's existing or future research activities. Early in the public comment period, the University of Washington Board of Regents provided a letter stating that the West Tunnel route with two stations could be supported by the University if isolated impacts on research activities can be remedied or mitigated. The University also stated that the Montlake (Rainier Vista) route would not meet the University's objectives for protecting research and could not be supported. The University encouraged Sound Transit to review a Modified Montlake Route (Preferred Alternative) that would be farther east of the Montlake alternatives examined in the 2003 Draft SEIS. Other issues raised included the potential impacts of an interim terminus station at the University, including concerns about spoils removal near the University of Washington Medical Center. The University stated that it did not support interim terminus station alternatives or system-wide tunnel spoils removal sites on its property.

The University also provided a brief letter commenting on the 2005 Draft SEIS, reiterating the concerns related to research impacts.

Several parties, including the University District Community Council and the Greater University Chamber of Commerce, commented on the University area station alternatives. Most of these comments were about construction impacts and construction duration, with more concerns about impacts of the Brooklyn Station options than for the NE 45th Station. Few comments were received for or against the Southwest Campus Station. In 2003/2004 the University District Community Council commented in opposition to the Brooklyn options, and supported the NE 45th Station. Similarly, the Greater University Chamber of Commerce was opposed to the north Brooklyn Station option, and supportive of the south Brooklyn Station option or the NE 45th Station. Other business and property owners in the area stated that either the north or south Brooklyn Station option could be beneficial and asked to be included in detailed design and construction planning to help reduce the potential for construction impacts.

Comments regarding the Modified Montlake (Preferred Alternative) University of Washington route station at Husky Stadium were generally supportive, with 20 to 30 commentors interested in the improved transit connections that could be offered. For example, the Laurelhurst Community Club supported the Modified Montlake Route with a station at the stadium. About 10 to 15 comments encouraged considering

connections to the existing Montlake bus flyer stop at SR 520, including a potential light rail station at that location. Except from the University of Washington, there were few comments about the original Montlake Station/Rainier Vista and route in the University District. Some comments encouraged the consideration of a NE 45th Station with a new Modified Montlake route. The University District Community Council, while listing a number of issues and concerns about the overall project, preferred the Modified Montlake route with a NE 45th Station. The community council and the Chamber also stated that funding for the Northgate extension should be secured before making a decision to extend light rail to the University District.

The University of Washington, the City of Seattle, WSDOT and King County Metro provided comments about the potential for increased traffic and pedestrian activity on the roadways surrounding the University of Washington Station, and requested that Sound Transit include grade-separated pedestrian passages across Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Place. These parties also provided comments about the need for effective transit circulation in the area, and safe and efficient access and connections for station patrons.

## **7.4 OTHER COMMENTS**

Comments were also provided on topics related to Sound Transit's proposal to implement North Link, raising issues that have previously been voiced in the Central Link EIS related to the overall Central Link Project and the Initial Segment. These issues include concerns related to the costs of the project, the technology choice, extensions beyond the Northgate Segment, Sound Transit's Regional Transit Long-Range Plan, and voter approvals.

## **7.5 COMMENTS BY PUBLIC AGENCIES**

### **7.5.1 University of Washington**

The University of Washington provided several written comments on the 2003 Draft SEIS, including the initial letter from the University of Washington Board of Regents advising Sound Transit of the initial conclusions of the Regents regarding the alternatives under consideration. The correspondence emphasized the importance of protecting the University's research mission. The Regents' letter stated that the West Tunnel route with two stations could be supported by the University, and that the Montlake (Rainier Vista) route could not be supported. The Regents' letter encouraged review of a Modified Montlake Route farther east of the Montlake alternative examined in the 2003 Draft SEIS. As a result, Sound Transit issued the Modified Montlake Addendum, examining an alternative east of the earlier routes, and later issued the 2005 Draft SEIS with further updates to the alternative.

The University letters provided detailed comments on the 2003 Draft SEIS, the Modified Montlake Route Addendum, and the 2005 Draft SEIS. These letters reiterated the importance of the research mission to education and the economy, discussing concerns related to light rail construction and operation in relation to University facilities and activities (including the University of Washington Medical Center). An interim terminus station or systemwide tunnel spoils removal at a station on University property were stated as unacceptable to the University. They noted the expectation that their concerns would need to be addressed in an amended memorandum of agreement between Sound Transit and the University. Attachments to their 2003 Draft SEIS letter express detailed concerns regarding potential construction impacts (noise, dust, economic hardship, and vibration), electromagnetic field and vibration impacts during operation, and the need for Sound Transit to mitigate these impacts.

Their letter in 2005 again expressed concerns about impacts to research facilities, but also discussed construction impacts, circulation issues in the University of Washington staging area, and their preferences for an underground walkway under NE Pacific Place and the Burke-Gilman Trail.

### **7.5.2 Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)**

In its letters, SDOT expressed appreciation for the strong partnership that Sound Transit and SDOT have developed, and generally found the North Link 2003 Draft SEIS a thorough and well-researched document. To strengthen the Final SEIS analysis, SDOT suggested more detail on bicycle and pedestrian accessibility, truck

haul routes (condition of pavement), impacts to utilities, and transit-oriented development. SDOT also stated its interest in continued discussion with Sound Transit on construction coordination and station area planning for North Link, similar to earlier approaches used for the Initial Segment and other elements of Central Link. In its letter on the 2005 Draft SEIS SDOT expressed a preference for grade separated pedestrian facilities and entrance options for the University of Washington and Capitol Hill Stations. SDOT also provided detailed review comments related to many elements of the environment.

### **7.5.3 King County**

King County stated that the 2003 Draft SEIS provides a thorough and adequate analysis of the project, and had a similar statement for the 2005 Draft SEIS. King County provided comments on the North Link route and station alternatives, as well as the goals King County sees as principal decision-making considerations, including access to major urban activity centers, support for pedestrian-friendly transit-oriented development, supporting regional and local land use and transportation objectives, providing convenient connections between major transit attractions, serving congested areas, and offering convenient connections to bus networks.

Based on these goals, the County noted in its 2003 Draft SEIS letter that the 12th Avenue NE Roosevelt Station appeared to offer more advantages than the 8th Avenue NE stations. No preference for a specific Northgate Station alternative was identified, although the County reiterated the importance of station design considerations that support transit-oriented development, pedestrian activity, and efficient bus operations. The County identified a preference for a First Hill and Capitol Hill alignment, (preferring the Nagle Station option due to lower business impacts). The County also discussed the relative advantages of all the University District stations, but did not identify a preference.

Detailed review comments were provided on the project description; transportation, land use and economics, neighborhoods, and construction sections; and the Transportation Technical Report. As noted above, King County also provided information about existing transit services, and mentioned areas where light rail would improve such services. This included the First Hill area, where King County identified long-term constraints in ensuring high-quality bus service due to increased congestion and the existing topography.

In commenting on the 2005 Draft SEIS, King County stated a preference for including the University of Washington Station pedestrian facilities and north entrance options as part of the project. King County also requested additional detail on parking demand estimates at Northgate Station, and design issues related to the TOD planned by King County. At the Roosevelt Station, King County supported the addition of a signalized intersection at NE 67th Street.

### **7.5.4 Seattle Planning Commission**

The Seattle Planning Commission's comments stated that the 2003 Draft SEIS appeared well written and the analysis of environmental impacts was generally adequate. Detailed review comments related to many elements of the environment were provided to help strengthen the Final SEIS analysis. The Seattle Planning Commission urged Sound Transit to give equal attention to all of the alternatives and assess them based on long-term mobility goals.

### **7.5.5 United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

The EPA's primary comments on the 2003 Draft SEIS pertained to construction activities and low impact development. EPA recommends construction-equipment mitigation measures to reduce emissions from diesel and gasoline engines. They identified the benefits from clean up of any hazardous waste sites encountered in the project right-of-way, and advocated low-impact development designs to minimize stormwater runoff. Comments on the 2005 Draft SEIS were similar, and noted impacts to the University of Washington research facilities as an important issue.

### **7.5.6 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife**

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's comments focused on the locations where the routes would cross water bodies. They were interested in the depth of the Portage Bay/Montlake tunnels, and potential stormwater impacts and mitigation measures at Ravenna, Thornton, and Maple Leaf Creeks.

### **7.5.7 Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)**

PSRC provided comments stating that all of the North Link alternatives were consistent with regional planning goals. They also provided comments on the economic development opportunities and benefits of North Link. PSRC suggested that Sound Transit identify locations where North Link could provide a link to other transportation investments, such as where North Link would connect with the Green Line Monorail (which at that time was still to be implemented). Other PSRC comments requested additional information on the potential future conversion of the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel to light-rail-only service, and the differences between station designs and their effects on access.

In a letter commenting on the 2005 Draft SEIS and Sound Transit's identification of a Preferred Alternative without a First Hill Station, PSRC noted the importance of serving regional growth centers such as First Hill with high quality transportation systems.

### **7.5.8 Washington State Department of Transportation**

WSDOT's letters noted its ongoing involvement and coordination with Sound Transit on the *Sound Move* programs, and provided information on several locations where proposed North Link alignments intersect with its facilities. This included tunnels under or along I-5 in the First Hill/Capitol Hill and Eastlake segments and routes along I-5 in the Northgate segment. Specifically, WSDOT discussed the need for the 8th Avenue alternatives to mitigate noise and visual impacts and to relocate I-5 ramps in a way that accommodates future I-5 improvements. The letter noted that some Montlake tunnel alignments could limit options for the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Project, which could include new ramps connecting to NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE (north of the Montlake Cut). WSDOT also noted that the design for Montlake vent Option C (Hop-In Market site) could conflict with SR 520 expansion options and encouraged further study of alternative layouts or alternative sites in the area that would allow both projects to move forward.

In its letter comments on the 2005 Draft SEIS, WSDOT provided updated information on the status of the SR 520 Bridge Replacement project and its options for a Pacific Street interchange, which could provide direct connections to the University of Washington Station. WSDOT recommended additional discussion of the cumulative effects and benefits of the projects, and encouraged continued coordination between the agencies.

WSDOT's letters also discussed permitting and approval processes, ongoing noise mitigation programs, and environmental topics including stormwater, runoff, noise, construction traffic, hazardous materials, limitations of future expansions of roadway capacity, displacement of housing, and visual impacts.

### **7.5.9 Seattle Public Schools**

Seattle Public Schools' comments identified concerns for construction and operation impacts at Roosevelt High School related to the 12th Avenue tunnel alternative and the effect of traffic, parking and noise on students, teachers, staff, and parents. The letter also addressed the University Heights Building, a historic property owned by the school district. Seattle Public Schools stated concerns that construction staging could affect the integrity of the historic building and would displace the Farmer's Market, and concluded that they did not support the 8th Avenue West Portal alternative if the University Heights staging option was included.

## **7.6 COMMON COMMENTS**

Each comment letter, comment form, email, and public-hearing oral statement (hereafter collectively referred to as public comments) made on the 2003 and 2005 Draft SEIS's and the Modified Montlake Route Addendum was assigned a comment letter number. Comments within each letter were also coded with an individual number. Copies of all comment letters received and responses to these comments have been included in this Final SEIS, Appendix N.

The majority of comments received generally supported North Link, but indicated preferences or opposition to specific alignments or site locations proposed for supporting facilities. Furthermore, many of the comments received regarded similar issues. These common topics or questions have been summarized into Common Comments below. Common Comments have been separated into three categories: Segment A

(denoted with “AA”), Segment B (denoted with “BB”), and overall project (denoted with “PP”). Common Comments and responses are provided below.

### **7.6.1 Common Comments – Project**

The following are Sound Transit’s responses to common comments received on the project, but that were not specific to an alternative.

#### ***PP-1. Purpose and Need.***

**Light rail is too expensive. Sound Transit chose light rail as the preferred technology as a result of the Regional Transit Project (RTP), but the SEIS failed to acknowledge that bus transit has greatly improved since the time of the RTP conception.**

**Response:** The purpose of the Central Link project is to construct and operate an electric light rail system connecting the region’s major activity centers. The Central Link Project is an element of the *Sound Move* Ten-Year Regional Transit System Plan adopted by the Sound Transit Board in May 1996. Voters within the Sound Move District authorized local taxes to implement the Plan in November 1996.

North Link is the northern segment of the Central Link light rail project. A substantial history of planning and public decision-making has led to the selection of the alternatives for Central Link. This includes the original Regional Transit planning studies, which were part of the regional transportation planning program defined under the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The publication of the 1999 FEIS for the project and the subsequent Record of Decision issued by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as well as all of the post-FEIS legal decisions, have confirmed the decision-making process that led to the identification of Link Alternatives and the selection of the project to be built.

All-bus and bus-transitway systems are not being considered for the North Link project and were previously screened out early in the process prior to the 1999 project-level FEIS for Central Link. The 1999 FEIS specifically addressed similar comments on the 1998 Draft EIS. See FEIS Section 7, comment group 1, specifically comment 1.3.

Through its future long-range planning and in other business lines such as Regional Express, Sound Transit is participating in ongoing regional planning programs, and is working with other governments and agencies that are moving forward with many of the strategies and approaches that have been suggested in the comments.

The absence of a review of system alternatives in the light rail proposal presented to the voters and in the 1999 FEIS was raised previously by project opponents in a NEPA lawsuit filed in federal district court. Following a review of the administrative record in the case and written arguments by the parties, the court concluded that the environmental review conducted by Sound Transit and the FTA, its timing, and the scope of alternatives and impacts analyzed was reasonable and adequate under the applicable legal standard. See *Friends of the Monorail v. United States*, No. C00-852Z (W.D. Wash. March 30, 2001); see also *Save Our Valley v. Sound Transit*, No. C00-715R (W.D. Wash. July 13, 2001). See also response to comment 1A.

Sound Transit recently reaffirmed its decision to extend light rail beyond the Central Link corridor with the agency’s adoption of an updated Long-Range Plan (July 2005). A supplemental EIS was prepared updating the analysis of the 1993 EIS on the Regional Transit System Plan. The supplemental EIS evaluates alternatives and impacts, including BRT, monorail, light rail, and other technologies, outside of the Central Link corridor. Following the issuance of the final supplemental EIS (June 2005) and public review and comment on a draft plan, the Sound Transit Board adopted its Long-Range-Plan on July 7, 2005. The plan includes light rail in the Central Link corridor and beyond, and it includes BRT and other transit modes for various other corridors.

As stated in the purpose and need section (Draft and Final SEIS Section 1.3), the North Link SEIS is a project-level review focused on route and station decisions for completing the Central Link light rail project to the north. Sound Transit is not reconsidering previous decisions regarding the selection of light rail for the Central Link corridor. The Central Link Final EIS has previously addressed prior decisions in Chapter 2, Alternatives.

### ***PP-2. No-Build Analysis.***

**The City of Seattle, King County Metro, and WSDOT will be greatly improving their programs; this fact was not adequately incorporated into the No-Build analysis. Other potential programs and policies to improve mobility through demand management are not mentioned. Both of these will be implemented before North Link begins, therefore this will affect the people's choice of mode. The project needs better comparison to a strong bus system.**

The No-Build Alternative was defined in a process that included other agencies and assumed the multimodal improvements planned by many parties, including Seattle and King County Metro. The definition of No-Build also reflects the region's long-term multimodal improvement plan, Destination 2030, and the planning process for Central Link and its purpose and need (see response to common comment PP-1). All of these programs currently include high levels of transit service and coverage. No-Build assumed continued growth in service levels of about 1 percent a year. Travel time, speed, and reliability continue to be challenges for bus systems that are subject to surface-street operations.

System coverage, travel time, and frequency are considered most directly in forecasts for No-Build (all bus) or light rail alternatives. It should be noted that the bus service levels in terms of frequency in the corridor are already high. Increasing frequency would be unlikely to change the performance of No-Build, given the existing congestion and delays affecting buses.

### ***PP-3. Comment Period.***

**The 2003 Draft SEIS comment period should be extended, especially considering the additions of documents that must be compared to the 2003 Draft SEIS.**

The comment period for the 2003 Draft SEIS was 70 days, which is 25 days longer than NEPA requires and 40 days longer than SEPA requires. The Modified Montlake Route Addendum had a comment period of 30 days, although there is no required comment period for an addendum. The Addendum also was designed to provide information in a manner that was readily understandable without requiring readers to consult the 2003 Draft SEIS, but that would also be directly comparable to the information in the previous document. Further, a second comment period was ultimately provided by the 2005 Draft SEIS.

### ***PP-4. Bus Routes.***

**The 2003 Draft SEIS did not address existing regional bus routes, how North Link will impact these routes, and bus/train transfers either before or after North Link is constructed and begins to operate.**

As described on page 3-13 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, "service implementation planning will begin 1 to 2 years before actual implementation and will involve a public process led by King County for Metro bus service, with final approval by the King County Council." Page 3-14 of the 2003 Draft SEIS also explains that, "Existing Community Transit and Sound Transit regional express routes would not be significantly changed, although there is some potential for modified routes to Snohomish County when North Link extends to Northgate." As described, the restructuring of bus service will focus on local bus connections. Although it is likely that some regional bus routes would be restructured, changes to regional bus service would be relatively minimal in comparison to the changes planned for local bus service. It is unlikely that the SR 520 regional bus routes would be truncated at one of the Link stations. Any potential changes to transit routes, including those serving SR 520, will be determined during the service implementation planning process, which will involve all affected transit agencies as well as the public. Please see Section 3.2.2 of the 2003 Draft SEIS for a discussion of transit service level of service. Site access plans are provided in Appendix J of the Final SEIS.

As shown in Table 3.2-9 and described on pages 3-12 and 3-13 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, average door-to-door PM peak hour travel times for all transit users are expected to decrease by 8-12 percent in the year 2030 with light rail implementation. While it is true that transfer rates would be expected to increase, transfer wait times are expected to be relatively short, and riders may choose a Link trip over a longer and potentially less reliable bus trip that is affected by surface-street congestion. With Link system implementation, overall travel times and the amount of transit service provided would substantially improve.

***PP-5. Funding for North Link.***

**The financial analysis was inadequate and misleading. Funding for the project is too risky and should be secured to Northgate before construction begins. The potential effects of I-776 on North Link funding should be further analyzed and disclosed.**

Chapter 5, Financial Analysis, provides preliminary capital cost comparisons and describes funding sources for the North Link alternatives evaluated in the SEIS. The Financial Analysis chapter in the Final SEIS has been updated to also provide a complete capital cost estimate and a proposed financial plan for construction of the Preferred Alternative (University Link) that Sound Transit has identified at this time. The Sound Transit Board will consider affordability, as well as other factors such as environmental impacts and ridership, prior to making final decisions on the project to be built.

The Financial Analysis chapter explains that the revenue stream approved by regional voters in *Sound Move* provides a committed source of local funding for that segment of the proposed North Link project between downtown Seattle and the University District. The North Link segment from the University District to Northgate can be constructed only if additional funds above that identified in *Sound Move* become available.

The North Link project must be funded from the North King sub-area of the Sound Transit District because it is located entirely within this sub-area. The Financial Analysis chapter of the 2003 Draft and Final SEIS describe Sound Transit's financial plan for the North King sub-area, including commitments to other projects and local funding sources. The Link Initial Segment uses funds from the North King and South King sub-areas. It is fully funded and under construction. It does not depend on additional revenue beyond those already authorized in 1996 by *Sound Move*. The Airport Link project is located in the South King sub-area and uses funds from that sub-area. Airport Link from the Initial Segment southern terminus to the Airport/SeaTac Station is funded and scheduled to open in 2009. Funding to construct Airport Link to South 200th has not been identified at this time.

The Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET) constitutes approximately 21 percent of the agency's local tax revenue. In November 2002, Washington State Initiative I-776 was approved by the voters. This Initiative repealed Sound Transit's authority to collect the MVET and lowered the state-wide MVET to \$30 per vehicle. The Initiative was ruled to be constitutional by the Washington Supreme Court in October 2003 – the same time as the 2003 Draft SEIS was printed. Because Sound Transit's MVET is pledged to repay bond debt, however, the Supreme Court directed the trial court to determine Sound Transit's right to continue to collect the tax. In November 2004, the King County Superior Court ruled that Sound Transit is legally entitled to continue to collect its MVET until the bonds the agency issued in 1999 are retired in 2028. The court also ruled that Sound Transit is not required to retire the bonds prior to maturity and there is no restriction on the way the agency can use the MVET taxes that are not needed to make the bond payments. The Superior Court decision has been appealed to the State Supreme Court and a decision on the appeal is pending.

In December 2002, at the request of the Federal Transit Administration, Sound Transit produced a 'stress test' on its baseline financial plan that reduced the agency's MVET collections to 0.1 percent, a level sufficient to cover the debt service on the outstanding 1999 bonds. That stress test indicated an MVET reduction would result in \$151 million in (then) currently approved board programs. If Sound Transit were unable to collect any MVET, the reductions in board approved programs would exceed those indicated by the stress test.

***PP-6. Proper Amount of Acquisitions.***

**Partial takes of small businesses usually cause the business to go out of business; this needs consideration in your displacements analysis.**

In Section 4.1 and in Appendix P4.1 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, Sound Transit provided a definition of how it estimates when a property would be fully or partially acquired and when a business or residence would be displaced. A partial acquisition would involve a portion of a property, and would not involve removal of structures, access, or features determined integral to the property's use. Sound Transit considers a business' ability to continue operations as part of this assessment. For instance, the loss of parking or changes to access and visibility are considered. However, the ongoing viability of an individual business depends on many factors, and there is no evidence to support a conclusion that partial acquisitions would, in themselves, lead to small-business failures. The discussion also noted that the indication of the level of acquisition was an

estimate for the purpose of evaluating environmental impacts, including impacts to businesses, and that final determinations would be made following final design and in negotiation with property owners.

***PP-7. Construction Impacts.***

**Tunnel construction can impact buildings, and increase the potential for settlement.**

The 2003 Draft and this Final SEIS Section 4.17 state the potential for settlement could exist for some properties, particularly where the tunnel or excavation would be shallow or in close proximity to foundations, and where soil conditions would be loose. The Final SEIS contains updated engineering information, including details for Alternative A2.1c, where impacts near the tunnel portal were identified. Section 4.17 also identified the mitigation measures available to minimize potential settlement effects, and to provide corrective action if any settlement occurs. Pre-construction and post-construction surveys of adjacent structures and a construction monitoring program will be established, including surface surveying and subsurface instrumentation. Depending upon the severity of the potential impacts, mitigation could include underpinning structures, installation of recharge wells (for dewatering), modifying construction techniques (such as the choice of pile type or installation equipment), replacement grouting (for tunneling), or re-leveling and repair as appropriate. Updated information on potential settlement risks are discussed in Sections 4.10 and 4.17.11 of the Final SEIS, incorporating the results of additional geotechnical analysis and engineering design.

***PP-8. Cost-Effectiveness.***

**Due to the early stage of project development, the FTA measure for cost effectiveness was not used in the 2003 Draft SEIS and is only being provided for the preferred alternative in the Final SEIS. The cost-effectiveness analysis is inadequate. Benefits to new riders were not identified. In addition, the EIS provides misrepresentation of the analysis' results. Impacts of community opposition/litigation must be accounted for.**

A cost-effectiveness measure was chosen that could be used to compare route alternatives at the conceptual engineering stage of project development. Cost per rider was chosen as an effective way to compare route alternatives, because it responds to both cost and project ridership. Sound Transit disagrees with suggestions that cost-effectiveness should only be calculated on the basis of new riders. All transit riders will benefit from the improved reliability and travel time savings created by the North Link project. There is no more reason to discount the benefits to existing bus riders of a transit project than there is to discount the benefits to existing drivers of a road improvement project. Other suggestions, such as comparing full capital cost to one day's use are not consistent with standard economic practice. The benefits and use of the North Link project will extend over many decades and annualizing the cost and ridership of the project reflects the project's long-term usefulness. The cost estimates are for capital costs only. Administrative costs, such as for litigation, are not included and would not change the relative comparison of alternatives. Mitigation measures and other contingencies have been included in the cost estimates used for the cost-effectiveness analysis as described in Chapter 5 of the 2003 Draft SEIS. The North Link Final SEIS includes a presentation of the Federal Transit Administration New Start user benefit cost-effectiveness measure for University Link. The user benefit measure generally reflects travel time savings for transit riders. Use of the measure is now possible because of further design of the Preferred Alternative.

## **7.6.2 Segment A Common Comments**

### *AA-1. Comments on Segment A's Alignments and Profiles.*

**Light rail plans as adopted by voters in 1996 included all alignments and stations underground. The option for at-grade or elevated routes was one key reason why the first Regional Transit Authority plan was denied in 1995. All alternatives for at-grade or elevated routes are still strongly opposed by the majority of the public, yet remain as alternatives considered in the EIS. Analysis of these alternatives has cost tax payers additional money that should and could have gone towards other components of the project.**

*Sound Move*, which was approved by voters in 1996, described a light rail system that would connect major urban activity centers from Northgate to SeaTac, but it did not specify the vertical or horizontal alignment throughout the corridor. The North Link SEIS and the original 1999 Final EIS appropriately examine the environmental effects of a range of alternatives designed to meet the purpose and need of the North Link project. The background for the development of Segment A alternatives was provided in Section 2 of the Draft SEIS.

### *AA-2. Alternative A2.1b/c Impacts on Parklands/Historic Resources.*

**Because of the size of the footprint/area over Ravenna Boulevard, cutting of mature trees, expansion of shade area, the potential (temporary) loss of use of the bike path, and creation of the station, the SEIS should change the impact level on Ravenna Boulevard parkland due to Alternatives A2.1b and A2.1c from “low” to “high.”**

Sound Transit's conclusion regarding the level of impact to Ravenna Boulevard is supported by concurrence letters from the City of Seattle Parks Department and the State Historic Preservation Office; these letters are included in the Final SEIS Appendix A. Sound Transit's conclusion recognizes that localized impacts would occur where the guideway crosses over Ravenna Boulevard, but it appropriately also considers the overall effect on Ravenna Boulevard as a larger park resource. The bike route would be temporarily impacted and detours would be available. The existing conditions in the area, particularly the presence of I-5, are important factors in determining the relative level of effect that would occur to the resource. As the map on Figure 4-16.1 shows, the Boulevard extends considerably farther to the east and west of the existing I-5 crossing. The Draft SEIS appropriately noted the potential for a moderate degree of visual intrusion including loss of trees and shading, and that there could be restrictions for present recreational users of the median caused by the potential crossing by Alternatives A2.1b and A2.1c. Alternative A2.1c was identified as having a comparatively higher level of impact. The impacts to Ravenna Boulevard are also discussed in the 2003 Draft SEIS in Sections 4.4 (Visual and Aesthetic Quality) on page 4-35 and Section 4.15 (Historic and Archaeological Resources) on page 4-130.

### *AA-3. Alternatives A2.1b/c Neighborhood Impacts.*

**These alternatives would result in significant residential displacement. Construction of the 8th Avenue route alternatives would cause severe impacts to the character of the neighborhood stemming from construction noise, vibration, blocked views/light, increased traffic, and reduction of on-street parking.**

Sound Transit has identified the 12th Avenue route (A1.1) as the Preferred Alternative and will make a final decision on the project to be built after publication of the Final SEIS. Sound Transit's conclusion regarding the level of long-term impacts of Alternatives A2.1b and A2.1c to the neighborhood was described in Section 4.3 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, and is updated for the Final SEIS. The analysis considered factors such as change in quality, interaction, and accessibility to community resources (see pages 4-33 to 4-35). The analysis of neighborhood impacts is a cumulative assessment of the individual environmental effects of the alternatives, based on acquisitions and displacements, traffic, parking, noise and vibration, and visual and other impacts, all of which include specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts. Significant impacts were not identified in any of these environmental topic areas. Construction impacts to neighborhoods are addressed in Section 4.17. The analysis reported in Section 4.3 states that localized impacts would occur in several areas along the 8th Avenue alignments, including at the vent shaft, near the station area, and along I-5. However, the

relative level of impact to neighborhoods is based on the overall conditions expected for the Roosevelt neighborhood, which is considerably larger than the areas that would be most directly affected. The analysis also considers the substantial benefits to be provided by the light rail project, which would improve transit access and mobility to the Roosevelt neighborhood.

Specific discussion of the level of displacements is provided with Section 4.1 (Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations) on page 4-1 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, which noted that Alternative A2.1c would have the most residential displacements, and Alternative A1.1 would have the least. Mitigation measures for parties directly affected by acquisitions and displacements were provided in the 2003 Draft SEIS page 4-5. Section 4.2 (Land Use and Economics) notes that the acquisitions would affect clusters of homes along I-5, but this would not adversely affect the overall pattern of residential land uses in the area.

Parking impacts were discussed in Section 3 of the 2003 Draft SEIS (page 3-34) and in 4.17, but were not considered to be substantial. Parking to be used during construction would be primarily along the construction staging areas, where property acquisitions would also occur. Direct long-term impacts to parking are limited; relatively few spaces are displaced given overall supply, and the potential for hide-and-ride parking impacts can be managed to prevent adverse effects to neighborhoods. Increased traffic due to operation of the light rail station is expected to be minor, and overall access and circulation throughout the neighborhood would be relatively unaffected compared to No-Build as discussed in Section 3.3.2 of the 2003 Draft SEIS. Traffic during construction is also localized around station areas and the construction staging area. Construction traffic activity due to materials would be intermittent, and the most intensive activities would not occur during peak travel periods.

Visual and aesthetic impacts were discussed in Sections 4.4 and 4.17.5. Section 4.4, page 4-45, which notes that in some localized areas, the visual change due to the project may be high, but can be moderated by appropriate landscaping treatments or other measures. The level of change to views and aesthetic conditions also considers the existing presence of I-5 in the area. The light rail project would have a similar scale and character to the existing I-5 facility, and the resulting level of change would be moderate. Temporary lighting impacts for construction work, as described in Section 4.17.5, could be shielded to block direct views from residential areas.

Noise levels during construction would be within the levels allowed in the City noise ordinance or a noise variance would be obtained. Several noise abatement methods could be implemented as described in Section 4.17.7. Noise and vibration impacts from Alternatives 2.1b and c, as discussed in Section 4.6, would be localized and the number of properties impacted is low, given the larger number of residential properties in the immediate area. For the impacted properties, the impacts would be mitigated to reduce noise and vibration to levels that are not significant compared to the No-Build Alternative. Potential measures include sound walls at locations including the tunnel portal alternatives near NE 60th and NE 80th. Updated information is provided in the Final SEIS in Section 4.6.

#### ***AA-4. Northgate Future Development.***

**Segment A will not aid conversion of the Northgate area into an urban center where people work, reside, and shop. Rather, Segment A will turn the Northgate area into a giant adjunct parking lot.**

As discussed in Section 4.2 (Land Use and Economics), the introduction of light rail is consistent with and anticipated by the City of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan as well as neighborhood plans for the area. Updated information on the City of Seattle and King County Metro activities and plans in the area is provided in the Final SEIS. Sound Transit's project is designed to improve mobility and reduce reliance on the automobile by providing a connection between the Northgate area and other major high density employment and residential centers in the region. Sound Transit does not propose additional parking at the Northgate station, but rather proposes to replace parking displaced by the project alternatives. Further, the purpose of the light rail project is not to convert Northgate into an urban center. Northgate has already been designated a regional growth center through the actions of other parties, including the Puget Sound Regional Council in VISION 2020, and through comprehensive planning of the City and County as required by the Growth Management Act. Several supporting planning activities by the City of Seattle and King County Metro are currently underway; see Section 4.2 of the Final SEIS for an update.

***AA-5. Alternative A2.1b/c. Property Values.***

**Due to the numerous and significant impacts of at-grade or elevated alignments, property values in the neighborhood will be greatly reduced.**

Sections 4.2 (Land Use and Economics) and 4.3 (Neighborhoods) of the 2003 Draft SEIS and Final SEIS evaluate the degree of impact that would occur for properties adjacent to the light rail alignments. The analysis found that there would not be significant adverse effects to land use, economic activity, or neighborhoods. However, the SEIS has not speculated about either the positive or the potential adverse effects to property values, which typically involve a wide range of other factors.

***AA-6. Construction Impacts and Mitigation.***

**The Draft SEIS lacks details on proposed mitigation for the extensive and lengthy construction period.**

The 2003 Draft and Final SEIS identify potential mitigation measures for the construction impacts identified in Section 4.17. The mitigation measures are designed to minimize impacts, which are described for each element of the environment, and considered cumulatively for their potential to adversely impact land use, neighborhoods, and economic activity. It is also important to note that the natures of the impacts are based on conservative assumptions about construction activities, including assumptions that are on the high end for the anticipated duration and intensity of construction activities. In many locations, the duration of activity would likely be less than described. Also, the most intensive construction activities would occur intermittently during the construction period, and would grow less intensive as construction progresses. Sound Transit's mitigation program for the project is included as Appendix M to the Final SEIS.

***AA-7. Public Outreach.***

**The residents and tenants along the 8th Avenue alignment have not been adequately informed of the proposed alternatives.**

Sound Transit provided public notice of the initiation of the North Link project SEIS in October 2001. A public scoping period was held, including open houses in Segment A, to inform area residents and businesses of the project, even though scoping is not required for a supplemental document. Sound Transit also received a substantial number of comments from parties in the area. The 8th Avenue alignments are also similar to previously evaluated alternatives considered in the Central Link Final EIS in 1999, and additional planning for alternatives in Segment A has been underway throughout the intervening period. The North Link SEIS scoping process, which included the public notices about the start of the environmental process and descriptions of the alternatives to be evaluated, is discussed on page 2-20 of the 2003 Draft SEIS. The 2003 Draft SEIS was released in November of 2003, and made available online, at the Sound Transit office, and in multiple public libraries and neighborhood centers. Sound Transit also sent out mailers and held public meetings, and public hearings were also scheduled to gather public comment (see Appendix B of the 2003 Draft SEIS for public outreach). In addition to the scoping and open-house meetings, more than 50 other community and neighborhood events for groups and locations in Segment A are identified in Appendix B.

***AA-8. Impacts to Roosevelt High School.***

**Regarding Roosevelt High School, Sound Transit should thoroughly evaluate pedestrian access, truck traffic, on-street parking, and noise impacts related to construction activities of the Roosevelt Station.**

Potential impacts to public services, including Roosevelt High School, were discussed in Sections 4.13.2 (long-term impacts) and Section 4.17.13 (construction period impacts) of the 2003 Draft SEIS. This information was updated for the Preferred Alternative station at 12th Avenue NE in the 2005 Draft SEIS and is also incorporated within the Final SEIS in Section 4.17.

The station construction and its entrances would be near Roosevelt High School. Typical construction impacts, as described in the 2003 Draft SEIS for the original 12th Avenue Station at Roosevelt, would occur. This includes lane closures, parking loss, bus or transit stop relocation, congestion, and construction traffic on 12th Avenue NE.

Hide-and-ride issues for the Roosevelt Station area are anticipated to be low given existing restrictions on parking in the area. The Roosevelt commercial area, including NE 65th Street, is an active mixed-use area, and

the presence of the station is not likely to result in a major change in activity levels. The station's location is also not anticipated to conflict with transit or school bus loading areas, which are along the east side of the street. Minor revisions in transit stops have been identified for the station to improve connections with the station. These issues are discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final SEIS.

The south station entrance to the Roosevelt Station is on the west side of NE 12th Street, at NE 65th Street, which will allow patrons to cross at a signalized crosswalk. The north station entrance is on the west side of NE 12th Street, south of NE 67th Street, which does not have a painted crosswalk or signal, although crossings are allowed. The nearest crosswalk is at NE 68th Street. Sound Transit would work with the City of Seattle, Seattle Public Schools, and the neighborhood to determine the most appropriate treatments to provide for safe and effective pedestrians access at this location; options could include painted crosswalks or signals, street lighting, warning lights, or signage. These issues are also discussed in Chapter 3 of the Final SEIS.

Construction activities for the station would increase activity levels near the station, but impacts to school operations, students, or faculty are not expected. The lane closures would be confined to the west lane of NE 12th Street. Reductions in parking would be minor, as existing restrictions in both on-street and off-street parking in that area minimize the potential for unauthorized use of other public parking areas during construction. Although traffic delays may occur, construction traffic management plans will be coordinated with the school to minimize effects to school-related transport, particularly during the peak periods for the school. Noise, dust, dirt, and construction-related impacts, discussed previously in Section 4.17 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, will be minimized through the measures described in the 2003 Draft SEIS; however, the school buildings are not immediately adjacent to the construction area and are separated by 12th Avenue NE and a playing field. The intensity of construction impacts would lessen considerably with that distance, and the impacts are not expected to be at a level that would disrupt the function of the school.

#### ***AA-9. Impacts to the University Heights Community Center.***

**Special attention will be required if Sound Transit uses University Heights as a staging area because the City of Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board deemed the building historically significant in 1971. Use of this site will render the building virtually useless.**

Sound Transit is aware of the historic status of the University Heights School and has included this resource in the historic analysis in Section 4.15.1 of the 2003 Draft SEIS and Final SEIS. The Preferred Alternative avoids the use of the property for construction staging. However, temporary use of the University Heights Community Center as a staging area was designed not to adversely affect the historic character of the building. The potential displacement of the University Heights Community Center and its tenants was discussed in 2003 Draft SEIS Section 4.1 (Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations), 4.2 and 4.17.3 (Land Use and Economics, including construction), and 4.3 and 4.17.4 (Neighborhoods, including during construction). If Sound Transit ultimately requires the use of the University Heights Community Center as a staging area for the project, Sound Transit would negotiate with the District to address issues related to the use of the school district's property. However, long-term use of the property would be unaffected after the construction period ends.

#### ***AA-10. Farmers Market.***

**The 8th Avenue Alignments should not be considered due to the displacement of the Neighborhood Farmers Market. The Neighborhood Farmers Market is the largest farmers market in the state of Washington, served by 68 farmers, visited by over 100,000 shoppers, and grossing over \$1.3 million in sales annually. Relocation of the market remains impossible due to scheduling and size.**

The concerns about the displacement of the Neighborhood Farmers Market under Alternative A2.1b are reflected in the 2003 Draft and Final SEIS in several locations. Sound Transit has identified Alternative A1.1 as the Preferred Alternative, which would avoid displacing the market. In Sections 4.17.3 and 4.17.4 (pages 4-158 and 4-161 of the Draft SEIS), the construction impact to the market is noted, and alternatives to avoid the displacement of the market are identified. The potential difficulty of relocating the market is acknowledged in this section as well, and is identified as an adverse effect to the neighborhood.

### ***AA-11. Public Safety.***

**If consideration of the 8th Avenue alignment through a residential neighborhood persists, Sound Transit should address mitigating measures for potential increases in crime. Measures should be taken to ensure a safe and inviting pedestrian atmosphere.**

The 2003 Draft and Final SEIS do not conclude that there will be impacts due to an increase in crime in and around the light rail facilities. Rather, the document in Section 4.13.2 discusses studies that crime in transit facilities is directly related to crime in the surrounding areas. No conclusive patterns have been shown relating crime incidents to station access. However, along the 8th Avenue alignment, which is located along I-5, an existing restricted-access facility, the potential for increased crime is considered low. The alignment would be between the residential area and I-5. The document does state that light rail operation would likely require additional police and security staff and that security measures would include personnel who rove between stations whether contracted with law enforcement or private agencies or provided directly by Sound Transit.

### **7.6.3 Segment B Common Comments**

#### ***BB-1. Montlake Remote Vent Facility Alternatives.***

##### ***A. Why does a Montlake Route Require a Remote Vent Facility in the Montlake Area?***

**This common comment asked how Sound Transit had determined the need for and location of remote facility alternatives.**

The need for and characteristics of remote vent facilities and traction power substations were stated in Section 2.3.1 of the 2003 Draft SEIS. During normal operation, light rail tunnel projects require ventilation shafts and emergency access in case a fire or other emergency occurs in the tunnel. Sound Transit determined the potential location for the remote vent facilities considering the route alignment and system operating factors. These operating factors include speed and frequency, travel time, the distance to the next station or remote vent facility in either direction, and the length and depth of the tunnel. Sound Transit's maximum travel time for a Montlake remote vent facility was 2.5 minutes of travel time, and the travel time between the Capitol Hill station and Option C or the Preferred Alternative vent facility is estimated to be 2.4 minutes; Options A and B are slightly less. Substations for electrical power supply could be incorporated within the remote vent facilities as well; substations are needed as frequently as 1.5 miles from each other, depending on power supply demands for the trains.

As part of the development of alternatives for North Link, described in Section 2.8 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, Sound Transit conducted an alternative development and evaluation process for identifying the alternatives, including the remote vent facility components. For the Montlake routes, Sound Transit identified potential remote vent facility locations considering the operational criteria discussed above, topography and geology, accessibility, environmental impacts, constructibility, relative cost, and other factors. The tunnel alignment itself was also a limiting factor, due to the need to cross the Ship Canal and reach the Montlake or University of Washington Station while avoiding major utilities and other physical features. As a result, there were very few locations in the area that successfully met the criteria. In addition, much of the area is already heavily developed, with no parcels of substantial size available that were not already developed or anticipated for other uses. Farther to the south, the steeply sloping hillside of Capitol Hill represented a substantial engineering and cost constraint. At higher elevations, the combination of the steep slopes and the depth of the tunnel resulted in deep shaft vents that would be greater construction challenges and higher costs. Specific site options are discussed below.

##### ***B. Are There Other Alternatives to the Montlake Route Remote Vent Facility Options?***

**Many comments asked Sound Transit to reconsider other locations for the Montlake remote vent facilities that could avoid the use of private property. Many comments suggested the facility should be placed on public property. Alternative locations suggested included the State Route 520 right-of-way, Interlaken Park, Montlake playfield, Husky Stadium, arboretum, or near the Museum of History and Industry.**

**SR 520 Rights-of-Way.** Sound Transit and WSDOT have coordinated closely to develop their project alternatives in a manner that will meet each project's objectives while minimizing environmental impacts and avoiding potential engineering conflicts. Both projects are for essential public facilities that are needed to

address critical transportation concerns in the region. WSDOT has stated that the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project alternatives would require all the existing right-of-way owned by the state in the Montlake vicinity. It is also likely that some additional areas may be needed to accommodate one or more of the SR 520 alternatives currently under consideration, and no decision has been made on the project's Preferred Alternative. WSDOT is currently conducting conceptual engineering and preparing the EIS for the project. In the specific areas identified where there is open space today near the on- and off-ramps to SR 520 west of the Hop-In Market, WSDOT has proposed stormwater treatment facilities in the future. These areas would also be needed for construction staging and to avoid constraints on the SR 520 Bridge Replacement Project.

**Interlaken Park.** During early engineering for North Link, Sound Transit reviewed potential remote vent facility locations in Interlaken Park, but found that the topography limited the area available for necessary construction activities, limited facility design, added cost, and that the environmental impacts would be higher than for other alternatives. In addition to being a park property, Interlaken Park is eligible for listing on the National Historic Register (page 4-127 of the 2003 Draft SEIS), and it is part of the Lake Washington Bicycle Path. Stream and wetland resources were also present. The difficulties of construction, combined with the level of environmental impacts and the further restrictions under federal law regarding impacts to or uses of historic and parks properties under Section 4(f) (See Appendix H of the 2003 Draft SEIS for more information on Section 4[f]), were the primary factors in eliminating Interlaken Park sites from further consideration.

**Montlake Playfield.** The potential for a remote vent facility location in the Montlake Playfield was evaluated in response to suggestions received during the public comment period. The park sites were eliminated from further consideration, because the remote vent facility would disrupt recreational users and are adjacent to residences and would also involve the use of parks resources, which are protected by Section 4(f).

**Husky Stadium.** The University of Washington Station at the stadium site already features a vent facility and traction-powered substation (TPSS), which are required features for all stations. Sound Transit was able to redesign the station to eliminate the need for the TPSS in the Montlake area, but the project route still required the need for a vent facility south of SR 520.

**Other Locations.** Sound Transit conducted engineering and field investigations to identify potential remote vent facility locations, considering factors such as operational criteria, topography and geology, accessibility, environmental impacts, constructibility, cost, and other factors. The sites also had to be within a reasonable proximity to the tunnel route itself. Sites north of SR 520 would be undesirable due to the train travel time to the next remote vent facility location to the south, which would be at the Capitol Hill Station. Sound Transit's criterion for siting this vent is 2.5 minutes of run time, and travel times between the Capitol Hill station and vent Option C (the Preferred Alternative) is estimated to be 2.4 minutes. Options farther north would exceed the travel time criterion and would constrain the future capacity of the system. In addition, the Museum of History and Industry site is too far to the east of the alignment needed to reach the Montlake Station. The sharper curve required to reach a site at the Museum of History and Industry would be substantially more expensive and would involve an s-shaped configuration to return to the station location. Similarly, the Washington Arboretum would be too far to the east to be reasonably considered.

Potential sites farther south of Options A, B or C were also eliminated due to the rapidly increasing slope of Capitol Hill, which substantially increases the depth and cost required for the shaft. Please also see response to common comment BB-1A.

***BB-2. Remote Vent Facility Community Impacts.***

**The proposed Montlake remote vent facility locations (Options A and B) do not fit into the context of a dense historic neighborhood and will significantly impact the community. Overall noise, vibration, land use, visual, transportation, construction, settlement, and cumulative impacts for the proposed locations of the remote vent facility have not been adequately addressed. Locating a remote vent facility (with or without residential displacement) in the Montlake neighborhood will still add an unacceptable degree of noise impacts to the neighborhood. Noise, air pollution, and increased traffic (due to construction), will drive property values downward, and lower the amount of property taxes the State collects. What are the specific remote vent facility design criteria with respect to size, hours of operation, noise levels during operation, air quality during operation, and frequency, duration, and noise levels during testing?**

In response to public comments and concerns about impacts of the vent in Montlake, Sound Transit developed the Preferred Alternative, which is a refined design and site layout at the Hop-In Market site, avoiding or reducing many of the common concerns, including removal of the neighborhood market.

The level of long-term impacts to the neighborhood of the vent options are described in Section 4.3 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, and the Final SEIS has an updated discussion. However, the conclusions of the 2003 Draft SEIS remain valid. The analysis considered whether the remote vent facility would result in a substantial change in quality, interaction, and accessibility to community resources (see pages 4-33 to 4-35). The analysis of neighborhood impacts is a cumulative assessment of the individual environmental effects of the alternatives, based on acquisitions and displacements, traffic, parking, noise and vibration, and visual and other impacts, all of which include specific mitigation measures to reduce impacts. Significant impacts were not identified in any of these environmental topic areas, and the area affected remains a small portion of the overall Montlake community. Construction impacts to neighborhoods, including Montlake, are addressed in Section 4.17. Sound Transit is committed to working with the community during final design as described in Section 4.4.2. The specific findings by environmental topic are discussed below.

Transportation and parking impacts due to the remote vent facility were discussed in Section 3 of the Draft SEIS (page 3-36) as well as in Section 4.17; long-term impacts were minor to none, and construction impacts were identified but not considered substantially adverse to the overall neighborhood. Parking to be used during construction would be primarily along the construction staging areas. Direct long-term impacts to parking are limited; relatively few spaces are displaced given overall supply. Although trucks would be traveling to and from the site, overall access and circulation throughout the neighborhood would be maintained. Construction traffic activity due to spoils removal and delivery of materials would be intermittent, and the most intensive activities would not occur during peak travel periods.

The property acquisitions and related residential or business displacements required for the remote vent facility options were provided in Section 4.1 (Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations). Mitigation measures for parties directly affected by acquisitions and displacements were stated in the 2003 Draft SEIS page 4-5.

Section 4.2 (Land Use and Economics) considered the level of acquisitions, the presence of the remote vent facility structure, and the minor effects of the facility operation. The analysis found that neither the residential acquisitions nor the displacement of a business would adversely affect the overall pattern of land uses in the area and that the operations of the remote vent facility would not impair the continued use of adjacent properties.

There is no evidence to support a conclusion that a vent facility would depress property values. The removal of a property from government tax rolls is considered in the review of economic impacts, but would be negligible in terms of overall tax revenues.

Visual and aesthetic effects of the remote vent facility were discussed in Section 4.4 (pages 4-45 and 4-46), and the discussion has been updated in the Final SEIS. The section notes that the structure could contrast with the visual character of the neighborhood. However, the visual effects of the remote vent facility structure would be very localized, and would remain similar in scale to the nearby properties, including residences. The effects also can be moderated by appropriate landscaping treatments or other measures such as designing structures compatible with the character of the area (see page 4-46 of the 2003 Draft SEIS).

The affected properties and sites are not historic. The environmental review for WSDOT's SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project has indicated that an area of the Montlake neighborhood may be eligible for listing as a district in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The boundaries and adjacent properties were also reviewed by Sound Transit's environmental analysis. The district definition includes residences to the east of Montlake Place E and north of SR 520, which would be within 200 feet of the vent shaft, as well as areas between SR 520 and the Montlake Cut. The vent facility behind the Hop-In Market would not be in the district, would not be visible from most parts of the historic district, and would not otherwise alter the historic setting or affect the character of the district. No adverse effect to the district is anticipated.

Noise and vibration impacts from the construction of vent facilities are discussed in Section 4.17.7. Long-term noise impacts from the remote vent facilities are not anticipated. Vibration impacts are also not anticipated either from the remote vent facility or from the tunnel below. The operating fans within the remote vent facilities are designed to move a substantial amount of air in a short period of time. However, they are for emergency use and would not run regularly. Periodic testing would occur to ensure the fans, alarms, and other emergency equipment are operational. The testing is expected to normally take place once a month during daytime hours and should not take longer than an hour or two for the entire testing session. The loudest items, the primary fans, are normally only run for approximately 10 minutes during the test sessions. Fan operation noise levels were initially expected to range from 75 to 85 dBA at the nearest property line; however, implementation of additional noise attenuation treatments could reduce noise levels. Section 25.08.530 of the Seattle Noise Ordinance states that "Sounds created by emergency equipment and emergency work necessary in the interests of law enforcement or of the health, safety or welfare of the community" are exempt at all times. Testing is required to assure public safety.

The emergency vent fans are normally housed in a cinder-block or concrete housing with noise-reducing louvers installed on a side of the structure facing away from noise-sensitive receivers. Ventilation shafts in the Portland light rail system are located less than 50 feet from a residence, and the operator has never received any noise complaints during the testing process. Construction noise levels during the daytime hours, for sensitive buildings nearby (residences), are anticipated to be between 62 and 74 dBA, which is under the daytime noise limit of 82 dBA. Nighttime (10 PM to 7 AM) maximum noise levels would be lower, ranging from 35 to 60 dBA, and typical noise levels for a given one-hour construction period would be about 2 dBA less than the maximum levels. The existing ambient levels in the area have been measured at 55 dBA. The project construction levels would be less than the anticipated nighttime maximum limit, which is expected to be 60 dBA for a typical one-hour period, and 70 dBA for the maximum.

Although there would be vibration from some construction activities, it is unlikely that any structural damage would occur. Additional detail on construction noise is provided in Section 4.17.7 in the Final SEIS. Also, a vibration monitoring program would be in place prior to construction. The program would track vibration levels whenever construction was near vibration sensitive structures, and mitigation measures would be available to minimize vibration impacts.

Air quality or air pollution impacts would not be anticipated from operation. The system would be electrically powered and would not generate emissions. The ventilation shafts are provided in the rare case of a fire or other emergency occurring in the tunnel, and the fans are large and capable of moving a substantial amount of air in a short period of time. However, it should also be noted that the trains and the materials in the tunnel are designed to have a very low potential for fire. Precise emergency procedures and necessary equipment would be determined during final design. In the event of a fire, smoke and other emissions would be expected to rise and not affect neighboring properties. If nearby properties were affected they would be evacuated in a manner similar to the response when any individual property or area experiences smoke or fire. Other comments raised concerns about terrorism or the presence of other agents in the air. Sound Transit would design the system to maximize public safety and minimize risks as discussed in Section 4.13 of the 2003 Draft SEIS and Final SEIS. Sound Transit's Link Fire/Life Safety Committee would address the details of fire fighting, emergency medical, and other safety and security issues related to the tunnel, similar to the procedures already developed for the Beacon Hill Tunnel in the Initial Segment.

### ***BB-3. Remote Vent Facility – Hop-In Market.***

**The long-standing, family-owned Hop-In Market is one of two local grocery stores that serve the local community. Displacement of this market eliminates convenient access to necessities for a large**

**portion of the community, including the elderly and disabled. Removal of the market will increase traffic. Loss of the market would result in less state and local tax money. The parking lot of the Hop-In Market provides multiple community functions. Friends and family congregate in the parking lot to carpool to school, work, and extracurricular activities; Husky fans use the lot for parking and as a supply venue, and the parking lot also serves as a retail space for Christmas trees.**

Sound Transit recognizes the popularity of the Hop-In Market and its contribution to the neighborhood. The 2003 Draft SEIS identifies and evaluates the adverse effects that would result from the implementation of Option C, which would require acquisition of the property where the Hop-In Market is located. The direct impacts are primarily due to the acquisition of the property and the displacement of the business and the employees. Although loss of the market would result in less state and local taxes, the reduction is minor considering overall tax revenues, as stated in Section 4.2 of the 2003 Draft SEIS. Sound Transit acknowledges that the Hop-In Market serves as a location for various community functions and this has been noted in the Final SEIS section on neighborhood impacts. Secondary uses such as additional supply for Husky Games or seasonal uses, which are not the primary uses, and the levels of impacts are covered by the discussion in the Final SEIS. In response to comments, Sound Transit identified a refinement to the vent facilities previously examined in the 2003 Draft SEIS. The option is at the Hop-In Market site, but reduces the footprint and avoids market displacement.

#### ***BB-4. Remote Vent Facility - St. Demetrios.***

**Vent location Option A would place parking pressure on the St. Demetrios Church as well as the community.**

Sound Transit recognizes that parking supply issues are an important consideration for the Montlake area. The church has provided statements about the efforts it has made to minimize its own parking and congestion impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. Section 4.17 of the 2003 Draft SEIS (page 4-156), notes that the remote vent facility construction would displace 27 spaces in the church parking area. The loss of parking and revisions to access for the church during the 2 years of construction would reduce supply during the church's peak usage periods, and would require replacement parking or other management approaches to maintain accessibility for the church and to avoid spillover impacts to neighborhoods. This could include satellite parking or shuttles to other nearby locations, although this would be less convenient for churchgoers than on-site parking.

#### ***BB-5. Settlement Vibration/Soils.***

**The Montlake community is largely composed of a collection of 1920's brick Tudor revival homes. Vibration impacts on the structural stability of these types of homes and geologic soils beneath have not been adequately addressed.**

Sound Transit recognizes that the homes in the Montlake area include a substantial number of residences from the 1920's and older. Although other homes in the area are of historic stock, other area properties collectively and individually do not rise to the level of distinction necessary for inclusion in the NRHP. Affected properties are not in an area that has been determined to be a historic district (see response BB-2). For all properties, regardless of historic status, Sound Transit is committed to minimizing the potential risks of settlement or vibration during tunneling. Given the tunnel depth, the anticipated risk of settlement or vibration is low. The 2003 Draft SEIS, Section 4.17, disclosed that the potential for settlement could exist for some properties, particularly where the tunnel or excavation was shallow or in close proximity to foundations, and where soil conditions were loose, which does not apply to homes in the area. Section 4.17 also identified the mitigation measures available to minimize potential settlement effects and to provide corrective action if any occurs. Pre- and post-construction surveys of adjacent structures and a construction monitoring program will be established, including surface surveying and subsurface instrumentation. Depending upon the severity of the potential settlement impacts determined during final design, mitigation could include underpinning structures, installation of recharge wells (for dewatering), modifying construction techniques (such as the choice of pile type or installation equipment), replacement grouting (for tunneling), or re-leveling and repair as appropriate. Updated information on potential settlement risks are discussed in Sections 4.10 and 4.17.11 of the Final SEIS, incorporating the results of additional geotechnical analysis and preliminary engineering. This

analysis found that the Preferred Alternative had a low potential for vibration impacts in the area, both for short-term settlements and for long-term operations.

#### ***BB-6. Businesses Near Broadway East.***

##### **Concern for property owners (businesses) near Broadway, and due to potential cut-and-cover construction on Capitol Hill.**

The concerns of businesses about disruptions due to the construction of a Capitol Hill Station were reflected in the 2003 and 2005 Draft SEIS documents, and updated information is provided in the Final SEIS. The 2003 Draft SEIS and Final SEIS discussion of construction impacts included all aspects of the environment and address impacts to Broadway businesses. Section 4.17.7 (page 4-169) of the 2003 Draft SEIS identified the concerns, including disruption of access, noise, dust, loss of parking, and the potential for lower levels of activity if potential customers chose to avoid the area. The 2003 Draft SEIS also characterized the business impacts as higher for the Broadway option because of its impacts on Broadway itself. As discussed in Section 4.17.3 on page 4-159 of the 2003 Draft SEIS, cut-and-cover construction on Broadway, one of the most business-intensive arterials on Capitol Hill, would affect not only the businesses immediately adjacent to the construction area, but also would affect traffic and circulation to the larger area. The Preferred Alternative, which was discussed in Section 3.1.2 of the 2003 Draft SEIS and in Section 4.17 of the Final SEIS, describe construction actions in more detail for a revised layout of the Nagle Option.

#### ***BB-7. First Hill***

##### **Is the First Hill Station justified? How would construction impact the residents and businesses on First Hill?**

Sound Transit's Preferred Alternative does not include a First Hill Station, although it does provide benefits to serve parts of the First Hill area. The Sound Transit Board will make a final decision on the project alternative to be built after publication of the Final SEIS. The purpose of the North Link project is to "...reduce costs and construction risks compared to the original Segment B route selected by the Sound Transit Board in 1999, and provide a cost-effective solution that maximizes light rail ridership given available resources." Serving high-density urban centers such as First Hill and Capitol Hill helps to maximize light rail ridership. The area already provides substantial employment, including major employers such as Swedish, Virginia Mason, Providence and Harborview medical centers. Employment in the First Hill station area alone is expected to increase 58 percent by 2030, housing is expected to grow 72 percent, and population is expected to grow 16 percent (see the discussion in Section 4.2.2 and Appendix P4.2 of the 2003 Draft SEIS). As noted in the 2003 Draft SEIS, location of a transit station in the First Hill neighborhood (Alternatives B1.A, B1.D and B1.G) would be consistent with the First Hill Neighborhood Plan and City Comprehensive Plan, which designates First Hill as an Urban Center.

The 2003 Draft SEIS discussion of construction impacts addresses all aspects of the environment. In Section 4.17.7 (page 4-169), the 2003 Draft SEIS discloses that noise impact potential was high. This would primarily be a concern for residences, which are considered more sensitive to noise. Mitigation measures including equipment choice, acoustical treatments, and restricting the hours of operation for equipment were discussed in Section 4.17.7 of the 2003 Draft SEIS. Business impacts are also identified, including the potential disruption to access, parking, and circulation, although Sound Transit will maintain access to all businesses that are adjacent to the project area; properties with businesses that would be displaced by construction staging or by permanent facilities are identified in the 2003 Draft SEIS in Section 4.1. The Final SEIS provides additional analysis, particularly of nighttime noise, including minimum and maximum noise levels for nearby receivers, and a discussion of potential mitigation measures.

#### ***BB-8. Nagle Place.***

##### **What are the impacts of the Nagle Station on parklands and historic resources? The 4(f) evaluation was inadequate. Evaluation of impacts to the Chinese scholar tree was inadequate. Site characterization and traffic impacts to Cal Anderson Park were inadequate.**

Letters of concurrence with Sound Transit's findings about the park have been provided by the City of Seattle and the State Historic Preservation Office, see Appendix A. The 2003 Draft SEIS identified the impacts of the Nagle Place Station option to historic or parkland resources in Sections 4.15, 4.16, and 4.17. This included an evaluation of the effects to the Chinese scholar tree, which was discussed in Section 4.6 as a

visual and aesthetic feature, and in Section 4.16, Parklands. These discussions indicate that the tree could be impacted and that Sound Transit proposes to relocate the tree. However, it is also important to note that the tree does not possess special status as a historic landmark feature. In addition, the Section 4(f) evaluation in Appendix H focused specifically on the adverse effects to parklands and historic resources, and appropriately defined impacts and provided the discussion required at this stage of the EIS process. Please see the Final SEIS, which has been updated to provide additional information regarding the historic status of Cal Anderson Park, the Preferred Alternative for Capitol Hill (which now avoids use of the park), and the Section 4(f) evaluation.

***BB-9. Montlake Station.***

**This station should be underground, have proper bike facilities, be closer to SR 520 for better bus connectivity, and be a mixed-use facility having other businesses (e.g., convenience store, coffee shop).**

A Montlake Station to the south of the locations currently proposed would be less effective in meeting the project's purpose and need, which is to construct and operate a light rail system connecting the region's major activity centers, including the University District and downtown Seattle. The Montlake/Rainier Vista Station and the Preferred Alternative University of Washington Station both include covered bike facilities, providing covered storage and room for expansion. The University District is a major travel market with a high demand for transit use and substantial plans for long-range growth in population and employment. Stations farther to the south of the alternatives currently under consideration would increase the distance that riders would need to travel from the University of Washington to access the system (and reduce the attractiveness of using light rail). Although the Preferred Alternative University of Washington Station would effectively serve patrons north of SR 520, it would also be accessible to users from the SR 520 Montlake Flyer stop and points south. The University of Washington Station is located southwest of Husky Stadium and within 0.5 mile of the existing Montlake Flyer stop at SR 520. The traffic analysis and ridership forecasts estimate that most riders at the Montlake/Rainier Vista or University of Washington Station would have origins and destinations north of SR 520. In addition, Sound Transit and King County Metro provide high-quality express bus service between the Eastside and downtown Seattle and between the Eastside and the University District. There are not currently plans to truncate those services and force a transfer, which would not improve travel times or convenience for most patrons. As part of the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, WSDOT has considered options to improve access and connectivity for the Montlake Flyer stop, including the potential for a direct ramp from the freeway to the intersection of Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street, and other new interchange options. The SR 520 EIS is expected to be issued in May 2006. Comments about proximity to retail are noted; Section 4.2 of the SEIS rated the area as having low potential for other redevelopment, but also noted that the stadium, greater campus and University of Washington Medical Center were major land uses to be served.

***BB-10. University District Station Alternatives.***

**The feasibility of the Modified Montlake Route (Preferred Alternative) connecting to a northern University-District station at Brooklyn south of NE 45th Street and/or the NE 45th Street station (NE 45th Street and 15th Avenue) should have been explored in the Addendum.**

Alternative B3.D, connecting the Montlake/Rainier Vista Station to the station located at NE 45th Street and 15th Avenue NE, was considered in the 2003 Draft SEIS. The Modified Montlake Route evaluation in the Addendum did not include that specific combination. As noted in Section 1 of the Addendum, the purpose of the Addendum was to address the concerns of the University of Washington related to the impacts of the Montlake route and station at Rainier Vista. The suggested alternatives remain within the range of alternative combinations considered in the Final SEIS. The Preferred Alternative could be connected with any of the north University District station alternatives considered in the SEIS including the other Brooklyn options or the NE 45th Station.