Thank you for your comments describing the cultural importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. See Section 2.5.1 for a description of the refined Segment A alternatives that avoid displacing the church.

The Seattle Latvian Lutheran congregation is experiencing a feeling of deja vu. Yet again it has become a possibility that our church and community center will be taken from us, as it was 44 years ago. For the older members—this is the place they built with their hands, volunteering their time, after work and on weekends. Built not only with brick and mortar, but also with hopes and dreams—a center for their children and grandchildren, so that they too could learn about their Latvian heritage.

In the 42 years since we are in our present location, this has become our Latvian church home. It’s where we gather on Sundays to worship in the language of our heart—the only place in Seattle, where services are held in Latvian. And, since our community has now grown to include many “adopted Latvians” who many not speak the language, but do feel at home—we also have services once a month in English.

It’s the spiritual home to which our children and grandchildren return for Christmas and Easter. It’s where we celebrate the birth and baptism of our little ones. (Next Sunday, we will be baptizing Kevin Erik, whose mother was also baptized in our church—a continuity that adds richness of meaning for both parents and grandparents!)

It’s where we rejoice with young couples (and occasionally, not so young) as they set out on the journey of marriage—and where we mourn those whose life journey has come to an end, in church, our family home.

I speak for all of us—the founding members who built our church, their children who are now bringing their own children here, as well as our dear “adopted” Latvians: it is our hope and our prayer that this time it won’t be deja vu, that Sound Transit will find a way to let us remain in our church home that is so important to our lives.

Sincerely,

Pastor Deina Cilnis
Thank you for your concerns about the potential displacement of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and for highlighting its significance to the region’s Baltic community. Following the Draft EIS, the Sound Transit Board directed Sound Transit to develop a Preferred Alternative that would avoid displacing the church. The Final EIS describes the additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE and avoid the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained, although a portion of land on the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative and other at-grade alternatives. Elevated alternatives would also require a portion of the church property.

Several sections in the Final EIS have been updated to address these changes: Section 2.5.1 describes the Preferred Alternative and the refinements in other alternatives for Segment A; Section 4.1 describes the acquisition impacts; Section 4.4 describes impacts to community facilities and neighborhoods. In addition, Appendix F presents revised conceptual engineering plans for the refined Segment A alternatives; Appendix I-4.1 contains detailed maps and tables concerning acquisition, displacement, and relocation requirements for each Segment A alternative, and Appendix G has visual simulations.
Thank you for providing signatures regarding opposition to Alternatives C1 and C2. Per the request of signatories, the signatures have not been included in the Final EIS.

Attached are approximately 1,800 signatures on petitions against Routes C1 and C2. There are more petitions against C1, only because our group, Save Seward Park, did not unite with the residents and business owners against C2 until after the Sound Transit Meeting on August 21.

When we petitioned, we used the comparison chart (Chapter 5, Table 5-4 Comparison of Segment C Alternatives) and the map (Summary, Figure 8-8, Alternatives C1, C2, and C3) from the DEIS so that people would understand what they were signing and had extra copies available as hand-outs. (See attached documents.) Almost without exception, the signers said that C3 was "the way to go"; "a no brainer"; "why are the other two routes even in the picture?" These are a few examples of their pro C3 comments.

We also told the people who signed the petition that their information would be sent only to the Sound Transit Board because many people expressed concern about how their information would be used.

If you have questions, I can be reached at (425) 776-5374.

Very truly yours,

Maryellen Walsh

Enclosures (Comparison Chart, Map and Petitions - 181 pages with app. 1,800 signatures)

Cc: Lynnwood City Council (Comparison Chart and Map only)
    Save Seward Park and Wetlands Group
Please note that the majority of patrons for most stations would be arriving via transit, walking or biking, but parking is still expected as part of a solution that attracts patrons who might otherwise make the trip on congested highways.

The parking supply levels currently proposed reflect continued projections showing demand for parking as one element of an effective multimodal access plan, consistent with Sound Transit's adopted System Access Policy. Even with potential redevelopment in station areas, the project is being designed to serve the larger north corridor area, which is densely developed, largely residential and constitutes a large population that uses park and rides and transit today to reach jobs and destinations at the regional centers in the north and south, including downtown Seattle, Northgate and Lynnwood.

The plan for transit service connections to stations will be refined in coordination with partner transit agencies and local jurisdictions as the project approaches the start of operation; in King County, this planning would be led by King County Metro. The project's current transit integration plan for the project anticipates frequent local services connecting to the stations, most of which connect to other activity centers east or west of I-5, but circulators could be considered.

Comment noted.
There is no "party of record" designation for this project. Instead, interested parties are encouraged to sign up to receive periodic project updates and information disseminated by email. Sound Transit has added Patricia Sumption’s and Janet Way’s email addresses to the project update list.

September 23, 2013

Sound Transit Board
e/o Roger Iwata
Union Station
401 S Jackson St
Seattle, WA 98104

Re: Lynwood Link Light Rail Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Iwata and Sound Transit Board members:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS for Lynwood Link Light Rail Project. Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund hereby requests “party of record” status with legal standing in this matter, and also requests party of record status and legal standing for its board members, Janet Way and Patricia Sumption.

Although Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund was present and made oral comments on the Lynwood Link Light Rail project in April 2012, we did not receive notice of this opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. For that reason we were scrambling to get these comments written by the deadline. Please make sure Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund stays in your records this time.

We request “party of record” status with legal standing in this matter

Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund (TCLDF) is a non-profit organization begun to provide grassroots support to protect Thornton Creek, its tributaries, and their ecosystem. TCLDF was incorporated in 1999. Its board and members are composed of citizens who live within the Thornton Creek watershed and beyond. These folks are concerned about the possible negative effects of the proposed North Corridor Transit Project and Light Rail Station area.

It is important to TCLDF that concerns of this and other neighborhood and citizens are heard, along with those of governments and businesses. TCLDF has worked in the past to accomplish goals that protect Thornton Creek and still accommodate other stakeholders and competing needs. We worked hard to bring all sectors to the table when we sought to daylight part of Thornton Creek south of the Northgate Mall and our efforts resulted in a project which included retail, condominiums and apartments, the daylighted creeks, a small park, and parking facilities for the adjacent Metro Transit station.
Sound Transit recognizes the importance of Thornton Creek and its associated wetlands. None of the alternatives would entail in-water work in Thornton Creek. Sound Transit also is designing the project to minimize the potential for construction impacts and for permanent facilities to interfere with possible future fish habitat restoration projects, including at Thornton Creek. Please see Section 4.8.6 Mitigation Measures in the Ecosystems section of the Final EIS. This section discusses Sound Transit’s policy on ecosystems mitigation, calls for avoiding environmentally sensitive resources where possible, and requires mitigation to achieve no net loss of ecosystem function and acreage. The project’s final design and permitting processes will also provide opportunities for interested parties to review design proposals and make comments.

The Draft EIS did not find a broad set of unavoidable and significant adverse effects that cannot be mitigated. The Draft EIS included a review of potential adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative effects in all topic areas required under NEPA and SEPA, and the Draft EIS has been subjected to the review of the public, including other resource agencies and jurisdictions. The Final EIS has further detail on Sound Transit’s mitigation commitments for the Preferred Alternative and potential mitigation for other alternatives. The Summary section S.10 discusses areas where unavoidable adverse effects may remain after mitigation, and these would primarily be related to the removal of mature vegetation and trees in areas to be occupied by the guideway. The project would not directly lead to overbuilding or over-densification, as any other proposed plans or developments not allowed by currently adopted plans would require additional approvals by local jurisdictions.

Sound Transit remains open to suggestions for minimizing impacts and providing mitigation. It will also continue to explore ways to reduce impacts through final design and permitting. In conjunction with the

Lynnwood Link Extension
2013 Draft EIS Comments and Responses
permit processes, Sound Transit will provide further opportunities to involve the public, including interested parties such as the TCLDF.

C-038-004
Please see responses to Paramount Park Neighborhood Group's comments C-033-001 through C-033-024.

comment letter. Those comments parallel what Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund would have written.

Please include our comments in the hearing record, and consider them in your administrative review and notify us of any and all meetings, hearings or updates on this proposed project.

We incorporate by reference, our original oral scoping comments at the April 23, 2012 hearing and all of the comment letters received at that time. We also incorporate by reference all documents and comment letters submitted to date on the DEIS process.

Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, knowing how important it is to have Stakeholders from all sectors involved for best results, is looking forward to working with the Sound Transit Board and other entities that will be work on the implementation of this planning effort.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Sumpston, board member,
Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund
16510 – 11th Avenue NE,
Seattle, WA 98125
206-525-1708
September 23, 2013

Lauren Swift, Lynnwood Link Extension DEIS
Sound Transit
401 South Jackson Street
Seattle, Washington 98104

Re: Lynnwood Link Extension Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments

Dear Ms. Swift,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Lynnwood Link Extension.

Transportation Choices Coalition is a statewide nonprofit organization working to bring Washingtonians more and better transportation choices. We view this project and all projects that move light rail further north as a vital component of the Central Puget Sound’s future regional transportation infrastructure, providing a fast, reliable, economically and environmentally sustainable way for our growing population to reach homes, jobs and destinations. The Lynnwood extension will be an economic development engine, dramatically improving access throughout the region and stimulating additional public and private investments in Seattle, Shoreline, Montlake Terrace, Edmonds and Lynnwood. Finally, we hope that the introduction of high-capacity transit will maximize existing, and catalyze new, vibrant neighborhoods and urban centers, thereby creating great places for people to live and work.

In order to achieve these long-term goals, Lynnwood system alignment and station siting decisions must maximize the potential for meaningful Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) throughout the alignment. These vibrant neighborhood and urban centers—providing a complete array of amenities, housing and transportation choices, in proximity to high-capacity transit—have demonstrated countless long-term social and environmental benefits and are a central strategy to accommodating growth in a sustainable manner in our region. In addition, system alignment and station siting decisions must minimize the short-term and long-term environmental and social impacts of construction of the system.

We understand that reduced sales tax revenue and an agency wide shortfall may push you to look at up-front cost saving opportunities in the system design and construction. However these short-term cost saving measures should not compromise the potential benefits of the system by limiting long-term access and ridership of the system. It is imperative that the Lynnwood Link project optimizes access within and between urban centers, as promised in the overwhelmingly approved ST2 package in November 2008.

Based on these considerations, we make the following comments on the DEIS:

[Comment text follows]
Your reasons for preferring three stations in Segment A, as featured in Alternatives A10 and A11, are noted. The Preferred Alternative has stations at NE 145th Street and NE 185th Street and considers an option for a 130th Street station.

Your preference for Alternative B2A due to its two stations is noted. The Final EIS considers an option to the Preferred Alternative for a second station.
Thank you for your comments describing the cultural importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. Please see Section 2.5.1 of the Final EIS for a description of the refined Segment A alternatives that avoid displacing the church.

September 12, 2013

Sound Transit:
Draft EIS Comments c/o Lauren Swift
401 S. Jackson St.,
Seattle, WA 98104

Along with other members of the Washington State Latvian community, I am very concerned about the future of our church and community center because of the impact that the Light Rail extension north to Lynnwood will have on our facility.

We have at the center a library with several thousand volumes of Latvian books and journals. The library serves the entire community: older people who feel the need to read in their native language; younger people who want to learn about Latvian authors and Latvia’s history; and children in Latvian school, who are studying the Latvian language and learning about the culture of their parents and grandparents.

The library is a source of reading material for our Latvian Book Club, which meets regularly throughout the year. By donating not insubstantial sums to the Baltic Studies fund each time we meet, the Book Club supports the Baltic Studies program in the Scandinavian Department at the University of Washington. UW officials have consistently expressed their gratitude for the great support from the Latvian community.

Each year our Latvian library ships hundreds of books by Latvian authors living in the west to libraries and schools in Latvia. These books were not available, and indeed forbidden, to readers in Latvia during the 50 years of communist occupation.

If we lose the Latvian Center, the library will cease to exist and our community will be deprived of the strong link to its cultural heritage that books provide. We ask you to do everything possible to let us keep the church and center.

Sincerely,

Dr. Vaira Pelekiš-Christopher
Librarian
Seattle Latvian Community Center
Thank you for your concerns about the potential displacement of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and for highlighting its significance to the region’s Baltic community, including the Seattle Latvian School. The Sound Transit Board directed Sound Transit to explore a Preferred Alternative that would avoid displacing the church. Since the publication of the Draft EIS in June 2013, additional engineering was undertaken to reduce adverse effects on the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church property and facilities. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall (also called the cultural center). Access to the property and its functions have been maintained. Several sections in the environmental document have been updated to address these changes including: Section 2.5.1 describes the refined alternatives for Segment A; Section 4.1 describes the acquisition impacts; Section 4.4 describes impacts to community facilities and neighborhoods; Appendix F presents revised conceptual engineering plans for the refined Segment A alternatives; Appendix I-4.1 contains detailed maps and tables concerning acquisition, displacement, and relocation requirements for each Segment A alternative.

The church building was evaluated as a noise and vibration-sensitive property, as discussed in section 4.7 Noise and Vibration, and further detailed in the noise and vibration technical report. The technical report details noise levels at the church for existing conditions and for future years with and without the project. Sound Transit is replacing the existing noise wall with a higher noise wall, in part for the church but also to mitigate the residential properties around the church. As a result, there would be no remaining impacts to the church and the outside noise levels are predicted to be similar to existing noise levels.

Construction of the light rail project near the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church would take approximately 1 to 2 years. Access to the
We urge the transit commission to work closely with the Latvian and Northgate communities to find a solution that allows continued access to the building and mitigates all impacts so that our School can continue operating successfully. Impacts to the school from the light rail include, but are not limited to, noise coming from the tracks during outdoor time, vibration, and lack of parking in the event any of the alternatives result in reduction in parking. In addition, Sound Transit should plan to relocate the school temporarily during construction since a closure of the school for any period would be disruptive to the children and the education we provide.

While school is primarily on Saturday mornings, we also have several events that are held on weekend evenings with adults and community members present. If parking is severely limited, this will impact our ability to hold these events.

Thank you in advance for reviewing our school's comments and taking them into consideration when considering this expansion of mass transit.

Sincerely,

Ann-Marie Petersons

church and community center buildings would be maintained during construction, and parking supply would be maintained as much as possible, although, access or parking areas may temporarily shift as the realigned access roadway is developed. During final design and construction planning, and throughout the construction period, Sound Transit will coordinate with the church and the school to minimize impacts on church and cultural center buildings and their related activities and functions.
Sound Transit appreciates receiving these documents from your events. Many of these components are discussed in the Draft EIS. During final design, Sound Transit will work with local jurisdictions and offer opportunities for public involvement as the detailed design of the station continues. The Sound Transit project does not yet define commercial or recreational space in the facilities, although Sound Transit does have a Transit Oriented Development policy as described in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS, and is open to transit-oriented development partnerships.
Thank you for the suggestions on transit service and access features for the stations. As described in the EIS, Sound Transit developed preliminary station access plans in coordination with King County Metro, Community Transit, WSDOT and the local jurisdictions. This included a transit integration plan addressing potential changes to transit service to serve the stations. However, specific changes to routes and services would be made by each of the local transit agencies in a public planning process that would occur prior to system opening. Each of the stations include pedestrian and bicycle access features, and where streets are altered or reconstructed for the project, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are included consistent with local jurisdictional plans and standards.

Summary of Ideas from TOD Event for the Korean Community

On July 11, 2013 about 60 members from the Korean Community attended an event at the Shoreline Conference Center convened by Senior Services and facilitated by Yun Sook Kim, State Representative Cindy Ryu provided opening remarks and connected Senior Services to the Korean Community. The event was made possible by an Equity Grant from the Growing Transit Communities Project administered by Impact Capital. King County Council Member Rod Dembowski, Shoreline City Council Members Chris Eggen, Chris Roberts and Jesse Salomon attended the event. Successful transit communities are created through inclusive planning and decision making processes, which is why the event was held. Participants were given an opportunity to begin thinking and talking about what kind of community they wanted to live in. Their feedback is organized under the topic areas below.

Bicycle/Walking/Bus Connections
- Bicycle storage that is safe and secure
- Enough parking spaces particularly for commuters
- Accommodation for elders and people with disabilities
- Expanded bus service to connect the community to the station, especially East-West, but also between King and Snohomish
- Bicycle lanes that connect the community to the station
- Able to get to the station by walking or biking
- Circulating shuttles picking up people to take them to the station so they wouldn't have to bring their car; stopping at shops, the library and other popular destinations along the way
- Places to visit by foot that are near the station where people can shop, fitness center, grab coffee or a snack
Thank you for your comment on the need for additional housing choices in the city of Shoreline. Although the zoning designations at the time of the Draft EIS did not permit multi-family or mixed-use development near any proposed light rail station, the City of Shoreline has since been conducting subarea planning and environmental review for the NE 185th Street Station area. The plan changes and related zoning could accommodate higher density residential and commercial mixed-use developments and apartments surrounding the light rail station area, and this would help to improve access to transit for populations that may not own automobiles. While the City's plan and any rezoning is an action of the City of Shoreline, it is evaluated as an indirect impact of the Lynnwood Link Extension project, which would develop a station within the city's action area; see Section 4.2.4 for details.

Thank you for your suggestions regarding possible amenities and businesses that could be associated with light rail facilities. Section 4.2.4 in the Land Use section of Chapter 4 of the Final EIS discusses Sound Transit's transit-oriented development program, as well as the transit-oriented development-oriented potential for each of this project's proposed station areas.

The stations are well lit, are continually monitored by security cameras, and are regularly monitored by security personnel. Sound Transit would implement a number of measures to deter crime in the station areas. Measures to minimize crime would include the use of equipment (e.g., closed-circuit TV [CCTV], sealed fare boxes, and automatically sealed exits), the use of anti-crime programs such as anti-graffiti programs, and the use of security personnel. See Section 4.14 - Public Services, Safety, and Security.
C-042-006
Your comment that a station at NE 155th Street is not favored is noted.

C-042-007
Comment noted. Sound Transit has completed a high-capacity transit corridor study from Lynnwood to Everett as part of the Long-Range Plan Update and ST 3 planning. See http://www.soundtransit.org/Projects-and-Plans/Long-range-Plan-update

C-042-008
Sound Transit light rail stations will have racks and/or lockers for bikes. The project includes bicycle and pedestrian access facilities at station areas and reconstructed streets, but longer routes or trails to the station area are not currently defined as part of the Lynnwood project. Sound Transit does not operate bike rental enterprises. Parking spaces would be provided at each of the station locations included in the Preferred Alternative. Stations and parking structures will be ADA-compliant, so they will accommodate people with disabilities, elders, and others. Sound Transit will work with local transit agencies and the cities to coordinate transit services to stations, but any changes to routes and services would be made by King County Metro or Community Transit, the local transit agencies.

C-042-009
Please see the response to comment C-042-003.
C-042-010
Please see response to comment C-042-004.

C-042-011
Sound Transit designs and maintains its stations to be safe, secure and clean. The stations are well lit, feature security cameras, and are regularly monitored by security personnel. Crime is not expected to increase as a result of operation of the stations. Several studies have concluded that crime around stations mirrors crime rates in the surrounding neighborhoods. Most areas in the project corridor have low crime rates. Sound Transit would implement a number of measures to deter crime in the station areas. Measures to minimize crime would include the use of equipment (e.g., closed-circuit TV [CCTV], sealed fare boxes, and automatically sealed exits), the use of anti-crime programs such as anti-graffiti programs, and the use of security personnel. 2010 crime statistics related to already built Sound Transit facilities show that the crime rate per number of riders at transit facilities and on light rail and commuter rail trains is substantially lower compared to overall per capita crime rates in Seattle, Tukwila, and SeaTac.

Based on a system-wide policy adopted by the Sound Transit Board, Sound Transit stations generally do not include public restrooms, partly for health and safety/security reasons.

C-042-012
The noise analysis for the Lynnwood Link uses the FTA and local code impact criteria and Sound Transit mitigates noise impacts to levels below the criteria. Potential mitigation measures for noise are described in Section 4.7.7 of the Final EIS.

C-042-013
Your comment stating that a station at 155th Street is not favored is noted.

**C-042-014**

Thank you for the suggestions. Decisions about future land uses and private development, such as the types of shops and restaurants around Sound Transit stations, is not determined by Sound Transit.

Sound Transit facilities will be ADA-compliant, and will be developed in accordance with Sound Transit’s Sustainability Plan, as described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, which outlines goals to protect the environment and create a healthy community and economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Link with Group Impact Note:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Recreation</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Recreation</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Recreation</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Retail Stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Recreation</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Recreation</td>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Cultural Centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Art projects, especially local, mobile, bureaucrats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Concert venues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Cultural centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Cultural centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Cultural centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Cultural centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Cultural centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation/City Services</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Arts centers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- "Sources" column indicates the number of sources cited for each category.
- "Means" column indicates the number of means of analysis used.
- "Total" column is the sum of sources and means.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>2014 Lynnwood Green (Airport)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Utility</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Public works assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Utility</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Real work, work planning and design connecting to the station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA for older, handicapped, disabled, people with luggage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA accessibility, curb access, non-ship-planned projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA waiting shelters, ADA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA, access for safety and exit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA, access for safety and exit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retail Environment</td>
<td>Environmentally friendly &amp; sustainable building: LEED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retail Environment</td>
<td>Markets and mixed uses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retail Environment</td>
<td>Creative retail and living area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retail Environment</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Retail Environment</td>
<td>Retailing atmosphere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Design for older “build” for the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local Environment</td>
<td>Local area, local area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Parking, bus stops, Sunny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety at station and platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety at station and platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety to the “stay to stay”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety to the “stay to stay”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Security, security, security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

Taken as the number of items this list was based on a group table-definition. The other pages of this table are not complete at a sight, but can be divided into 3 columns, but that is unknown. Some items may fit into duplicate categories, but there is no explanation here.
Thank you for your comments describing the importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and community center to the Estonian community. See Section 2.5.1 for a description of the refined Segment A alternatives with reduced impacts on the church. Under all alternatives, the project now avoids the potential displacement of the church or community center.

During project construction, the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and center would experience temporary effects from construction, but coordination and mitigation by Sound Transit would allow normal church and cultural center activities to continue. Construction would be ongoing for 1-2 years in proximity to the church. Construction would occur predominantly during weekdays between about 8 am and 6 pm, though evening and weekend construction may occasionally be required. In addition to truck traffic and temporary changes in access routes in the area, other effects such as noise, dust, light, and glare are described in Sections 3.3, 4.5.3, 4.6.4, and 4.7.4; mitigation is outlined in Sections 3.6, 4.5.6, 4.6.7, and 4.7.7. Longer term, mitigation with noise walls would avoid long-term noise impacts for the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church or community center, as discussed in Section 4.7.3, with mitigation measures in Section 4.7.7.
Your support for alternatives with stations at NE 145th Street and NE 185th Street is noted.

Thank you for your comments in support of stations at NE 145th Street and NE 185th Street.
Dear Mr. Iwata and Sound Transit Board:

This letter provides comments on the Lynnwood Link Extension DEIS, Chapter 4B Ecosystem Resources, July 2013, on behalf of the Friends of Jackson Park Trail. FGPT is a community group that formed to establish a walking trail around the City-owned Jackson Park Golf Course. The trail opened this year and is already very popular with locals and people from further afield. Our group hopes to not only work with the City of Seattle to maintain the trail but to protect the healthy forested areas and restore impacted public lands the trail passes through. Currently, significant parts of the trail pass ivy-choked trees and thickets of blackberry, knotweed, holly, laurel and other invasive species that diminish the trail’s appeal to humans and wildlife.

We understand that possible mitigation sites for the Lynnwood Link extension include an area east of 5th Ave NE and adjacent to Jackson Park Golf Course, particularly along North Branch Thornton Creek, where wetland and riparian mitigation could be constructed. As long as access to and along the trail is not reduced, such a project would be very welcome. In addition to benefiting Thornton Creek water quality and habitat, it would greatly enhance trail users’ experience and could help prompt and leverage work along other trail segments. Native trees and other vegetation along 5th NE could screen the trail from the visual and auditory impacts of I-5. We are currently starting our work to develop a plan for improvements. We would appreciate it if you would keep us informed of the status of mitigation plans so we can coordinate with you about the work, should this mitigation option be selected (please use my email: sp_chickens@earthlink.net).

We understand that, while not mentioned in the DEIS, two properties are available in Shoreline just north of NE 145th St, the trail’s northern border (tax ID 663230-00501a and 663230-0830). While the Jackson Park trail is south of NE 145th St, a heavily used traffic corridor, the trees and undeveloped areas on the north side of NE 145th provide a green window that somewhat eases the impact on trail users of this busy street. It seems inevitable that changes in transit and related development near I-5 will bring even more people to the area, people who will need natural areas to provide visual and auditory relief. Preserving wetlands and green spaces in this area is a cost effective way to reduce the inevitable impacts of development, provide for public enjoyment of natural areas and open spaces that attracted so many of us to this area, and would support migrating birds, a specific mitigation need discussed in the DEIS.

Finally, the undeveloped areas north and south of NE 145th were once connected and perhaps in the future they can be again. If these undeveloped properties are preserved, we support Shoreline’s efforts to purchase both properties to preserve wetlands and green space near Paramount Park.

Finally, we want to echo several points made by the Thornton Creek Alliance:
- Keeping mitigation in the watershed is important, given the totality of changes likely as a result of the Link Extension.
- Contiguous or proximal projects should be sought to maximize the ecological function of each.
- Placing three native trees for every tree removed for the transit project will help reduce impacts on migratory birds.

C-045-001
The Final EIS and the Ecosystems Technical Report provides further information on the impacted wetland areas and potential mitigation, based on current conceptual designs used for the EIS and other measures defined for the Preferred Alternative. Further details on the mitigation, including mitigation sites, would be developed by Sound Transit during final design and permitting stages for the project. Local jurisdiction and resource agency permitting processes will also provide further opportunities for public review and input by interested parties.

C-045-002
Thank you for sharing your thoughts on the potential benefits of developing mitigation in the Jackson Park Golf Course/Thornton Creek area. The project’s design and permitting process would include extensive coordination between Sound Transit and city agencies with responsibility for issuing permits and approvals, but would also have opportunities for coordination with other interested parties.

C-045-003
Thank you for your comment and the suggestion on two sites/properties for mitigation.

C-045-004
Your comment supporting wetland and green space preservation with these properties is noted.

C-045-005
If project-specific mitigation is developed for this project, site selection would emphasize a watershed approach. Plans would be developed in cooperation with resource agencies. This project will follow all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations, including tree protection standards and tree replacement ratios.
Thank you for considering our comments.

Ellen Hale
Friends of Jackson Park Trail
(206) 679-0935
Us_chickens@earthlink.net
Thornton Creek Alliance
P.O. Box 25690
Seattle, WA 98110

October 5, 2013

Dear Ms. Smith and Sound Transit Board:

Please accept the enclosed comments from Thornton Creek Alliance (TCA) on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Lynnwood Link Extension.

TCA's focus is restoring the ecological balance to the Thornton Creek Watershed. In our view, any major infrastructure project in the watershed, such as ST's rail extension, has a vital obligation to improve that balance that has been so heavily weighted against natural systems over the last 100-plus years.

Please make TCA a “party of record” for all matters relating to Lynnwood Link and include these comments in the hearing record and consider them during administrative review.

If you have any questions about TCA’s comments, please don't hesitate to contact me at the address above, or 206-365-8965, or rualice@comcast.net.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Ruth Williams, President
Enclosure

Cc: Seattle City Council
    Shoreline City Council
    Seattle Mayor

TCA is an all-volunteer grassroots, nonprofit organization of 115 members dedicated to preserving and restoring an ecological balance throughout the Thornton Creek watershed. Our goal is to benefit the watershed by encouraging individuals, groups, schools, businesses, and government to work together in addressing the environmental restoration of the creek system including: water quality, stabilization of water flow, flood prevention, and habitat improvement through education, collaboration, and community involvement.

Thornton-creek-alliance.org
and on Facebook!
Thornton Creek Alliance
P.O. Box 25690
Seattle, WA 98165-1190

Thursday, October 5, 2013

Comments on Lynnwood Link Extension Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

C-046-001
Thornton Creek Alliance (TCA) applauds Sound Transit’s (ST) mitigation policy “to avoid impacts on environmentally sensitive resources as much as possible” (Section 4.8.6, page 4-145). As the DEIS acknowledges, the impacts of the Lynnwood Link Extension would be accumulative and amplified by increases in traffic and density. Therefore, it is imperative that ST goes beyond the area of direct impact for the Affected Environment.

C-046-002
This project will comply with all local critical area codes, including prescribed buffer widths within each local jurisdiction. See Section 4.8 - Ecosystem Resources in the Final EIS for current wetland impact information.

C-046-003
None of the alternatives would entail in-water work in Thornton Creek; therefore, Sound Transit does not have any plans to daylight the stream or replace culverts. Sound Transit designs would also avoid conflicts with anticipated fish habitat restoration projects, such as those on the state’s fish passage project list. For example, where I-5 culvert replacements are anticipated, Sound Transit could design bridges or box culverts for the guideway to accommodate future restored stream channels.

C-046-004
This project will abide by all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations. Minimization of impervious surfaces is a priority for Sound Transit in consideration not only of ecological factors, but also capital costs and long-term maintenance. As stated in the Draft EIS Section 4.9.2, Sound Transit is evaluating measures to control risks to water quality that include minimizing impervious footprints, avoiding the placement of project elements in or near water resources where possible, and installing appropriate surface water management facilities. Sound Transit is also evaluating potential cumulative impacts of growth in the surrounding area, considering that
new developments would also be required to implement required stormwater best management practices.

C-046-005
Locating mitigation within the watershed impacted is a priority for Sound Transit. Federal, state, and local regulations may require Sound Transit to mitigate impacts on wetlands and buffers using an approved mitigation bank (if available in the future), King County in-lieu fee program, or project-specific mitigation developed by Sound Transit. If project-specific mitigation is developed for this project, site selection would emphasize a watershed approach.

C-046-006
This project will abide by all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations, including tree protection standards and tree replacement ratios. Contiguous or proximal projects will be considered in wetland, stream, and buffer mitigation site selection.

C-046-007
Since the review of potential mitigation sites for the Draft EIS, these sites are no longer available. Both are scheduled for construction in 2014. The sites will be removed from Sound Transit’s review of potential sites under consideration for project-specific mitigation.

C-046-008
Thank you for the suggestion on two other sites/properties. These have been added to list of properties considered for mitigation sites.
The Ecosystem Resources Technical Report provides additional information on fish species in the North Branch of Thornton Creek, including observations of Chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon. The potential impacts on fish by guideway construction and operation under the light rail alternatives are discussed in Section 4.8.2, Long-term Impacts. Also see the Final EIS Appendix O, the Biological Assessment prepared in support of Endangered Species Act compliance for the project.

The Ecosystem Resources Technical Report provides additional information on the regulations pertinent to this analysis. Compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act is discussed on page 4-146 of the Draft EIS.

Cc: Seattle City Council, Shoreline City Council, Seattle Mayor