

6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION

Public involvement and agency coordination activities are important components of the NEPA/SEPA environmental process.

Sound Transit and the FTA are providing ongoing opportunities for all those interested in the Lynnwood Link Extension to be involved, get information, ask questions, and give comments. Sound Transit and FTA have a formal Coordination Plan with specific elements for agency and tribal outreach and public involvement. The Coordination Plan is summarized in this chapter and the project's public involvement, agency, and tribal coordination activities are further defined.

The public involvement and agency coordination effort for what is now the Lynnwood Link Extension began in October 2010, when FTA and Sound Transit began early scoping for the North Corridor Alternatives Analysis. They issued public notices in the Federal Register and SEPA Register, advertisements and legal notices in local newspapers, postcard mailings, and email messages. They held three public meetings (one each in Seattle, Shoreline, and Lynnwood) and one agency meeting during the early scoping period. FTA and Sound Transit requested the public to submit suggestions about the transportation problems of the project corridor and to propose a broad range of potential transit solutions. See the *Alternatives Analysis Report and SEPA Addendum* (September 2011), in Appendix K, Supporting Documents, for more information about the Alternatives Analysis, which led to the alternatives evaluated in this Final EIS, and its public involvement and agency coordination. The scoping phase for the Draft EIS for the Lynnwood Link Extension started September 30, 2011, as discussed in Section 6.2.1.

6.1 Coordination Plan

The public involvement, agency coordination, and tribal coordination efforts outlined in the project's Coordination Plan cover activities from the Alternatives Analysis process through the Final EIS. These efforts also comprise agency and tribal coordination and outreach that Sound Transit formally initiated when the project began environmental scoping for the Draft EIS. This process has continued through the release of the Draft EIS, the subsequent public comment period, and the development of the Final EIS. The Coordination Plan provides a structured approach to public outreach for the project team throughout the EIS process.

The Coordination Plan also includes strategies for outreach to traditionally hard-to-reach populations, such as minority, low-income, and low-English proficiency populations. The plan aims to identify and involve minority and low-income populations that the project could benefit or affect adversely. Sound Transit and FTA recognize it is important to try to reach all people potentially affected by the project.

6.2 Public Outreach Activities and Methods

The project's outreach activities have continued throughout the environmental review process, which culminates with the release of the Final EIS, Sound Transit Board's selection of the project to be built, and FTA's issuance of a Record of Decision. Some activities have occurred at specific project milestones, such as the publication of the Draft EIS, while other types of activities have been conducted on an ongoing basis, such as targeted community outreach. The following subsections summarize the outreach activities and methods used or planned during the project's environmental process. A detailed list of all the public outreach activities conducted to date, including public meetings and hearings, is provided in Appendix L, Public Involvement and Agency Coordination.

6.2.1 Scoping

Sound Transit and FTA conducted early scoping for an Alternatives Analysis beginning in October 2010. Following the release of the Alternatives Analysis report, Sound Transit conducted formal public scoping. Scoping supports the environmental review process requirements of NEPA and SEPA. The scoping process began with the public notice of the intent to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register on September 29, 2011, and in the SEPA Register on September 30, 2011. The formal notices were accompanied by advertisements and other public notices and outreach materials. Scoping notice postcards were sent to 103,000 addresses, and emails were sent to 1,000 email addresses. During the scoping period, Sound Transit and FTA asked the public to comment on the proposed Purpose and Need Statement, the environmental issues to be evaluated in the Draft EIS, and alternatives to be considered for evaluation in the Draft EIS.

To provide project information to the public during scoping, Sound Transit produced the following documents and made them available on the project Web site (<http://www.soundtransit.org/1le>) and at public meetings (all are part of Appendix K):

- *Scoping Information Report:* This summary of the environmental scoping effort provides a planning history of the project, the results of the Alternatives Analysis, the draft Purpose and Need Statement, the range of alternatives being considered for study in the Draft EIS, the potential environmental topics to be reviewed in the Draft EIS, and the project schedule.
- *Coordination Plan:* This plan is a summary of the efforts to engage the public, agencies, and tribes throughout the environmental review process. This plan was then finalized after the public scoping period ended, and was updated following the release of the Draft EIS.
- *Alternatives Analysis Report and SEPA Addendum:* This is a summary document and complete technical report describing the initial study Sound Transit

conducted to define the most promising alternatives for further review in the Draft EIS, along with alternatives to be dropped from further consideration.

During the 30-day scoping period, Sound Transit and FTA held public meetings in Seattle, Shoreline, and Lynnwood, and an agency meeting in Shoreline. They received 69 comment submittals from individuals, 14 from jurisdictions and agencies, and three from organizations. The comments received during scoping were provided to the Sound Transit Board for consideration before the Board identified the alternatives for analysis in the EIS. The *Environmental Scoping Summary Report* (Sound Transit 2011f) summarizes all the comments received during scoping. Table 6-1 provides further details on the scoping meetings (including early scoping).

Table 6-1. Public, Agency, and Tribal Scoping Meetings

Scoping Meetings	Dates	Number of Attendees
Public	October 7, 12, and 14, 2010	200 people
Agency and Tribal	October 14, 2010	9 agencies
Public	October 11, 13, and 18, 2011	185 people
Agency and Tribal	October 11, 2011	13 agencies

The majority of the comments Sound Transit and FTA received were positive. All the jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations that provided written comments either supported the proposed project or offered advice on the project's next steps into the environmental process. None were opposed.

Seven of the agencies and jurisdictions specifically indicated support for an I-5 alternative, as did all of the organizations that commented. Several agencies voiced concerns about an SR 99 alternative's impacts, costs, ridership, or ability to meet other purpose and need objectives. Most of the individual public comments supported the proposed project or one or more of the light rail alternatives. Several agencies suggested additional sites or options, including stations at NE 130th Street, NE 155th Street, and 200th Street SW. Three of the individual public commenters were opposed to the proposed project, including one who preferred bus rapid transit instead of light rail. The other comments varied, but included suggestions about environmental or land use factors, and the purpose and need for the project. A number of commenters asked Sound Transit to move ahead quickly to build the project.

6.2.2 Tech Talk

Tech Talk was an informal, lunch-hour outreach activity during the scoping period on October 7, 2011, and during the Draft EIS comment period on September 13, 2013. Project managers provided information about the project and answered questions online. Participants accessed the broadcast by going to video.soundtransit.org. The videos of the broadcasts are on the project Web site.

6.2.3 Public Meetings, Open Houses, Briefings, and Workshops

In addition to scoping meetings, Sound Transit has held public meetings, open houses, and workshops to present project information and solicit comments from the public. The format typically included time for the public to view project information and to speak with project team members one-on-one. Appendix L lists all public meetings and briefings for the project to date. Sound Transit has continued to hold these public events as the project progressed through the EIS process.

Sound Transit also regularly provides briefings to neighborhood associations, organizations, and businesses located within the project vicinity to provide project information and to answer questions. Briefings typically include a presentation by project staff and an opportunity for questions and answers.

6.2.4 Community Events

Sound Transit representatives have attended various community events planned by other organizations to reach community members who might not otherwise seek out information about the Lynnwood Link Extension. These events, which included street and community fairs and festivals such as Cinco de Mayo celebrations in corridor communities and nearby towns, proved to be an effective way for Sound Transit to reach new people interested in the project. With booths and staffed tables at the events, Sound Transit representatives talked to the public about the project, helped them sign up for the project mailing list, and informed them of other ways to be involved. Sound Transit reached several thousand people in this way, beginning with outreach during the project's early planning, continuing on through public scoping, and throughout the development and release of the Draft and Final EIS documents.

In 2011, in support of early scoping and the Alternatives Analysis, Sound Transit attended eight events, engaging more than 1,100 community members; in 2012, the year EIS scoping and EIS alternatives were being identified, Sound Transit attended eight events, engaging more than 830 people in the community; in 2013, the year the Draft EIS was released, Sound Transit attended six events, engaging nearly 650 community members. In 2014, as the Final EIS and additional engineering studies were being completed, Sound Transit attended seven events, engaging nearly 700 people. Appendix L lists the community events that Sound Transit has attended.

6.2.5 Drop-in Sessions

In March 2012, Sound Transit held 10 drop-in sessions along the project corridor in Seattle, Shoreline, Mountlake Terrace, Edmonds, and Lynnwood at various public locations, such as community centers, grocery stores, and libraries. These sessions were advertised by postcards inviting people to drop in at the locations to talk to

staff, learn more about the project, and provide additional feedback prior to the Sound Transit Board identifying the alternatives included in the Draft EIS. Sound Transit staff members spoke with approximately 450 people during these sessions.

In June 2014, Sound Transit held four drop-in sessions along the project corridor at the Northgate Community Center in Seattle and the public libraries of Shoreline, Mountlake Terrace, and Lynnwood. These sessions were advertised by postcards, inviting people to drop in at the locations to talk to staff and learn more about the project, including the Preferred Alternative considered in this Final EIS. Sound Transit staff members spoke with approximately 250 people during these sessions.

6.2.6 Project Web Site

The project has a Web site (www.soundtransit.org/llc) that provides current project information, including project maps, schedule, and project-related documents, which Sound Transit updates regularly. The Web site is also a document archive and includes a video animation of the Preferred Alternative, which has been viewed often by Web site visitors.

6.2.7 News Media

At times, Sound Transit uses local newspapers to inform, educate, and involve the public. News releases and advertisements for public meetings are sent to newspapers in the project vicinity.

6.2.8 Fact Sheets, Brochures, and Newsletters

Fact sheets and brochures are often distributed at public meetings, workshops, and community events. The purpose of the fact sheets and brochures is to concisely provide project updates. Newsletters were mailed and emailed in April 2011 (emailed only), June 2012, March 2013, January 2014, and June 2014 to provide project information and updates. In addition, annual project updates were sent to email subscribers.

6.2.9 Email Subscription List

Sound Transit maintains an email subscription list of people who have expressed interest in the project, or who have requested project information, and provides periodic project updates and e-newsletters to subscribers. At the close of September 2014, there were 3,318 subscribers to the email subscription list.

6.2.10 Kiosks

Sound Transit rotates three project information kiosks throughout the corridor with updated project information for residents and environmental justice populations (see Section 6.2.13 Environmental Justice Coordination), typically at public libraries, community centers, or community colleges within the project corridor. They were first displayed in December 2012, and will continue to be displayed up to final

design, at which point Sound Transit will evaluate whether kiosks are still an effective way to provide the community with project updates. The kiosks have displayed the early planning area; announced public meetings, hearings, and comment periods; advertised the availability of the Draft EIS; and provided information about the Preferred Alternative. They are always stocked with the most recent newsletter. To increase exposure, they are relocated based on the number of project information sheets that were taken by the public. They include a short statement in several different languages inviting non-English speaking community members to contact Sound Transit for more information. Languages include Vietnamese, Tagalog, Spanish, Korean, Chinese, and Amharic.

6.2.11 Fieldwork Outreach

Sound Transit provided advance notice to property owners and residents prior to geotechnical work, vibration and noise testing, and topographical surveys during the spring and early summer of 2014. Recognizing that some of this work would be out of the ordinary in residential areas when large equipment is in operation with potential noise and vibration effects, the purpose of the outreach was to:

- Alert potentially affected residents and businesses, especially property owners who had already signed Right of Entry agreements
- Inform the public where they can find additional information
- Reduce surprises associated with this work
- Comply with permitting agencies' notification requirements (as applicable)

Sound Transit notified the public about upcoming field work through telephone calls to known property owners and hand-distributed flyers. They also placed fieldwork activity information in other project-related materials, including a spring newsletter, information kiosks, e-updates, and the project Web site.

6.2.12 Property Owner Outreach

Starting in 2013, Sound Transit used the following ways to reach out to property owners who could have some or all of their property acquired:

- Before the Draft EIS, Sound Transit mailed notification letters to property owners letting them know their property could be affected. The letters invited potentially affected property owners to contact Sound Transit staff to set up a meeting to learn more about the potential effects. The first set of notification letters was mailed in June 2013, the month before publication of the Draft EIS. Subsequent mailings occurred in February and March 2014, following further design modifications to the Preferred Alternative.
- Sound Transit met with potentially affected property owners in person, at their request. A group meeting included residents of Cedar Creek Condominiums and Northgate West Condominiums. Sound Transit also

met several times with representatives of the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church, including once with the greater church community.

- Sound Transit consulted individuals by telephone at their request, including potentially affected property owners, and non-affected property owners concerned that their properties would be acquired.
- Sound Transit added potentially affected property owners to the project's mailing list to receive the Winter 2014 newsletter and the announcement of the Sound Transit Board's recommendation of the Preferred Alternative. An electronic version of the newsletter was also sent to the email recipients on the subscription list. Throughout the notification process and individual meetings, property owners have submitted their email addresses and signed up to the project's email subscription list for project updates.
- Sound Transit contacted property owners for right-of-entry approval prior to geotechnical work, vibration and noise testing, and topographical surveys (see Section 6.2.11, Fieldwork Outreach). Sound Transit will continue to communicate with potentially affected property owners as it refines the design of the proposed alternatives. It will update property owners after key milestones, such as the Sound Transit Board's selection of the project to be built, and the completion of final designs.

6.2.13 Environmental Justice Coordination

At the start of project outreach activities in late 2010 and again in 2011 and 2013, Sound Transit worked to better understand demographic and community characteristics in the corridor, with a particular focus on low-income and minority populations. Stakeholder interviews helped the agency identify community organizations in the project corridor that were likely to represent or provide services to minority and low-income individuals. The resulting environmental justice population outreach activities conducted for the project are summarized in Section 4.4, Social Impacts, Community Facilities, and Neighborhoods, and Appendix C, Environmental Justice Analysis. Some examples of Sound Transit's targeted outreach are:

- Publication of the environmental scoping notices in *La Raza*, *Korean Daily*, *Seattle Chinese Times*, *Russian World Newspaper*, *Seattle Chinese Post*, and *tu Decides*.
- Project staff attendance at Cinco de Mayo festival events to hand out project materials translated into Spanish and a Spanish interpreter present to translate.
- Project posters distributed to several organizations that serve minority and low-income populations in the project corridor.

Sound Transit's environmental justice outreach activities to date are summarized in Table L-1 in Appendix L.

6.3 Agency Coordination

In addition to the public meetings and hearings to which agencies are invited, Sound Transit coordinates with agencies via periodic meetings designed to gather input. These meetings are either policy- or technical-related, depending on the topic of discussion. The participating and cooperating agencies with which Sound Transit has been coordinating for the proposed project are listed in Table 6-2.

Table 6-2. Participating and Cooperating Agencies

Cooperating Agencies ^a	Participating Agencies ^b
Federal Highway Administration	U.S. Department of Interior
Washington State Department of Transportation	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
City of Edmonds	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
City of Lynnwood	Homeland Security/Transportation Security Administration
City of Mountlake Terrace	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
City of Seattle	Federal Emergency Management Agency
City of Shoreline	Federal Railroad Administration
King County	National Park Service
Snohomish County	Seattle City Light
	Snohomish County Public Utility District
	Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
	Washington State Department of Ecology
	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
	Community Transit
	Everett Transit
	City of Mill Creek

^a A cooperating agency is any federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or project alternative (40 CFR 1508.5).

^b A participating agency is any agency with an interest in the project (23 USC 139(d)).

Sound Transit has been coordinating project planning with many of the agencies since the Alternatives Analysis. For several years, FHWA and WSDOT have been involved in the development and review of alternatives affecting I-5 or the use of I-5 right-of-way, and they have participated in technical reviews of the preliminary Draft and Final EIS documents. Local jurisdictions and other cooperating agencies have been similarly involved since the project's inception.

6.4 Tribal Coordination

Sound Transit contacted the following federally recognized tribes that have treaty rights, cultural resources, or other interests in the project area:

- Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
- Snoqualmie Tribe
- Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians

- Suquamish Tribe
- Tulalip Tribes
- Yakama Nation

FTA initiated government-to-government consultation with the affected tribes and invited them to become participating agencies. FTA and Sound Transit will continue to consult with the tribes regarding potential natural and cultural resources impacts. In compliance with the Historic Preservation Act, Sound Transit also contacted the Duwamish and Snohomish tribes, which are not federally recognized but have interests in cultural resources in the region.

6.5 Draft EIS Comment Period

Sound Transit published the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS in the Federal Register and SEPA Register. The public comment period for the Draft EIS ran from July 26, 2013 to September 23, 2013 and included four public open houses and public hearings:

- August 14, 2013 — Nile Shrine Golf Center, Mountlake Terrace
- August 20, 2013 — Northgate Community Center, Seattle
- August 21, 2013 — Embassy Suites, Lynnwood
- August 22, 2013 — Shoreline Conference Center, Shoreline

In addition to the Federal Register and SEPA Register notices, Sound Transit advertised the comment period through mailed postcards, emails, community calendar postings, and online and print display advertisements.

Sound Transit collected written comments on the Draft EIS via mail, email, comment forms, and court reporter transcriptions of oral comments made during public hearings. Sound Transit received 634 comment documents (written, email, and hearing transcripts) during the comment period from agencies, tribes, and public. They were reviewed by Sound Transit and FTA, and considered during development of this Final EIS.

Chapter 7, Draft EIS Comments and Responses, discusses the public outreach and involvement process leading up to the release of the Draft EIS and summarizes the comments received. Appendix P, Draft EIS Public Comments and Responses, provides Sound Transit's and FTA's response to each substantive comment received.

Preferred Alternative

Based on information in the Draft EIS, and comments from the public, agencies, and tribes, the Sound Transit Board, in Motion M2013-96, identified a Preferred Alternative in November 2013 for evaluation in the Final EIS. Motion M2013-96 also directed Sound Transit to further evaluate potential modifications and options

for the Preferred Alternative and other alternatives, as described in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered. Sound Transit conducted further public outreach and communication about the Preferred Alternative. This outreach included emails to those on the project email list, social media, a newsletter, updates on the project Web site, drop-in meetings, and booths or kiosks in community centers and gathering places in the corridor where staff, handouts, and displays provided updates.

6.6 Final EIS, Sound Transit Board Action, and the Federal Record of Decision

The Final EIS is one of the final steps in the NEPA and SEPA process before FTA and Sound Transit decide whether to take further action on the project. This Final EIS was released with a notice of availability published in the Federal Register, advertised in the *Seattle Times* and other publications, and with written notice to all parties that commented during scoping or in the review of the Draft EIS. Distribution of the Final EIS in written and electronic form mirrors the distribution used for the Draft EIS.

The Sound Transit Board, following the Final EIS release, will select the project to be built. After the Board takes action, FTA is anticipated to issue a Record of Decision in accordance with NEPA. At that point, Sound Transit would move forward with securing federal funding, completing final design, obtaining permits, starting construction, and then moving into operations. Other federal, state, and local agencies, such as FHWA, WSDOT, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the corridor cities will also be asked to take action on permits and approvals and may rely on this Final EIS to support their decisions. See pages iv-v of the Summary for a list of approvals that the project is expected to need.

7 DRAFT EIS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This chapter summarizes the agency, tribe, and public comments Sound Transit and FTA received during the 60-day public comment and review period following the release of the Draft EIS for the Lynnwood Link Extension on July 26, 2013.

A Draft EIS Public Comment Summary Report was prepared for the Sound Transit Board and FTA following the public comment period, and posted on the project Web site. Based on its review of the Draft EIS, and comments received from the public, agencies, and tribes, the Sound Transit Board identified a Preferred Alternative for evaluation in this Final EIS, along with other alternatives. All of the comments received are in Appendix P, Draft EIS Public Comments and Responses.



7.1 Overview of the Draft EIS Comments

Sound Transit and FTA received 634 comment submittals from the public (individuals), agencies, tribes, businesses, and organizations. The comment tallies in Table 7-1 include the spoken comments made at the public hearings, as well as written comments. Some of the written comments came in the form of petitions, including one that had been posted online and endorsed by more than 1,800 people.

The two most common topics were the impacts to the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and Community Center in Seattle in Segment A, and to Scriber Creek Park in Lynnwood in Segment C.

Most of the other comments focused on a preference for one or more of the light rail alternatives or station locations, but many people also had specific comments on potential environmental issues discussed in the Draft EIS. These topics notably concerned acquisitions, displacements, and relocations; ecosystem resources; transportation; noise and vibration; visual and aesthetic resources; social impacts, community facilities, and neighborhoods; and parks and recreational resources.



Table 7-1 shows the number of comments Sound Transit and FTA received by commenter type during the comment period.

Table 7-1. Comment Submittals Received by Commenter Type

Commenter Type	Number
Federal Agency	5
Tribe	1
State or Regional Agency	4
Local Agency	15
Businesses	8
Organizations or Groups	46
Individual	555

7.2 Comments from Agencies and Tribes

Three federal agencies provided brief comments on the project but generally did not endorse specific alternatives. Four state agencies commented, including WSDOT. The local agencies, including all cities along the corridor, wrote to support the light rail extension and indicated preferences for specific alternatives. They also had comments about areas of environmental concerns and mitigation. Table 7-2 lists the agencies and tribes that provided comments to Sound Transit and FTA.

Table 7-2. List of Agencies and Tribes Providing Comments

Federal Agencies	Local Agencies and Jurisdictions
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Alderwood Water & Wastewater District
U.S. Department of Interior	Community Transit
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Edmonds School District
Other Governments	King County Department of Transportation
Ambassador of the Republic of Latvia	City of Lake Forest Park
Tribes	City of Lynnwood
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe	City of Mountlake Terrace
State Agencies	City of Seattle
Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP)	City of Shoreline
University of Washington's Department of Scandinavian Studies	City of Shoreline Fire Department
Washington State Department of Ecology	Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
Washington State Department of Transportation	

7.2.1 Federal Agencies

The letter from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had no comments on the Draft EIS, but noted potential wetland impacts that would require its involvement during the project's permitting phases.

The U.S. Department of Interior sent a letter indicating no major comments, but subsequently amended the letter to note that two park properties, Twin Ponds Park in Shoreline and Jack Long Park in Mountlake Terrace, were developed with Land and Water Conservation Funds, and should be protected from transportation impacts. It noted that the NE 155th Street Station option with Alternative A5 (and Alternative A7) has the potential to affect Twin Ponds Park if transit users parked there for commuting purposes.

The EPA wrote in support of the overall project and its potential to provide environmental benefits, but expressed concerns about alternative alignments in Segments B and C that would affect aquatic or wetland resources or park properties. It asked for further information to be developed for the Final EIS, but also stated it had no major objections to any of the Segment A alternatives, or to Alternatives B1, B4, or C3. EPA recommended that the Final EIS include:

- A 404(b)(1) comparative alternatives analysis of wetlands impacts, particularly for Segments B and C
- More detail on Alternatives C1 and C2 construction and operation impacts to Scriber Creek Park and the Scriber Creek wetland complex
- Identification and listing of land purchase funding sources as well as use restrictions applied to parks and natural areas that would be affected by the proposed project
- Effects on ecological connectivity, including restoration options
- More detail on cumulative impacts to Scriber Creek Park and wetlands from the Lynnwood alternative for the OMSF
- Information about parking supply during construction

7.2.2 Tribes

The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe thanked Sound Transit and FTA for addressing its previous concerns, and added the following comments:

- Prefer Alternative C1 because it would have the fewest impacts on Scriber Creek and Swamp Creek tributary, associated wetlands and floodplain, and thus fewer impacts to salmon and salmon habitat
- Include Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division on state-owned culvert replacement projects (due to recent federal court decisions related to tribal involvement for such projects)
- Prefer enhanced treatment methods for stormwater water quality treatment to maximize removal of heavy metals and oils that may otherwise adversely affect salmon

7.2.3 State Agencies

WSDOT submitted a comment letter thanking Sound Transit for the cooperative planning to date. It noted the importance of keeping WSDOT's freeway management systems operational throughout construction (CCTV, Variable Message Signs, data station, ramp meters, etc.). WSDOT emphasized the need for effective multimodal access to stations. It also cited visual impacts as a key concern, and that WSDOT believed some areas had higher visual impacts than the Draft EIS stated. It asked Sound Transit to further explore mitigation measures and minimize the loss of vegetation, particularly large trees.

DAHP submitted a comment letter concurring with the Draft EIS preliminary finding that the project would have no adverse effect to historic resources.

Ecology wrote in support of alternatives that avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and streams in the project corridor, such as Alternative C1 or C3, which reduce impacts to the Scriber Creek wetland complex. Ecology also submitted technical comments on the ecosystems and water resources sections of the Draft EIS.

The University of Washington's Department of Scandinavian Studies submitted a letter to express concern for the future of the Latvian Community Center (located at the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church), stating that the Department uses the Latvian Community Center to hold activities and events.

7.2.4 Regional and Local Agencies and Jurisdictions

PSRC wrote a letter concurring with the Draft EIS findings that the project would generally be consistent with regional planning documents. PSRC asked Sound Transit to provide more comparative detail on the transit-oriented development potential of various station alternatives. PSRC also asked Sound Transit to include station access data by mode and to show how those different modes contribute to potential ridership.

The letter from the King County Department of Transportation focused largely on Segment A alternatives. It emphasized station access issues, including the need for connecting transit service and nonmotorized travel options, combined with transit-oriented development in lieu of park-and-rides. Additionally, the King County Department of Transportation suggested the EIS acknowledge future tolling and other transportation demand strategies.

The letter from King County specifically supported Alternative A10 or A11, which include stations at NE 130th Street and NE 145th Street. It favors the NE 130th Street Station because it would capitalize on the strong ridership projections, provide more efficient local bus connections, and provide good nonmotorized access. It also supported a NE 145th Street Station, but asked for further study of lower parking capacity there because of congestion problems, with potentially more spaces at

NE 185th Street. King County also suggested a non-median station at Mountlake Terrace (with suggested design modifications) to allow continued transit use of the existing freeway stop by Sound Transit and Community Transit during light rail construction. King County also provided comments from its paratransit service division focusing on ADA-accessible facilities.

The City of Seattle supported the Alternative A1 alignment, but they preferred a station at NE 130th Street as shown on Alternative A5/A10 (Option 1), with no parking at NE 130th Street. The preference for the A1 alignment included specific comments on the following topics:

- Reducing impacts to the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church by maintaining its right-of-way access
- Reconstructing NE 130th Street off-ramp to address a high accident location
- Retaining trees on the east side of 1st Avenue NE between 113th Street and 115th Street
- Retaining strong existing
- connections and opportunities to provide improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities if 1st Avenue NE and the 117th Street bridge are reconstructed
- Including sidewalks and a bicycle lane on the west side of 5th Avenue NE between NE 130th Street and NE 145th Street

The City of Seattle's comments on the NE 130th Street Station (Alternative A5/A10, Option 1) suggested the station would expand access to the regional transit system. This station would have an average weekday ridership of 3,200 compared to 2,200 average weekday riders at the NE 145th Street Station, and would provide a unique opportunity for bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access.

The City of Mountlake Terrace supported the light rail project and noted the City's support for transit-oriented development. Although the City stated Alternative B1 was acceptable, the City prefers Alternatives B2 and B2A because they would provide the greatest opportunity for transit-oriented development. The City does not favor Alternative B4 because it is least supportive of transit-oriented development.

The City of Shoreline wrote a detailed comment letter that expressed excitement about the extension of light rail to Shoreline. The City identified NE 145th Street (Option 2) and NE 185th Street (Option 1) as the best locations for stations; the letter also provided details on the planning the City is doing in support of these stations. The City also noted that the NE 155th Street Station was not preferred because it would have higher impacts and less effective access. The City recommended a mostly at-grade alignment, and stated its interest in continuing to work with Sound Transit on project planning and design, especially in station areas

to ensure effective multimodal access. A letter attachment detailed further technical comments on the Draft EIS, including transportation-related issues at the station sites, as well as visual, ecosystem, land use, public safety and security, and utility impacts and issues.

The City of Lynnwood supported bringing light rail to the Lynnwood Transit Center, and proposed an alternative configuration, “C3 Modified,” which it preferred over the alternatives in the Draft EIS. Alternative C3 Modified would be between Alternatives C2 and C3. The following are the City’s key comments:

- Traffic impacts will be worse than presented in the Draft EIS
- A separate analysis is needed for the OMSF as an independent project
- The expectation that 80 percent of riders will arrive by bus is optimistic
- Alternative C3 could limit future development potential in areas slated for the highest density development in the Lynnwood regional growth center, particularly the City Center block located east of 44th Avenue West.

The City of Lake Forest Park wrote in support of light rail on the east side of I-5 in Segments A and B, and supported stations at NE 145th Street and NE 185th Street.

The letter from the Edmonds School District supported either Alternative B2 or B2A. The letter also supported the City of Lynnwood’s C3 Modified alternative. The Edmonds School District asked to participate in the engineering and planning process for the Segment C alternatives because these alternatives would affect their property.

The letter from the Alderwood Water & Wastewater District requested that Sound Transit work with the District to ensure water supply is maintained in the vicinity of I-5 and the Interurban Trail.

The letter from the Shoreline Fire Department supported the NE 145th Street Station. The Fire Department is concerned that a NE 155th Street Station would interfere with its fire station operations.

Community Transit’s letter supports the project. The agency expressed its intent to serve Link light rail stations in Snohomish County. The detailed comments focused on proposed mitigation measures to preserve mobility during construction, as well as system design elements that will enable effective bus-rail integration. Community Transit prefers Alternative C1 and Alternatives B1 and B2. Community Transit agrees with the comments provided by King County Metro’s paratransit service, requesting that the station design maximize accessibility for all patrons.

7.3 Comments from Businesses

Sound Transit received eight comment letters from businesses within the project area:

- Cairncross & Hempelmann
- Cascade Trophy
- JC Auto Restoration
- Mayes Testing Engineers, Inc.
- Mike Raskin
- Mortgage Capital Associates
- Mullally Development Company
- Simon Property Group

Simon Property Group, the company that owns Northgate Mall, submitted a detailed letter from its attorneys outlining concerns about the cumulative effects of the Lynnwood Link Extension, Northgate Link Extension, and King County’s plans for transit-oriented development south of the mall. The letter described concerns about mall traffic access, visibility of the mall for customers coming from I-5 and 1st Avenue NE, traffic on arterials and local streets near the mall, and parking—both parking for mall patrons and exacerbation of existing “hide and ride/park” problems.

The Mullally Development Company, owner of the Northgate Plaza Apartments, does not believe the Draft EIS fully takes into account the project’s impacts on their property. They have concerns about the access to their property (they would like a more complete discussion of access during construction), and noise and vibration impacts. They prefer Alternative A1, and do not agree with the conclusion that the Northgate Plaza Apartments are eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Sound Transit received a letter from Cairncross & Hempelmann, a law firm representing several unnamed local, national, and international real estate developers constructing and/or planning transit-oriented development projects adjacent to future Sound Transit light rail stations. The law firm provided its assessment of the potential for transit-oriented development in the corridor by alternative, and supported Alternatives A3 (for its stations at NE 145th and NE 185th Streets), B1, B2, B2A, and C1.

Five businesses in Lynnwood provided comments. All strongly preferred Alternative C3, or an alternative that is not aligned along 52nd Avenue West, to avoid the business acquisitions that Alternative C1 would have. These businesses stated that relocation would be difficult. One of the businesses employs more than 100 employees.

7.4 Comments from Community Organizations

Sound Transit received comments from community organizations, including established organizations as well as less formal neighborhood groups. Most of these groups wrote in support of the project, but some had concerns about specific alternatives or issues. Table 7-3 lists the community organizations that commented.

Table 7-3. List of Community Organizations Providing Comments

Comments from Community Organizations		
145th-155th Street Station Citizens Committee	Latvian Association of the State of Washington	Seashore Transportation Forum
185th Station Citizen Committee	Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad	Seattle Congregation of Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church
American Latvian Association	Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of Seattle and Latvian Association of Washington	Seattle Estonian Society
American Latvian Association, Latvian Museum	Latvian Seniors Association	Seattle Latvian Community Center
American Latvian Youth Association	Latvian Sorority Gundega	Seattle Latvian Lutheran Church
Bellevue Sister Cities Association	Lettonia State of Washington Alumni Association	Seattle Latvian School
Cascade Bicycle Club	Mezotne Latvian Language Camp	Senior Services
Edmonton Latvian Society	Northgate West Condominiums	Sigulda
Estonian American National Council	North King County Mobility Coalition	Sound Cities Association
Feet First	Paramount Park Neighborhood Group	Thornton Creek Alliance
Fellowship of American Baltic Spouses	Parkwood Neighborhood Association	Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund
Friends of Jackson Park Trail	Pilchuck Audubon Society	Transportation Choices
Futurewise	Ridgecrest Neighborhood Association	West Coast Latvian Song Festival
Honorary Consul of the Republic of Estonia		
Lithuanian-American Community—Washington State Chapter	Save Scriber Creek Park	World Federation of Free Latvians

About half of the written comments from organizations, as well as half the statements made at public hearings, were associated with the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and its community center. These commenters urged Sound Transit to choose an alternative that would not affect the church or community center because it is an important and unique community resource. Twenty-three different organizations affiliated with Latvian heritage sent written comments, including the Honorary Consul of the Republic of Estonia in Seattle. Their comments consistently highlighted the importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and Community Center for the local and national Baltic community. Many of the comments described how these facilities have been used

for cultural activities and events for more than four decades, after being relocated in the 1970s. Some representative comments follow:

“The center is of important cultural heritage and importance to Seattle-area Latvians and Balts. When the Latvian refugees were admitted to the United States after World War II, several hundred settled in the Seattle area.”

“The church and the center are the glue holding our organization (Latvian Sorority Gundega) and our community together, allowing it to grow while preserving Latvian ethnicity and culture.”

“I am very concerned that all of the proposed alternatives will severely impact the Latvian Church and Community Center and the activities of hundreds of families who consider it their ‘ethnic home.’”

Organizations such as Futurewise, Sound Cities Association, Transportation Choices Coalition, North King County Mobility Coalition, and SeaShore Transportation Forum commented on transit-oriented development, mobility, and access issues. Most of these organizations preferred a station at NE 145th Street and were opposed to the NE 155th Street Station, typically citing access and transit-oriented development potential for their preferences. Most also supported the NE 185th Street Station, and Futurewise and Transportation Choices Coalition supported a station at NE 130th Street. They also supported Alternative B2A, citing its transit-oriented development potential.

Transportation Choices Coalition, Feet First, and the Cascade Bicycle Club emphasized the need for the project to provide multimodal benefits, including benefits to bicyclists and pedestrians, and urged Sound Transit to do more to provide facilities and infrastructure for these travel choices. Some of the suggestions included evaluating potential new bicycle and sidewalk facilities within a 3-mile radius of the proposed light rail stations, adding more stations, constructing more sidewalks and bicycle improvements instead of parking facilities, and siting the stations as far from I-5 as possible. Several parties questioned the need for parking garages when the region is encouraging denser communities that depend less on the automobile.

The North King County Mobility Coalition was concerned with ADA issues. The organization felt the Draft EIS focused primarily on the needs of able-bodied commuters, and it would like to see greater outreach to and input from special needs communities as the project continues.

Several community or neighborhood groups and associations located along the corridor wrote comments about specific alternatives and issues near them. Many of these groups were from neighborhoods in Segment A, and included the Ridgcrest Neighborhood Association, the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group, the Parkwood Neighborhood Association, and neighborhood groups near the NE 185th Street and NE 145th/NE 155th Street stations. Several of these groups discussed

trade-offs between the NE 145th Street and NE 155th Street Stations, but indicated that their members were not unified in a station preference. Others encouraged Sound Transit to develop stations that were in scale with the neighborhood and allowed good access from the neighborhoods. Congestion, parking, visual impacts, noise, and safety were common concerns.

The Save Scriber Creek Park group circulated a petition against Alternatives C1 and C2, and gathered approximately 1,800 signatures (their count). They stated Alternative C3 was the clear “winner” with their group.

The Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund, Paramount Park Neighborhood group, Thornton Creek Alliance, and Friends of Jackson Park Trail wrote letters concerning impacts to Thornton Creek and other natural resources in the project area, water quality, parks, trails, and open spaces; several of the letters suggested areas where mitigation was needed.

7.5 Comments from Individuals

Sound Transit and FTA received 555 comment submittals from individuals, either in writing or recorded by court reporters at the open houses and public hearings. They covered a wide range of topics; the most common are presented here.

Segment A Alternatives

Of the Segment A alternatives, A1 was most often identified as the preferred route with A5 and A10 having the second greatest preference. Of the alternatives for station locations, more people favored the NE 130th Street Station, followed by preference for the NE 145th Street Station and the NE 155th Street Station. Of the options for the NE 185th Street Station, those who identified an option chose Option 1 (at-grade station east of I-5 with 500-stall parking garage to the west) over the other two options.

Segment B Alternatives

Of the Segment B alternatives, B2A was preferred by the most people. With this alternative, more people supported the 220th Street SW Station than opposed it.

Segment C Alternatives

Of the Segment C alternatives, the majority of responders preferred Alternative C3, with C1 the second most preferred. Those in support of Alternative C3 typically cited the need to preserve Scriber Creek Park, but many also noted acquisition and displacement impacts and stream and wetland impacts. The majority of those in favor of C1 provided their comments via a form letter with no explanation for their preference.

Acquisitions, Displacements, and Relocations

Most of the individual comments were related to acquisitions, displacements, and relocations, primarily regarding the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. Comments related to other properties were less common, although several provided detailed descriptions of the impacts to specific properties. For instance, the owner of rooming houses south of the proposed NE 130th Street Station was concerned with acquisition of the properties and the effects it would have on investment and income. Similar comments came from businesses affected by Alternative C1 or C2.

Social Impacts, Community Facilities, and Neighborhoods

Comments on social impacts, community facilities, and neighborhoods focused largely on the Segment A alternatives, especially the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church, and on Segment C Alternatives C1 and C2. The largest number of comments were from members of this church and users of the community center. They described the importance of the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and community center and stated concerns about not only the loss of these facilities, but also the potential effects of the loss of community.

Transportation

Transportation had the third greatest number of comments among environmental impact topics. The most common comments concerned pedestrian and bicycle amenities, parking, transit, and local streets and intersections. The main comments related to parking included on-street parking conflicts between local residents and commuters, insufficient parking, and too much parking (i.e., Sound Transit should not provide parking). Commenters also emphasized the need to integrate local transit with the light rail system and expressed concern over increased traffic in the vicinity of station locations and the potential effects on local streets and arterials.

Land Use and Economics

Most comments on land use and economics were related to transit-oriented development, including comments favoring specific stations that they felt could create transit-oriented development opportunities. Other commenters noted concerns about property values for single-family homeowners, or the need for mitigation during construction.

Visual and Aesthetic Resources

There were some concerns about impacts on visual and aesthetic resources. Most of these comments were from those living in single-family homes abutting the proposed alignments.

Noise and Vibration

Noise and vibration-related comments were mostly about the potential for noise, and included comments from single-family homeowners and representatives of the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Ecosystem Resources

Most of the comments on ecosystem resources related to tree and vegetation removal, and impacts to streams and wetlands. Most expressed concerns about the impacts of Alternatives C1 and C2 on the ecosystem resources at Scriber Creek Park and associated wetlands.

Public Services, Safety, and Security

The few comments received on this topic were mostly about impacts to the fire station near the proposed NE 155th Street Station.

Cultural, Archaeological, and Historic Resources

There were few comments on this specific topic, although there were many comments noting the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church as an important cultural center for Latvians and those with Baltic heritage.

Parks and Recreational Resources

This topic received numerous comments. Most were related to the parks and open space in the vicinity of Alternatives C1 and C2, especially Scriber Creek Park.

Suggestions for Other Alternatives

Sound Transit received some comments recommending other alternatives or modifications to the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS. Chapter 2 describes how these suggestions were addressed in the Final EIS. The primary suggestions were:

- The City of Lynnwood suggested a modified Alternative C3 that would potentially allow greater redevelopment of the City Center property block east of 44th Avenue West; the modification would place a station and alignment generally midway between Alternatives C2 and C3. (The Edmonds School District supported this suggestion as well.)
- The Pilchuck Audubon Society asked Sound Transit to consider an alternative that would avoid the Scriber Creek area. It proposed extending the route farther along I-5 before shifting east to the Lynnwood Transit Center or continuing the route north to the Alderwood Mall.
- Futurewise asked Sound Transit to consider a new alternative in Segment C to allow for a station closer to the Lynnwood Transit Center.

Most other commenters did not suggest new alternatives, but many encouraged considering options to avoid affecting the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church, including a comment suggesting moving I-5 to the west. Others recommended options that would avoid properties in specific locations. Another suggested a station at 220th Street SW in the freeway median.

7.6 Responses to Common Comments

Appendix P of this Final EIS includes responses to each substantive comment received during the Draft EIS public comment period. It lists the commenter's name and comments, and provides Sound Transit's and FTA's responses. Table 7-4 shows some of the most common comments received and the responses. They have been summarized or paraphrased.

Table 7-4. General Responses to Draft EIS Common Comments

Common Theme	Common Response
Alternatives Considered	
Consider a modified Alternative C3.	In response to the City of Lynnwood's request for a modified Alternative C3 to better connect to the Lynnwood Transit Center, preserve re-developable land, and minimize wetland and stream impacts, Sound Transit, in collaboration with the City of Lynnwood, developed a modification of Alternative C3 for the Final EIS. The Final EIS calls this the Preferred Alternative.
Consider increasing the number of stations.	Sound Transit considered additional stations beyond those outlined in earlier planning studies and additional stations were added as a result of early EIS scoping comments. Opportunities for stations also need to coincide with east-west access points, which are limited. As a regional transit project with a purpose and need to connect major regional centers, the number of stations needs to be balanced with the prevailing surrounding densities (single-family residential in much of this corridor) and the increase in system-wide travel time that would result from adding stations.
Did Sound Transit consider routes away from I-5?	Alternative routes away from the I-5 corridor were considered during the Alternatives Analysis and early EIS planning based on input from the public during early scoping and EIS scoping. These routes included alignments along Lake City Way, 15th Avenue NE, and SR 99. Given the lack of available right-of-way in the largely developed areas outside of I-5, these other alignments would involve higher levels of impacts to traffic and the built environment (particularly neighborhoods), lower ridership, and higher costs. For more detail see Section 2.6 in Chapter 2.

Table 7-4. General Responses to Draft EIS Common Comments

Common Theme	Common Response
Transportation Impacts and Mitigation	
Multimodal access to the stations should be a high priority. Sound Transit should accommodate all modes, including buses, bicycles, pedestrians, and automobiles.	The project's purpose is to expand the light rail system in order to provide reliable, rapid, and efficient transit service that, among other benefits, connects to the regional multimodal transportation system. This system includes buses, bicycles, pedestrians, automobiles, paratransit, and persons with disabilities. Appendix F, Conceptual Plans, of the Final EIS illustrates the conceptual design of station features that accommodate these modes. Sound Transit has also adopted a system access policy to help guide access decisions throughout the region.
Suggestions to lower or increase the parking provided at stations.	The alternatives identify the number of park-and-ride spaces for station options as a planning estimate that serves as a conservative basis for impact analysis, cost estimating, and ridership forecasts. For the Final EIS, additional parking supply options were also considered at Mountlake Terrace Transit Center and the Lynnwood Transit Center. The estimates consider accessibility of the station area, overall ridership, conditions of the local roadway network, the desires of the local jurisdictions and surrounding community, and the likely demand for automobile access to the stations. The automobile demand is also analyzed from an overall corridor perspective and the distribution of spaces by station. Sound Transit balances the sizing and design of the parking facility at the station with the need for good multimodal connections in order to serve the needs of the region as well as local communities. The agency's system access policy will also guide final design details about parking spaces.
What are the proposed traffic mitigation and improvements in the neighborhoods surrounding the proposed stations?	The traffic impact mitigation measures are identified in the Final EIS in Chapter 3. Sound Transit updated them to reflect design refinements as well as additional traffic forecasts and analysis. In addition to mitigation, some elements of the project (such as new or modified roadways, sidewalks, and intersections) are described in Chapter 2, with conceptual designs illustrated in Appendix F.
Environmental Impacts and Mitigation	
4.1 Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations; 4.4 Social Impacts, Community Facilities, and Neighborhoods	
Avoid displacement of the Seattle Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. The church is culturally important to the region's Latvian community, the larger Baltic community, and those interested in Scandinavian studies.	All Segment A alternatives now realign a section of 3rd Avenue NE to avoid displacing the church or the church hall (also called the cultural center).

Table 7-4. General Responses to Draft EIS Common Comments

Common Theme	Common Response
4.2 Land Use	
Consider transit-oriented development at station locations.	Sound Transit's policy is to support transit-oriented development around its light rail stations. However, conceptual plans for the stations (including parking garages) do not depict specific transit-oriented development details. Several stations are also on the I-5 right-of-way, where non-transportation uses are not allowed, although development could still occur on nearby properties. Sound Transit will consider opportunities to encourage transit-oriented development partnerships with others. Sound Transit will also coordinate with local jurisdictions and other property owners to consider opportunities to maximize transit-oriented development potential in station areas.
4.5 Visual and Aesthetic Resources	
Retain mature trees to improve aesthetics and to provide a visual separation for the residential areas surrounding the stations.	The Preferred Alternative has modifications to minimize tree removal in some locations, but in other locations removal is unavoidable. The project will include landscaping and aesthetic treatments where feasible, and WSDOT and the Cities also have tree replacement requirements that apply to the project. It may take 15 to 20 years for plant growth to fully screen large facilities, such as parking garages or the guideway, and replacing the mature evergreen trees could require 30 to 50 years of growth. Section 4.5.6 in Chapter 4 has more details.
4.7 Noise and Vibration	
Retain a tree buffer to minimize noise created by the light rail.	Dense, evergreen foliage, at least 100 feet deep and 20 feet high, has been shown to reduce noise from traffic by up to 3 dB; however, the project corridor is too narrow to maintain enough foliage to notably reduce noise levels. Buffers may still be used to help minimize visual impacts. Section 4.7 (Noise and Vibration) describes the mitigation measures Sound Transit would take to address noise impacts.
Noise pollution from I-5 is already an issue; please minimize additional noise that would result from the proposed light rail.	It is Sound Transit's policy to mitigate moderate to severe noise and vibration impacts caused by the project, as defined by FTA and FHWA criteria.
4.8 Ecosystem Resources	
Sound Transit's alternatives should protect wetlands and streams.	The alternatives were developed to protect or avoid impacts to wetlands and streams, especially high quality resources. In areas where impacts may still occur, Sound Transit has explored design refinements that could avoid or reduce impacts. In addition to complying with local, state, and federal environmental laws and regulations that emphasize avoidance and minimization, Sound Transit's policy, Executive Order No. 1, Establishing a Sustainability Initiative for Sound Transit (2007), states that Sound Transit's projects are to avoid impacts on environmentally sensitive resources to the maximum extent practicable and to provide adequate mitigation to ensure no net loss of ecosystem function and acreage as a result of agency projects. These values have been incorporated in the design of the alternatives for this project.

Table 7-4. General Responses to Draft EIS Common Comments

Common Theme	Common Response
4.9 Water Resources	
Incorporate low impact development into all alternatives to the maximum extent feasible.	Sound Transit requires all projects to consider low impact development methods, such as permeable pavement, as a first choice for stormwater treatment. Many such measures are already incorporated within the project's conceptual designs, and Sound Transit will continue to consider low impact development strategies as part of the final design.
4.14 Public Services, Safety and Security	
Avoid interference with Shoreline Fire Station No. 65 near proposed NE 155th Street Station.	Sections 4.14.2 and 4.14.5 in Chapter 4 describes measures Sound Transit could apply to manage traffic serving the station while maintaining effective access for the fire station. If this station is included in the project, Sound Transit would work closely with the City of Shoreline and the Fire Department to resolve potential conflicts with bus and vehicle traffic, and to maintain emergency response times and access during the construction period and light rail operation.
4.17 Parks and Recreational Resources	
Please avoid impacting Scriber Creek Park.	Alternatives C1 and C2 impact Scriber Creek Park. Alternative C1 crosses Scriber Creek Park, while Alternative C2 runs near (but outside) the southern border of the park. Section 4.17.6 in Chapter 4 includes proposed measures to mitigate impacts if these alternatives are selected; however, for Alternative C1, some impacts would be unavoidable. For this reason, FTA has determined that Alternative C1 would result in a Section 4(f) use of Scriber Creek Park; therefore, Sound Transit would need to pursue alternatives that would avoid the park. The Preferred Alternative and Alternative C3 would not impact Scriber Creek Park.