

---

**From:** home <abcs04@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 3:44 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Comments on DEIS

A very comprehensive report, and the volume of information is overwhelming for a decision-maker. Some observations and suggestions:

- I-341-001** • All of the criteria seem to be presented as equal to one another. For instance, the number of properties expected to be taken by any one option is equated to a ridership estimate. Check the results from Central Link for both of these – and the other elements – and you'll no doubt find that some were more accurate than others. This "certain" information should be a major consideration, as this is *actual* experience, even though it's a different segment with, more than likely, different people making the estimates...but, their methodologies are probably similar. I'm comfortable in my feeling that you'll find that property impacts and capital cost estimates were closer to reality than ridership estimates were for Central Link. A percent accuracy for each element would be useful, so as to not fall into a trap of considering each element is equally accurate, which is what looked to be the case in my reviewing this DEIS.
- I-341-002** • "Cheap" shouldn't be the top priority, but perhaps "bang for the buck" should be. I'd rather see 4 stations built well than 5 or 6 stations built bare-bones.
- I-341-003** • Spacing of stations should be considered, as well as what that conveys/feels like, i.e., is this a limited-stop transit mode, or more like a bus or streetcar? Additionally, does a station at location "X" give you something valuable enough that otherwise would be lost. I was glad to see that there were estimates for gains and losses associated with each station in the DEIS, as this hasn't been presented verbally, rather, I have only heard of the "ridership" lost, which is misleading, not only for the gray area that ridership estimates tread into, but also for a lack of completeness, because there are a myriad of objective "pros" and "cons" that should all be presented as a table for you to weigh.
  - Regarding spacing, on approximately a straight line, the mileages from Northgate Station to: 130th (1.5), 145th (2.3), 155th (2.8). The mileages from 130th to: 145th (0.8), 155th (1.3), 185th (2.8). The mileage from 185th to Mountlake Terrace Transit Center: 3.1, The mileage from Mountlake Terrace Transit Center to: 220th (1.0), Lynnwood Transit Center (2.0). This spacing, along with access considerations/feasibility, suggests that an option that's not listed may be more prudent, stations at 130th and 185th. The ST2 plan defined a "general" scope for the project, voters expect the decision makers to wade through the options, not capitulate to cities' whims (e.g., your board bypassing Southcenter) unless they make sense to the region, with the result not precisely what they saw in the initial materials (e.g., King County Metro's upcoming plan for reductions will differ from what they suggested last spring). It's a fluid process, most voters are smart enough to realize that, and we saw that the "actual" Central Link differed from the initial proposal. Beware of the territoriality of the proponents of various options!!!
- I-341-004** • Connections to regional multi-modal transportation systems is a goal. It is instructive as to where we are **today** at each of the proposed station locations, as we are in a financially-challenged environment and are likely to continue to be so; all one has to do is look at the federal debt issue or the state special session issue. As one statement noted, you should seek: "stations that are easily accessible by foot, bike, bus, or car." I'd add: "given the financial environment of **today**." Are sidewalks complete, which the DEIS didn't seem to focus on well, and from which directions from what population would this draw from? Are there bicycle lanes in place, and what is the total population that this may draw from

### I-341-001

Your comments concerning the presentation of information used to compare project alternatives are noted. The purpose of an EIS is to present potential impacts of a project to the public and decision makers. The various environmental resources are not weighted. The methodologies used to make estimates for project impacts are generally similar to the methodology used for the Central Link environmental review document and both are based on conceptual engineering design.

### I-341-002

Sound Transit's objective is to develop a project that best meets the purpose and need for the project, minimizes environmental impacts, and is cost effective.

### I-341-003

Your comments on spacing between the proposed light rail transit stations are noted. As a regional facility that is linked with the local transit network, the station spacing reflects a balance between access, travel times, ridership, current land use, and the land use plans of local jurisdictions. The neighborhoods between NE 130th and NE 155th Streets are among the most dense in the corridor, and therefore one station only with a larger gap between the stations would have given fewer people good accessibility to transit (particularly for walk or bike trips). The Draft EIS alternatives also were arranged to allow other combinations of stations, but as the strongest support in public comments and from local jurisdictions was for a NE 145th Station from early scoping through the Draft EIS, a unique alternative featuring a NE 130th and NE 185th combination did not appear necessary.

### I-341-004

A detailed inventory of existing pedestrian facilities within 1/2 mile of the stations and existing bicycle facilities within 1 mile of the stations is

I-341-004

(neighborhood streets would have a higher possibility than major arterials)? What transit routes serve that location, particularly all-day service, and how frequent? What are today's traffic volumes on the major approach streets? Hopefully, you've seen this first-hand during peak a.m. and peak p.m. commutes at each prospective station location, knowing that light rail-bound motorists will seek neighborhood cut-throughs where main streets are clogged. What multi-family and business developments are nearby or are proposed for the next 10 years? The certainty favors today's conditions over tomorrow's possibilities under a "if money is no object" perspective that some proponents are using in their attempt to influence you, which is a dangerous assumption to take on.

I-341-005

- It should be considered secondary what is possible in order of cost (weighting each). For instance, are existing roads nearby the proposed locations wide enough **today** where bicycle lanes could be striped, a relatively-inexpensive proposition that has high likelihood of reality, and then what's the feasibility of their widespread use (neighborhood streets would have a higher possibility than major arterials)? The same question for completing sidewalks and widening them, which is more expensive and thus less likely of becoming reality, and should be weighted as such. Three of the overpasses in the study: 130th, 145th, and 185th, have narrow sidewalks, and the first two have heavy vehicular traffic volumes adjacent and harrowing (at best) bicycle conditions that are only for the "professional" bicycle commuter. The same question for widening streets, but here the possibility of securing funding coupled with the dwindling time (less than 10 years) are **huge** impediments, sharply reducing the possibility of this coming to fruition, and mitigation of existing traffic during construction should be a consideration. While I didn't see the volume numbers within the DEIS (it is a huge document), I did see the proof that traffic volume matters within the DEIS, with the highest accident incidents on 145th, then 130th, and none at 185th. Each of these accident numbers would be higher with the addition of a light rail station on those streets.

I-341-006

- It should be considered tertiary if something's been *zoned* for higher density with no developer in the wings, as a development could take years or decades. It should be considered how many quadrants around the stations *could* be developed: all four corners, 3, 2, or only 1. For instance, the 130th location has a park in one quadrant and part of another. The 145th location has a park and a private school in two quadrants. The 155th location has a park in one quadrant. The 185th location has a school district property in one quadrant...though, that quadrant is also a destination of a senior center and stadium.

I-341-007

- It should be considered secondary what bus transit *may* do, as we're talking 10 years from now, and most of the planners making the guesses today will be in different positions or retired by then, while nobody can guess with certainty what the financial situation will be in 2023. At present, we're awaiting a cut in Metro service that is to start 1 year from now that's equivalent to eliminating Community Transit's *entire* service. It's therefore more instructive what transit is doing today: are they avoiding certain streets and using others. For instance, 130th has no service cross-town over the freeway, but the BRT-like Metro #41 (from Lake City to Northgate) is 5 blocks south. At 145th, the peak-hour service goes north/south on 5th NE in the peak direction, another travels in the opposite of peak going east in 145th in the a.m., all avoiding the I-5 overpass; one peak direction, peak only route (#308) comes from the east over that overpass, another (#304) from the west turns short of it; the only all-day route (#347) goes the off direction for peak direction travel. There's no cross-town service on this street. The 155th, 185th, and 220th locations have some degree of cross-town service. Mountlake Terrace and Lynnwood Transit Centers have ample transit service all day today.

I-341-008

- Regarding specific locations: 130th should have parking along 5th NE just north of the prospective station, and particularly if the next station north is at 155th or 185th. For 145th, due to the high traffic on that street (over 30,000 vehicles/day on the east approach, over 25,000 from the west; see <http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/Council/Staffreports/2012/Staffreport022712-9a.pdf>), parking should be split: perhaps a location in the 145th/15th NE-20th NE area, which should be a consideration for 130th and 155th options as well. For 155th, I was surprised that expanding the existing parking at Twin Ponds Park (just west of the I-5 overpass) into a garage wasn't considered. Shoreline Community College to the west is expanding its campus, the city is aiming to make the Westminster Square to the west more viable, developments are planned to the east (15th NE), other destinations (Crest Cinemas, skateboard park) are nearby, and buses travel in all 4 directions. For 185th,

provided in the Transportation Technical Report that supports the Draft EIS impact analysis as well as the design of station areas and ongoing access planning. An inventory of existing transit services is also included in the Transportation Technical Report. City future land use plans were evaluated during analysis of station siting, and is also discussed in Section 4.4 of the EIS.

**I-341-005**

All of the light rail alternatives would meet or exceed local jurisdictional, Sound Transit, and ADA design standards for pedestrian facilities fronting the stations areas and roadways that are reconstructed as part of the project. Specific locations where increased sidewalk widths are needed to accommodate peak pedestrian volumes are identified in the Transportation Technical Report, which is included the Final EIS as an electronic document. Bicycle lanes may be added to roadways reconstructed for the project where possible, but extensive bicycle lane striping or sidewalk completion is not a component of this project.

Section 3.2.8 discusses safety at intersections impacted by the project. Pedestrian and bicycle volumes are expected to increase at intersections near proposed stations, which could result in greater potential for conflicts. However, the project would have minimal impact on traffic safety; station areas will be designed for multimodal access and to minimize the potential for traffic conflicts. At NE 145th Street, for example, the project would improve safety with geometric modifications and access changes with a new signal at the I-5 northbound on-ramp at 5th Avenue NE.

**I-341-006**

Your comment is noted. These factors were considered in the TOD potential analysis.

**I-341-008**

doing the same – expanding the existing – in this case stadium parking lot into a garage makes the most sense, and I'd like to see wider sidewalks over I-5 in any event. In conjunction, WSDOT should install a traffic signal at 205th St./244th SW/SR-104 and 5th NE, as I suspect that 5th NE will become a major access route (given that access from beyond 10th NE to the east is challenging), perhaps even for *Swift* or *RapidRide* bus rapid transit buses. For the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center, the east location is the only one that makes sense, and they have a wide sidewalk over I-5 on the north side, while bicyclists have plenty of room to operate, though they could use a striped lane.

Good luck in what I hope is narrowing down the options, not selecting a final one.

**I-341-007**

Your comment is noted. Current transit service in the project study area is discussed in Section 3.1.2 of the EIS.

**I-341-008**

Your comments about parking are noted. The Final EIS discusses Sound Transit's current parking plans at each proposed station; see Section 3.2.7.

**I-342-001**

This comment required translation into English. The translation is located on the next page along with Sound Transit's response.

---

**From:** bruno.strautins@lma.lv  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 10:59 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Latviešu Sabiedriskais centrs

**I-342-001**

Sveicināti, dārgie tautieši! Esmu sašutis par ideju likvidēt Latviešu Sabiedrisko centru. To nedrīkst pieļaut! Tā ir viena no mūsu mazās tautas nedaudzajām kultūras salihām plašajā pasaulē!!!

Cerēsim, ka izdosies to nosargāt!!!  
Sirsnīgus sveicienus no Latvijas-  
Rīgas-sūtot,  
Bruno Strautiņš, Latvijas Mākslas akadēmijas profesors

I-342-002

Latvian	English
Sveicināti, dārgie tautieši! Esmu sašutis par ideju likvidēt Latviešu Sabiedrisko centru. To nedrīkst pielaut! Tā ir viena no mūsu mazās tautas nedaudzajām kultūras salīnām plašajā pasaulē!!!	Dear fellow countryman! The idea of the liquidation of the Latvian Community Centre has shocked me. This cannot be permitted! This is one of the few islands of culture of our small nation within the global world!!!
Cerēsim, ka izdosies to nosargāt!!!	Let's hope we succeed in defending it!!!
Sirsnīgus sveicienus no Latvijas-Rīgas-sūtot, Bruno Strautiņš, Latvijas Mākslas akadēmijas profesors	With warmhearted greetings from Latvia - Riga, Bruno Strautiņš, Professor of the Art Academy of Latvia

### I-342-002

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 results of 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.

**I-343-001**

Your concerns about the Lynnwood Link Extension impacting your neighborhood are noted.

---

**From:** Emily Jewell <ejjewell@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 9:19 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on alternatives for segment A

---

From: ejjewell@hotmail.com  
To: lynwoodlinkdeis@soundtransit.org  
Subject: Comments on alternatives for segment A  
Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2013 21:15:14 -0700

To Whom It May Concern:

After carefully reading through your executive summary of the DEIS, my heart is in my throat. I am going to have difficulty commenting on it without expressing that, but that panic is, in and of itself, something you

**I-343-001** need to know. I may not have a property that you confiscate (call it what it really is), but how you proceed with this project will either only moderately affect myself and my neighbors, or ruin my neighborhood (and possibly my finances). "The Greatest Good of the Greatest Number" should not come at such a high cost to those of us that already live here.

I live within 100 yards of the intersection of Roosevelt Way and 5th Ave NE. I often work from home, and have done since Nov 2006, so I know my street intimately. My street, NE 130th, will see only 4-6 cars NOT belonging to residents all day long. Neighbors walk their dogs up and down it. Hardly anyone parks on it - cars are tucked neatly into driveways. Gardens are usually well-tended, even creative, since they are on show to everyone. Because of our numerous trees, we get many birds, from migrating Juncos, to resident hummingbirds and Steller's Jays. My neighbors two doors down the hill have had the rare and endangered Pileated Woodpeckers visiting their garden all summer. We only get this sort of wildlife here because of our extensive tree canopy and our peace and quiet. If the wind is from the east, birdsong is often louder than I-5.

**I-343-002** | If you put a station at NE 130th St, the ensuing traffic (car and foot), and noise, as well as the felling of so many mature trees that screen us from the freeway, will considerably diminish our quality of life. There is very little room for a station at this intersection, compared to what is available at NE 145th St, which you can plainly see from the satellite view on Google Maps. Noise will more than double, and because of the 130th St Bridge over the freeway, you won't be able to erect a noise mitigation wall which will help us. Soundproofing insulation in our houses won't help if we want to open a window - or enjoy gardening, or a barbeque outside; nor will it keep wildlife from being frightened away.

**I-343-003** | Because of the tight site at NE 130th St, you won't be able to provide nearly enough parking, so train riders will either not be able to find parking in the designated lot you will supposedly build, or will ignore it, and will turn our street into a parking garage instead. Inevitably, car crime, litter, and graffiti will follow. It's no good saying that you will plan for this contingency - you will plan for what you think SHOULD happen rather than for actual human behaviour. If this sounds cynical, I can point to an excellent example of this 250 yards down 5th Ave NE, where the elimination of the Northgate North Park & Ride to build a new park resulted in most of those people driving half a mile north and parking all up and down 5th Ave NE (making it much more dangerous to cycle there, past all of those parked cars (none of whom ever seem to look before opening their doors)). Send someone up here and I'll be happy to show you this Unintended Consequence. Moreover, your own studies apparently state that you'll hardly gain any riders by putting a station at 130th St. Is it worth ruining our neighborhood to serve a few hundred other people?

**I-343-005** | My comments could apply nearly as well to the proposed 155th St site. Once again, it is a relatively quiet residential area, though it already has more traffic than we do. To my mind, the alternatives that put a station at 145th St are the only ones that keep disruption to a minimum throughout segment A. 145th St is already very busy, and has much more room geographically speaking for a station and parking which could serve both North Seattle and South Shoreline. This more versatile location would save money by eliminating

### **I-343-002**

Noise walls are planned for all alternatives in this area as mitigation for the light rail noise impacts that exceed the FTA criteria. See Section 4.7 in the Final EIS for the projected noise impacts in your area.

Foliage, if dense, can provide slight reductions in noise levels. It could provide up to a 3-dBA reduction in transportation noise for locations with at least 100 feet of dense foliage that contains leaves year-round. However, a 3-dB reduction in noise level is barely perceptible to most people, so foliage in virtually all areas of this project corridor has little effect in reducing noise.

### **I-343-003**

As you noted, parking would be limited at the NE 130th Street Station, if it is built. One station option calls for approximately 100 spaces at a leased lot and another station option would not include parking. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the NE 130th Street Station options.

### **I-343-004**

Your comments about crime at the NE 130th Street Station are noted. See Section 4.14.2 in the Final EIS for Sound Transit crime analysis. 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. The stations would be well lit, continually monitored by security cameras, and regularly monitored by 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 the surrounding neighborhoods.

- I-343-005** | one station; the money saved there could be spent to make sure that the mitigation for local residents and wildlife was as effective as possible - instead of an afterthought. With that in mind only alternatives A1 and A3 are acceptable.
- I-343-006** | If those of us who live on the doorstep of a proposed station weren't scared already, your online panel discussion would have done it. Your spokesman Michelle made it clear from the language that she used in the panel discussion that one of your goals is to PROMOTE "Transit-Oriented Development" in the neighborhood of the stations - which virtually assures that whatever neighborhood gets a station will change out of all recognition. This will certainly increase tax revenues from the people you can shoehorn into the site, and
- I-343-007** | will certainly eliminate yet more of Seattle's already shrinking tree canopy. Your spokesman Steve, when asked about impact on the Thornton Creek watershed, just muttered something about "complying with all the regulations" by which he means he doesn't give a f\*\*k as long as all the correct boxes are ticked on the forms. He mentioned providing "replacement wetlands" - clearly NOT in the Thornton Creek watershed (and therefore no use to those of us who live there), which, in case you had forgotten, is supposedly a salmon stream, albeit a degraded one. I find it utterly hypocritical of you to be so easy on yourselves in these circumstances when you are so tough on struggling farmers in these counties if they get anywhere remotely NEAR a tiny tributary of a salmon stream. But hey, they aren't a fashionable minority either, are they? We can get our food from Mexico, right?
- I-343-008** | In summary: If you put a station at 130th, you may not need to confiscate my house, but you will probably degrade my neighborhood's quality of life so much that I will be forced to try to sell it, and probably lose money on it, 'cause no family in their right mind will want it. A developer will be able to buy it cheap enough that he can put a "multi-family" development on it - shorthand for an edge-to-edge 4-pak
- I-343-009** | townhouse development encouraged by your TOD rezoning, complete with poisonous stormwater runoff flowing directly downhill into Thornton Creek and thence into Lake Washington. You will have eliminated all the mature vegetation that provides stormwater storage and filtration, and wildlife habitat. A win-win situation all round.

**I-343-005**

Your comment stating your preference for the Segment A alternatives that include a proposed light rail transit station at NE 145th Street is noted.

**I-343-006**

Sound Transit is interested in transit-oriented development in locations where it makes sense, so each proposed station location was assessed for that potential; see Section 4.2.4 of the Final EIS. This does not mean that all stations are good candidates for future development. Sound Transit prepared a *Station Area Transit-Oriented Development Potential Report* that provides details about each station area and how it might (or might not) support future development. Each city must be involved in discussions about how, and if, development might occur around a station. At the NE 130th Street Station, the current zoning to support future development is limited. Any rezoning is the responsibility of the City of Seattle and not part of the Lynnwood Link Extension project.

**I-343-007**

One of the key considerations in the development of the design alternatives was the protection of ecosystems, including wetlands and streams. Numerous federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations have been enacted with this goal in mind; Sound Transit plans to comply with these laws and regulations. Sound Transit's commitment to ecosystem protection is further demonstrated through the agency's policy [Executive Order No. 1, Establishing a Sustainability Initiative for Sound Transit (2007)] on ecosystem mitigation, which is 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 are incorporated in the design of the alternatives for this project.



I challenge your design team to prove me wrong.  
Dejectedly yours,  
Dr. Emily A. Jewell DVM

Section 4.8 of the Final EIS presents all the anticipated impacts on ecosystem resources by the project, and presents mitigation measures to address those impacts that would be unavoidable. One of the potential compensatory mitigation locations for wetland impacts is along North Branch Thornton Creek.

**I-343-008**

Your concerns about the value of your property near a light rail station are acknowledged. Section 4.3 of the EIS discusses the impact of the transit facilities on property values.

**I-343-009**

Sound Transit recognizes the importance of Thornton Creek and the citizens living within its watershed. Managing stormwater runoff to Thornton Creek and its tributaries is a priority for Sound Transit. Sound Transit will control potential risks to water resources through project planning, design, and the application of required best management practices. Sound Transit will improve conditions in the watershed by replacing existing areas of non-native vegetation with native plants. Sound Transit also will minimize the potential for construction of the project to interfere with possible future fish habitat restoration projects by designing and locating project features to avoid Thornton Creek.

To The Sound Transit Board,

My name is Wendy Nelson and my family lives at 20043 12th Ave.N.E. directly below the Lake Forest Park/ Edmonds exit of I-5. This also puts us directly below the path of your Sound Transit project which will have a major impact on our home and neighborhood. I have read the DEIS report and talked to Matt Sheldon several times about our serious safety concerns. I would like to thank Mr. Sheldon, again, for coming to our neighborhood barbecue to speak with us about Sound Transit's plans. Still many of my fundamental questions have yet to be answered with any degree of certainty or hard information.

I-344-001

The terrain between our home and I-5 is a very steep, tree covered hillside comprised mostly of fill dirt from the original I-5 project. My home is at the very bottom of this hillside and roughly 90 feet from your proposed rail line. This greenbelt between us and the freeway acts as a sound barrier, a beautiful visual barrier but more importantly the trees protect the hillside from erosion and absorb a great deal of water runoff heading towards the creek that borders the other side of our neighborhood. I would like to know your plans for dealing with the water run-off, the destabilization of our hillside during construction and the continued stability of the hill after your project is finished. I would also like to know your plans for sound mitigation as well as the impact of continued vibration on the hillside. What safeguards are in place in case of earthquake or accident? Where can I see the results of your soil tests from our hillside? Who do we contact when trees from the state's hillside fall onto our property once you remove the current windbreak of trees? What are your precautions to prevent mudslides?

I-344-002

My neighbor Michael Cameron has submitted an alternate plan for this leg of your project and I ask that you please give it serious consideration. It allows the track to avoid our neighborhood entirely and puts the rails on a trajectory more inline with the Mountlake Terrace transit center where the station will be located. I can only hope this change would be more cost effective than building sound walls, walls with landscaping for erosion control, catch ponds for water run-off and the strong possibility of lawsuits should any of these solutions fail to work. While we have been told repeatedly that you will be living up to all the required federal standards for all of these issues it has been my observation that federal standards are generally not the "gold standard" for an industry but more along the lines of the bare minimum required by law. We find these are very limited reassurances for us.

We love our homes and the quality of life our neighborhood has provided for us. We all chose this area for the beauty of it's setting. We're blessed with the variety of wildlife that inhabits the hillside including the occasional deer. I hope you will give us the same kind of consideration you would want for yourselves and your neighbors if this project was in your backyard.

Sincerely,  
Wendy and Ken Nelson

**I-344-001**

The EIS includes a summary of the geologic hazards that have been identified in the project areas. The project design will address identified geologic hazards, including evaluation of erosion potential and slope stability along the project alignment, in accordance with applicable building codes. The project design plans will address stability of both the light rail elevated structure and the steep slope between I-5 and your property that is affected during construction and after construction. At this time, site-specific recommendations for prevention of mudslides or landslides on your property are unavailable, but will be available as the design progresses into final design. Sound Transit will employ measures to prevent slope destabilization during construction and operation of the project. Section 4.9 of the EIS discusses the mitigation for erosion and sediment control during construction. Section 4.11 discusses impacts to the geology and soils in the project area. Section 4.7 addresses noise and vibration impacts, and describes mitigation to address them.

**I-344-002**

Your concerns about the project's potential impacts on your property are noted. Sound Transit received Mr. Cameron's alternate plan, and it is included in this set of comments and responses. The Final EIS Appendix F, Conceptual Plans, shows the proposed alignment for the Preferred Alternative. Sound Transit has proposed mitigation outlined in the Final EIS and mitigation commitments listed in Appendix N to address project impacts, with the intention of avoiding and minimizing impacts on adjacent land uses.

---

**From:** karin <k-rana@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 11:02 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** RE: Lynnwood Extension DEIS

Please use this copy not the one previously sent.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft DEIS for the Lynnwood Extension. This email contains comments and concerns regarding the routing and analysis. For perspective, I have a degree in Sustainable Transportation and Livable Communities and worked on the design and build-out of several LRT lines in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul region and served on the Senior Staff team for the HUD Sustainable Communities Grant. I also worked for the State of Washington for 17 years leading implementation of the Economic Adjustment Initiative, a component of the NW Forest Plan, and served as Senior Planner under Growth Management Services where my specialties were SEPA-GMA integration and economic development. I have been active in the Latvian community in Minneapolis and in Seattle, where I taught in the Latvian School, performed with the folk dancing troupe, and sang and led ensembles and artistic performances. My son was christened at the church.

My comments are specific to the environmental justice aspects of the project, and the preferred alternative.

Environmental Justice

Nineteen years have passed since the signing of Executive Order 12898. While the Environmental Protection Agency has been the primary steward of the Environmental Justice Executive Order. In 2010 the Federal Transportation Department and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development joined the effort, thus escalating the importance and prominence of environmental justice in decision affecting the building of regional transit systems and other major federal investments. This action had immediate effect in Saint Paul, where during the planning for the Central Corridor the low-income community in the Rondo neighborhood was bypassed by the train that would pass directly through their community. The outcome of their outrage and concern was the addition of three stations and commensurate federal resources to accomplish the task. It also put the federal spotlight on Minneapolis-Saint Paul to ensure that the region developed and implemented citizen participation and engagement in a matter that was culture and community sensitive, genuine and creative in its tools and tactics, and shared decision-making with the communities.

The Minneapolis and Saint Paul community were highly sensitized to the various aspects of environmental justice; that it is more than giving those from underserved and underrepresented communities the vehicles and the direct access into the decision making process for major infrastructure investments like light rail, it was also recognition that culture is an important aspect of environmental justice. This is important as our country and the Pacific Northwest region continue to diversify.

It is my assertion that cultural diversity and the definition of environmental justice communities are relevant when considering the impacts of routing, mode, and construction of the proposed Lynnwood extension. Culture is a component of sustainability and environmental justice. In 2004, the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council released a report containing several recommendations that are directly relevant to this project including:

1

### I-345-001

Thank you for your detailed comments on the environmental justice, pertinent regulation, and your own personal experience associated with the Saint Paul Central Corridor Light Rail Project. 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.

Sound Transit communicated with representatives from the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church prior to the release of the Draft EIS; see Appendix L of the EIS, which lists all the project's outreach activities.

I-345-001

**I-345-001**

- “Encourage enhanced community assessments and communication methods to improve cultural sensitivity for environmental justice communities”
- “There is an acute necessity to improve and create more effective communication between facilities, regulators and environmental justice communities”
- “New and consistent opportunities are needed to help environmental justice communities influence decisions”

While the provides the standard socio-economic review typical of most planning documents of its kind, it is silent on the matter of cultural environmental justice. Cultural environmental justice is not always correlated with underrepresented or underserved communities, it is often associated with a history of diaspora. If a community has a critical mass in a community like Seattle, for example, the reasons are often linked to displacement and where refugees secured sponsorships to relocate and start new lives. Our country has experienced waves of displaced people coming to its shores. Many of these communities stick together, recreating home and continuing traditions while living in a larger macro American society.

I think the environmental review of the Lynnwood alternatives should be strengthened with language added that: 1) the Latvian Lutheran Church is a vital cultural center that serves as a focal point for cultural, social, and political activities of Baltic communities across the western states and Canada, 2) there should be on-going communication between the Project Office and the Baltic community, with the community invited to participate on the Communication Advisory Committee, the Business Advisory Committee for the LRT project and other project management bodies, and that 3) the Baltic Community should be directly involved in the decision-making for the proposed Lynnwood extension.

My understanding is that the leadership and members of these communities had no idea that the alternatives analysis was underway in 2010-2011, so the DEIS was a surprising and unpleasant shock. It goes to show that standard forums of outreach: press releases, public meetings, etc. are not the most effective ways of reaching today's public; intentional and innovative community engagement by Sound Transit. This is especially needed in corridors like this one where there are multiple issues and multiple actors. Sound Transit failed in this area and needs to do more to genuinely engage the communities it seeks to serve.

**I-345-002**

Preferred alternative

First, it needs to be stated that light rail is not going to resolve the congestion issues in the project area. Congestion is likely to worsen even with the introduction of light rail. Light rail could possibly be part of a solution that includes completing the HOV lanes, introducing BRT along key corridors and on I5, and ensuring that different transit modes, including bike and pedestrian amenities, are built out and functional. I know there is some BRT in the area but it really doesn't function like BRT should (and the removal of express bus service because there is now BRT does not serve the region's riders at all.) Further, since more modes will be needed, are the proposed stations located in the right place? Will future BRT stop in the same places? Will the modes “talk” with each other to make navigating the systems easy for riders?

Second, each alternative considers only at-grade and elevated tracks. The Sounder between downtown and the airport does a little bit of everything: at-grade, elevated and tunneled. Why isn't tunneling considered along this segment of the build-out? It seems that more geotechnical analysis is in order before it is determined that one of the proposed alternatives is the best one.

Third, any alternative that takes out housing, multifamily housing, and environmental features like a restored wetland is a red flag. In the instance of multifamily housing, removing these developments to make way for light rail is an oxymoron. Light rail encourages density. In this instance, the train is taking it out.

**I-345-002**

The analysis of traffic conditions presented in Chapter 3 compare future traffic conditions for 2035 for the No Build Alternative (without extension of the light rail system) and the light rail alternatives as people will opt to ride light rail. Section 3.2 explains that vehicular traffic will increase in the future, but it will not increase as much under the light rail alternatives. Completing the HOV lanes on I-5 is part of the evaluation of alternatives considered in the Draft EIS because such improvements are not under the purview of Sound Transit. Sound Transit will coordinate with the transit agencies serving each of the station areas in the future, but it will be the responsibility of the transit agencies to decide on the best alternative to improve bus transit connections to the proposed light rail stations. Light rail stations will included pedestrian and bicycle facilities; see Section 3.2.5 in the Final EIS. Chapter 3 discusses bus integration in Section 3.1.2.

Regarding tunneling, the topography in the project corridor lacks major changes that would point to a tunnel configuration as the most practical or cost-effective design approach. Sound Transit's alignment policy, described in Chapter 2, reserves tunneling as an alternative only when topographic, density, lack of available right-of-way, or environmental concerns mark other options inappropriate.

It is true that the Lynnwood Link Extension Project would remove multi-family housing and impact some wetlands. Sound Transit has attempted to minimize these types of impacts to the extent possible while designing the project to address the project Purpose and Need.

The extensive traffic modeling conducted at this initial phase of the project examined travel patterns of the work force residing in north Seattle to make sure that the selected project corridor would best serve the travel needs of workers. A map of the travel patterns of the north Seattle to Lynnwood laborshed is not included in the EIS, but the

**I-345-002** Finally, I have several macro suggestions:

- that you add a laborshed analysis to your review to determine if the workforce actually resides where the proposed stations are placed. It is possible to map laborsheds, Portland does this for example with planning routes, and you may not be reaching the places where the most workers reside or need to go, and
- that Sounder revisit its alternatives analysis to determine if all possibilities were really examined or not (going where you have the most right of way isn't always the best route.) It seems that they were not, especially when coupled with the reasonable assumption that the engagement during the alternatives analysis phase was minimal and passive.

**I-345-003** In closing, any route that removes a cultural center of regional significance, has only five stations with negligible or minimal opportunities for transit-oriented development, and that removes housing is unacceptable. In the spirit of environmental justice where:

- Fair treatment means that no group of people should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental and commercial operations or policies
- Meaningful Involvement means that:
  1. people have an opportunity to participate in decisions about activities that may affect their environment and/or health;
  2. the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision;
  3. their concerns will be considered in the decision making process; and
  4. the decision makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected

the impacts of the Preferred Alternative to the Baltic community and its cultural center of regional significance are unacceptable. A route, mode, or engineering solution that removes the impacts is welcomed.

If, upon further, transparent and inclusive analysis other routes prove unfeasible for technical reasons then, commensurate compensation to the center and the community for the loss or reduced functionality of its center is appropriate, as is an environmental justice grant to support collaborative problem-solving and participation in the planning process and in developing mitigation priorities of any impacts and unforeseen and unintended consequences.

Sincerely,  
Karina Berkholtz

---

From: karin [mailto:k-rana@comcast.net]  
Sent: Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:53 AM  
To: 'LynnwoodLinkDEIS@soundtransit.org'  
Subject: Lynnwood Extension DEIS

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft DEIS for the Lynnwood Extension. This email contains comments and concerns regarding the routing and analysis. For perspective, I have a degree in Sustainable Transportation and Livable Communities and worked on the design and build-out of several LRT lines in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul region and served on the Senior Staff team for the HUD Sustainable Communities Grant. I also worked for the State of Washington for 17 years leading implementation of the Economic Adjustment Initiative, a component of the NW Forest Plan, and served as Senior Planner under

3

analysis conducted closely examined available data to make sure the selected light rail transit corridor would best serve the metropolitan area.

Prior to starting the EIS analysis, Sound Transit performed an extensive Alternatives Analysis, which considered several routes and transit concepts. The Alternatives Analysis is located on the Lynnwood Link Extension Project website, within the document archive. Chapter 6 of the Final EIS describes the public outreach encompassing the Alternatives Analysis and continuing through the EIS process.

### **I-345-003**

Your comments are noted. As mentioned in the response to comment I-345-001, the Latvian Church will not be displaced by the Lynnwood Link Extension because Sound Transit was able to redesign the access to that property.

Note: A duplicate set of comments was received as part of the email and is not reproduced here but is retained in the project files.

---

**From:** Ginny Harris <ginnyharris777@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 20, 2013 5:33 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Sound Transit Lynnwood

**I-346-001** | I prefer the C-4 plan proposed by the City of Lynnwood to Soundtransit for the LynnwoodLink.

C-4 has the least impact on Scriber Lake Park, wetlands and wildlife in our area.  
Also, C-4 has the least impact on businesses and residents who would need to relocate.

**C-1, C-2 and C-3 are not acceptable!**

I attended the Sept. 14th meeting at city hall regarding this subject.

Thank you,

Ginny Harris  
5823 202nd. St. SW.  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

### **I-346-001**

Your preference for a new Alternative C4 that has been recommended to Sound Transit by the City of Lynnwood is noted. What you refer to as Alternative C4 is similar to a modified Alternative C3, which is the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides a description of the Preferred Alternative.

---

**From:** Mary <brierpatch111@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 20, 2013 4:57 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Rail station in Lynnwood

**I-347-001** I attended the meeting on Sat. Sept. 14 at Lynnwood City Hall where the proposals for the location of the new light rail station was shown and discussed by the people attending. I would like to see the rail line put where there is the least disturbance to the Scriber Lake and creek areas and also to not displace homes and businesses. After reviewing the proposals and also by going by car over to see the sites I think a rail line and station can be put where there is no tearing down of homes or business buildings.

**I-347-002** There was concern about the disabled not being able to get off the rail train and getting over to the buses. I think that is where the Dart buses would come in to play. The rail station can be put very close to the Lynnwood Park and Ride bus station where transfers can be made easily by walking or by the Dart bus.

**I-347-003** The "C" Proposal would be the best of the proposals that we were given to consider. I understand that the fourth proposal could not be used because the rail line at this time stops at the Lynnwood Park and Ride. I would like to see the "C" Proposal used as the priority and from that proposal make modifications if they are needed.

Mary Glover

### **I-347-001**

The Preferred Alternative evaluated in the Final EIS minimizes impacts to Scriber Creek Park and wetlands, businesses, and residents. Section 4.1 of the Final EIS discusses the project's property impacts for each alternative, Section 4.8 for wetland impacts, and Section 4.17 for parks impacts.

### **I-347-002**

All Sound Transit facilities are designed to meet the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA). Paratransit load/unload locations will be reviewed during final design to minimize travel distance for persons with disabilities.

### **I-347-003**

The comment names a proposal that was not part of the EIS or part of later suggestions by the City of Lynnwood. Sound Transit has developed a modified Alternative C3 as the Preferred Alternative.

---

**From:** Breezy Freimanis <breezyf@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 2:21 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** LATVIAN CENTER - Northgate - Sound Transit Link Light Rail

Hello,

My name is Brianna Freimanis. I am a member of the Latvian community here in Seattle and am here to voice my concerns of the impact of the Lynnwood Link Extension in Northgate on our church and community center.

The Latvian Lutheran Church is the central gathering place for friends and families of Latvians living in the area. It is used very frequently by Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians living in and around Seattle for functions such as church services, rehearsals, weddings, meetings, and a Latvian school, which I attended as a child.

I am a member of the Latvian folk dance group, Trejdeksnitis. We rehearse at the Latvian center every week, and would like to continue doing so as we perform very frequently and at international festivals, like the Latvian Song and Dance Festival we participated in this summer. I am also a singer in our choir, Sigulda, which performs at various festivals, community gatherings, and church services. Personally, the groups I am involved in use the center at least 2 times a week. If we lose this place to rehearse, I fear the effect it will have on our ability to continue the amazing work we do.

**I-348-001** It is imperative that as construction moves forward with the Link Light Rail, we are allowed access to our center. Disrupted access or relocation of our center would weaken our community, both financially and emotionally. We have spent years re-establishing our community after the loss of our last center in the 1970s to eminent domain. We are fortunate, as a cultural group, to have recovered and maintained a place where we, friends, and family from across the country and world, can gather to celebrate our traditions. My concern is that another relocation or disruption would be detrimental to our continued cultural heritage, and perhaps would be one we may not recover from.

I fully support the Link Light Rail, and continue to hope that you will take into consideration the ongoing effects it will have on our Latvian community. Please allow us continued access to our center as you move forward with the Lynnwood Link extension project. Thank you.

Respectfully,  
Brianna Freimanis

### **I-348-001**

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 results of 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 edge of the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative. Sound Transit will also maintain access to the church and center during construction.



---

**From:** Hank Landau <hglandau@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 10:16 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Transit

Greetings

**I-349-001** | I urge you to take all reasonable means to accommodate bicycle riders on light rail and to encourage the development of safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to transit stations

My children, grandchildren and I all ride bicycles and would appreciate a safe and convenient alternative to the automobile

Thank you

Hank Landau

Henry G. Landau Ph. D.  
23829 115th Pl. W  
Edmonds, WA 98020  
206 546 2093

### **I-349-001**

Bicycle facilities, including bicycle parking, will be included at light rail stations and on the trains. The project will include ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities that front the station areas and roadways that are reconstructed as part of the project.

---

**From:** mattymaxus@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Friday, September 20, 2013 3:22 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Options at 145th St. Station

**I-350-001** A formal request to highly consider the option that moves the on-ramp North.

It is evident that this option is more difficult to adopt due to additional logistics with the DOT.

However, I implore that it IS THE adopted option due to additional bus access to the station (distance from on-ramp will be from one side of station rather than in the middle, allowing for a more sophisticated Shoreline bus transfer location than just two bus slots).

Another important item to consider is the reduced need to acquire the properties on the South side of 148th St., as well as reducing the negative effect of the properties on the North side of 148th St.

I thank you for reading this email, and I sincerely hope that these comments are deemed sound enough to warrant serious consideration.

Sincerely,  
Matthew Alan Maxwell  
(Life long resident of 145th impact area.)

What great thing would you attempt if you knew you could not fail?  
-Robert H. Schuller

### **I-350-001**

The Preferred Alternative moves the on-ramp to the north, which you indicate would be your preference. See Appendix F, Conceptual Plans, of the Final EIS. Section 4.1 and Appendix I-4.2 discuss the project's property impacts.

---

**From:** Jerry Rice <jrice300@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 6:57 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Draft EIS coments

To whom it may concern:

- I-351-001** | I live on 148th street across from the proposed parking garage. As it stands at this point our property will not be taken. I have concerns about my ease of access to my home on this dead end street during and after construction. It s my understanding that there will not be a traffic light to regulate traffic in and out of the garage with both the entry and exit on my street. I understand Seattle is doing all this without parking garages. If "no garages" is going to work for Seattle why not Shoreline? If we are beating a dead horse on this, I feel the less of evils is alternative #2 as proposed. Another concern I have during the construction phase is the hours of operation. Will the construction noise levels be lowered during the overnight hours? And if so, to what degree?
- I-351-002** |

Jerry & Carol Rice  
330 NE 148th St.  
Shoreline, WA 98155  
206-364-7342

### **I-351-001**

Please see the Final EIS Appendix F, Conceptual Plans, for specific details on the NE 145th Street Station. The ingress and egress to the parking garage will not be located on NE 148th Street.

Station parking facility sizing balances the need for parking supply with other good multi-modal connections in order to serve the needs of the region as well as local communities. Sound Transit promotes multi-modal access to their stations by including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including bicycle parking, and by integrating bus and paratransit.

### **I-351-002**

For construction, the local construction noise ordinance will be applicable, and Sound Transit is committed to maintaining construction noise levels within the criteria. Sound Transit would work with residents and businesses to minimize construction noise impacts.

For nighttime construction, some aspects of which could be needed due to the heavy volumes of traffic on I-5 and other arterial roads, a noise variance would be required from each of the cities where construction would be performed. During that time, Sound Transit will work with the local jurisdiction to arrive at construction specifications that minimize construction-related impacts to nearby communities. However, this would likely affect trucking or hauling activities, rather than the on-site work needed to build a garage or the station.

**I-352-001**

Your comments stating your support for a light rail transit station to be located at NE 145th Street is noted.

---

**From:** Tom P <tommpoi@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 12:54 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Comment on the draft DEIS

Sound Transit DEIS Comment:

**I-352-001** I support locating Shoreline's southern Sound Transit station at the 145<sup>th</sup> street site. I prefer this location because fewer homeowners will be negatively affected there than would be at the 155<sup>th</sup> option. This is because the Jackson Park Golf Course and Lakeside School would be on the southern side of the station, not family homes. Neither the golf course nor the school would be negatively affected by that station. I am sure almost all people who bought homes in Shoreline did so because they like it as is and want to keep it that way, not to be bought out by developers or live in a high density congested area surrounded by apartment houses. For the common good Sound Transit should take those homeowners into consideration, and doing so would not negatively affect Sound Transit. For Sound Transit to succeed, the bulk of your riders will come from the entire region, not from the removal of single family homes and densification of small areas around your stations. I do not believe you will gain significantly more riders by choosing the 155<sup>th</sup> St. location over the one at 145<sup>th</sup> St. In addition, it should be much cheaper for Sound Transit and all government agencies to upgrade the infrastructure around the 145<sup>th</sup> St. exit, which is what most of your riders will use to access your station.

Again, I support locating the station at 145<sup>th</sup> street. Thank you.

Tom Poitras

---

**From:** darcy niedermeyer <darcymn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 8:44 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** DEIS comment

Dear Sirs,  
Please accept this email as a comment on the Lynnwood Link Extension project.  
Name: Darcy Niedermeyer  
Mailing address: 13330 3rd Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98125  
Property address: 147 NE 116th St, Seattle, WA 98125

This property is on the east side of 15, next to the 117th St overpass as it becomes 1st Ave NE.

**I-353-001** This comment is concerning Segment A, Northgate to Shoreline. There are 6 Alternatives to consider. Here are my opinions as they relate to the property at 147 NE 116th st, and the livability of that home.

**A1** keeps the light rail away from the home and away from the neighborhood. It also preserves more homes in the neighborhood, with out having to purchase and relocate many local residents. This option keeps the rail the furthest possible from the neighborhood. With a planting buffer, this keeps this small neighborhood livable. This is my preferred option.

**A3 (A7 & 11) & A5 (A10)** both have the rail line running on my property line, with no buffer. This puts the rail 12' from the bedrooms of the home. This would be a major impact on the quality of life for living in this home. With the light rail running 20 hr a day, this will impact the people occupying the home for the next 50 years. It will also diminish the value of the property for resale, with no compensation from Sound Transit.

Thank you for your time in considering this comment.  
Darcy Niedermeyer

### **I-353-001**

Your preference for Alternative A1 is noted. The Preferred Alternative for this project includes Alternative A1 with modifications. The Preferred Alternative at your location would have a wall between the tracks and residences. See Figure G-13 in Appendix G of the Final EIS for an example.

---

**From:** Dagnija Johnson <dagnijajohnson@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 1:40 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Draft EIS Comment re: Seattle Latvian Community Center & Church

**I-354-001**

The Latvian Community Center and Church play a vital role in keeping the Latvian language and culture alive. Saturday School is well attended by students up to the 12<sup>th</sup> grade. The students learn the language, customs, songs etc.. We have an annual garage sale which, in addition to being a fundraiser, brings neighbors from far and near to purchase many Latvian baked goods. And buy high quality garage sale items. The majority of the attendees are repeat customers. Our Christmas Bazaar also brings repeat customers, some from as far away as Whidbey Island, Tacoma and Portland. This event offers the opportunity for the Saturday School parents to raise funds to keep the school viable. Also, the customers may purchase hand-made goods, jewelry and baked goods. Thus bringing our culture to many people.

Our dance troupe utilizes the Center for practicing, as well as performing. They raise funds through their performances so they can represent the Seattle Latvian Community at Latvian Song/Dance Festivals in North America and abroad.

The Center hosts a fund raiser to support the Baltic Studies program at the University of Washington. The program includes Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian studies.

The Church services are well attended and have an English language service once a month. Thus not excluding those who do not speak Latvian. They also have Sunday School for youngsters and Bible study sessions.

Our Center is not only for Latvian events, but is open for Estonian and Lithuanian events such as their independence day celebrations. They also participate in events hosted by the Latvian Community.

The current site has been home for many years after being displaced from the Wallingford location in 1969. It would be a major financial impact to our community if we need to start all over again. Also, many of our population are elderly. A move may affect their ability to get to an unfamiliar location. The caretaker and her family live in a house on the property, the proposed change will disrupt an entire family.

There are many negative impacts to the Latvian Community if the Sound Transit proposal is approved. Please take these in to serious consideration before making a decision.

Thank you

Dagnija Valdmanis Johnson

1

### **I-354-001**

Your comments about the importance of the Latvian Church and community center to you is acknowledged. 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.

**Renee Laigo**

1116 NE 195<sup>th</sup> Ct. Shoreline, WA 98155 206-306-1021

September 22, 2013

To: Sound Transit Board Members  
Re: Lynnwood Link Ext. Preferred Alternatives

Here is my wish-list for the 185<sup>th</sup> St. station and remarks for the preferred alternative south of the station. I grew up in Shoreline and live ½ mile (20 min walk) from proposed station. I drive through all proposed station areas on a daily basis.

**I-355-001 | 185<sup>th</sup> St. Station Option #1**

- At Grade
- Parking Garage on West Side with good lighting and emergency call stations
  - (Much less of an eyesore and more conducive to community development on east side)
- Covered walkways from garage crossing 1-5
- Pedestrian safety for crossing 185<sup>th</sup> from South side of 5<sup>th</sup> must be considered. Is it possible to have a station entrance on South side of 185<sup>th</sup>?
- Also Kiss-n-ride as conceptualized seems to be in poor proximity to intersection for merging
- Prefer design details reflective of natural environment as opposed to any one ethnic group, with exception of Northwest Native American
- It is hoped that when 5<sup>th</sup> avenue is re-aligned that mature trees to the east can be preserved as our mature trees define our area.
- Station design to promote ability to have community open space as this is currently a walking community and we anticipate further transit oriented development
- Bike lockers and water fountains.

**If 145<sup>th</sup> station is chosen I advocate for OPTION 1.** I am highly concerned re: bus pedestrian, and general traffic surrounding this intersection. The North placed parking garage seems to be a safer option so that garage and bus turn around entrances and exits be off 148<sup>th</sup> st. rather than directly on/off of 5<sup>th</sup> avenue. In the second option you have the garage exiting where the lineup to the northbound on ramp is making Left turns impossible from the garage. However, even with Option 1 I think more can be done for making more room for busses to have a loop on the first floor of the parking garage that is a separate entrance from cars etc. So travelers coming from East, West and South of 145<sup>th</sup> do not have to cross highly busy streets. It will likely be safer for the 1-5 Northbound ramp traffic. Also the Kiss-n-ride/paratransit area right on 5<sup>th</sup> seems like a difficult place to merge. Covered Pedestrian walkways in plaza area to S. of garage, maybe translucent of some sort, would be desirable in our climate.

**I-355-002 |** I notice most of the board members live on the East side and that you will have a video tour of the proposed station areas, but have found in my own consideration of optimal station areas it is helpful to walk/drive around the proposed station areas to get more of a feel. For instance if your goal is to increase pedestrian ridership there are more

**I-355-001**

Your desired improvements for the NE 185th Street Station are noted. Many of the items listed are included in the current design such as, at-grade, parking garage on the west side of I-5 and bicycle parking. See Appendix F for the current design of this station.

**I-355-002**

Your comments about to the proposed light rail transit stations at NE 130th, NE 145th, and NE 155th Streets are noted. Your preference for the NE 145th Street Station Option 1 is noted. The station design at NE 145th Street for the Preferred Alternative has been revised since the Draft EIS; see Appendix F of the Final EIS for the current design.

The current design has the entrance/exit for the parking garage on 5th Avenue NE, not NE 148th Street. Also, the kiss and ride area is not located right off of 5th Avenue NE.

As your comment suggests, there are trade-offs and pros and cons at each of these locations. Station analysis indicates that ridership will be similar regardless of the station locations; see Section 3.2.2 of the Final EIS.

**I-355-002** | homes within a 15 min. walking radius ( I walked it!) around the 155<sup>th</sup> st. station vs the 145<sup>th</sup> St. station. Diverting increased bus traffic to 155<sup>th</sup> may be better than the already clogged 145<sup>th</sup> area. Driving on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue near 145<sup>th</sup> will give you a better sense of traffic. I don't envy the decision you have to make re: 145<sup>th</sup> vs 130<sup>th</sup> and/or 155<sup>th</sup> st. stations. I would say that 130<sup>th</sup> provides easier access for more low income homes concentrated in that area and connects the Lake City and Bitter Lake areas to lightrail, but your materials seem to suggest that people in those areas would take the bus south to the Northgate station.

Thank you for you enormously detailed DEIS. I look forward to participating further as station design progresses.

Sincerely,

Renee L Laigo



---

**From:** Tija Iles <tija.iles@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 21, 2013 10:40 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Sound Transit Link Light Rail system impacting the Seattle Latvian Church and Center at 11710 3rd Ave N.E, Seattle, WA 98125

I am writing to voice concern over the proposed plans for the Lynnwood Link Extension of the Sound Transit Link Light Rail system, specifically as it pertains to the Latvian Church and Community Center.

**I-356-001** I have been a long time user of Sound Transit and always support the growth and expansion of mass transit. While I believe the extension of the Light Rail system would be a valuable asset to the greater Puget Sound region, I urge the board to carefully consider the impact on the local community in drafting the proposed line.

As a member of the Latvian community, I primarily use the Latvian center for dance practices, fundraisers, and performances with the folk dance group Trejdeksnitis. Our group is very active in the larger community, regularly performing at Folk Life, Yule Fest, and the Seattle Public Library's "Baltic Rites of Spring" program. Through the support of the local community, our group has been able to travel all over the United States as well as to Latvia to participate in the UNESCO recognized Latvian Song and Dance Festival, as recently as this summer. I take great pride in being a member of this group as we are widely recognized as being one of the top dance troupes outside of Latvia.

Having the ability to participate in this group through the use of the Latvian Center has been essential in keeping me connected to the larger Latvian Community. Sometimes multiple times a week I find myself commuting to Seattle from my home in Tacoma to participate not only in dance activities, but also to attend or volunteer at special events or fundraisers, including our yearly Christmas Bazaar and Spring Rummage Sale. The Latvian center hosts many events such as this that are enjoyed and celebrated not only by the Latvian community all over the Northwest, but also by the larger Seattle community.

I am also a graduate of the University of Washington's Baltic Studies program. The use of the Latvian community center is vital to my undergraduate program. It provides a host for many important lectures, visiting speakers, and events, including hosting the Latvian President this upcoming Sunday. As the local Estonian and Lithuanian communities have no cultural centers of their own, they have built a strong relationship with the Latvian community and have shared use of our facility since its inception. The Latvian Church and Community Center is an irreplaceable home base for all members of the Baltic community to connect, as well as a place for the Seattle community to celebrate three often overlooked cultures and heritages.

The loss of home is not a foreign concept for the Baltic community, considering that our local community was founded by members who were forced to flee their homeland and settle in the Seattle area in exile. The preservation of our heritage is of utmost importance to this community,

### **I-356-001**

Thank you for your personal comments describing the cultural importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church to you, the region's Latvian community, and the larger 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.

**I-356-001** and the Latvian Church and Community Center has been an essential part of that preservation. I urge the Sound Transit board members, engineers and planning committees to find a solution that does not once again force us to lose what we've worked so hard to build and maintain.

Thank you,

Tija Iles

8509 57th Ave E

Puyallup, WA 98371

---

**From:** Erik Ruis <erik.ruis@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 7:43 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Sound Transit Link Light Rail system impacting the Seattle Latvian Church and Center at 11710 3rd Ave N.E, Seattle, WA 98125

Sound Transit DEIS  
c/o Lauren Swift  
401 S. Jackson Street  
Seattle, WA 98104

**Re: Sound Transit Link Light Rail system impacting the Seattle Latvian Church and Center at 11710 3rd Ave N.E, Seattle, WA 98125**

Dear Ms. Swift,

**I-357-001** I wish to add my voice to the many concerns you must have received over the proposed plans for the Lynnwood Link Extension of the Sound Transit Link Light Rail system, along the east side of I-5, with potential devastating effect on the Baltic community in Seattle and beyond.

I was born and raised in a Latvian family in Seattle. A huge part of my childhood and youth were spent at the Latvian center, where there was always something going on: Latvian school on Saturdays, church on Sundays, folk dancing, choir, crafts groups and so on. I remember pitching in as a teenager on volunteer weekends to help build the church and center. Next to me were other teenagers, pensioners, people from all over the Northwest. One big family doing their best to build a home for future generations to be able to preserve and honor their heritage.

As it happens, I have now lived most of my life in Europe, away from Seattle -- but not really ever away from the Latvian center at 11710 3rd Ave N.E. Over the years, I have always managed to return there for family events -- weddings, milestones, and funerals. I celebrated my own marriage there and attended the funerals of both of my parents. In short, I could not begin to imagine my family's life without the Latvian church and community center, which are now under such grave threat. To me and to many others these are not just buildings on a piece of land. This is a major part of us.

Surely there must be a way to develop modern transportation networks without crippling a community that brings a cultural richness to the diverse mosaic that is the strength of Seattle and, indeed, the USA. Please consider these very human factors as you continue to evaluate the impact of the proposed plan. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Erik Ruis

London

## **I-357-001**

Thank you for expressing the importance of the Latvian Center to you and the Latvian 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.

---

**From:** Yoshiko Saheki <bczbczcz@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 7:26 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** comment on DEIS

**I-358-001** | I am opposed to parking structures at proposed stations on 145th and 155th in Shoreline.

Light rail through Shoreline is suppose to curb automobile use. However, any parking lot invites automobile use. By building a parking structure, you are encouraging commuters to drive through the surrounding neighborhoods of the station to get to the station. To make light rail more environmentally friendly, you should instead be promoting walking, biking or taking the bus to the station, not driving a car. Moreover, a parking structure would blight the neighborhood of the light rail station. Who wants to live near a parking structure?

As I understand it, there is a city ordinance in Seattle that prohibits creation of new parking lots. Shoreline has no such ordinance. Given the proximity of the proposed stations to Seattle, a parking structure would attract a significant number of Seattle commuters. There is something unfair about this and the impact will be borne entirely on the Shoreline neighborhoods surrounding the new station, whether that is on 145th or 155th.

Yoshiko Saheki  
2349 N 147th  
Shoreline, WA 98133

### **I-358-001**

Station parking facility sizing balances the need for parking supply with other good multi-modal connections in order to serve the needs of the region as well as local communities. Sound Transit promotes multi-modal access to their stations by including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including bicycle parking, and by integrating bus and paratransit.

**I-359-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your overall support of the Lynnwood Link Extension project and your particular support for the A5, A7, A10, and A11 alternatives.

---

**From:** Julia Deak Sandler <juliadeak@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 9:16 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Proposed stations for lynnwood extension

Hello,

**I-359-001**

I am a resident of the olympic hills neighborhood of seattle, and I am very excited about light rail coming here to the north end! I urge you to complete this project as soon as possible so that we can decrease congestion on I-5 and make our city cleaner and more walkable. To that end, I would advocate for a stop at 130th St and Roosevelt Way, which is a large, walkable intersection served by the 41 bus and near high density housing and some retail.

So I would like to see option A5, A7, A10 or A11 implemented.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia Sandler

1714 NE Brockman Place

Seattle, WA 98125

--

Julia Deak Sandler, PhD

Extension Lecturer

Univ. of Washington Int'l & English Language Programs

phone: 206-522-5578

---

**From:** Shane Valle <shane.valle@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 8:28 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Lynnwood Link DEIS comments

Hello:

**I-360-001**

Aside from my complete disagreement with the choice to site the Lynnwood Link alignment in the same right of way as I-5 (I'm guessing the potential cost of land acquisition was the determining factor - kind of short-sighted when considering this is intended to be a regional rapid transit system to last a century), which serves a market already served by I-5 instead of serving a new market and/or creating a new market via development, I have only one bone to pick with the design. I listened to the entirety of the "tech talk" on the 13th and I still can't figure out why the potential for development in surrounding station areas has not been maximized. The immediate station areas are slated to include a parking garage and not much else. Parking lots are not inherently bad. However, rail transit has a unique ability to move large amounts of people in and out of an area without the negative impacts automobiles bring. The impacts include but are not limited to constant noise, pedestrian safety concerns and the large allocation of space required to store and move automobiles which has no alternate use. These aspects negatively impact the environment that pedestrians find safe and comforting. To create the sustainable, dense and walkable nodes that rail transit enables it is imperative that the station area be as welcoming to pedestrians as possible. Every single rapid transit rail station is an opportunity to flip the paradigm that rules in the suburban Puget Sound - where the basic unit of design can again be the pedestrian instead of the car.

With the given alignment choice it will already be an uphill battle to get dense, pedestrian-oriented development in the immediate station area but that doesn't mean there shouldn't be a push for it. How about consolidating the park and rides and placing them at just a few locations? Make them larger and site them at the stations that have the least potential for non-automobile-oriented development. Depending on the aim of the park and ride (to take motorists off of I-5 as they approach the station and take the train into the city or divert motorists that normally travel to I-5 via surface streets and then into the city)

**I-360-002**

I was shocked when during the meeting the question was asked if there was a "preferred alternative" among the board and the answer was no. As a planning and capital project agency ST should have a pretty clear idea of what the "best" system looks like and have rational reasoning to back it up instead of fearing public backlash for having such a position. Public input should be an important part of planning for establishing what is valuable but planners and engineers are brought in to think in a broader sense, both spacial and temporal. Leaving such decisions up to the public is slightly reckless. I would like to see a preferred option and then a discussion about that.

**I-360-003**

This wasn't supposed to turn into rhetoric-spewing, a sermon or a lecture. It's just frustrating to see great opportunity squandered while taxpayers pay a premium for it. Should this extension of Link prove to be nothing more than train stations and parking lots to access them I am afraid the project will accomplish little more than adding a few lanes to Interstate 5. What is currently being planned

### **I-360-001**

Please see Chapter 2, Sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.2, for a discussion of the environmental, transportation, land use, and other factors that led to alternatives along I-5. As Section 4.1 of the EIS explains, using I-5 right-of-way reduces the amount of private property acquisitions.

Station parking facility sizing balances the need for parking supply with other good multi-modal connections in order to serve the needs of the region as well as local communities. Sound Transit promotes multi-modal access to their stations by including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including bicycle parking, and by integrating bus and paratransit.

Sound Transit's transit-oriented development policies support such development around its stations, with Sound Transit working in partnership with local jurisdictions and potential developers. However, local jurisdictions control the land use decisions that ultimately determine what kinds of development can occur.

### **I-360-002**

Agencies often do not have a Preferred Alternative identified during the Draft EIS evaluation stage because the Draft EIS is the first time all the potential impacts of a project are presented to the public and decision makers. The Preferred Alternative is identified in the Final EIS.

### **I-360-003**

Your comments about the Lynnwood Link Extension are noted. Chapter 6 of the Draft EIS provides an overview of the public outreach activities and methods for this project.

**I-360-003** will constitute a commuter railroad that sees limited use outside of peak hours. I understand that ST has to look out for many interest groups but the future of our region should have immense weight when considering the design details of a project that will not be fully-realized for 10 years and will have an indelible affect on the spacial composition of our region for decades afterward.

Last but not least, thank you! Keeping a pulse on public sentiment around a large project is no small task and I can't even begin to fully appreciate all of the measures taken to make sure as much of the public is engaged as possible. I am curious about all of the different ways you field public input and how you weight it and how it shapes a project. Is there any more detail you can provide about the process than what is on the web site?

Thank you so much!

--  
Shane Valle  
University of Washington '14  
Civil Engineering  
School of Music

Save The Seattle Latvian Center

I-361-001 I was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin to Latvian and American parents. My parents were instrumental in my developing a keen interest in my family heritage, both American and Latvian.

I am a proud US citizen. I am also proud of my Latvian heritage.

I moved to Seattle in 1978, when I was 21 years old and discovered the Seattle Latvian Center and Church in the early 1980's when I started attending the annual Christmas Bazaar (held each year in early November). It satisfied my hunger for the taste of the foods and the sound of the Latvian language of my Latvian mother and her parents.

I joined the Seattle Latvian Folk Dance Group Trejdeksnitis (tray-decks-neet-iss), in 2002 and have been a member ever since. We rehearse in the wonderful hall at the Center each week for 3 hours from September through June or July. We are able to learn and share the richness of Latvian music and dance by performing at key events in the Seattle Latvian community as well as for local community events (NW Folklife Festival), at the North American Latvian Song and Dance Festivals, and of course, the epic Latvian National Song and Dance Festival in Riga. This summer, we had the thrill of participating in the Song and Dance Festival and joined the largest group of participants in the history of the Festival (over 40,000 singers, dancers, musicians and artisans) due in large

I-361-001

Thank you for your comments describing the cultural importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church to you and the Latvian 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.



I-361-001

part from the support and guidance of the Seattle Latvian Community Center and its numerous organizations. Being able to be a part of something so culturally significant is something younger generations should be able to look forward to. Trejdeksnitis (tray-decks-neet-iss) has been in existence since 1962 and there would be a huge void if its Latvian Center home no longer existed.

Because I see the importance of learning and sharing cultural heritage, over the years my involvement in the Seattle Latvian community has deepened. I have studied Latvian language at the UW Baltic Studies Program, which has strong ties to the Center. My daughter attended the Latvian Saturday School here for 2 years and joined me in the dance group for 4 years.

I have been singing with the Latvian Vocal Ensemble Sigulda for the last 2 years. This wonderful collection of singers, and our dedicated director, rehearse at the Center weekly (in the hall or church) and perform for church holidays and important cultural gatherings.

I volunteer for events and fundraisers as I can, to support the hard working, dedicated and resilient people that are the roots that keep the American-Latvian community alive.

This Center is a beacon for Latvian-Americans in the Pacific Northwest, and needs to continue to act as a central hub. It needs to be a hub for social and cultural gatherings, to provide people with the opportunity to network with one another, allowing experiences and information to be passed around. The sharing of ideas is arguably one of the most important facets of a progressive society as it promotes collaboration amongst people and helps define what is commonly called community.

I-361-001

The unity of the Latvian community has played a huge role in preserving its culture over time.

The Seattle Latvian Center needs to remain as a beacon of culture, especially as younger generations may find the need to become educated about their heritage.

Sincerely,

Sandra A Vetter

2315 NE 89<sup>th</sup> St.

Seattle, WA 98115

206-930-8326

svetter@seanet.com

September 22, 2013

Dear Sound Transit Board,

I submit the following letter of comment concerning the Draft EIS report Sound Transit prepared for the Lynnwood Link Extension project.

I-362-001

As a resident in the general vicinity of the 185<sup>th</sup> St Station (approximately ¼ mile west of the station and just N. of N. 185<sup>th</sup> St.), one of my major concerns is accessibility to the station by means other than the automobile. The station and train route will obviously have the most visual and auditory impact to those residents living adjacent to the sites. On the other hand, the congestion that comes with increased traffic flow to and fro the station will have an impact to all the residential neighborhoods surrounding the station.

Transit service and connectivity, as well as safe pedestrian and bicycle routes need to be prioritized in the station area planning. This should include:

- Covered walkways, bike lanes, and dedicated transit lanes as part of the rebuild of the NE 185<sup>th</sup> St. bridge on I-5.
- Promote pedestrian safety and access by building sidewalks to/from the station
- Parking should be provided as part of the station, but the number of parking spaces should be carefully considered. Build too many, and single occupancy vehicular traffic will be encouraged. Build too little, and residential streets may be over run with station parking. I am a proponent of a 300 car capacity parking garage on the west side of I-5 along NE 185<sup>th</sup> St..
- Add appropriate traffic control devices and/or design elements to promote safety for commuters, neighborhood residents, and vehicles at the redesigned intersection of NE 185<sup>th</sup> St (as shown in Option 1).
- Transit access loop turning into the station from 8<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and exiting the station via NE 185<sup>th</sup> St (as shown in Option 1).
- An at-grade train track and center platform design as shown in Option 1. At – grade is preferable over the visual and auditory impact of an elevated train.

I am concerned that the N. 185<sup>th</sup> St. station could become a large Park and Ride facility, when it should be so much more. The station will be a large physical presence in the community. As such, its design elements should support the surrounding community in order to mitigate the visual and sound effects of the station and train route. These design elements should include:

- Architectural and artistic elements to the station building and surrounding area to create a station that is aesthetically pleasing and reflective of our community's cultural diversity.
- Locate the parking garage on the West side of I-5 along NE 185<sup>th</sup> St (as shown in Option 1). This parking garage could help with the parking needs of large sports events such as the high school football games and soccer tournaments
- The station design should include public gathering places to enjoy music and mingle with friends. Provide inside and outside public gathering places. Include a

### I-362-001

Your comments about the NE 185th Street Station design are noted. Appendix F, Conceptual Plans, contains Sound Transit's current design for that station.

The light rail stations will have pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities to support and encourage multi-modal access. The project will construct ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities fronting the station areas and along roadways that are reconstructed for the project.

Design elements of the station and parking garage will consider the context in which the light rail facility is located. However, the final design of the station will focus on providing the necessary features of a light rail station.

Station parking facility sizing balances the need for parking supply with other good multi-modal connections in order to serve the needs of the region as well as local communities. Sound Transit promotes multi-modal access to their stations by including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including bicycle parking, and by integrating bus and paratransit.

I-362-001

solarium with bright light, public art, plants inside and an outside gathering place to rest, eat and meet your neighbors and enjoy the music of buskers.

I-362-002

Shoreline, like so many other communities in the Pacific Northwest, prides itself on our parks, tree-lined streets and a heightened environmental consciousness. A few years ago we increased our property taxes in support of our parks and green spaces. Protection of our tree canopy is a community priority. The Lynnwood Link Expansion project will necessitate the removal of trees along the train route. The station site itself will also create more paved surfaces. To mitigate the loss of trees and vegetative cover, Sound Transit should:

- Preserve as many of our mature trees as possible
- Replant the areas disturbed to restore and maintain our “urban forest”
- Incorporate public green spaces adjacent to the train station area
- To mitigate the removal of CO2 sequestering services of mature trees and increased paved areas, incorporate green roofs in the station area design
- Wherever possible, use permeable pavement to minimize the overall increase of impermeable surface areas and its effect on surface water management.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Guthrie  
18531 Ashworth Ave N.  
Shoreline, WA 98133

### I-362-002

Sound Transit will preserve as many mature trees as possible, and replant disturbed areas. The incorporation of green roofs could be incorporated in the design, but that decision would be made during final design.

Sound Transit requires all projects to consider low-impact development (LID) methods, such as permeable pavement, as a first choice for stormwater treatment (Design Criteria Manual, July 2012). Sound Transit will evaluate the feasibility of permeable pavement throughout the project area.

# Astrida R. Blukis Onat

2001 E. Lynn St. Seattle, WA 98112 USA  
tel: 206 324-4365  
email: astrida@comcast.net

MEMO: September 22, 2013

To: LynnwoodLinkDEIS

From: Astrida R. Blukis Onat, PhD

Re: Latvian Center

Prior retiring my company - BOAS Inc. - from active cultural resource work, we had the opportunity to serve Sound Transit as a contractor on the main Link Light Rail project. It was overall a positive relationship and I have always supported public transit, as a concept and personally.

**I-363-001**

Little did I expect that the Sound Transit project beyond Northgate would negatively impact the heart of the Latvian Center, a place that is the core of the Latvian American community in Seattle, a community of which I am a part. As an anthropologist, I have worked with many communities as they have struggled with forces that are a constant threat to their existence. The current interaction between Sound Transit and the Latvian Center community (including American of Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian descent) is not unlike others I have worked with. Except this time it is happening in the context of my own ethnic community,

Community centers of various ethnicities are often the key points of contact between members of a specific community as members strive to maintain an ethnic identity. This process of retaining identity while becoming a part of the American fabric is an important aspect of our larger society. You will undoubtedly be getting many letters detailing the significance of the Center from individuals and institution to whom it is of great and sustaining importance. I would like to add my name to that of my fellow American of Latvian descent. Please do seriously reconsider alternatives to the impact your current plan will have on this community.

If I can be of any assistance in this process, please let me know.

## **I-363-001**

Thank you for your comments describing the importance of the Latvian Center to you. 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.

Eduard Raisters  
5436 17<sup>th</sup> Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106

Sound Transit DEIS  
Comments c/o Lauren Swift  
401 S. Jackson Street  
Seattle, WA 98104

*RE: Sound Transit Link Light Rail system impacting the Seattle Latvian Church and Center at 11710 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue N.E., Seattle, WA 98125*

Dear Ms. Swift,

**I-364-001** I am writing this letter out of concern for the impact of the Lynnwood Link Extension on the Latvian Church and Community Center located at the above address. As it is currently slated, any of the link options provided in the DEIS by Sound Transit will severely limit, if not bar, access and use of the community center that is home to many, and that simply cannot be allowed.

This center is home to more than just a church, it is also the local hub for all Baltic (Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian) communities and their respective activities. Much of my life has been spent at the Latvian Center, including but not limited to: Saturday morning Latvian language school, Sunday church services, dance practices for the local folk dance ensemble "Trejdeksnītis" and confirmation classes. This church and center has seen the beginnings of many new lives, as well as the final farewells for others. These activities have had a profound impact on who I have become as a person, and continue to shape the youth of the Latvian American community here in Seattle. I am concerned that limiting access and use of the Latvian Center during and after construction will have an unfathomable impact on the Latvian community as a whole. In 1969 our first Latvian center in the Wallingford area of Seattle was acquired by eminent domain for the construction of a park. This was perceived by the Latvian community as an opportunity to construct the very center that is now threatened by the Lynnwood Link Extension. From 1969 to 1972, when the construction of the new center was completed, the Latvian community had a difficult time keeping the church, school and cultural activities operating in various rental spaces. This time around relocation cannot be an option, as many families have moved to the area in order to be proximate to the center.

Even if access and use of our center is barred only for the duration of the construction of the link, it would have a devastating impact on our community, especially the youth who are currently learning what it means to be Latvian. Without a home for our Latvian community during those years, I feel that there could be an insurmountable decline in community participation and engagement in cultural activities. I urge Sound Transit to continue to explore different options in the engineering and construction of this link segment that would not impact this center as drastically as it is currently slated to.

I thank you for taking the time to read my comments and concerns, as well as those from other members of the community. I sincerely hope you come to recognize the grim situation we currently find ourselves in.

Sincerely,



Eduard Raisters  
Project Lead, The Gear Works, Seattle

### **I-364-001**

Thank you for your comments describing the importance of the Latvian Center to you and the Latvian 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 during construction and operation of the project.

---

**From:** dzommers@q.com  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2013 3:27 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** DEIS comment etter

Sound  
Transit  
ed September 23, 2013  
Draft EIS  
Comments  
mitted via Email  
c/o Lauren Swift

Dat

Trans

Re: Lynnwood Link DEIS/Seattle Latvian Lutheran Church and Community Center

**I-365-001** This letter concerns the Lynnwood Link DEIS issued July 26, 2013, involving the Seattle Latvian Church and Community Center located at 11710 - 3rd Ave NE.

Much has already been said about the Latvian Church and Center and its impact not only on the Latvian community but other Baltic communities and perhaps even other small countries no one seems to know much about. Since from 1950 and on I witnessed many of the events leading up to today's crisis so I believe I can relate some of the thoughts, feelings, and most of all, determination, behind building this Church and Center.

Those of us lucky enough to emigrate to America clearly understood our good fortune. After all, we had just escaped our homeland feeling pretty lucky being still alive, spent years as refugees, and once here, spent years looking for family members who, as it turned out, had not been so lucky. Very quickly it also became clear that there was a very energetic effort in place to delete the very country of Latvia and its language off the map, off the face of the earth. Against their will Latvians were scattered throughout the vast Soviet Union and other ethnicities were imported (usually against their will) to Latvia. Seeing and hearing this, we, the lucky ones, felt obligated to prevent the Soviets from accomplishing their goal. Besides, we now lived in America..

Naturally, this early on, language was a barrier so the Latvians migrated toward each other for company. I still remember the many, many discussions around the dinner table comparing, telling and retelling each other's stories, experiences. At the same time it became obviously necessary to include others outside our personal circle of friends but with the same background which eventually led to the forming of the church. That was done but we had to use other church facilities for our services. Eventually as families settled in, got jobs, paid off their emigration and education expenses (most were educated but without US credentials) the next step was to

1

### I-365-001

Thank you for your comments describing the history of the Latvian community in the US and in Seattle, and the Latvian Center's importance to the 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 during construction and operation of the project.

I-365-001

acquire a church and center of our own. I believe our first church and center at 43rd and Densmore (and how we lost it) has already been thoroughly discussed.

The 43rd and Densmore matter was a huge setback, left us with very little money, and begging and pleading for other facilities in order for us to continue our activities. It must be said there were many, many helping hands in that regard but we still did not have a home of our own.

In time a property was found, donations and personal loans made and eventually we commenced building our "Latvia in Exile", still with the determination that we would not be wiped off the face of the earth. This "Latvia in Exile" purposefully was designed and built to handle all sorts of activities, activities to maintain and teach our language and culture (and have some fun as well). Large and small spaces were provided for innumerable activities, many focused on teaching our children about our heritage. There were classrooms, meeting rooms, a large kitchen, a large hall with a stage and one that could be used for dances, balls, and large meetings. I must point out here that these dances were family affairs attended by grandma, grandpa, mom, dad, the teenagers and even the little kids. They were all generational and, on a personal note, great fun.

A somewhat unexpected outcome of the Church and Center is that it has become our day by day, nail by nail living history of us all for the past 65 years. The moment you walk onto the property you see evidence of who did what, when. We see the work of an uncle (now deceased, but remembered) who did the landscaping, we see the work of a father, grandfather or even great-grandfather who worked on the roof, we see the building a father, and now grandfather, spent hours, days, weeks to design (during his "free time") all with the goal of leaving something for his family and their future. It is a walk down memory lane for those of us who knew these people, but more importantly it is a living monument of the work done by the parents, grandparents and great grandparents who first lost everything, started over, started over again, and then over again until they finally prevailed.

No spanking brand new building will ever replace this facility. Mitigations you promise and swear by will do nothing but, in time, make the place so unpalatable that eventually people will stop coming (Christmas Eve candle light service with trains zooming by every couple of minutes?). In essence, what the Soviets could not accomplish Puget Sound Transit will - all under the guise of fairness and freedom for all.

Dzintra A. Zommers  
5341 Ruby Way NE  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110  
[dzommers@q.com](mailto:dzommers@q.com)



The building was built without asking for any handouts or favors from the government or any other entity whatsoever. It was built solely with the community's own labor. Vacations were given up as were weekends and holidays.

Sound Transit DEIS  
c/o Lauren Swift  
401 S. Jackson Street  
Seattle, WA, 98104  
LynnwoodLinkDEIS@soundtransit.org

**Re: Sound Transit Light Rail system impacting the Seattle Latvian Lutheran Evangelical Church and Seattle Latvian Community Center at 11710 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE, Seattle, WA, 98125**

Dear Ms. Swift,

I-366-001

I am writing to you today to add my voice to the many concerns regarding the Lynnwood Link extension of the Sound Transit Link Light Rail system along the eastside of Interstate-5. This extension of Light Rail Link will have devastating effects on not only the Latvian community of Seattle, but the Baltic community of the Pacific Northwest.

While I did not grow up in Seattle, as many of the people you have been hearing from did, I spent a great deal of my adult years there, with the Latvian Community Center as the epicenter of my activities. I have spent countless hours singing in the Latvian women's choir, dancing with the Latvian folk dance group, teaching Latvian school, worshipping at our church, meeting foreign dignitaries, and celebrating the many milestones of my ancestors at our Latvian Community Center. I have met and befriended people from all around the world- from students who are now teachers, to pensioners who have told the most amazing first-hand stories of life in Latvia, to the best friends anyone could ever ask for.

Though I have spent much of my life away from the Seattle Latvian Center, I have never felt closer to it. The Latvian Community Center has been part of my life for over 20 years. I simply can't imagine a Seattle without this institution. The level of activities and pride in the Seattle Latvian Center are greater than ever before. If the Latvian Community Center were to cease to exist, the impact would be devastating and demoralizing to our community. The loss would extend to social, cultural, religious, educational, and developmental activities.

I urge the Sound Transit board members, engineers, and planning committees to find a solution that allows the Latvian community to retain its present property and location in a way that maintains its viability. If our community should be forced to relocate itself, for the second time in forty years, it would be an insurmountable challenge.

Thank you for your consideration. I truly hope a reasonable solution can be found.

Sincerely,

Dina Alita Kancs  
[dinaalita@gmail.com](mailto:dinaalita@gmail.com)

### I-366-001

Thank you for your comments describing the importance of the Latvian Community Center to you. 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.

23 September 2013

Sound Transit DEIS  
401 S. Jackson Street  
Seattle, WA 98104

Comments on Lynnwood Link Extension Draft EIS

Attention: Lauren Swift  
Via email: [LynnwoodLinkDEIS@soundtransit.org](mailto:LynnwoodLinkDEIS@soundtransit.org)

Dear Ms. Swift:

This letter is written in support of the I-5 Light Rail alternative based on ridership (5.9 million new riders/18.5 million riders annually), capacity (8,880 riders/hour), capital costs (\$108/ rider w/estimated ridership) and annual operating costs (\$1.24/rider w/estimated ridership).  
[*Alternative Analysis Report*, p 3-50]

**I-367-001 Preferred alternative station placement in Lynnwood**

Regarding the placement of the Lynnwood station, **this letter rejects C-1** because of its negative impact on existing property owners (106 parcels, 77 residences and 31 businesses) and its negative impact on Scriber Creek Park. There is no sound economic reason to run the elevated railway above 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave West, which is developed, instead of along I-5, which is not.



**C3: ALONG I-5 TO LYNNWOOD PARK-AND-RIDE STATION**

**I-367-001**

Your comments about the Segment C alternatives are noted. The Preferred Alternative evaluated in the Final EIS includes a modified Alternative C3. This alternative minimizes Scriber Creek Park and wetland impacts, and realigns the guideway and station to better connect with the Lynnwood Transit Center.

**I-367-001** Regarding alternatives C-2 and C-3, our project support hinges on two things: parking garage access and impacts to Scriber Creek Park and the Interurban Trail. Of the two alternatives, C-3 has the least impact on Scriber Creek Park and C-2 the least impact on the Interurban Trail. As proposed, C-2 is more likely to attract ridership because of ease of access to the rail station. However, we do not believe that the C-2 proposal is the best solution for commuters, residents or the environment.

**I-367-002** Regardless of the alternative chosen, expanded parking at the transit center is essential as it is already over-capacity. **For aesthetics and practicalities, the logical location of the parking garage should be in the current southeast park-and-ride lot, east of 46<sup>th</sup> Ave West.** The Draft EIS includes analysis only for locating the parking garage west of 46<sup>th</sup> Ave West.



**Alternative parking proposal for C3.**

- First, this section of the park-and-ride (southeast of the transit center) is in an area of negative slope relative to 200 Street SW and the transit center. Thus an elevated parking garage would be less visible from residences and businesses.
- Second, an elevated station could connect directly onto the parking garage, which could serve as the foundation for a pedestrian and bicycle walkway to the transit center area (perhaps exiting alongside the existing 4-way stop, east side). This walkway could also provide ADA-compliant access to the transit center.

Without easy access, the distance from the transit center and elevation differential will be a barrier to ridership for the C-3 alternative. For example, the walk from the (current) leased Northgate parking garage spaces (southwest corner) to the transit center is approximately 200 feet, on level ground. The Lynnwood walk could be as much as 500

### **I-367-002**

The current design for the station and garage at the Lynnwood Transit Center for the Preferred Alternative includes some of your suggestions: the garage is located to the east of 46th Avenue West, and the station would connect to it. The Preferred Alternative would result in approximately 530 more spaces than there are today.

I-367-002

feet and on an incline.

- Placing the parking garage alongside the rail station means that the current transit center would not need relocation. It would, however, require re-engineering with regard to exit-and-entrance paths. It might be reasonable to allow access only on the north side, for example, via 46<sup>th</sup> Ave West, and exit only on the southwest side along the perimeter of the existing parking lot via 48<sup>th</sup> Ave West.

With the parking garage placed in the current southeast section of the park-and-ride area, we support C3, assuming limited impact on the Interurban Trail.

**A word about economic impacts**

I-367-003

At the Lynnwood public meeting on 14 September, some citizens expressed concern that the transit station would result in decreased property values. Research suggests the opposite if the project is implemented well.

Research on property values in San Francisco after the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the BART system identified the “rent premium” associated with being within one-quarter mile of BART was \$34 per month. In addition, the models suggest that a house immediately adjacent to BART would have a resale value approximately 38% more than an identical home 35 kilometers away and not near BART service. Researchers have found similar increased property values in Buffalo, NY; eastern Massachusetts; suburban New Jersey; suburban Philadelphia; Portland, OR; and St. Louis. [1,2,3,4]

In addition, residents of multi-modal neighborhoods have lower total transportation costs than people who live in “automobile-dependent” communities. Moreover, proximity to transit is a boon to employment and education centers. [5]

However, it is important to minimize nuisance effects, such as noise and poor aesthetics. This is one research finding that bolsters building the parking garage in the southwest corner of the existing park-and-ride and works against alternatives C2 and C3 with the elevated train running along 52<sup>nd</sup> and through the park. [6]

I-367-004

**Preferred alternative station placement in Mountlake Terrace**

As with the Lynnwood location, we want to make sure that the light rail station integrates with and complements the existing transit station. In this instance, there is also a new parking garage to consider. **This parking facility is already over-capacity on many weekdays.** It is critical that the light rail system integrate seamlessly with parking and that parking at the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center be expanded to accommodate additional riders.

- The proposal to maintain parking at the current 880 spaces is insufficient (B1).
- The proposal to expand parking by 200 spaces is insufficient (B2A) but it is the best of the alternatives because it considers the need for expanded parking.

**I-367-003**

Your comments about the potential economic impact of the project on property values are noted. See Section 4.3.4 of the Final EIS for a discussion of this topic.

**I-367-004**

Station parking facility sizing and design is balanced with the need for good multi-modal connections in order to serve the needs of the region as well as local communities.

As with all its light rail and parking facilities, Sound Transit will design the Mountlake Terrace Transit Center Station and parking facility to fit well within the community, and to effectively provide access. The Preferred Alternative would not add more parking spaces, but the Final EIS includes options at the Mountlake Terrace and the Lynnwood Transit Center that would increase the overall total compared to the Draft EIS alternatives. Section 3.2.7 of the Final EIS discusses the proposed parking facilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proceedings.

Kathy E. Gill & Michael S. Schamens  
7025 193<sup>rd</sup> Pl SW  
Lynnwood WA 98036

Laura & John Kimball  
7123 192nd PL SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Colleen Kwan  
5605 219<sup>th</sup> Pl SW  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

Maurice & Dixie Schamens  
7033 193<sup>rd</sup> Pl SW  
Lynnwood WA 98036

#### Endnotes

Lynnwood Draft EIS and supporting documents accessed from SoundTransit.org:

<http://www.soundtransit.org/Projects-and-Plans/Lynnwood-Link-Extension/Lynnwood-Link-Document-Archive/Lynnwood-Draft-Environmental-Impact-Statement>

[1] Diaz, R.B. (n.d.) "Impacts Of Rail Transit On Property Values," Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc, Mclean VA. Retrieved from [http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/media/uploads/nm/impacts\\_of\\_rail\\_transit\\_on\\_property\\_values.pdf](http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/media/uploads/nm/impacts_of_rail_transit_on_property_values.pdf), 22 September 2013.

[2] National Realtors Association. (n.d.) "Public Transit Boosts Property Values, If Conditions are Right." Retrieved from [http://www.ppta.net/todtoolkit/assets/downloads/ValueMarketability\\_Link\\_TransitBoostsPropertyValues.pdf](http://www.ppta.net/todtoolkit/assets/downloads/ValueMarketability_Link_TransitBoostsPropertyValues.pdf), 22 September 2013.

[3] Hess, D.B. and Almeida, T.A. (May 2007) "Impact of Proximity to Light Rail Rapid Transit on Station-area Property Values in Buffalo, New York," Environmental Studies. doi: 10.1080/00420980701256005. Retrieved from <http://usj.sagepub.com/content/44/5/6/1041.abstract>, 22 September 2013.

[4] Armstrong, R.J. and Rodriguez, D.A. (January 2006) "An Evaluation of the Accessibility Benefits of Commuter Rail in Eastern Massachusetts using Spatial Hedonic Price Functions," Transportation. doi: 0.1007/s11116-005-0949-x. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11116-005-0949-x>, 22 September 2013.

[5] Smith, J.J. and Gihring, T.A. (2010, November 28) "Financing Transit Systems Through Value Capture," Victoria Transport Policy Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/assets/Uploads/Value-Capture-Annotated-Bibliography-Litman.pdf>, 22 September 2013.

[6] Garrett, T.A. (2004) "Light-Rail Transit in America. Policy Issues and Prospects for Economic Development," Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Retrieved from [http://www.stlouisfed.org/community\\_development/assets/pdf/light\\_rail.pdf](http://www.stlouisfed.org/community_development/assets/pdf/light_rail.pdf), 22 September 2013.

September 23, 2013

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

Dear Sound Transit:

I write to state my concern about the fate of Latvian Church & Community Center as you proceed with Light Rail extension to Lynnwood. On this subject you will have already heard from many Latvians, Estonians and Lithuanians, who for obvious reasons want to save the Center for their own unique purposes of cultural and religious expression and preservation. My perspective comes at one remove from those of Baltic heritage but it is nonetheless deeply felt. I have no Baltic family lineage but my wife of 40 years is Latvian-American. Through the decades I have learnt a good deal of the Latvian language, sufficient to take some part in the richness of this vibrant culture.

You should keep in mind that there are many like me, non-Balts who are yet part of the extended reach of the Baltic tradition and who value it profoundly. It is not only Balts who go to the wide range of events at the Latvian Community Center & Church nor it is only Balts who see the beneficial workings of these institutions on broader society.

While I have nothing against the expansion of light rail, and, indeed, as a Lynnwood resident welcome it, I do feel you need to rethink the effect of your plans and revise them in such a way as to leave the Center and Church as undisturbed as possible.

Yours very truly,

Richard C. Wiest  
2030 151<sup>st</sup> PL SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98087-6345  
Tel. 425-678-8774  
porculcemic@gmail.com

### **I-368-001**

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.

**I-368-001**



22 September 2013

I-369-001

Sound Transit DEIS  
401 S. Jackson Street  
Seattle, WA 98104

Comments on Lynnwood Link Extension Draft EIS

Attention: Lauren Swift  
Via email: [LynnwoodLinkDEIS@soundtransit.org](mailto:LynnwoodLinkDEIS@soundtransit.org)

Dear Ms. Swift:

A few thoughts concerning the Lynnwood Station and MLT stations.

Placement - Lynnwood station, I reject C-1 and C-2 because of their negative impact on existing property owners, their negative impact on Scriber Creek Park, and poor use of existing right-of-way (I-5 corridor). There is no viable reason I can see to run the elevated railway above 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave West, instead of along I-5.



C3: ALONG I-5 TO LYNNWOOD PARK-AND-RIDE STATION

Alternative C-3 is my preferred option, especially if the parking garage is put where the current transit center parking is at, and expanded vertically. The same goes for Mountlake Terrace Freeway Station, increase of parking capacity is necessary (I currently live very near it and frequently the parking is full). I do understand option C-3 impacts the Interurban Trail but compared to alternatives C-1/2, it has the least impact on Scriber Creek Park and surrounding established neighborhoods.

### I-369-001

Your comment stating your preference for Alternative C3 is noted. The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS is a modified Alternative C3, with a parking garage east of 46th Avenue West. See Appendix F, Conceptual Plans, for the current design drawings.

**I-369-002** Expanded parking at the transit centers is essential as they are already over-capacity. The logical location of the parking garage should be in the current southeast park-and-ride lot, east of 46<sup>th</sup> Ave West. The Draft EIS includes analysis only for locating the parking garage west of 46<sup>th</sup> Ave West which I feel negatively impacts/displaces too many established, developed areas.

With the parking garage placed in the current southeast section of the park-and-ride area, I support C3 knowing that some impacts on the Interurban Trail will require mitigation.

**I-369-003** It is important to minimize nuisance effects, such as noise and poor aesthetics. This is best accomplished by utilizing the I-5 corridor to its maximum as those 2 issues are currently being mitigated to an extent (sound barriers and walls). Using the limited access area improves the security of the system (minimal access to passers-by).

Rolf Vitous  
5904 236th St SW  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

**I-369-002**

The Preferred Alternative includes a parking garage located on the east side of 46th Avenue West.

**I-369-003**

Your comment about minimizing nuisance effects by utilizing the I-5 corridor is noted.

September 22, 2013

Sound Transit  
Draft EIS comments  
c/o Lauren Swift

I am commenting on the Lynnwood Link DEIS issued July 26, 2013. As a member of the Seattle Latvian Community, whose Community Center and Church at 11710 - 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE in the Northgate area of Seattle, scheduled for destructive impacts should any of the alternatives be approved, I am writing to voice my concern over the proposed action.

The decision impacts not only the Latvian and Baltic communities, who have been active within the halls of the center for over 40 years. Countless other groups have used the center and continue to use it for their own functions, meetings and church services.

**I-370-001**

The loss of the entrance/exit to the center may as well be seen as a total loss of the property, a problem that could be solved with a better alternative than the ones currently presented.

The meaning behind the church and community center has been a monument to a struggling, small, immigrant community who built the structure; a testament to a people who were able to escape Soviet-occupied Latvia and make a new life for themselves and future generations in the Seattle area.

The gravity and impact of removing this church and community center from us would be huge, the impact of which would be reflected on the children and community who would have no place to go for some time.

Given the aging Latvian community here in Seattle, the idea of relocating is not very viable. I hope that a solution can be created that would allow for the progress of Sound Transit as well as the continuing existence of the Latvian Community Center.

Sincerely,  
Monika Hanley

### **I-370-001**

Thank you for your comments describing the importance of the Latvian Community Center to the Latvian 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 results of 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.

I-371-001

To Whom it Concerns,

My father passed away in 2007. When my brother and I went through his belongings, we found, tucked away in a box along with his yearbooks, diplomas and other important documents, a spiral-bound notebook. I can best describe it as a project record, a yearbook in its own right, showing the various stages of the construction and of the completion of the Seattle Latvian Center.

This document was written in 1972, long before “PC” and “Mac” were household terms; long before, with the simple click of a mouse, one could apply Latvian fonts with its own custom accent marks that make each word more legible to its Latvian reader; long before there was a Kinkos on every corner or a Shutterfly from which one could order a custom-printed and professionally-bound hardcover book. In 1972, someone keyed this document on a typewriter, added BY HAND page after page of accent marks, photocopied pictures, timelines & ledgers, then penned a custom message to each receiver: “Dear Mr. & Mrs. Aldis L. Andrejevs, thank you for your donation.”

Why? Why would someone spend all of that time to put together a construction report for a couple hundred members of some obscure community? For the same reason my dad kept it for 35 years along side his other most sentimental records – because it's important; because that report represents a monumental event for Seattle's ever-growing Latvian population. It marks the time in our history when we got our very own community center.

I don't know if you know anything about Baltic immigrants, or the vast number of cities where populations of Latvians have sprouted up. I won't bother you with the historic details of our ancestor's exodus from the fatherland, but I will assure you that those who found their way to the shores of Elliot Bay were a proud people who understood that the only way to maintain our Latvian heritage, culture and language was to give themselves and future generations a gathering place - a place to be used for education, a place to celebrate spirituality, a place for open forums, exchanging ideas, and social events where young Latvians (who would otherwise have no way to interact with other Latvian youth), could meet, perhaps even fall in love, and add to the population a couple of kids named Markus and Daira.

The author of this report, Edvins Circenis, included this passage within its first few pages. It's titled “For the Latvian Youth and our Country's Freedom”.

“The last clanging hammer has rung, quiet now is the singing saw, the hurried diligence of the workers has finally come to an end. Among a grove of 100-year-old pines stands our newly completed church & community center.

This new center affirms our faith in the future of Latvia and in its freedom. It will serve to house our spiritual and public forums and, more importantly, will harbor the growth of our Latvian youth to insure our culture and our beliefs will not disappear with future generations.

Let this center & church be a symbol of our Latvian culture, our Latvian spirit and our Latvian togetherness. May it give us the strength to survive and to fight for that which is most important to us – our country's freedom.”

My grandmother just turned 95 years old this month. She and my grandfather worked along side several other volunteers to build our center. Although her short-term memory fails her from time to time, her long term memory is still sharp as a tack. I am one of the lucky few who still get to hear the stories direct from the source. “Daira”, she tells me, “with my own two hands, I hammered nails into

## I-371-001

Thank you for your comments about the importance of the Latvian Community Center to you, and the larger Latvian and Baltic communities in Seattle. 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 results of 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.

I-371-001

that church ceiling.” My grandmother is one of the proudest of the proud – I’ve heard most of the stories of her accomplishments: from her days in Germany during the war, working in a hospital with no nurses training, to her time at Boeing, where she secured a laboratory job for .80¢ an hour, just barely speaking English, supporting a crippled husband and 2 small children, and never having worked in a lab a day in her life! Despite all of her achievements, one of her proudest moments to date is helping to build our community center. When her family moved to Seattle from Houghton, MI, the local Latvian Church funded the move with what seemed like an impossible sum of money to a struggling, immigrant family. By helping to build the center & church, my grandmother feels like she gave back to the community a gift of immeasurable value. And you know what, she’s right. She did. They all did. It is their legacy.

Do you know how difficult it is to grow up a native-speaking Latvian, or Lithuanian, or Estonian in America? It’s kind of like raising a Husky in Cougar territory – not impossible but really hard without the right support system. Now, imagine you’re a Husky fan without a stadium. Taking the center away from us is like telling all the Husky fans in Seattle that they can still celebrate the purple & gold – they just have to do it in Pullman. It’s not going to happen. You’re going to lose members, you’re going to lose support and, most importantly, you’re going to lose future generations.

In my right mind, I cannot sit back passively and let our center be eradicated, not when the first thoughts that popped into my head when my son was born was what it was going to be like to take him to his first Christmas service at this church, or to his first day at Latvian School, or wondering at which social function, in the very same ballroom where his parents celebrated their matrimony, he might meet his future wife?

I beg you, from my generation of Seattle Latvians who grew up at this center, please, do not destroy this legacy. Don’t take this birthright away from our children. There has to be another way, a way that will not disrupt the operations of the center & church, a way that will not leave hundreds of us wondering, “What now?” or, more appropriately, “Where now?”

I thank you for both your time and your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Daira L. Anderson

[dairaanderson@gmail.com](mailto:dairaanderson@gmail.com)  
425-773-2195

---

**From:** Maira Ruisis <rigasmaira@clearwire.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 22, 2013 4:32 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Latvian Cultural Center Impact

**I-372-001** I am a first generation Latvian who came to the United States in 1950 having lived with my family as refugees in Germany since the age of 8 months until I was 6 years old. Along with thousands of other displaced Latvians, my family lost everything they owned and had to start completely over in the United States.

I moved to Seattle in 1969 and immediately became active in the Latvian community. We had a small community center at that time, but with the heart, soul, labor, and love, built our present Latvian Community Center and Church. This was no small task and it has been the hub of our, both, cultural and religious activity. The center not only serves Latvians, but also Estonians and Lithuanians.

The center hosts weekly activities from Latvian school, to church services and various meetings. Throughout the years, I have been active in the drama group, choir, school and Latvian camp. I am happy to say that the next generation is still active in the center's activities and sending their children to Latvian school as well as participating in its many other activities.

To say we could relocate is a travesty. The cost of building a new center would be prohibitive to our community and the location would no longer be the conveniently central one for our community.

The sound transit committee NEEDS to hear our voices and RESPECT the cultural importance of our center and impact of SOUND TRANSIT'S potential destruction or negative consequences by the running of its line so near or through our center.

Respectfully yours,

Maira Ruisis

### **I-372-001**

Thank you for your comment describing the importance of the Latvian Community Center and Church to you, and giving a brief history of it. 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.