

06/25/2026 Board of Directors Meeting Written Public Comment Submissions

Submissions

Lynn L. Haney	3
Martin Westerman	4
David Hsiao	8
Brien Chow	13
Paula Goode	21
Vanessa Carr	24
Donna Popich	25
Candace Shattuck	26
Kim Schwarzkopf	27
Jared Jonson on behalf of SCIDpda	29
Betty Lau	32
T.K. Finn	34
Margaret Fredrick	35
Marilyn Kennell	36
Jan Roberts	38
T.A. Scidmore	39
Unnamed Commenters	40

Lynn L. Haney

Note: The supplemental comments corresponding to this comment can be found at the end of this document.

Dear Board Coordinator, Sound Transit Board of Directors

RE: Supplemental Written Comments of Lynn L. Haney

Resolution No. R2026-13: (OMF South Project)

Impacted Property: 33049 24th Ave S, Federal Way, WA 98003 (King County Tax Parcel No. 797880-0681)

Sound Transit ROW No.: OMF111

Dear Board Coordinator,

I represent James and Lynn Haney, owners of Parcel OMF111. Following their initial June 9 submission (including Exhibits A–L) and participation in the June 11 System Expansion Committee hearing, they are submitting the attached Supplemental Comments. This supplement directly addresses administrative developments and staff disclosures that emerged during that hearing.

Pursuant to Sound Transit’s public comment procedures, please ensure this supplemental material is formally included in the official administrative record and distributed to the full Board ahead of the meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 25, 2026, at 1:30 PM.

Kindly confirm receipt of this email and advise when these materials have been distributed to the Board members.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mark Roellig, WSBA #9392

Martin Westerman

Greetings Board members,

You may recall our late 2022 email, asking you to save taxpayers \$2.5 billion on WSLE. WSLE cost estimate then was \$3.5 billion. Today, it's \$5-\$9 billion to link West Seattle with Downtown. You are supporting the most expensive light rail project on Earth. But you don't need to.

At \$1.5-\$2 billion cost per mile cost, WSLE will only carry 5400 rail riders per day 4 miles to SODO (until 2042-45). That's \$3000 cost per rider. Metro buses carry 27,000 riders per day now, directly between West Seattle and downtown — for \$15 per rider. . Which of these options looks like the better investment of public money to you?

In 2022, we proposed that ST integrate an urban gondola system into its bus and light rail network, particularly in hilly areas such as West Seattle. For lower cost, carbon footprint and time to delivery, reduced disruption and destruction, it would deliver more passenger throughput than buses or light. But in 2024, Sound Transit CEO Peter Rogoff asserted that Sound Transit could do that, even though cities across the world already have. A sampling:

- La Paz, Bolivia (Mi Teleférico): 160,000-300,000 riders per day (rpd) across its 10-line network
- Mexico City, Mexico (Cablebús Lines 1, 2, & 3): 70,000-80,000 rpd
- Medellín, Colombia (Metrocable): 50,000-65,000 rpd; Line K carries 30,000 rpd
- Caracas, Venezuela (Metrocable): Up to 20,000 rpd
- Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic (Teleférico de Santo Domingo): ~20,000 rpd
- Toulouse, France (Téléo): 8,000-15,000 rpd
- Ankara, Turkiye (Yenimahalle–Şentepe teleferik): 10,000-15,000 rpd, with up to 86,000 rpd capacity

If you feel ST3 binds you to particular modes, and cannot think and act "outside the box," then follow the suggestions of transit experts who have been presenting less expensive, lower carbon, faster delivery options to you since 2017. In addition to gondolas, they have suggested:

- rebuilding the WS bridge at two points to:
 - create exclusive bus lane to & onto SR99 N exit,
 - build WS bridge exit to 6th Av busway
- interlining through one tunnel, and dropping the unneeded second tunnel proposal
- creating BRT for WS, or putting more ST3 money into RR C and H lines with more exclusive bus lanes
- using \$1 billion to turn the entire Metro bus system into electric trolleys
- demanding SDOT prioritize maintenance of bus route roadways in partnership with Metro and ST
- adding east-west bus connections to feed existing Sounder and light rail stations
- better employing BNSF-Sounder trackways
- reducing WS transit deserts, and resuming WS area transit that Metro eliminated
- using automated vehicles
- focusing on (\$12 billion) Ballard for 54,000-100,000 riders per day, and delaying low-ridership WSLE
- not building either over-priced light rail line (as suggested in both the DEIS and FEIS (No Build option))

Beware: University of Sydney (Australia) transport scholars David Hensher and Corinne Mulley showed photos of the same transit stop, but with a different vehicle — bus, BRT, and light rail — to 1,370 people in six Australian capital cities. They asked, "Which one would you like to travel in most?" And while many of those asked did not ride public transit, nearly 72% liked the light rail image best.

Building light rail to improve our region's image will not improve our transit ridership or productiveness. Refer to latest figures from the Puget Sound Regional Council: even with 20% additional build-out, light rail will carry less than 2% of regional trips.

Your responsibility is to steward public money by spending it wisely. Please take that responsibly seriously.

All the best,

Martin Westerman, [Rethink The Link](#)

Greetings Board Members,

Your Public Involvement statement is entirely false. It is unfortunate, as ST is a public agency that should live up to its words: "Fostering public trust through transparent communication, meaningful involvement and being responsive to concerns and issues."

ST set a deceptive tone shortly after the 2016 ST3 vote, when West Seattle Transportation Coalition's asked for WSLE maps to conduct a June 2017 public outreach meeting. Sound Transit refused to release them, so WSTC filed a public records request, and got what looked like weather maps Trump had drawn on with a Sharpie. ST explained they represented ST's "1% thinking." Three counties had just voted in ST3 for a non-existent WSBLE plan.

ST did not make efficient progress thereafter. On May 12, 2023, ST secretly emailed the Federal Transit Administration that it expected only 5400 riders per day on WSLE for the 2032-2042 period, because it would only reach SODO, not downtown as voters expected in ST3. WSLE had claimed 34,000 per day ridership before the ST3 vote, 27,000 per day for the vote,

Now in 2026, ST claims WSLE is "shovel ready," though is not yet 30% designed, and no route, utility and other key elements have been settled.

How did we get here? Seattle City Council Members Rivera and Moore stated in June 2025 that Sound Transit has never been transparent about WSBLE, nor have Seattle leaders been transparent about it, and the public has the right to be engaged in decisions that deeply impact them around WSBLE.

Sound Transit board members have repeatedly stated that they are delivering what voters approved in ST3. This is also not true. As former SDOT Director Scott Kubly wrote in the June 12, 2026, Seattle Times, even ST board members are not adequately informed about Sound Transit's WSLE plans.

Since 2016, Sound Transit has provided no forums for discussion of "irreparable" environment damage (DEIS & FEIS), impacts to economies and communities. And it has refused to discuss transit options that are less expensive, disruptive and destructive, lower-carbon and faster to deliver than light rail. Specifically, since before the November 2016 ST3 vote, we have watched Sound Transit:

- mislead the public about WSBLE routing, plans, budget, timeline, impacts and benefits
- fabulously overestimate its West Seattle-Downtown (WSLE) ridership forecasts
- miscalculate its SODO right of way needs by 35%
- run itself \$35 billion into debt, triggering re-alignments and an "Enterprise Initiative"
- delay WSLE and BLE by years past ST3's voter-approved delivery dates,
- miscalculate WSLE costs, from the voter-approved \$1.6 billion total cost to nearly \$2 billion per mile, making it the world's most expensive light rail project

- apparently collude with the City of Seattle to hide from the federal government “irreparable” WSLE environmental damage listed in the DEIS and FEIS,
- generate nearly 400,000 tons of GhGs per year, with no possibility of mitigating it, and cut nearly 140 acres of carbon-absorbing trees, with plans to cut six more forest acres for WSLE
- change voter approved plans without new public votes
- approve and build stations with access issues for riders
- repeatedly interrupt light rail service due to elevator and escalator failures, unanticipated track work, energy failures and MLK pedestrian injuries and fatalities,
- refuse to meet with local residents who will be most affected by WSLE
- annually help fund a supposedly “grassroots” group to rally for trains at all Sound Transit meetings
- try to acquire properties between the CID and West Seattle before any route or other key elements are settled (see above).

In January 2025, Rethink The Link colleagues requested from the Washington Secretary of Transportation’s office an audit of where ST3 monies had been spent. WSDOT replied that ST funds were so co-mingled, they could not be accurately tracked.

Your Public Involvement statement is false. To remedy that, you must live up to it beginning with this meeting.

Expectantly,

Martin Westerman, West Seattle

Greetings, Board Members,

It’s hard to imagine a more poorly conceived plan than Motion M2026-21.

It picks a lower-ridership option (WSLE at 5400 riders per day) over a higher-ridership option (BLE at up to 100,000 riders /day), and makes WSLE the world’s most expensive light rail project (\$1.5-\$2 billion per mile). Do you see this as an achievement?

Motion M2026-21 rejects the advice of transit experts since 2016, who have presented less expensive, less polluting, lower carbon, less disruptive and destructive options that can be deployed faster to improve public transit now, not in 20 years. This aligns with your failure, noted earlier, to abide by ST’s statement of Public Involvement.

WSLE is a light rail stub that will only connect West Seattle and SODO for ten years after it is built. It will require riders to make two transfers to connect with Downtown, and according to ST, may only carry 5400 riders per day. Meanwhile, Metro Transit buses will carry about 27,000 riders per day between West Seattle and Downtown on a “one seat,” no transfer ride.

Motion M2026-21 is financially irresponsible — a waste of hard-earned taxpayer dollars, for little transit benefit. It falsely claims that WSLE is ready for Final Design designation. It is not: WSLE is barely at 30% design, no utility or other key elements have been settled, and plans have been repeatedly altered since it was first proposed in 2016.

Even by 2050, with 20% additional light rail build-out, the Puget Sound Regional Council sees light rail carrying less than 2% of all regional trips. Presently, total regional transit ridership is lower than it was ten years ago. The Angle Lake-U District light rail spine has never achieved daily ridership goals set in 1996. And 30 years from now, PSRC sees buses only carrying 5% of trips. The remaining 85%-90% of trips? Single and shared occupancy vehicles.

We urge you to vote NO on Motion M2026-21. Focus on building better transit options than on light rail at any cost.

Expecting you to show reason and vision,
Martin Westerman & colleagues

David Hsiao

David Hsiao
15907 SE 254th Place
Covington, WA 98042
davidlh028@gmail.com
253-267-9315

Via Email and Certified Mail/RRR

June 20, 2026

Sound Transit Board of Directors
c/o Board Administrator
401 S. Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104

ATTN:

A.J. Circhirillo - Real Property Project Manager
Jonathan Nichols - Legal Department
Sound Transit Public Records Officer
Sound Transit Appraisal / Valuation Unit
OMF South Project File Administrator

SUBJECT: Resolution R2026-13 - Parcel No. 7978800581 / ROW No. OMF107

Formal Submission for Administrative Record, Request for Deferral, and Parcel-Specific Clarification

1. PURPOSE OF SUBMISSION

This letter is submitted for inclusion in the administrative record prior to Board action on Resolution R2026-13.

The purpose is to ensure that parcel-specific information necessary to evaluate the necessity, scope, duration, impacts, and valuation relevance of the proposed property interests affecting Parcel No. 7978800581 / ROW No. OMF107 is clearly documented and identifiable in the record.

This request is made in a cooperative administrative context to support clarification and continued resolution of outstanding questions.

2. REQUEST FOR RECORD COMPLETENESS / TIMING CONCERN

Shortly before the Board meeting, Sound Transit provided a substantial volume of engineering drawings, plan sheets, and related materials.

While appreciated, these materials are not presented in a parcel-specific manner that clearly identifies all information applicable to OMF107, including:

- specific easement areas
- specific work descriptions
- parcel-level purpose explanations
- duration and obligation definitions

As a result, the property owner has not yet been able to reasonably identify all parcel-specific information necessary for full review prior to Board consideration.

3. PARCEL-SPECIFIC INFORMATION GAP (CORE ISSUE)

Based on current review, parcel-specific written clarification is still not clearly identifiable for the following categories:

- Construction-related impacts affecting OMF107
- Access and circulation impacts
- Drainage and stormwater-related impacts
- Temporary and/or permanent easement boundaries
- Duration and extension provisions
- Restoration, mitigation, and post-construction obligations
- Restrictions affecting development, utilities, grading, or site use
- Parcel-specific necessity and project purpose explanation

Accordingly, the scope, duration, and impacts of the proposed property interests remain not fully verifiable from the current parcel-level record.

4. TEMPORARY MITIGATION EASEMENT - CLARIFICATION NEEDED

The materials reference a "Temporary Mitigation Easement" affecting OMF107. However, parcel-level documentation does not clearly explain:

- the specific mitigation purpose (environmental, drainage, construction-related, or other)
- the specific physical work to be performed
- why OMF107 is required for the mitigation activity
- the duration and any extension provisions
- monitoring, maintenance, planting, or restoration obligations
- the long-term effect on property use or development potential

In addition, clarification is requested as to whether any conditions associated with the Temporary Mitigation Easement-such as planting requirements, monitoring obligations, maintenance periods, or regulatory or permit-related requirements-may extend beyond the stated temporary term or otherwise result in continuing or long-term impacts on property use, access, or development potential.

Without this information, the property rights being requested cannot be fully evaluated for necessity, scope, duration, or impact.

5. COMPARISON WITH OMF111 - PARCEL CONSISTENCY

Within the same project, Sound Transit has provided clearer parcel-specific descriptions for comparable temporary easements, including OMF111. Those materials include:

- defined scope of work
- plain-language description of construction activities
- clearly stated duration
- restoration and post-construction obligations

By comparison, OMF107 is described primarily as a "Temporary Mitigation Easement" without an equivalent parcel-specific explanation of purpose, scope, duration, or impacts in the current record.

This difference in parcel-level clarity affects the ability to consistently evaluate necessity, scope, duration, and valuation relevance across comparable project impacts.

6. VALUATION RELEVANCE (CLARIFICATION REQUEST)

Because valuation depends on clearly defined scope and duration, clarification is respectfully requested regarding whether the following are fully reflected in any valuation or project assumptions:

- extension provisions (if applicable)
- mitigation, monitoring, and maintenance obligations
- restoration or long-term site conditions
- impacts on development timing or site utilization

Where these elements are not fully defined at the parcel level, valuation assumptions may require clarification to ensure consistency with the actual property rights being sought.

7. REQUEST FOR PARCEL-SPECIFIC CLARIFICATION

To ensure a complete and reviewable administrative record, the property owner respectfully requests written clarification for OMF107 addressing:

- Each property interest being sought (temporary or permanent)
- Legal description and area (square footage)
- Purpose of the Temporary Mitigation Easement
- Specific work to be performed on or affecting the parcel
 - Engineering, environmental, drainage, or operational basis
- Duration and extension provisions
- Construction, access, drainage, and environmental impacts
- Restoration, mitigation, monitoring, and maintenance obligations
- Restrictions on development, utilities, grading, or site use
- Whether valuation reflects full duration and obligations
- Supporting parcel-specific drawings and technical documents

8. PARCEL-SPECIFICITY REQUIREMENT (CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE)

The property owner requests only documents, drawings, descriptions, and written explanations that are specifically applicable to Parcel No. 7978800581 / OMF107.

General project materials are not sufficient unless clearly identified or indexed to show applicability to this parcel. T

his request is made solely to ensure a complete and reviewable administrative record and to avoid misinterpretation of parcel-specific impacts.

9. RECORD PRESERVATION REQUEST

The property owner respectfully requests that this submission be:

- Included in the official administrative record for Resolution R2026-13
- Placed in the project file for Parcel No. 7978800581 / ROW No. OMF107
- Forwarded to the Board prior to any action
- Forwarded to Legal Counsel and Appraisal / Valuation Unit for awareness
- Preserved for any future compensation-related evaluation

10. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Nothing in this correspondence shall be construed as a waiver of any rights, claims, objections, or defenses, all of which are expressly reserved.

Respectfully submitted,

David Hsiao

Property Owner

Parcel No. 7978800581

ROW No. OMF107

Project: OMF South Project

Dear, Chair and Members of the Board.

This is the written copy of the speech.

My name is David Hsiao, and I am the property owner of Parcel No. 7978800581, identified as ROW No. OMF107 under Resolution R2026-13.

I am submitting this statement for inclusion in the official record.

My concern is that the parcel-specific record for OMF107 is still not complete enough to allow meaningful evaluation of the necessity, scope, duration, impacts, and valuation of the proposed property interests.

Shortly before this meeting, Sound Transit provided a large volume of engineering drawings and plan sheets. While appreciated, those materials are not clearly organized in a parcel-specific way showing what applies to OMF107, including easement areas, work descriptions, duration, extension provisions, and obligations.

Key issues remain unclear, including construction impacts, access impacts, drainage impacts, easement boundaries, restoration obligations, and post-construction conditions.

OMF107 is described as involving a Temporary Mitigation Easement, but the parcel-level documents do not clearly explain the specific purpose, physical work, duration, monitoring obligations, or long-term effect on property use and development potential.

We continue to request project-specific information explaining the necessity, duration, alternatives, and impacts to our property. We have not identified any parcel-specific analysis for OMF107 addressing

impacts to the remainder property, development potential, use restrictions, or mitigation obligations. If such analysis exists, please identify it in the project record.

Within the same project, Sound Transit has provided clearer parcel-specific descriptions for comparable easements, including OMF111. OMF107 has not yet been described with the same level of clarity.

Because valuation depends on defined scope and duration, I respectfully request that the Board defer action on Resolution R2026-13 until the requested parcel-specific information is provided and reviewed.

If the Board proceeds today, I respectfully request that this objection and request for deferral be preserved in the official record.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
David Hsiao

Brien Chow

Written Public Comment by Brien Chow for Sound Transit Board Meeting, Thursday, 6/25/26 at Union Station, 1:30 p.m.

I am Brien Chow, co-founder of Transit Equity for All (TEA) and chair of the Outreach Committee of the Chong Wa Benevolent Association of Washington.

Why **DSTT2** Should Be Deferred:

Governance, Accountability, and Transit Performance Concerns

Prepared for: *Sound Transit Board, Regional Decision-Makers, Legislators, Transit Stakeholders, and Community Advocates*

Executive Summary

The Central Puget Sound transit system faces significant financial and governance challenges.

Sound Transit acknowledges a **\$35 billion affordability gap**.

In response, the agency adopted a *System Update Plan* that deferred numerous projects and program elements. However, the multi-billion-dollar **Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel 2 (DSTT2)** remains active.

Does advancing **DSTT2** under current conditions represent sound fiscal practice?

*Is the Sound Transit governance structure
the culprit for continuous budget crises
and decision-making errors?*

"Good decisions are based on evidence, not momentum."

The Five Pillars of Analysis

Pillar	Core Concern
1. The Architect's Legacy	<i>Long-term leadership is closely tied to the planning assumptions that produced today's affordability gap.</i>
2. Board member insulation	<i>Political appointment structures may limit independent oversight and accountability.</i>

3. The Insider Career Pivot	<i>The CEO selection process raised concerns about conflict of interest, transparency and institutional independence.</i>
4. Real Estate Priorities	<i>Station location decisions prioritize redevelopment opportunities over rider connectivity and accessibility.</i>
5. The <i>North & South of CID Alternatives</i>	<i>Preferred station alternatives create significant accessibility and connectivity problems.</i>

Pillar 1: The Architect's Legacy

Dow Constantine served on the *Sound Transit Board* for nearly two decades, including multiple terms as Chair and Vice Chair during the development and approval of ST3.

Now he is the CEO directly overseeing the staff, raising issues of conflicts of interest and a new ability to advance his prior announced goals of “*building a new neighborhood*” rather than advancing regional and ridership goals under the Six Principles adopted by the board.

Key Concern

When the leadership establishes the original framework, it is also responsible for evaluating outcomes. Is there sufficient institutional independence to objectively reassess past decisions and correct past mistakes?

Pillar 2: Board Member Insulation

Sound Transit is a regional appointment system rather than direct voter election.

During his tenure as *King County Executive*, *Dow Constantine* appointed **10 of the 18 voting board members**, who likely supported his views and then in turn, hired him as *Sound Transit CEO*.

Key Concern

A governance structure heavily dependent upon political appointments and connections makes it harder to conduct independent reviews of what the board has decided.

Public Process Concerns

As *Kathleen Barry Johnson*, Executive Director of Historic South Downtown, testified before the Sound Transit Executive Committee on May 14, 2026,

“South Downtown has not had access to the work that is ongoing behind the scenes” and “without more information, the community cannot weigh in on the deliberations you have before you.”

She further warned that the public needed more time to receive information from *Sound Transit* and share opinions.

These concerns raise important questions about transparency, meaningful community engagement, and whether stakeholders have been given adequate opportunity to understand and evaluate the **North and South of CID station** alternatives before critical decisions are made.

Pillar 3: The Insider Career Pivot

*The public and media pointed out the conflict of interest that 10 board members **CEO Dow Constantine** appointed to the ST board all voted to hire him as CEO, despite his lack of expertise in managing large, complex infrastructure projects.*

Other Questions:

- *Final deliberations conducted in executive session*
- *Limited public transparency*
- *Lack of Consideration of external transit executives*
- *Selection by a board that included members he had previously appointed*

Key Concern

While the process complied with existing procedures, the transition from King County Exec to Sound Transit CEO reinforced perceptions of institutional continuity rather than independent leadership accountability.

Pillar 4: Real Estate Priorities Versus Transit Utility

One of the most debated decisions in the *Ballard Link program* was the move away from the previously studied **4th Avenue Station** concept near the *Chinatown International District*.

Both the **North and South of CID station** platforms are physically located outside the formal boundaries of the *Chinatown International District*, meaning neither station is actually situated within the CID neighborhood it is intended to serve.

The vast majority of transit advocates and CID community members support the **4th Avenue Hub station because it offers:**

- *Direct Sounder connections*
- *Direct Amtrak connections*
- *Seamless transfers*
- *Stronger regional integration and accessibility*

The **North of CID** alternative is located adjacent to the former *King County Administration Building* site.

That decision clearly showed redevelopment and property acquisition received greater weight than maximizing transit performance and rider convenience.

Key Concern

Station location decisions should be driven by mobility outcomes, transfer quality, and regional connectivity rather than adjacent redevelopment potential. And it should not have disproportionate impacts on communities of color, non-English speakers, and those with disabilities.

“The purpose of the Title VI service monitoring requirement is to ensure that prior decisions related to the **distribution of fixed route transit service and facilities have not resulted in a disparate impact or disproportionate burden on protected populations.**”
— Sound Transit Title VI Service Monitoring Report (2022)

Pillar 5: “Names Should Match Locations...”

North and South (“OUT”) of CID

The proposed names appear *disconnected* from the actual station locations. “*Midtown*” would not be in Midtown, and “*Dearborn Street*” would not accurately identify a platform located closer to *6th & Royal Brougham*.

Why are descriptive, geographically accurate names being replaced with names that may create confusion for riders?

To address downtown alignment costs, *Sound Transit* advanced a **South of CID** alternative on *Dearborn Street*, but it’s an entrance only. *The station platform is .4 miles farther south.*

For many stakeholders, this preferred alternative represents gigantic red flags about racial and disabled communities' equity and accessibility worries.

“Transit Connectivity Out the Window”

The proposed *South of CID* station would:

- *Be located at least one-half mile from the historic **Chinatown International District** core, .6 miles if one is attending an event at the Wing Luke Museum or Theater Off Jackson; and .9 miles to Little Saigon Creative.*
- *Lack direct Sounder, Amtrak, streetcar, bus, and ferry integration*
- *Require extra and longer transfer movements*
- *Increase walking distances for many riders by at least 12 minutes*

Passengers would arrive in an area dominated by freight, industrial, and highway infrastructure rather than a welcoming regional transit hub environment.

***North of CID* preferred alternative would:**

- *Locate a major transit station on one of **Seattle's steepest hills**, potentially increasing barriers for seniors, people with disabilities, and families with strollers.*
- *Require deep bore tunnels*
- *Require multiple elevators and escalators*
- *Reduce multimodal connectivity by locating the station farthest from existing transit services and transfer points.*
- *Retain the Midtown name while failing to connect the very destinations and transit services that define Seattle's Midtown area.*
- *Threaten the Reynolds Hotel with eminent domain, potentially erasing a living piece of Japanese American history that endured despite Executive Order 9066 and World War II-era displacement.*
- *Place the station farther from critical cultural and community-serving institutions, including the Wing Luke Museum, Little Saigon Creative, and ICHS, where many limited-English-proficient residents' access culturally and linguistically appropriate healthcare.*

Key Concerns

North and South of CID stations are stand-alone stations that do not function as an integrated multimodal transfer center. Whereas the **4th Avenue Hub** would be the closest location to transfers

and destinations in the CID.

Accessibility Concerns

Advocates for seniors and people with disabilities raise concerns regarding:

- *Multiple elevator transfers*
- *Extra transfers from the south required to continue north*
- *Significant vertical circulation*
- *Long outdoor walking/wheel chairing distances; uphill to new Midtown station*
- *Complex way-finding requirements*

Many riders could face two or more elevator movements before reaching street level and then still be required to complete substantial outdoor travel to the next station uphill using wheelchairs, walkers, canes.

Key Concern

North and South of CID stations pose additional, unnecessary barriers for wheelchair users, seniors, blind and low-vision riders, the hearing impaired and other individuals with mobility challenges.

Structural Solutions for a Transparent Reset

1. Reclassify **DSTT2** to Deferred Status

Sound Transit should vote to move **DSTT2** into “*deferred status*” and conduct a comprehensive reassessment of alternatives based on cost-benefit analysis and racial, economic, and ADA friendly standards.

Benefits include:

- *Preserving debt capacity*
- *Reducing financial risk*
- *Protecting systemwide expansion commitments*
- *Allowing additional evaluation of lower-cost alternatives*

Analyze modern **Communications-Based Train Control (CBTC)** technology to maximize capacity within the existing **Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel (DSTT1)**.

2. Strengthen Governance and Oversight

The *Washington State Legislature* should evaluate reforms that improve accountability and independent oversight.

Potential approaches include:

- *Independent oversight boards*
- *Professional control boards*
- *Directly elected governance structures*
- *Enhanced transparency requirements*
- *Greater financial review authority*

Objective: Ensure major capital decisions receive independent scrutiny.

3. Standardize Infrastructure Design

Sound Transit should use:

- *Standardized station designs*
- *Modular construction approaches*
- *Reduced excavation requirements*
- *Proven international best practices*

Examples such as Vancouver SkyTrain demonstrate that simpler station designs can reduce costs while maintaining high-quality service.

Conclusion

The debate surrounding *DSTT2* is no longer solely about engineering or alignment selection.

It has become a broader discussion about:

- *Fiscal stewardship*
- *Public accountability*
- *Accessibility*
- *Governance*

- *Regional transportation priorities*

The project has evolved into a costly downtown infrastructure program that no longer delivers the regional ridership benefits originally envisioned.

The *North and South of CID* alternatives reduce connectivity, create new accessibility burdens, and weaken the regional transit hub concept voters expected.

Placing *DSTT2* into formal “**Deferred Status**” would provide an opportunity for an independent reassessment of costs, benefits, accessibility impacts to protected populations, and long-term system priorities.

I ask you:

*Should limited public resources be committed to a second downtown tunnel,
or should those resources be focused on completing and optimizing the
broader regional transit system that voters were promised?*

Brien Chow

Co-Founder Transit Equity for All
FOR MORE INFORMATION...

linktr.ee/TransitEquityforAll **MFo4th**

Key References

Sound Transit Records

- Sound Transit Board Motion M2025-15 (CEO appointment and compensation)
- Sound Transit Board Motion M2026-09 (system planning and performance measures)
- Sound Transit System Update Plan and Enterprise Initiative materials

Policy and Research Sources

- Transportation Choices Coalition: "The Future of Sound Transit: What's Happened and What's Next"
- Bellevue Chamber Eastside Business Roundtable presentations
- The Urbanist: Analysis of North and South CID alternatives
- Sound Transit environmental review documents
- Sound Transit Board meeting materials and public records
- HNTB report, 2023
- VMS report, 2023

Paula Goode

Dear Sound Transit Board Members,

I am writing regarding the West Seattle Link Extension and the statements in the recent project update describing Sound Transit's commitment to public involvement, transparency, responsiveness, and public trust.

While I appreciate the efforts staff have made to engage the public, many residents throughout the region continue to express a very different experience. This concern extends beyond West Seattle and reflects a broader challenge facing Sound Transit as it confronts a reported \$35 billion financial gap across the ST3 program.

Public trust is not built through the number of outreach events held. It is built when residents believe their concerns are seriously considered and can influence outcomes. Too often, community engagement appears focused on explaining predetermined decisions rather than evaluating whether assumptions, project scope, or alternatives should be reconsidered.

The recent reduction in the Ballard Link project demonstrates that Sound Transit can revisit long-standing assumptions when financial realities require it. Many taxpayers therefore reasonably ask why similar scrutiny is not being applied across the entire ST3 portfolio, particularly to projects that have experienced significant cost escalation or changing ridership assumptions.

As Sound Transit considers proposals such as extending debt repayment periods to 75 years, I believe it is important to first ask a more fundamental question: if a project requires extraordinary financing mechanisms to remain viable, should the agency reevaluate the project scope, delivery method, or underlying assumptions before asking future generations to carry the burden?

This is not an argument against transit investment. It is an argument for fiscal stewardship. Every dollar spent on one project is a dollar unavailable for other regional priorities, including completing the broader rail spine, maintaining existing infrastructure, and delivering mobility improvements where they can provide the greatest benefit.

I encourage the Board to place greater emphasis on transparent financial evaluation, meaningful consideration of alternatives, and public engagement that allows communities to help shape decisions before they become commitments. Restoring public confidence will require more than outreach; it will require demonstrating that Sound Transit is willing to reconsider plans when facts, finances, or public concerns warrant it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paula Goode

Dear Chair, Board Members, and CEO Constantine,

I am writing in support of the concerns raised by many West Seattle residents regarding the West Seattle Link Extension (WSLE) as well as an affected private citizen. While this discussion focuses on one project, I believe it represents a much larger question facing Sound Transit: how should the Board respond when financial realities change?

The Board now has an opportunity to demonstrate that Sound Transit is willing to govern differently than it has in the past.

The question is no longer whether West Seattle deserves high-capacity transit. The question is whether the current design remains the best use of limited public resources given today's costs, today's ridership projections, and a nearly \$35 billion affordability gap.

The recent proposal to reduce the WSLE project by approximately \$2 billion demonstrates that assumptions made years ago are not immutable. That is not a weakness—it is responsible governance. The willingness to reevaluate projects as circumstances change is exactly what taxpayers should expect from any organization entrusted with billions of public dollars.

That same willingness should extend across the entire ST3 program.

If Ballard can be reevaluated, then West Seattle can be reevaluated. If West Seattle can be reevaluated, then every remaining project should be examined through the same objective financial lens. Every project should compete on its current merits—not simply because it reached a particular stage in planning years ago and the momentum albeit with blinders, is still running under pressure.

Before authorizing Final Design, I encourage the Board to ask one simple question:

If this project were proposed today—with today's costs, today's ridership, and today's financial outlook—would we approve it in its current form?

If the answer is no, then moving forward simply because of prior decisions is not good stewardship of public funds.

The discussion surrounding 75-year bonds makes this question even more important. Extending debt obligations toward the end of this century may improve today's cash flow, but it also transfers today's financial decisions to future taxpayers who had no voice in the original vote. Before asking future generations to finance projects approved in 2016, the public deserves confidence that every remaining project has been rigorously evaluated under today's conditions.

Many voters believed ST3 represented a commitment to completing the regional spine while delivering equitable mobility improvements throughout the district. Every dollar committed to one project is a dollar unavailable for another. Fiscal stewardship therefore requires continually asking whether scarce resources are being allocated where they produce the greatest regional benefit.

This is not an argument against transit. It is an argument for responsible governance.

Successful public agencies periodically revisit assumptions, evaluate changing conditions, and adjust priorities accordingly. They do not view reassessment as failure; they view it as accountability.

Finally, I encourage the Board to consider whether Sound Transit's governance structure itself should evolve. An agency with this level of taxing authority, borrowing capacity, and long-term financial obligation should continually seek greater transparency and stronger public accountability. Public trust is earned not only by delivering projects, but by demonstrating the willingness to ask difficult questions before committing billions more in taxpayer resources.

The decisions before you will shape transportation—and public finances—for generations. I respectfully ask that fiscal stewardship, objective prioritization, and long-term sustainability guide those decisions.

Respectfully,

Paula Goode

Lake Forest Park City Councilmember

Co-Founder, Citizens Organized to Rethink Expansion (CORE)

On Thu, Jun 25, 2026, 4:41 AM Marilyn Kennell <mkennell@gmail.com> wrote:

Seattle Link Extension light rail stub should be deferred - not rammed through.

(1) The WSLE light rail stub is unaffordable and impractical.

At \$5 billion for just four miles of track, it remains one of the most expensive urban rail projects in the world. Sound Transit disclosed to the FTA that it will carry only 5,400 daily riders to SODO. An additional \$2 billion tunnel will be needed to connect West Seattle residents to downtown. Although extravagant designs for the Alaska Station and Duwamish bridge were scaled back, the cost per mile still stands at \$1.3 billion.

(2) Sound Transit is financially irresponsible.

Their solution to inept planning? Allocate more funds? Scare the public by saying that every month of delay will cost up to \$50 million? Tax communities where stations will be built? Get the legislature to

allow the issuance of 75-year bonds? Do you really think your constituents want to be paying more taxes for this boondoggle?

(3) WSLE is not ready for Final Design designation. The project was barely at 30% design even before the plans were dramatically altered. Sound Transit proposes removing a station, digging a 4,400-foot tunnel, altering the Alaska station, and diminishing the flashy bridge design and the size of its footings! Can you seriously vote WSLE into the Final Design phase on just “ideas” and “concepts”?

Marilyn Kennell
West Seattle

Vanessa Carr

This couldn't be more unfair. This is no good! Take your money pit and lies to the public out of here!

For a fraction of the costs you could massively improve our bus lines and trolleys.

Vanessa Carr

West Seattle

Donna Popich

Board Members,

I urge you to vote no on Motion M2026-21.

This motion would authorize another \$48.8 million for consultant support services, bringing the total contract value to nearly \$132 million. At a time when Sound Transit has eliminated the Avalon Station, citing affordability concerns, it is difficult for taxpayers to understand why consultant expenditures continue to escalate.

West Seattle residents have repeatedly raised concerns about neighborhood impacts, disruption to businesses and residents, environmental effects on Longfellow Creek and surrounding habitat, and the long-term consequences of construction through established communities. Yet Sound Transit continues to move deeper into final design while feigning transparency and asking for additional consultant funding rather than demonstrating that these concerns have been fully addressed.

The staff report notes that all of a sudden consultant efforts identified more than \$2 billion in potential cost savings. If that is true, the public deserves a transparent accounting of exactly what those savings were, which recommendations were adopted, and how they affected project decisions. Residents should not be asked to simply trust that nearly \$132 million in consultant spending has produced real value. (Look where blind trust has gotten our communities thus far). Before authorizing another major expenditure, the Board should require a higher level of accountability, transparency, and actual; public input, which includes the very feasible option, "No Build WSLE."

Please slow down, demand clearer answers, and protect both taxpayers and the communities that will live with the consequences of your decisions for generations.

donna popich, 37-Year West Seattle Resident

4042 38th Ave SW

Seattle, WA 98120

206-371-9003

Candace Shattuck

I am writing to object to ST's description about how they have sought public support, been open to suggestions, and the like. Most of what they are saying in that regard is untrue, lies plain and simple. I urge you all to take a look at yourselves in the eyes and not proceed. The sea of long term bonds is irresponsible too.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Candace Shattuck
2745 California Ave SW, Apt 435
Seattle, WA 98116
410-725-1240**

Kim Schwarzkopf

Hi Sound Transit Board Members,

I've lived in West Seattle for 30 years (since 1996) and have seen a lot of change in the "Urban Village" (Avalon/ Delridge/ Junction) area over the years.

I want to call out a big huge BALONEY to all of Sound Transit's claim of "fostering trust" and caring about meaningful public involvement.

It is very unauthentic and feels like sleazy marketing at this point, because the engagement is very sub par, at best.

Your outreach and engagement is not responsive or inclusive and you have always been shoving what you want down our throats (bending to corporate interests and not what the community really needs).

2 oversized stations?! and maybe some bike rack and bench placements?! That's about as meaningful as it ever got.

Why build a huge expensive concrete bridge (same size as the West Seattle Bridge) for only one (light rail) mode of transportation?

Here's a IDEA- What about a design that includes a MULTI - MODAL Bridge across the River?

Wanna be environmentally sound? Give pedestrians and bikes and scooters and strollers and wheelchairs a safe and green bridge to travel, along the light rail (if you're going to force it through anyway).

I do wish you would be open to conversations and dialogue about the environment (and community).

If we really are going invest over Billions and Billions of dollars for ONLY 4 miles of Train tracks elevated through SoDo, over the Duwamish River and into West Seattle, then let's do it right!!

Let's blow the doors off of sustainability- by making it regenerative and restorative!

YES! Please involve the people that live here (and have been displaced)! We TRULY CARE about the environment!

I INVITE all of you for a tour around this area- to tour Longfellow Creek where the salmon return and the beavers regenerate! We can go visit the Duwamish River too- Seattle's ONLY RIVER!!!

Please reach out to me anytime!!!

My email is seaweedtoasted@gmail.com

Let's have a meaningful conversation.

Thank you for considering.

Kim

Kim Schwarzkopf, Producer

[206.250.4264](tel:206.250.4264)

Jared Jonson on behalf of SCIDpda

Note: Corresponding to this comment can be found at the end of this document.

Hello Sound Transit Board of Directors:

I am pleased to offer comments on behalf of the Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation & Development Authority that reiterate our priorities for the ongoing work of the ST3 – Ballard Line Extension Project. The SCIDpda and its Board of Directors have long agreed with the coalition of CID stakeholders urging Sound Transit to move forward with the 4th Avenue Shallow alternative for the BLE CID segment. Simply put, we believe that this option is the best choice for the future of our community. Our positions on the Ballard Link Extension decisions are as follows:

1. **Connectivity and Accessibility Requirements for the Preferred Alternatives** If the Sound Transit Board moves forward with the Dearborn and Midtown stations for the CID segment, ensuring strong connectivity to the CID must be a central priority. Sound Transit should invest in infrastructure and public realm improvements that make travel between Dearborn, International District/Chinatown, and Midtown stations intuitive, accessible, and safe. SCIDpda requests that Sound Transit commit, in the Draft EIS and in binding project agreements, to the following specific connectivity measures:
 - **Wayfinding and pedestrian infrastructure:** Sound Transit must fund and design a continuous, ADA-accessible pedestrian connection between the Dearborn Street Station, the existing International District/Chinatown light rail station, and King Street Station. This connection
 - must be legible, safe, and maintained as a Sound Transit obligation—not delegated to the City of Seattle or left to future funding cycles.
 - **Transfer time analysis:** The Draft EIS must include a quantitative analysis of transfer times between the Dearborn Street Station and existing transit modes (Link, Sounder, Amtrak, Metro bus). This analysis must include peak event conditions (stadium events, Lunar New Year, and other large community gatherings) that have historically been omitted from Sound Transit’s analysis and that SCIDPA previously identified as a gap in the 2022 DEIS.
 - **Station access from the CID core:** Station entrance locations, plaza design, and signage must prioritize orientation toward the CID’s commercial and cultural spine along S. King Street, 5th Avenue S., and Hing Hay Park—not solely toward the Dearborn Street corridor.
2. **Equitable Transit-Oriented Development: Legally Binding Community Ownership Commitments** Equitable Transit-Oriented Development, especially at the Dearborn Station location, should be prioritized for CID-based affordable housing and community-serving development. Public investments in transit should create opportunities for existing residents and families to remain in the neighborhood rather than accelerate displacement pressures. Community Development organizations based in the CID are best positioned to understand and serve the district with decades of experience developing affordable housing, stewarding community assets, and serving the cultural and linguistic needs of CID residents. In our 2022 DEIS comment letter, SCIDpda stated that “the community would need assurance that community ownership would be prioritized in any TOD opportunity associated with the project” and that “these measures must be in the form of explicit legal

commitments; the promise of a TOD opportunity alone is not sufficient mitigation.” SCIDpda is concerned that without explicit legal protections, market-rate development pressures will override the community ownership and affordability goals that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle have publicly committed to. That position has not changed. We therefore request:

- **Right of first refusal for CID-based community development organizations:** Sound Transit should establish, through a legally binding disposition policy or Community Benefits Agreement, a right of first negotiation or first refusal for CID-based community development organizations on any Sound Transit-controlled parcels in proximity to the Dearborn Street Station. This should be formalized before the Final EIS is published.
 - **Affordability minimums:** Any residential development on Sound Transit-adjacent or Sound Transit-controlled land near the Dearborn Station should be subject to a binding minimum affordability requirement as a condition of disposition.
 - **Anti-displacement protections:** The Draft EIS must include a displacement risk analysis specific to the Dearborn Station area, given the proximity to existing CID residential and commercial properties and the documented history of infrastructure-driven displacement in this neighborhood.
3. **Draft EIS Public Comment Period: Minimum 90 Days, with Language Access**
Requirements When the next Draft Environmental Impact Statement is released, Sound Transit should provide no fewer than 90 days for public review and comment. The CID includes many residents, business owners, and community members who rely on translated materials and trusted community-based outreach to participate in complex planning processes. Sound Transit should continue prioritizing language accessibility by releasing translated materials simultaneously with English-language documents, providing interpretation at public meetings, and supporting culturally responsive outreach efforts that allow the CID community to fully understand and respond to project impacts.
4. **New DEIS Environmental Justice and Historic Preservation Analysis Must Address 2022 Deficiencies** SCIDpda’s 2022 comment letter identified several critical deficiencies in the original Draft EIS that rendered the Environmental Justice analysis inadequate. As Sound Transit prepares the new BLE Draft EIS, we emphasize that these deficiencies must be corrected. Failure to do so will jeopardize the adequacy of the new EIS under NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act. Specifically, the new Draft EIS must:
- **Account for cumulative impacts:** The Environmental Justice analysis must explicitly incorporate the cumulative burden of prior public infrastructure projects on the CID community including I-5, the Kingdome, the SR-99 Deep Bore Tunnel, and multiple streetcar projects as required by NEPA. The 2022 DEIS acknowledged this history in its narrative but excluded it from the formal impact analysis, resulting in a conclusion of “no disproportionately high and adverse impact” that SCIDpda believes was unsupported.
 - **Correct the offsetting benefits analysis:** Sound Transit must not characterize improved access to regional transit as an “offsetting benefit” for Environmental Justice populations in the CID. As SCIDpda noted in 2022, this benefit accrues broadly to all regional riders. It does not disproportionately benefit those who bear the disproportionate burden of construction and displacement impacts. This characterization is inconsistent with EPA and FTA Environmental Justice guidance.

- **Address Section 106 and historic preservation obligations:** The new Draft EIS must include a full assessment of impacts to the Seattle Chinatown Historic District and any contributing buildings under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The 2022 DEIS did not propose mitigation for potential loss of contributing historic structures. Sound Transit should initiate Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer without further delay, and must not defer these conversations to the Final EIS.
- **Conduct a visual quality analysis:** The 2022 DEIS did not perform a formal visual quality analysis for the CID segment. The new Draft EIS must include one, with specific attention to how station entrances, ventilation structures, and construction fencing will affect the public realm in and around the Chinatown Historic District.

SCIDpda continues to believe that the 4th Avenue alternative would provide the strongest connectivity to and from the CID for generations to come. If that cannot be achieved, the Sound Transit Board needs to prioritize the same sense of connectivity for the preferred alternatives, ensuring that residents, workers, small businesses, and visitors can easily access and move between the CID and the regional transit system. The loss of a centrally located station should not result in the loss of connectivity, accessibility, or economic opportunity for the neighborhood.

As sound transit advances this project, we encourage the Board to engage with SCIDpda as a trusted community partner. With decades of experience developing affordable housing, supporting small businesses, and advancing community-led development in the CID, SCIDpda brings long term perspective on the needs, opportunities, and challenges of the neighborhood. We look forward to serving as a constructive partner to Sound Transit on this project, ensuring that these decisions strengthen connectivity, support equitable development, and benefit the CID for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Jared Jonson

Co-Executive Director

Seattle Chinatown-International District Preservation & Development Authority (SCIDpda)

www.scidpda.org

[Book](#) a meeting with Jared | [Book](#) a meeting with Jared and Jamie



Betty Lau

Written Public Comment by Betty Lau, Sound Transit Board Meeting, Thursday, 6/25/26, 1:30 p.m., Union Station.

I'm Betty Lau, co-founder of Transit Equity for All and board member of the Chong Wa Benevolent Association of Washington.

At last month's Sound Transit board meeting, much ado was made of rebuilding the trust between the board and staff members, and to a lesser degree, rebuilding trust with the public through greater transparency and the keeping of promises.

Start with Chinatown International District. Here is a partial list of why most of us in the CID do not trust Sound Transit:

1. 2019 The Government Relations & Community Engagement department told us that because Sound Transit could not determine which route would be best, community had a choice between the 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue routes for light rail. We chose 4th Avenue because after reading the 2022 DEIS, any 5th Avenue alternative would effectively destroy Chinatown.
2. 2020 Community Advisory Groups (CAGs) are convened to explain stations and routes in the DEIS. Everyone I fill out an application for is accepted, except me. The CAGs are disbanded after a few meetings, never to meet again.
3. 2021 Top down tightly managed "workshops" begin regarding the 4th and 5th Avenue choices. At the one conducted in Chinese, Sound Transit Chinese speaking staff tell Chinese speaking seniors not to choose 4th Avenue.
4. 2022 The DEIS generates 5,400 public comments; the vast majority of which support the 4th Avenue route. Sound Transit staff suddenly cease talking about community choice.
5. 2023 Instead of proceeding with the community's choice of 4th Avenue (supported by SODO, Pioneer Square, 6 legislative districts, Seattle Subway, 1st Hill Transit Committee, , majority of the CID organizations, plus 11,000 signatures on letters and petitions), we get the ST board's preferred split stations of North and South of CID, despite Sound Transit's engineering firm reports critical of both (HNTB report, VMS report).
 - Information embargo on the split stations begins.
 - HNTB report highly critical of N&S of CID stations
 - VMS report highly critical of N&S of CID stations
 - Neither report is presented at any ST board or sub-committee meeting
 - Hidden information = Hidden transparency

6. 2024 North of CID station rebranded Midtown even though it's not in Midtown, and South of CID station is rebranded Dearborn Street, even though the platform is ¼ mile farther south at 6th and Royal Brougham (HNTB report, 2023).
 - Community is told translations are only for those living in station areas, despite ST3 being a regional system with multilingual speakers living throughout the region; therefore, limited information = limited transparency
7. 2025 A special study critical of the 4th Avenue light rail route is presented to the board. No benefits or advantages are mentioned. [Contrast this with the critical reports of the split stations never seeing the light of day.]
8. 2026 The now 3-year-old information embargo on the split stations combined with CEO Constantine's recommendation for a 60-day comment period instead of the former 90-day period indicates secrecy to push through the split stations without adequate review by the general public, the CID community or the disabled community.
 - May 7: Staff admit Racial Equity Toolkits (Seattle's, King County's, Sound Transit's) are not used in Sound Transit planning and decision making
 - No community collaboration and planning for making the new DEIS understandable to limited English proficient who need translations and the disabled, who need information in braille, auditory, and other modes.
 - To date, zero use of the CID Community Engagement Toolkit, despite pledges by your Government Relations and Community Engagement Department to do so.
 - We have yet to see any published analysis of any use of city, county, or Sound Transit racial equity toolkit for anything Sound Transit does, especially with regard to the Enterprise Initiative or the split stations.
 - We have yet to see any cost benefit analysis to justify station or alignment costs.
9. 2004-present: Requests for correcting ID/C station name to align with City Ordinance neighborhood name of Chinatown International District continuously ignored, while other station names get changed immediately
10. The Sound Transit Language Assistance Plan calls for 3 annual in-language community meetings per year. These have never happened, even in English.

There are many more examples, but above are just a few experiences of why many of us simply do not trust what some of your agency staff have to say.

How to move forward? Repair past harms and verify what you say.

Thank you.

T.K. Finn

I've been attending ST community meetings for quite a few years, in my current neighborhood and in other neighborhoods, and as a resident and an officer in several community groups. I find it ironic that Sound Transit says that it is committed to actively seeking public feedback at all project stages.

I have never been to a public meeting in which Sound Transit EVER wanted to engage the public in any conversation that wasn't a staged and crafted exhibition of smoke and mirrors. The public meetings in West Seattle are an embarrassment if Sound Transit really thinks they are "committed to actively seeking public feedback at all project stages".

The November 24, 2025 meeting at Youngstown Cultural Arts Center consisted of a series of slides presenting the "new and improved" Sound Transit plans. Many of these slides also included cost estimates for the "new and improved plans".

The April 1, 2026 meeting, also at the Youngstown Cultural Arts Center, was the same slides, this time without any cost estimates associated with them on the slides themselves, and the same rhetoric about how Sound Transit had gone back to the drawing board to save money – except that the numbers didn't add up between the numbers from November 24, 2025, and April 1, 2026.

Additionally, Sound Transit has promoted groups such as The Transportation Choices Coalition (November 24, 2025 – Let's Build the Damn Trains promotion) and the new West Seattle Urbanist Group (which started in January 2025 and was giving out pink T-shirts at the April 1, 2026 meeting) at these public meetings, while not allowing questions, comments, or information sheets from other people or groups that had concerns.

I encourage the Board to place greater emphasis on transparent financial evaluation, meaningful consideration of alternatives, and public engagement that allows communities to help shape decisions before they become commitments. Restoring public confidence will require more than outreach; it will require demonstrating that Sound Transit is willing to reconsider plans when facts, finances, or public concerns warrant it.

Yours,

T. K. Finn

Margaret Fredrick

Dear Sound Transit board members,

Please defer the WSLE and create more opportunities for community outreach on the subject. The residents of West Seattle need to be able to voice their concerns about the possible negative impacts of the extension, and so far, they have not had the opportunity to do so at the many public Sound Transit events. Building plans and pro-light rail sentiments have been the main focus of these events, with no time for people to actually express their concerns.

If Mayor Wilson is willing to fund the Seattle Transit Measure by doubling the sales tax, which will include adding an additional 100,000 bus trips a year, then it would make a lot more sense to use that money (and the amount it would take to build the WSLE) to improve the bus service only, instead of building an unnecessary train extension.

Lastly, please bring back the #37 route in particular. Bus service is still needed in the Alki/Beach Drive area, which won't even be served by light rail if it is built here. #37 wouldn't even need to travel downtown, now that the RapidRide routes H and C exist, as some people have pointed out. It could simply be a West Seattle-only route, instead.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Margaret Fredrick

Marilyn Kennell

Seattle Link Extension light rail stub should be deferred - not rammed through.

(1) The WSLE light rail stub is unaffordable and impractical.

At \$5 billion for just four miles of track, it remains one of the most expensive urban rail projects in the world. Sound Transit disclosed to the FTA that it will carry only 5,400 daily riders to SODO. An additional \$2 billion tunnel will be needed to connect West Seattle residents to downtown. Although extravagant designs for the Alaska Station and Duwamish bridge were scaled back, the cost per mile still stands at \$1.3 billion.

(2) Sound Transit is financially irresponsible.

Their solution to inept planning? Allocate more funds? Scare the public by saying that every month of delay will cost up to \$50 million? Tax communities where stations will be built? Get the legislature to allow the issuance of 75-year bonds? Do you really think your constituents want to be paying more taxes for this boondoggle?

(3) WSLE is not ready for Final Design designation. The project was barely at 30% design even before the plans were dramatically altered. Sound Transit proposes removing a station, digging a 4,400-foot tunnel, altering the Alaska station, and diminishing the flashy bridge design and the size of its footings! Can you seriously vote WSLE into the Final Design phase on just “ideas” and “concepts”?

Marilyn Kennell

West Seattle

Dear Board Members,

Have you read the following statement from Sound Transit’s recent West Seattle Link update?

“Public involvement - Sound Transit is committed to actively seeking public feedback at all project stages for the West Seattle and Ballard Link Extension Projects with the overarching goal of fostering public trust through transparent communication, meaningful involvement and being responsive to concerns and issues. The project team will continue reaching out to communities, businesses, stakeholders, and agencies to shape the project by asking questions, holding conversations with project staff, and seeking out ideas and comments.”

Sound Transit's statement does not reflect our community's experience.

(1) Fostering public trust- FALSE

Sound Transit’s outreach primarily targets property and business owners in the Junction, rather than engaging the broader West Seattle community. They have not addressed questions about the significant negative impacts on our community.

(2) Transparent communication or meaningful involvement - FALSE

(3) Responsive to concerns and issues - FALSE

Sound Transit has yet to engage in a genuine dialogue with the West Seattle community. Our questions are often left unanswered, and Sound Transit’s public forums rarely provide opportunities for meaningful feedback. For example, at the April 1st event, both CEO Constantine and Mayor Wilson left immediately after their remarks, with Mayor Wilson notably advocating for 75-year bonds while wearing a “Build the Trains” T-shirt.

(4) ... shape the project by asking questions, holding conversations with project staff, and seeking out ideas and comments. - FALSE

Sound Transit’s recent survey appeared to be designed in support of its own agenda. Community outreach at Sunday markets is facilitated by friendly staff, but they often lack in-depth knowledge

and decision-making authority. Station design events invite public input on minor aspects, such as seating preferences, rather than substantive issues.

We invited the Sound Transit board to join our community walks along the WSLE route (2023, 2024) and to the transit forum we held (2025). No board members came to any of these. And our repeated formal requests to share independent transit research at board meetings and retreats are ignored, leaving us feeling despair and cynicism about our inability to participate in the decision-making process.

Nevertheless, our efforts to engage are on record, as are the board's actions. Sadly, we are the ones who will be directly affected by the outcomes for generations to come. Until we can participate in our futures, please defer work on WSLE. Please vote NO on M 2026-14 and M2026-21.

Marilyn Kennell
West Seattle

Jan Roberts

Defer the WSLE.

It is unaffordable and impractical. 4-mile stub \$1.3 billion per mile

It is financially irresponsible. Issuance of 75-year bonds? Do you really think your constituents want to be paying more taxes for this boondoggle?

It is not ready for final design phase designation. It is still in the idea and concept phase.

Jan Roberts
206 920-0130

T.A. Scidmore

Seattle Link Extension Light Rail Stub should be deferred and possibly dropped completely. Do NOT ram this through.

There is ample research and evidence that supports the project is unfeasible, and the cost-benefit ratio does not support building it. Plenty of research and evidence has been sent to the board to support deferring or dropping the West Seattle light rail stub. Please Vote NO on Motion M2026-14 and NO on Motion M2026-21.

T. A. Scidmore

Highland Park, Seattle

Unnamed Commenters

This is in no way a complaint, but rather quite the compliment. We are in town for a brief period from Sylvania Georgia. Tiny little place, no trams or much else. Today I decided to go to Chinatown on a recommendation. Rode the tram down there by her directions. Started back asked someone which tram, they sent me on the wrong one. There were 3 of us and we had no idea where we were going and started to panic like crazy. I was so panicked that I really couldn't focus on trying to figure anything out. We had a flight leaving the airport soon. I just knew we were going to miss the flight and freaked out. H. Rahimi was the security guard on the tram. He was the kindest person to us! When he saw just how upset I was he decided to get off with us twice and redirect us on the right path. He even offered to carry my book bag because it looked heavy. I couldn't believe just how kind he was. I tried to give him \$20 and asked him to have dinner on me. No way he would even consider taking the money. I don't know his first name, but I won't forget him. You have quite a gem in him! He saved the entire trip from becoming a disaster for us.

PLEASE! Can you be reasonable? There is NOTHING viable about the West Seattle link and the fiscal irresponsibility is beyond comprehension!
PLEASE!

The transparency you advertise is non existent! Meeting with concerned WS residents hasn't happened. Questions go unanswered at the meetings! You are falsely making statements. Not good enough!

I am opposed to the west Seattle extension because we already have three bus routes (56,C,57) that could be expanded to meet demand. Also, commuters would have to ride from west Seattle to sodo and then ride from there to downtown instead of taking one bus that goes directly downtown.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF SOUND TRANSIT

**In Connection with Sound Transit Board Action Regarding Property Acquisition
Authority / Resolution No. R2026-13 (OMF South Project)**

LYNN L. HANEY'S SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS/STATEMENT REGARDING THE JUNE 11, 2026, SYSTEM EXPANSION COMMITTEE MEETING

Lynn L. Haney and James Haney, owners of Parcel OMF111, 33049 24th Avenue South, Federal Way, WA 98003, respectfully submit this Supplemental Statement to the full Board of Sound Transit.

Purpose: Response to New Factual Developments

This statement is a direct supplement to the initial Prefiled Statement/Comments of Lynn L. Haney previously submitted and forwarded to the full Board.

We are filing this supplement exclusively to address new administrative developments and staff disclosures that emerged during the System Expansion Committee hearing on June 11, 2026. Because these critical Committee discussions occurred after our initial filing, this brief update ensures the Board has a complete roadmap of what the Committee and we expect before a final vote is called on June 25, 2026.

We Support the Project - But We Have Concerns

We support the overall OMF South Project and its regional transit benefits. We are not seeking compensation. We are not asking for delays. We are concerned about the Sound Transit proposal to place an unneeded sidewalk along the west side of 24th Avenue South and seek a Temporary Construction Easement that would eliminate our parking and access. We are asking this Board to answer a question before it votes: what specific public transit benefit does this approximately 1,000-foot sidewalk actually provide?

The proposed sidewalk connects to no existing pedestrian network. It serves no Sound Transit facility and fronts only six occupied homes on a short residential street that is not a thoroughfare and is on the opposite side of the road from the actual rail corridor. It appears to exist solely because the City of Federal Way has requested it as a permitting condition - not because it is necessary for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the OMF South Project.

If staff cannot provide a clear answer to that question on June 25, the Board should carefully consider whether the necessity determination for this specific sidewalk configuration has been adequately negotiated and supported. A municipal permitting accommodation that disrupts six households, destroys established landscaping, eliminates residential parking and driveway access for years, and connects to nothing, warrants a clear demonstration of necessity before condemnation authority is granted.

We want this regional expansion to succeed. Our concern is localized strictly to an engineering choice that imposes an almost insurmountable daily burden on our neighborhood - and particularly on our caregiving household - when less disruptive alternatives exist and have not been meaningfully explored.

This Is a Residential Corridor Issue, Not Solely a Single-Parcel Issue

Although Parcel OMF111 is the subject of this filing, the concerns discussed by the System Expansion Committee extend beyond a single property. The proposed sidewalk and construction easement configuration affects multiple occupied homes along this section of 24th Avenue South that depend upon reliable driveway access, emergency response access, utility continuity, deliveries, parking, and normal residential use.

The Committee's June 11 discussion reflected broader concerns regarding how these residential impacts will be managed during construction. Any footprint reduction, curb-line alignment, phased construction approach, or access-management plan adopted here has the potential to benefit multiple households while reducing project risk and improving neighborhood compatibility.

Accordingly, the issue before the Board is not whether the project should proceed, but whether it can be implemented in a manner that minimizes unnecessary impacts on residents while still satisfying the City's permitting objectives and Sound Transit's project goals.

This Matter Comes Before the Board as a Matter of First Impression

The Staff Report we received on June 11 frames Resolution No. R2026-13 as an action to "ratify" previous authority under Resolution No. R2024-26. However, Sound Transit's initial statutory notice letters failed to comply with the mandatory 15-day timeline required by RCW 8.25.290. As a result, that prior action was procedurally void, meaning we were not provided the legally mandated period to evaluate the proposal and submit comments before the initial Board hearing and action. We have now had that opportunity.

Therefore, this resolution comes before the Board as a matter of first impression. The Board is making a fresh, baseline determination for the first time with the opportunity to hear full public comments. Modifying the footprint or building in protective language does not require the Board to "reverse" a previous policy decision, because no legally binding acquisition decision has ever existed for this parcel.

Options Fulfilling the Committee's Questions

On June 11, the System Expansion Committee chose not to issue a standard "do-pass" recommendation. Instead, they left the resolution open and directed staff to investigate project modifications with the City of Federal Way and address residential access concerns along the affected portion of 24th Avenue South before June 25.

To make compliance simple for staff, we propose the following clear, win-win solutions:

Option A: Design Modifications for Municipal Alignment (Cost, Impact & Easement Reduction)

While our family's circumstances present unique concerns, the proposed sidewalk and easement configuration affects an entire residential frontage along 24th Avenue South. Any reduction in easement width, construction footprint, or driveway disruption would benefit multiple households by preserving access and reducing acquisition and construction impacts.

We suggest that staff present a design or permit variance to the City of Federal Way under the following frameworks:

- **No Direct Transit Benefit:** The proposed streetscape does not appear to connect to any Sound Transit facility and is located on the opposite side of the roadway from the rail corridor. It also does not connect to any existing sidewalk network (there are no sidewalks on South 330th Street and 333rd Street at 24th Avenue South). It does not appear to provide a direct operational benefit to Sound Transit or its riders, appearing to function solely as a municipal requirement imposed by the City of Federal Way. It is truly a "Sidewalk to Nowhere."
- **The Opposite-Side Relocation:** Sound Transit should consider placing the required sidewalk on the East side of 24th Avenue South, adjacent to the rail corridor and I-5 right-of-way, rather than on the West side of the street serving six occupied homes. An East side configuration should satisfy the City of Federal Way's permitting preference while entirely removing construction impacts, multi-year easement acquisitions, and safety hazards from an established residential corridor. We ask staff to evaluate and present this alternative at the June 25 Board meeting.
- **The Curb-Line Alignment:** Align the proposed sidewalk tightly along the standard curb line, matching the existing neighborhood infrastructure further west on South 330th and South 333rd Streets. Moving this sidewalk to the curb line would create a streetscape consistent with existing neighborhood design standards, and should satisfy the City's structural preferences while reducing or eliminating the need for substantial residential easements and construction impacts. This represents a clean, immediate savings of public transit funds by eliminating complex appraisals and administrative overhead costs across the residential corridor.
- **Cedar Grove Park Buffer:** Board Member Roscoe specifically asked staff at the hearing to explore whether the City of Federal Way would accept a greater share of the temporary construction easement burden through Cedar Grove Park, which sits in the vicinity of these residential properties and is not currently subject to any TCE. We strongly support this inquiry. Whether a sidewalk is placed on the East or West side of 24th Avenue South, shifting any portion of the construction footprint onto park land - which has no residents, no medical access needs, and no driveways - would directly reduce impacts on the cluster of homes fronting 24th Avenue South while still satisfying the City's infrastructure requirements.

Option B: Provisions for Residential Safety

If permitting conditions prevent a change to the physical footprint, Sound Transit should adopt residential access protections applicable throughout the affected portion of 24th Avenue South. At a minimum, the necessity determination for Parcel OMF111 should include the following safeguards:

- **Absolute Medical Access:** Guarantee a stable, unobstructed, ambulance-compliant path of travel from the public ROW to our front door at all times. Wheelchair and walker transfers involving mobility-impaired adults cannot safely occur over loose construction gravel or uncompacted dirt ramps.
- **On-Site Parking Safeguard:** Retain or immediately replace a functional vehicle parking footprint adjacent to the home foundation to facilitate safe patient transfers.
- **Secondary Vehicle Ingress:** Preserve continuous access to our exterior storage shed for secondary transportation, including a motorcycle.
- **Utility & Logistic Continuity:** Prohibit multi-day disruptions to core utilities (water, power, sewage, gas, communications) and preserve daily civic logistics, including mail delivery and municipal waste removal.
- **Phased Construction Footprint:** Utilize a phased, non-exclusive construction management approach which would reduce the duration and size of the easement rather than taking blanket, exclusive multi-year control right up to our home's foundation.

We noted that at the June 11 hearing, a member of Sound Transit's own staff volunteered that the agency should develop strategies to "maintain access to these homes to be able to come in and out" during construction. We ask the Board to treat that commitment as part of the record and to require staff to present a concrete access maintenance plan on June 25 - not merely an assurance that access will be considered.

Conclusion

The Committee forwarded Resolution No. R2026-13 to this Board without recommendation - an explicit signal that the Committee itself is not yet satisfied that the public necessity determination for this sidewalk configuration can be justified. The central question remains unanswered: what transit benefit does this specific sidewalk configuration provide that could not be achieved with less impact on the six households whose properties and daily lives it disrupts?

Staff has been directed to report back on Federal Way's flexibility regarding the sidewalk footprint and the Cedar Grove Park buffer opportunity. Furthermore, individual members of this Committee have in the past stated an ongoing hesitation to grant sweeping condemnation authority before robust, site-specific coordination has occurred. We ask the Board to condition any final vote on June 25 on confirmation that those directed reports have been completed and shared with the Board and affected property owners. Any vote taken before staff fulfills its own commitments to this Committee would act on an incomplete record, bypassing the very negotiation strategies this Board prioritizes.

Notably, Sound Transit staff acknowledged during the June 11 hearing the need to maintain access to “these homes” during construction. The Board’s decision therefore concerns not only Parcel OMF111, but the practical management of residential impacts throughout this portion of 24th Avenue South.

We support this project and stand ready to work with staff and the City to implement the Committee’s directives, ensuring a swift agreement that balances regional transit goals, basic human safety, and strict fiscal responsibility. The alternatives discussed by the Committee offer an opportunity to achieve greater consistency with existing neighborhood infrastructure, reduce impacts across the affected residential corridor, and preserve the project’s overall schedule and objectives.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Board ensure that before any final determination regarding Parcel OMF111, staff has completed the inquiries directed by the Committee and affected property owners have had an opportunity to review the resulting information prior to the June 25 meeting. We will be present at that meeting to answer any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 17, 2026

Lynn L. Haney



June 25, 2026

Members of the Sound Transit Board of Directors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Ballard Link Extension light rail planning project.

We continue to value your leadership and appreciate your efforts to ensure the Ballard Link Extension project serves our communities, advances equity and increases overall connectivity throughout our region.

About SCIDpda

The Seattle Chinatown-International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda) is a 50+ year old community development organization that provides affordable housing to hundreds of residents and commercial space to dozens of businesses in our neighborhood. We work every day to preserve, promote, and develop the CID as a vibrant cultural and economic neighborhood for future generations.

Our Position on the CID Segment Preferred Alternative

The SCIDpda and its Board of Directors have long agreed with the coalition of CID stakeholders urging Sound Transit to move forward with the 4th Avenue Shallow alternative for the BLE CID segment. Simply put, we believe that this option is the best choice for the future of our community.

Our positions on the Ballard Link Extension decisions are as follows:

1. **Connectivity and Accessibility Requirements for the Preferred Alternatives** If the Sound Transit Board moves forward with the Dearborn and Midtown stations for the CID segment, ensuring strong connectivity to the CID must be a central priority. Sound Transit should invest in infrastructure and public realm improvements that make travel between Dearborn, International District/Chinatown, and Midtown stations intuitive, accessible, and safe.

SCIDpda requests that Sound Transit commit, in the Draft EIS and in binding project agreements, to the following specific connectivity measures:

- **Wayfinding and pedestrian infrastructure:** Sound Transit must fund and design a continuous, ADA-accessible pedestrian connection between the Dearborn Street Station, the existing International District/Chinatown light rail station, and King Street Station. This connection



- must be legible, safe, and maintained as a Sound Transit obligation—not delegated to the City of Seattle or left to future funding cycles.
- **Transfer time analysis:** The Draft EIS must include a quantitative analysis of transfer times between the Dearborn Street Station and existing transit modes (Link, Sounder, Amtrak, Metro bus). This analysis must include peak event conditions (stadium events, Lunar New Year, and other large community gatherings) that have historically been omitted from Sound Transit’s analysis and that SCIDPA previously identified as a gap in the 2022 DEIS.
- **Station access from the CID core:** Station entrance locations, plaza design, and signage must prioritize orientation toward the CID’s commercial and cultural spine along S. King Street, 5th Avenue S., and Hing Hay Park—not solely toward the Dearborn Street corridor.

2. **Equitable Transit-Oriented Development: Legally Binding Community Ownership**

Commitments Equitable Transit-Oriented Development, especially at the Dearborn Station location, should be prioritized for CID-based affordable housing and community-serving development. Public investments in transit should create opportunities for existing residents and families to remain in the neighborhood rather than accelerate displacement pressures. Community Development organizations based in the CID are best positioned to understand and serve the district with decades of experience developing affordable housing, stewarding community assets, and serving the cultural and linguistic needs of CID residents. In our 2022 DEIS comment letter, SCIDpda stated that “the community would need assurance that community ownership would be prioritized in any TOD opportunity associated with the project” and that “these measures must be in the form of explicit legal commitments; the promise of a TOD opportunity alone is not sufficient mitigation.” SCIDpda is concerned that without explicit legal protections, market-rate development pressures will override the community ownership and affordability goals that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle have publicly committed to. That position has not changed. We therefore request:

- **Right of first refusal for CID-based community development organizations:** Sound Transit should establish, through a legally binding disposition policy or Community Benefits Agreement, a right of first negotiation or first refusal for CID-based community development organizations on any Sound Transit-controlled parcels in proximity to the Dearborn Street Station. This should be formalized before the Final EIS is published.
- **Affordability minimums:** Any residential development on Sound Transit-adjacent or Sound Transit-controlled land near the Dearborn Station should be subject to a binding minimum affordability requirement as a condition of disposition.
- **Anti-displacement protections:** The Draft EIS must include a displacement risk analysis specific to the Dearborn Station area, given the proximity to existing CID residential and commercial properties and the documented history of infrastructure-driven displacement in this neighborhood.



3. **Draft EIS Public Comment Period: Minimum 90 Days, with Language Access**

Requirements When the next Draft Environmental Impact Statement is released, Sound Transit should provide no fewer than 90 days for public review and comment. The CID includes many residents, business owners, and community members who rely on translated materials and trusted community-based outreach to participate in complex planning processes. Sound Transit should continue prioritizing language accessibility by releasing translated materials simultaneously with English-language documents, providing interpretation at public meetings, and supporting culturally responsive outreach efforts that allow the CID community to fully understand and respond to project impacts.

4. **New DEIS Environmental Justice and Historic Preservation Analysis Must Address 2022 Deficiencies**

SCIDpda's 2022 comment letter identified several critical deficiencies in the original Draft EIS that rendered the Environmental Justice analysis inadequate. As Sound Transit prepares the new BLE Draft EIS, we emphasize that these deficiencies must be corrected. Failure to do so will jeopardize the adequacy of the new EIS under NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act. Specifically, the new Draft EIS must:

- **Account for cumulative impacts:** The Environmental Justice analysis must explicitly incorporate the cumulative burden of prior public infrastructure projects on the CID community including I-5, the Kingdome, the SR-99 Deep Bore Tunnel, and multiple streetcar projects as required by NEPA. The 2022 DEIS acknowledged this history in its narrative but excluded it from the formal impact analysis, resulting in a conclusion of “no disproportionately high and adverse impact” that SCIDpda believes was unsupported.
- **Correct the offsetting benefits analysis:** Sound Transit must not characterize improved access to regional transit as an “offsetting benefit” for Environmental Justice populations in the CID. As SCIDpda noted in 2022, this benefit accrues broadly to all regional riders. It does not disproportionately benefit those who bear the disproportionate burden of construction and displacement impacts. This characterization is inconsistent with EPA and FTA Environmental Justice guidance.
- **Address Section 106 and historic preservation obligations:** The new Draft EIS must include a full assessment of impacts to the Seattle Chinatown Historic District and any contributing buildings under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The 2022 DEIS did not propose mitigation for potential loss of contributing historic structures. Sound Transit should initiate Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer without further delay, and must not defer these conversations to the Final EIS.
- **Conduct a visual quality analysis:** The 2022 DEIS did not perform a formal visual quality analysis for the CID segment. The new Draft EIS must include one, with specific attention to how station entrances, ventilation structures, and construction fencing will affect the public realm in and around the Chinatown Historic District.



SCIDpda continues to believe that the 4th Avenue alternative would provide the strongest connectivity to and from the CID for generations to come. If that cannot be achieved, the Sound Transit Board needs to prioritize the same sense of connectivity for the preferred alternatives, ensuring that residents, workers, small businesses, and visitors can easily access and move between the CID and the regional transit system. The loss of a centrally located station should not result in the loss of connectivity, accessibility, or economic opportunity for the neighborhood.

As sound transit advances this project, we encourage the Board to engage with SCIDpda as a trusted community partner. With decades of experience developing affordable housing, supporting small businesses, and advancing community-led development in the CID, SCIDpda brings long term perspective on the needs, opportunities, and challenges of the neighborhood. We look forward to serving as a constructive partner to Sound Transit on this project, ensuring that these decisions strengthen connectivity, support equitable development, and benefit the CID for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Jared Jonson

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jared Jonson".

SCIDpda
Co-Executive Director

Jamie Lee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jamie Lee".

SCIDpda
Co-Executive Director

Nathan Frey

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Nathan Frey".

SCIDpda
Board Member