



May 2026

## SEPA ADDENDUM

**Description of Proposal:** The Sound Transit Board is considering alternative approaches for implementing the ST3 system plan in response to increasing costs and revenue shortfalls. These approaches were developed as part of the agency's Enterprise Initiative, a comprehensive review of all agency functions and expenditures that began in 2025. The purpose of the initiative is to respond to the affordability challenges in implementing the ST3 system plan, within the available financial capacity approved by the voters in 2016. The Enterprise Initiative also addresses multiple operational challenges facing the agency, including service delivery costs, operational resiliency investments, and on-going operations and maintenance costs. The Enterprise Initiative provides a comprehensive framework for responding to the agency's affordability and operational challenges, and it evaluates various tools and levers for addressing those challenges. One outcome of the initiative is a series of different approaches for Sound Transit Board consideration in the spring of 2026. Those approaches include the following potential high-level changes to the implementation of the ST3 capital plan and operations plan (ST3 Plan):

- Project phasing: Delivering an initial phase of a capital program (e.g., a light rail, commuter rail, or bus rapid transit extension) but deferring construction of the full project.
- Project deferral: Maintaining a project in the ST3 program, but allocating no or limited funding to it, acknowledging that the project will advance only as funding becomes available.
- Project modification: Incorporating specific capital project cost savings opportunities, including station or parking deferrals and eliminations.

**Description of Addendum:** This addendum evaluates at a programmatic level the proposed changes to implementing the ST3 Plan. The addendum is issued consistent with the State Environmental Policy Act (Chapter 43.21C RCW) and Sound Transit's State Environmental Policy Act Rules (Sound Transit Resolution R2018-17). It provides additional information and analysis related to implementing the ST3 Plan. This addendum adds to the environmental analysis contained in the 2014 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update (Nov. 2014), which served as the basis for the Board's 2016 adoption of the ST3 Plan. The information provided by this addendum does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in existing environmental documents, including project-level documents evaluating plan elements. As described below, no additional impacts beyond the range and type of impacts evaluated within Sound Transit's prior environmental documents are expected to result. The principal change is that some impacts would be delayed or deferred under the approaches being considered, while some of the benefits of implementing the full ST3 Plan would not be realized.

**Proponent:** Sound Transit (Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority)

**Location of the Proposal:** Within the Sound Transit regional transit authority district boundaries, including portions of King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties.

**Lead Agency:** Sound Transit (Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority)

**Responsible official:** Perry Weinberg  
**Position/title:** Managing Legal Counsel, Sound Transit

**Phone:** (206) 920-7130

**Address:** Sound Transit  
Legal Department  
Union Station, 401 South Jackson St., Seattle, WA 98104-2826

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Signature:**   
Perry Weinberg

The SEPA Addendum for the Enterprise Initiative and ST3 Plan Implementation and related material are available at <https://www.soundtransit.org/get-to-know-us/achieving-long-term-affordability>

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update (Nov. 2014) is available at <https://www.soundtransit.org/get-to-know-us/documents-reports/long-range-plan-final-supplemental-environmental-impact-statement>

For questions regarding the Addendum, contact Kent Hale, Environmental Planning Director, at [kent.hale@soundtransit.org](mailto:kent.hale@soundtransit.org) or 206-398-5103. There is no comment period or appeal period for an addendum.

May 2026

ENTERPRISE INITIATIVE AND ST3 SYSTEM PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

# Addendum to the 2014 Final Supplemental EIS for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update

Prepared pursuant to the Washington State Environmental Policy Act Chapter 43.21C  
RCW and WAC 197-11-625

Prepared by



CENTRAL PUGET SOUND  
REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY

401 S. JACKSON STREET  
SEATTLE, WA 98104



Addendum to the 2014 Final  
Supplemental EIS for the Regional  
Transit Long-Range Plan Update

May 2026

# Contents

|                                                                                |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Acronyms and Abbreviations.....                                                | ii |
| Introduction .....                                                             | 1  |
| Project Overview.....                                                          | 1  |
| Need for the Addendum .....                                                    | 2  |
| Potential Changes to Implementing the ST3 Plan .....                           | 2  |
| Environmental Consequences .....                                               | 4  |
| Introduction .....                                                             | 4  |
| Environmental Consequences of Project Phasing, Deferral, or Modification ..... | 4  |
| Transportation .....                                                           | 4  |
| Acquisitions and Displacements .....                                           | 6  |
| Land Use.....                                                                  | 7  |
| Economics .....                                                                | 7  |
| Social and Neighborhoods .....                                                 | 7  |
| Visual.....                                                                    | 8  |
| Noise and Vibration .....                                                      | 8  |
| Water Resources.....                                                           | 8  |
| Ecosystems.....                                                                | 8  |
| Energy .....                                                                   | 9  |
| Hazardous Materials .....                                                      | 9  |
| Public Services, Safety, and Security.....                                     | 9  |
| Historic and Archaeological Resources.....                                     | 10 |
| Parks and Recreation .....                                                     | 10 |
| Cumulative Effects .....                                                       | 10 |
| Indirect Effects .....                                                         | 10 |
| Conclusion.....                                                                | 10 |
| References .....                                                               | 11 |

# Acronyms and Abbreviations

|      |                                |
|------|--------------------------------|
| EIS  | Environmental Impact Statement |
| RCW  | Revised Code of Washington     |
| SEPA | State Environmental Policy Act |
| WAC  | Washington Administrative Code |

# Introduction

---

This addendum is issued consistent with the State Environmental Policy Act (Chapter 43.21C RCW) and Sound Transit's State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules (Sound Transit Resolution R2018-17). With this addendum, Sound Transit provides additional information and analysis regarding potential changes to implementing the ST3 capital and operations plans (ST3 Plan) as a result of the evaluation and findings of the Enterprise Initiative. This addendum provides a programmatic overview of changes being considered and their environmental consequences. This addendum adds to the environmental analysis contained in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update (Sound Transit, November 2014), which served as the basis for the adoption of the ST3 System Plan in 2016.

The information provided in this addendum does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in existing environmental documents. No additional impacts beyond the range and type of impacts evaluated within Sound Transit's prior environmental documents are expected to result from the proposed changes. The principal differences resulting from proposed changes to the ST3 Plan are that some impacts would be delayed or deferred under the alternative approaches being considered and, at the same time, some environmental benefits would not be realized.

## Project Overview

In 2014, Sound Transit issued a Final Supplemental EIS for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update, as noted above. That programmatic EIS evaluated the environmental consequences of different long-range plan alternatives. The "Current Plan Alternative" represented the agency's 2005 long-range plan, which also served as the "No Action" alternative. The "Potential Plan Modifications Alternative" evaluated a wide range of options for modifying the plan, including new high-capacity transit corridors and services. The Long-Range Plan Final Supplemental EIS evaluated the environmental effects of different mode choices, varying levels of improvements, and their timing. It evaluated the potential environmental effects of implementing alternatives and discussed potential measures for mitigating impacts. The impacts evaluated in the Long-Range Plan Supplemental EIS are the same types of impacts that would be expected from the plan modifications currently being considered.

Following the issuance of the 2014 Final Supplemental EIS, the Sound Transit Board adopted an Updated Regional Transit Long-Range Plan in December 2014 (Resolution R2014-31). The adopted long-range plan formed the foundation for the ST3 System Plan, which was adopted by the Board in June 2016 (Resolution R2016-16). Funding for the ST3 System Plan was approved by the voters in November 2016. The ST3 System Plan identified representative projects of different modes (light rail, commuter rail, bus rapid transit) to be constructed throughout the

Sound Transit district.

Work on project-level environmental review for various elements of the system plan began thereafter, including on light rail extensions to Tacoma, Everett, West Seattle, and Ballard. Among other things, that project-level environmental work evaluated the environmental consequences of different alignment alternatives, track profiles, and station locations.

## **Need for the Addendum**

Sound Transit is preparing this addendum in response to the evaluation and findings of the Enterprise Initiative. The Enterprise Initiative is a comprehensive agencywide effort to ensure that project delivery and operations are affordable going forward while delivering on the objectives of the ST3 Plan. Since the approval of ST3 in 2016, the world has changed. Unprecedented inflation, rising construction and labor costs, post-pandemic ridership patterns, and lower-than-expected revenue have all contributed to a significant gap in Sound Transit's long-term budget. Current cost estimates indicate a funding shortfall of approximately \$34.5 billion over the next 20 years. Sound Transit is committed to using all the tools at its disposal to close this gap, and the Enterprise Initiative reflects the efforts to find cost savings and project efficiencies across the entire agency.

As part of the Enterprise Initiative, the agency developed a series of alternative approaches for implementing the ST3 Plan within the financial capacity available to the agency. These approaches include the potential high-level changes to implementing the ST3 Plan described below.

## **Potential Changes to Implementing the ST3 Plan**

---

In August 2025, the Sound Transit Board of Directors adopted Motion M2025-36, which included principles and a process to help guide the Board on how best to implement the ST3 Plan given the cost increases and revenue shortfall challenges impacting both the capital and operating elements of the plan. These principles and processes, known as the Enterprise Initiative, were designed to lead the Board to update the current system plan (ST3) and the agency's long-range finance plan. The motion directed the chief executive officer:

“to develop a comprehensive framework to evaluate opportunities and actions across the areas of Planning & Policy, Capital Delivery, Service Delivery, and Finance with the goal of achieving a balanced and affordable long-range finance plan and a clear path to deliver the benefits of Sound Transit projects and services as quickly as possible.” (Motion M2025-36, Section 1.)

Since August 2025, Sound Transit has developed several approaches, or options, the Board of Directors may consider in modifying capital delivery and/or transit operations assumptions in

the current system plan. At its retreat in March 2026, the Board of Directors presentation described these approaches as follows:

- **Project Phasing.** Delivering an initial phase of a capital project (e.g., a light rail, commuter rail, or bus rapid transit extension) but deferring construction of the full project.

This approach would typically involve completing the project development phase for an entire extension. That is, project-level alternatives development and evaluation, environmental review, identification of preferred alternatives, conceptual and preliminary engineering/design (up to 30 percent), and Board action to define the project to be built. However, the Board would only authorize final design and construction of an initial phase or scope of the project depending on the level of funding available. Subsequent phases of delivery would be authorized when funding is available, which could be beyond the current timeframe of the Sound Transit Long-Range Financial Plan.

- **Project Deferral.** Maintaining a project in the ST3 program, but allocating no or limited funding to it, acknowledging that the project will advance only as funding becomes available.

This approach is similar to “project phasing” as described above, except no portion of the project would be constructed and operated until sufficient funding is identified. Project development activities (i.e., conceptual design and environmental review) could be completed or deferred. Discrete transit facility elements that could be deferred include park-and-ride facilities or parking at light rail, commuter rail, or bus rapid transit stations, as well as maintenance facilities for buses or commuter rail trains. Additional parking and access improvements at existing light rail or commuter rail stations could also be deferred.

- **Project Modification.** Incorporating specific capital project cost-savings opportunities, including station or parking deferrals and eliminations.

This approach could take two forms. First, projects would optimize designs for greater efficiency or cost savings without compromising service or passenger experience. Second, the scope of specific ST3 projects could be modified by removing or consolidating stations; removing park-and-ride facilities or parking at light rail, commuter rail, or bus rapid transit stations; deferring bus or commuter rail maintenance facilities; or deferring light rail or commuter rail stations until sufficient funding is identified. Additional parking, access, and platform improvements at existing light rail or commuter rail stations could also be deferred.

Other potential changes to implementing the ST3 Plan may require additional corridor-specific

studies that consider other system and regional transit network changes since the ST3 Plan was adopted in 2016. Future studies may evaluate ridership, travel time, cost effectiveness or cost per rider, comparative capital costs, operating and maintenance costs, and environmental consequences to inform future decisions on the best approach to serving a particular corridor.

The Sound Transit Board of Directors is expected to implement some combination of these approaches as part of the agency's Enterprise Initiative. The goal is to ensure Sound Transit continues delivering the capital expansion and increased high-capacity transit service within available financial capacity. Appropriate project-level planning, design, and environmental review will follow any changes to the ST3 Plan.

## **Environmental Consequences**

---

### **Introduction**

This addendum adds additional information and analysis about the environmental consequences of potential ST3 Plan changes at a programmatic or plan level, as part of phased review under SEPA (WAC 197-11-060(5)). It considers environmental consequences (both environmental benefits and impacts) and adds information to the 2014 Final Supplemental EIS for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update (Sound Transit 2014). Final decisions on project elements (e.g., alignment, profile, station locations) will be determined after completion of project-level environmental review and preliminary engineering, during which additional opportunities for public participation will be provided.

### **Environmental Consequences of Project Phasing, Deferral, or Modification**

The Sound Transit Board is considering several alternative approaches that have similar environmental consequences. Project phasing, project deferral, or project modifications that eliminate project elements (such as stations or parking) would all have similar environmental effects. Accordingly, these effects are discussed together below for each element of the built or natural environment. For elements of the environment not discussed below, no change to environmental consequences is expected, beyond eliminating or deferring an effect at specific locations as compared to the full project. These elements include air quality, visual, geology and soils, electromagnetic fields, utilities, and historic and archaeological resources. Potential changes in cumulative and indirect effects are also discussed below.

### **Transportation**

Project phasing, deferral, or modifications (including the elimination of stations) would all change overall system ridership for some period of time. Where light rail stations are eliminated, some potential light rail riders may switch to other stations or continue to use bus transit.

Deferral or phasing of commuter rail improvements would similarly affect ridership. Platform extensions at existing commuter rail stations are intended to facilitate longer train consists (from eight to ten car trains). Purchasing additional easements from railroad owners (e.g., BNSF for much of the Sounder commuter rail corridor) are intended to expand service capacity; and extension of commuter rail service beyond the existing service area (e.g., from Lakewood to DuPont) would generate new commuter rail ridership. If these improvements were deferred or phased, existing commuter rail ridership would likely remain consistent with current patterns, or experience only limited growth due to constraints of the existing commuter rail service.

Elimination or deferral of parking could reduce ridership if people choose to drive rather than find alternate modes to a station. Travel time would increase for some riders that continue to use buses or must walk or bike farther to access stations. Bus networks would be adjusted to bring people to the nearest station, although there could be more redundancy between rail and bus in a corridor with the elimination of stations. Adjustments to bus service could include maintaining existing bus services for longer than anticipated (e.g., ST Express routes or other feeder bus services) or adding additional bus services that were not previously planned.

Traffic impacts during operation and construction surrounding deferred or eliminated stations would not occur. Stations close to eliminated stations on a light rail extension could see an increase in riders as riders access the system at another nearby station or could see a decrease if more riders choose to remain on buses rather than transfer. Streets near light rail stations closest to the deferred or eliminated stations could see an increased impact on level of service if more riders access those stations by walking, biking, car, additional bus routes, or bus frequency adjustments. There could be greater impacts on pedestrian level of service at the stations as well, due to increased bus transfers at these stations or increased walk and bike access. Increased station access by any mode could lead to more potential for vehicle conflicts. Ridership increases at stations are anticipated to be relatively modest with station elimination, and traffic mitigation and improved non-motorized facilities adjacent to stations could avoid or minimize effects beyond those of the full project.

With project phasing or deferral of project completion, overall system ridership would decrease, although ridership at light rail interim terminus stations would increase for a period of time. As with the full build out for light rail or commuter rail extensions, bus networks would be adjusted to bring people to stations. As a result, transit riders from deferred station areas beyond an interim terminus would likely access the interim terminus station via bus or continue on bus rather than transfer to light rail or commuter rail.

Non-motorized and pick-up/drop-off trips at stations closest to eliminated or deferred stations and interim terminus stations could also increase. As a result, streets near light rail stations close to the eliminated/deferred stations and at interim stations could see an increased impact on sidewalk level of service. Increased bus transfers at these stations could also lead to greater

pedestrian level of service impacts at these stations. An interim terminus in areas with greater transit options and other nearby station options may have a smaller ridership increase and, therefore, lead to a relatively smaller increase in impacts on streets and non-motorized facilities. Increased station access by any mode could lead to greater potential for vehicle conflicts. In some cases, property access and circulation could require modification to maintain safety and accommodate station access. Traffic mitigation, such as intersection improvements, channelization, and signal timing adjustments, and improved non-motorized facilities, such as bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and signal timing adjacent to stations, could avoid or minimize effects beyond those of the full project.

Freight routes and access adjacent to stations that experience higher ridership levels because they are near an eliminated or deferred station or close to an interim terminus could be affected by increased traffic for pick up/drop off, increased bus transfers, and increased non-motorized access. Traffic mitigation and improvements to non-motorized facilities adjacent to the stations could mitigate the increase in impacts.

For eliminated stations, existing on-street or business-related parking would no longer be removed during construction or in the permanent condition. For deferred stations and stations beyond an interim terminus that include new parking facilities, associated traffic effects would occur later in time. At stations on a light rail extension with eliminated or deferred stations and interim terminus stations, more existing parking could be removed if additional bus transfer or layover spaces or pick-up/drop-off spaces are needed to accommodate additional ridership. Neighborhoods at stations near deferred or eliminated stations and near interim terminus stations and stations where planned parking is deferred or eliminated could see an increase in hide-and-ride parking. Hide-and-ride parking effects would depend on the amount of available, unrestricted parking near the stations. Similar to the full build, hide-and-ride impacts could be addressed by evaluating the availability of unrestricted parking and parking usage rates and working with the local jurisdiction to install parking restrictions such as fees and time limits.

### **Acquisitions and Displacements**

Project modifications that remove components, such as stations or parking facilities, would reduce property acquisition and residential and business displacements because most, if not all, of the property identified for those project components would no longer be needed. Project phasing or deferral of project components such as stations and parking facilities is not anticipated to reduce acquisitions because the project would eventually construct those components. Project phasing or deferral could increase property acquisitions and displacements if additional land is needed for maintenance facilities or access at an interim terminus station.

Elimination or deferral of stations and project phasing could increase ridership at nearby stations and an interim terminus. As a result, some additional property or use of right-of-way

could be needed at adjacent stations to support potential increases in ridership, such as larger pick-up/drop-off areas and increased bus bay and layover space to accommodate bus route modifications serving the station.

Project phasing or deferral could potentially increase the number of residential and business displacements in the future if development or redevelopment in the area increases density prior to full buildout of the deferred project components.

### **Land Use**

The elimination of project components such as stations and/or parking would reduce the overall conversion of land use to transportation use. Project phasing or deferral of project components is not anticipated to reduce conversion of land to transportation uses because the project would construct those components once funding became available. Increased conversion to support additional ridership, including larger pick-up/drop-off areas, increased bus bay and layover space, and additional or relocated maintenance access, could occur at other stations on a light rail, commuter rail, or bus rapid transit extension when stations are deferred or eliminated and at interim terminus stations.

### **Economics**

With the elimination of stations and/or parking, fewer businesses and employees would be displaced. Impacts to businesses surrounding station area construction would not occur, including reduced access and blocked visibility, traffic delays and rerouting, and noise and vibration. However, the reduced construction would also decrease benefits, including construction-related spending via construction jobs, purchase of goods and services needed for construction, and construction employees spending money in the community. These benefits and impacts would occur later in time with deferred stations and phasing for stations beyond the interim terminus.

### **Social and Neighborhoods**

With the elimination of project components including stations and/or parking, neighborhoods where these facilities were expected to be located would experience less change, including less or no improvement of transit access and no increase in activity in station areas, no traffic and access disruption from construction or operation, no changes in land use, and no visual change from light rail. These benefits and impacts would occur later in time with deferred stations and phasing for stations beyond the interim terminus.

For neighborhoods near interim terminus stations, there could be a slight increase in visual and land use change if additional property is needed to accommodate increased ridership such as bus layover and pick up/drop off. Increased activity in neighborhoods near interim terminus stations would be expected due to higher ridership.

## **Visual**

With the elimination of project components, including stations and/or parking, there would be no visual change, whether positive or negative, related to those specific components. Visual change, including impacts or improvements, would occur later in time with deferred stations and phasing for stations beyond the interim terminus. However, when applicable, elevated light rail guideway would still be constructed beyond the interim terminus for tail tracks or turnback tracks, and visual impacts related to the elevated structures would remain.

## **Noise and Vibration**

With the elimination of project components, including stations and associated parking, there would be no noise and vibration generated by those specific components. Operational and construction noise and vibration impacts would occur later in time with completion of deferred stations and phasing for stations and light rail guideway beyond the interim terminus. Operational noise and vibration anticipated from the guideway, whether elevated, at-grade, or tunnel, would still occur with the elimination or deferral of stations because the guideway would still be constructed between the stations initially constructed. Noise and vibration effects on neighboring properties could increase at the time deferred or phased elements are built if the surrounding area were to experience increased development during the interim period. The location of light rail related noise and vibration impacts might also change if different crossover tracks or other special trackwork (such as pocket and storage tracks) were required as a result of phasing, deferral, or project modifications. It is anticipated that all noise and vibration impacts from special trackwork could be mitigated.

## **Water Resources**

With the elimination of project components, the project would result in less increase in impervious surface and fewer impacts to surface and groundwater than the full project. Deferral of facilities and project phasing would delay these impacts. Additional bus facilities and passenger pick-up/drop-off space at stations near eliminated or deferred stations and at interim terminus stations are not likely to increase water resource impacts because design would prioritize avoiding resources. However, if additional impacts were to occur, mitigation measures would be developed similar to the full project. Elimination, component deferral, and project phasing would also remove or delay potential project benefits, including improved water quality treatment of runoff from existing pavement that would be redeveloped by the project to meet current standards. Similarly, mitigation for impacts to water resources would also not occur or would be delayed.

## **Ecosystems**

With the elimination of project components, some ecosystem impacts would be avoided. Deferral of facilities and project phasing would delay these impacts. Additional bus facilities and

pick-up/drop-off space at stations near eliminated and deferred stations and at interim terminus stations would not be likely to increase ecosystem impacts because design would prioritize avoiding resources. However, if additional impacts were to occur, mitigation measures would be developed similar to the full project. Elimination, component deferral, and project phasing would also remove or delay potential project benefits, including the benefits of ecosystem mitigation such as wetland and stream restoration and contributions to mitigation banks.

### **Energy**

With the elimination of project components, there could be slightly more surface transportation energy used if some potential riders do not choose to use transit. In this case, there would be slightly less construction-related energy consumption. There would also be potentially less greenhouse gas reduction from the associated reduced vehicle miles traveled compared to the full project. Electricity demand for powering light rail would be slightly reduced with the elimination of stations, although the guideway propulsion demand would remain. Deferral of facilities and project phasing would delay these impacts and benefits.

### **Hazardous Materials**

Elimination of stations and parking could avoid some potential for release of contaminants compared to the full build. Deferral of facilities and project phasing would delay these impacts. However, eliminating project components would also not provide removal or cleanup of existing potentially hazardous sites at stations and parking facilities. For deferred stations and stations beyond an interim terminus, cleanup of existing hazardous materials sites needed for light rail construction would be delayed. Contaminated properties would remain in their current state, and the potential for uncontrolled migration of existing contaminants could continue.

### **Public Services, Safety, and Security**

Population and employment growth within project areas will continue to increase, increasing public service demands. With the elimination or deferral of stations, traffic congestion could increase more than with the additional high-capacity transit access provided by these stations, and the benefits of reduced congestion due to these facilities would not be fully realized or would be delayed. Eliminated project components would not require emergency service support or Sound Transit security, although existing or future uses at these locations would continue to require public services. Eliminated or deferred project components and project phasing would remove or delay construction impacts, including the need for detours affecting emergency services, garbage/recycling routes, postal routes, and school routes.

## **Historic and Archaeological Resources**

Some historic and archaeological resource impacts would be avoided or delayed by deferring or eliminating project components. Additional bus facilities and pick-up/drop-off needs at stations near eliminated and deferred stations and at interim terminus stations are not likely to increase historic and archaeological resource impacts because design would prioritize avoiding resources. However, if additional impacts were to occur, mitigation measures would be developed similar to the full project.

## **Parks and Recreation**

Elimination of project components could avoid some parks and recreation impacts. Deferral of facilities and project phasing would delay potential impacts. Additional bus facility space at stations closest to eliminated and deferred stations and at interim terminus stations are not likely to increase parks and recreation impacts because design would prioritize avoiding resources. However, if additional impacts were to occur, mitigation measures would be developed similar to the full project. Elimination, deferral, and project phasing would also remove or delay potential project benefits, including improved access to and activation of park and recreation resources.

## **Cumulative Effects**

With deferral and project phasing, areas around a deferred component or interim terminus would experience construction effects twice, first during initial project construction and again when construction continues on the deferred or phased portion of the project. Construction would have similar effects as the initial construction for businesses, residents, and neighborhoods, including noise and vibration, dust, visual change, road closures and detours, construction traffic, and temporary parking displacement.

## **Indirect Effects**

With deferral or elimination of stations and project phasing, incentives for increased density, including transit-oriented development, would be reduced, delaying or reducing the environmental benefits of decreased vehicle miles traveled and efficient land use near stations. More riders may continue on the bus or take longer trips on the bus with the deferral or elimination of stations or project phasing, resulting in less improvement in bus level of service.

## **Conclusion**

---

Sound Transit has determined that an addendum to the existing 2014 Final Supplemental EIS for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update and related environmental documents is appropriate and that no additional programmatic environmental review is required. The potential changes to the ST3 Plan do not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts

and alternatives evaluated in the existing environmental documents. No new, probable significant adverse environmental impacts would arise, and no additional mitigation measures would be warranted. The principal differences resulting from the proposed modifications to the ST3 Plan are that some impacts would be delayed, deferred, or eliminated under the alternative approaches being considered, and some environmental benefits would not be realized or would be delayed. Other potential system plan changes would be evaluated further in corridor-specific studies to inform future decisions.

## References

---

Sound Transit. 2014. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan Update.

Sound Transit. 2005. Regional Transit System Long-Range Plan Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

Sound Transit. 1993. Regional Transit System Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement.