

August 23, 2013

TO: SOUND TRANSIT  
DRAFT EIS COMMENTS c/o LAUREN SWIFT  
401 SOUTH JACKSON STREET  
SEATTLE WA 98104

I-173-001

I attended the open house at Northgate Community Center August 21 and spoke on the Lynnwood Link Extension EIS.

I received a copy of the Summary DEIS which had some cost information in it after I spoke. The eight page handout at the sign-in desk had none.

I-173-002


Basically, my comments were that rail transit should not require a car to use and that stations should be at transit hubs and major destinations with minimum walking required- unlike the airport station which is as far away as possible from the terminal (on the far side of the parking garage).

Parking garages should be minimized, allocated to the highway budget not the rail budget. It looks like the garages cut the rail by 50%. Handicapped, young, elderly and poor need public transit. Tax dollars and debt should be used to make the system usable without a car.

I-173-003

See the CCC process that regional government was supposed to use coordinate all transportation and utility spending. The Bogue Plan of Seattle (1911) did that and the History of the Port of Seattle by Burke and Seattle Citizens Against Freeways by Tunks told how it was done since then. Excerpts from the two books are attached.

Hopefully the oil/asphalt/war conspiracy (HARPERS FEB. 1981) will be defeated so that we do not continue to use 4x our share of the planet's resources wasting 1/2 just commuting to work in major urban areas (that is why Senator Magnuson put Withdrawal and Substitution in DOT law-used by Oregon to get 18 miles of rail for 1/10 of what WA taxpayers will pay because our elected officials refused to allow a vote on it.

  
Barbara Zepeda  
308E Republican #708  
Seattle WA 98102  
206-324-8571

I-173-001

The public meeting handouts were intended as an overview of the project as were the displays. Sound Transit thanks you for taking the time to comment to the Draft EIS based on your receipt of the Summary Draft EIS.

I-173-002

The stations are planned to serve patrons using a variety of modes, with the majority of passengers expected to arrive by modes other than driving. However, the parking supplies considered reflect estimated demand and help park-and-ride spaces provide access to light rail for areas transitioning from suburban to urban densities. Sound Transit's System Access Policy is targeted to balance auto access needs, transit, and pedestrian and bicycles.

I-173-003

Your opinions are noted. Sound Transit remains committed to an open public process for project decisionmaking, and funding for the Lynnwood Link project was approved by voters in 2008.



The Port of Seattle's first Commissioners. From left, H.M. Chittenden, C.E. Remsberg and Robert Bridges.



Port Commissioners of 1976 pictured at a regular Commission meeting. From left, Jack Block, Henry L. Kotkins, Merle D. Adlum, Henry T. Simonson and Paul S. Friedlander.

HISTORY OF THE PORT OF SEATTLE BY PADRIC BURKE  
1976 PUBLISHED BY THE PORT OF SEATTLE, POBOX 1209, 98111

of King County would decide to create themselves into the Port of Seattle.<sup>30</sup>

Prior to this election there was an important matter that had to be decided—who would run for positions of commissioners. The Seattle Harbor Commission and the Seattle Commercial Club, as well as other parties that were sympathetic to the public port movement, realized that the utmost care had to be exercised in the selection of those men who would run as the Port's first commissioners.\* The special committee that Scott Calhoun was chairing for the Seattle Commercial Club, that had circulated petitions to put the Port of Seattle issue on the September ballot, acted as a screening committee for the selection of nominees to the Commission. As might be expected, those very groups that had worked so hard to defeat the public port legislation, i.e., the railroad and wharf interests, tried to place their own representatives on the ballot. Their strategy was apparent to almost everyone—they wanted to be certain that no port commission would carry out the mandate that the legislature had granted it, and put public interests ahead of private interest.<sup>31</sup>

Fortunately for the Port of Seattle, they failed, and generally the men that were nominated by the special committee of the Commercial Club and subsequently elected by the people of King County proved to be men of talent with a strong commitment to public service. The first man selected, and almost unanimously at that, was General Chittenden—the designer of the Lake Washington Canal. Chittenden, although paralyzed from the waist down proved to be almost tireless in his work for the Port in the brief years that were left to him. Chittenden was not only a brilliant engineer and an exceptionally learned man, but he also possessed a reputation throughout King County and most of the state for integrity and judgment—a reputation that was put to good advantage when the Port had to stand

\*Section Two of the Port District Act provided that any qualified voter could run for one of the three positions available after he had secured the signatures of 100 qualified voters on a nominating petition.

almost alone against occasionally hysterical critics throughout its first few years.

The second nominee that the Commercial Club put forward for one of the positions of Port Commissioner was by far the most controversial one, the former Populist Robert Bridges. Bridges had come to the U.S. from Ayershire, Scotland. It was in Scotland that he first experienced the inhuman working conditions that he was to campaign against the rest of his life. At the age of nine, according to Bridges' boast, he led his first strike when he headed a group of coal miners in a strike for better working conditions. When he arrived in King County in 1887, he went to work in the coal mines of south King County and became a union organizer. After working in the coal mines during the day, he taught himself how to read and write in the evenings and soon became an active force in various reform movements throughout the state.

Well-schooled in what the *Seattle Star* would call "The University of Hard Knocks," Bridges entered politics in 1896. In that year, after refusing a railroad pass and walking from Seattle to Ellensburg, he became the Fusion candidate for State Land Commissioner and was easily elected as the Populists swept the state. One of his first acts as Land Commissioner was to severely attack the Second Harbor Lines Commission for their giveaway of much of Seattle's valuable tidelands to the private dock and wharf owners.<sup>32</sup>

Looking more like a longshoreman than a port commissioner, Bridges stood six feet tall, with a great bony, broad face that seemed to wear a perpetual snarl, as it looked out from under a closely cropped head of hair that appeared to have been trimmed by an unsteady barber wielding a pair of hedge trimmers. The belligerent appearance of his looks was matched by an equally antagonistic personality and he never hesitated to attack what he termed simply "the interests" or the "kept press." He remained a controversial figure all his life. But even Bridges' enemies, who were numerous, gave him a certain grudging respect. Soon after Bridges was nominated by the screening committee, the *Town Crier*, the unofficial

organ of the Chamber of Commerce, anticipating Bridges' domination of the Port Commission, warned its readers that his election would undoubtedly destroy the "usefulness" of the Port Commission—a fateful prediction that was, to the *Town Crier's* horror, soon realized.<sup>33</sup>

The third nominee, C.E. Remsberg, was something of a mystery and a bit of a "wheeler-dealer." Nominally a Republican and chosen to balance the ticket between the supposedly neutral Chittenden and the Populist Bridges, Remsberg had come to Seattle shortly after the fire of 1889. Intending to only visit the city before returning to Virginia, he sensed that there were greater business opportunities in Seattle, and he decided to stay on. After investing two years' work in writing *The Revised Statutes and Codes of the State of Washington* and finding little demand for the book, he turned to real estate speculation in the northern part of the city. He had been a Justice of the Peace briefly from 1890-95, and was the manager of a small bank in the Fremont section of Seattle. He was, despite these ties, philosophically committed to the idea of municipal ownership and in some ways would prove himself as politically radical as Bridges.<sup>34</sup>

The actual decision by the voters of King County on September 5, 1911, to create a municipal corporation to be known as the Port of Seattle, was a fairly easy affair. The future Port had the support, in varying degrees of intensity, of every major newspaper in the city. The only groups that opposed it were the private dock and wharf owners. Even Colonel Blethen's *Seattle Times*, which tended to look on any mention of municipal ownership as something akin to a radical Wobblie plot, gave the proposal a limited degree of support. With such support the election proved to be a rather one-sided event and the Port of Seattle was created by a margin of more than three to one (13,771 to 4,538). The race for the three commissioner positions was equally one-sided, with Bridges, Chittenden and Remsberg easily defeating their opponents. But before the Port Commission could even begin to draw up a comprehensive plan

the opponents of municipal ownership were actively engaged in trying to reduce the Port to little more than a welfare agency for the private dock owners. Behind the Port were the long years of bitter struggle, while ahead of it lay, not a respite, but almost ceaseless controversy to maintain the very fabric of a public port.<sup>35</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Norman H. Clark, *Mill Town: A Social History of Everett, Washington: Its Earliest Beginnings on the Shore of Puget Sound to the Tragic and Infamous Event Known as the Everett Massacre* (Seattle, 1970), pp. 28-29.

Edwin T. Coman, Jr. and Helen M. Gibbs, *Time, Tide and Timber: A Century of Pope and Talbot* (New York, 1949), pp. 77-79 and pp. 220-224.

<sup>2</sup>Clark, pp. 28-42.

<sup>3</sup>Morgan, pp. 166-170.

Clark, pp. 101-102.

<sup>4</sup>Nesbit, 247-48.

<sup>5</sup>Robert Donald Saltvig, *The Progressive Movement in Washington*, (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1966), p. 37.

<sup>6</sup>*Seattle Star*, Nov. 5, 1905.

<sup>7</sup>Biographical sketch drawn from *Cotterill Papers*, University of Washington Archives.

<sup>8</sup>Saltvig, p. 92.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 93.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 95.

<sup>11</sup>Saltvig, pp. 105-105.

<sup>12</sup>*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, Jan. 1, 1895.

Hynding, p. 286.

<sup>13</sup>Hamilton Higday, "Notes Towards a History of the Port of Seattle," (unpublished and unnumbered Ms. c. 1920, primarily a collection of letters, in Northwest Collection of the University of Washington Library.

<sup>14</sup>Higday, Notes.

Robert Bridges *Scrapbooks*, Volume 4 (These scrapbooks, a collection of four volumes of unnumbered pages contain primarily newspaper articles covering the years 1890-1928. Unfortunately a number of the dates and origin of the articles are obscured in the collection.

<sup>15</sup>O'Connor and Gibbs, pp. 221-31.

<sup>16</sup>Bagley, p. 384.

Hynding, pp. 240-44.

*History and Advantages of the Canal and Harbor Improvement Project Now Being Executed by the Seattle and Lake Washington Waterway* (Seattle, 1902).

Nesbit, p. 404.

<sup>18</sup>Biographic sketch drawn in part from *The Hiram Chittenden Papers*, Washington Historical Library, Tacoma, Washington.

Higday, Notes.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*

SEATTLE CITIZEN'S AGAINST FREEWAYS

318 Margaret Cary Tunks 1999  
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
96-30929 DISCUSSES: 84, DAWO LEFFGURE  
ISBN 1-57502-387-3

vituperative spokesperson for the highway lobby, swallowing their orders without any attention to facts. The bill she signed merely changed the Department of Highways name to the Department of Transportation—the obsolete and useless department of transportation we still have. Her DOT law perpetuated the old, completely closed machinations in the Highway Department. It enlarged the highway commission from five to seven members, and the highway commission members were still figureheads, who merely nodded from time to time to acquiesce to the decisions that had already been made. The secretary was to be appointed by the governor from a list of three persons submitted by the commission, and the secretary was to have no term of office—unless forced out of the job by proof of wrongdoing.

The DOT perpetuated all of the old practices controlling spending. The department still would be funded with state highway trust funds that the State Constitution amendment limited to being used for ferry and road purposes only—so the transportation planning



ARE FIRST- ME, ME, ME-- ME!!  
CAN'T YOU SEE I'M STRIKING TO DEATH?  
UNRAVELLING: CAUTIONING THE SOCIAL THREATENMENT

processes could not be comprehensive and multimodal. The highway budget would continue to be used to coerce legislators to vote for bad bills at the threat of losing their highway projects; the highway budget bill would still be kept undercover until the end of the legislative session to prevent any worthwhile legislative review.

Part 4: Can Seattle Be Saved?

Now, in 1999, the highway lobby has a complete victory:

- The state of Washington still has no Department of Transportation—the electorate has no control over the spending of billions of dollars.
- The gas tax has been raised and raised.
- Referendum #49 was passed by 58% of the voters in the Washington State November 1998 election. It was a very clever move—all of the people who paid for state motor vehicle licenses were to get a \$30 cut in their motor vehicle taxes. The campaigners were able to conceal the fact that Referendum #49 made the state lose \$1.9 billion general funds (school funds, etc.) that were transferred to the state highway trust!

Seattle Saves Seattle?

Seattle will be saved only if the elected officials and the people of the city decide to save themselves—to pass this ordinance:

The city of Seattle hereby prohibits any additional capacity for motor vehicles in the city, except for a bus/rail transit ramp from I-90 at I-5 to the stadiums.

To quote Doug Kelbaugh: "Seattle must control the motor vehicles—the motor vehicles cannot control Seattle."

Can Seattle be saved? The saving of Seattle starts late, maybe too late. Seattle has suffered irreparable damage from the construction and use of the Big freeways into and through the city: Interstate 5 was supposed to be built east of Lake Washington, but political decisions were made for it to go through downtown Seattle—and the I-5 corridor bisected the two narrow peninsulas of the city, forced thousands of people out of their homes, created a noisy, polluted environment for those residents left within six blocks of the right-of-way and ramps, and made east/west travel difficult anywhere in the city. The construction of and traffic on the SR 520 bridge and highway have devastated the lovely fragile waterfront from Laurelhurst and the University on the north and the Alboerum, Montlake, Portage Bay and Komoike on the south. I-90

Karlis Zommers  
2847 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue W  
Seattle, WA 98119  
(206) 283-2974

August 22, 2013

To Whom It May Concern at Sound Transit:

I-174-001

The Seattle Latvian Center and Church have been a part of my life, literally, as long as I can remember. I am very concerned about the impact that light rail will have on the Center.

Starting as a very young child I attended Latvian School every Saturday. I started early because my Mom volunteered as a teacher at the school. My two brothers and cousins also went to Latvian School. Now, my older brother's kids have already gone through Latvian School. And, my younger brother's kids are currently enrolled. Seattle Latvian School is still thriving!

The Church has served as the foundation of many of my life's most important events. I happened to be born just before the church was built so I was christened at an interim church (after the City of Seattle forced the Latvian Community out of their original location in Wallingford). Over the years I have attended many christenings and wedding and, unfortunately, funerals. My brothers and I were all confirmed at the Church. This past May, in front of all of our friends and family, my wife and I were married at the Latvian Church.



May 5, 2013

The Latvian fraternities use Latvian Center for meetings and events. The center provides plenty of space and a central location where members from throughout the Pacific Northwest can gather. As a member of a Latvian fraternity I am occasionally called upon to serve in an honor guard when another member passes away. That is one of the traditions we use to show respect.

### I-174-001

Thank you for your comments describing the cultural importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. Since the publication of the Draft EIS, Sound Transit has revisited the alternatives in Segment A and modified them so that none of them would result in the displacement of the Seattle Latvian Center and Church. Please see the Final EIS for a description of the updated Segment A alternatives in Chapter 2 and revised text on the potential impacts to the Seattle Latvian Center and Church in Chapter 4.

I-174-001

Latvians honor their dead. You can see that if you stop by the Latvian Cemetery at Evergreen Washelli. Like many of my friends and family, we regularly stop by the cemetery to tend to the graves. It's in our DNA. It doesn't matter what time I stop by, weekday or weekend, more often than not I will see another Latvian at the cemetery there doing the same thing. Even if we're not leaving flowers, we're there to clean the headstones, pull weeds, or whatever needs to be done. I would think we have the best-kept part of the cemetery! I need to point out the close proximity of the Latvian Center to the Latvian Cemetery at Evergreen Washelli. All four of my grandparents are buried there.

We have less serious fun at the Latvian Center, too. Coming up on September 7 will be the annual golf tournament. After taking over the Jackson golf course for a day, we head back to the Center for steaks and tall stories about golf. People fly in from out of town for this event. The evening ends with the crowd gathering to sing songs. That may sound corny if you haven't been raised that way.

The Latvian Center is a crucial cultural hub for many families like mine in Washington State. I hope that Sound Transit can figure out a way to proceed with their expansion to Lynwood without destroying such an amazing place.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Karlis Zommers', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Karlis Zommers

---

**From:** J Altman <jaltman8@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 29, 2013 8:19 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Cc:** altman jeff  
**Subject:** east-west traffic near stations

**I-175-001**

Hi -- If stations are built at either N. 155th St. or at N. 185th St. in Shoreline, the construction process and ultimate layout of the station areas must take into account the important function of these two east-west corridors. As is well known, east-west traffic flow is more difficult because of the lack of corridors vs. north-south traffic flow. Currently, for the cities of Shoreline and Lake Forest Park, the most expeditious traffic flow is on N. 155th St. and N. 185th St. This is because flow on N. 145th St. and SR 104 is hampered by traffic density and numerous traffic signals at their I-5 interchanges.

So, if stations are built at either N. 155th St. and/or N. 185th St., make sure that east-west traffic flow for pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles is as little impeded as possible during both construction and subsequent light rail operation. Such mitigation measures as double-left turn lanes and sequentially timed traffic signals should be included.

Thanks for listening!

jeff altman  
18474 40th Pl. NE  
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155  
206/364-2180

**I-175-001**

The EIS includes an evaluation of how station sites and their construction activities would affect east-west alternatives. The project's detailed construction management plans will maintain effective east-west access and accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic as well. See Chapter 3 for more detail on traffic impacts and Section 3.6 for potential mitigation. Appendix H also shows conceptual plans for the Preferred Alternative, which includes further detail on some of the street improvements featured in the Preferred Alternative to maintain effective traffic operations.



---

**From:** Gavin Howell <oregavin@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 03, 2013 10:47 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Lynnwood link comment

Name: Gavin Howell  
Address: 23811 45th Pl W, Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

**I-176-001**

Of the B segment alternatives that I've looked at, my wife and I both prefer the B2A alternative. It would be optimal to have the rail station be in the parking lot of the transit center rather than the freeway median. Ridership would be higher, and it would also leave the current freeway bus station open during a lengthy construction period.

We like the idea of having 2 Mountlake Terrace stations in place. The parking at the current MLT Park and Ride can be a nightmare during the middle of the week, especially during fall and winter months while UW is in session. Sometimes the lot is full by 9am and doesn't have vacant spots until early afternoon. Having an additional station at 220th would relieve pressure on an already overstressed Mountlake Terrace Transit Center.

Our second preferred option is B1, which has a lower environmental impact than B2A and is more affordable.

Lastly, if alternative B4 is NOT chosen, I'd love to know what would happen to the current freeway station. After all that time and money putting that quality station in place, it would be a shame to scrap it entirely. Hopefully it could be put to some valuable use.

### **I-176-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your preference for Alternative B2A with the second Mountlake Terrace light rail transit station at 220th Street SW and your second choice support for Alternative B1. The continued use of the Mountlake Terrace freeway station is not a Sound Transit decision. The agency will coordinate with the bus transit agencies to realign bus services to serve the new light rail transit station. Sound Transit is also participating with others in planning for potential options for the existing freeway station, although this depends on the decisions about the light rail project to be built.

---

**From:** haleiwa311 . <haleiwa311@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 05, 2013 11:40 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Latvian Center Sound Transit EIS

Comments;

- I-177-001** | 1. The Latvian Lutheran Church and Latvian Center are linked as a cultural resource for Latvians and other Baltic Countries sharing a cultural heritage marked historically by repression and oppression felt by the older members who fled in 1944 and then spent years in displaced person camps in Germany prior to immigration to the USA and other countries. This center and church is their only meeting place and has been for nearly 40 years. The Church and Center are inseparable and the Sound Transit link proposed will destroy this resource regardless of which alternative is chosen. Insufficient discussion of this issue in the EIS.
- I-177-002** | 2. This project should be a design-bid-build project which will allow more time and more public input as time goes on.
- I-177-003** | 3. This project impact should require a Full EIS to adequately address alternatives that will not impact the Latvian Church and Center.
- I-177-004** | 4. An engineering assessment should be included in EIS to assure that the project will not affect the Church or Center with excessive noise and vibration from the proposed route and and trains.
- I-177-005** | 5. It may not be possible to provide adequate financial or other mitigation due to the necessary encroachment on the property by this project. To relocate the Center from the Church is the equivalent of separating a child and its parents.
- I-177-006** | 6. Reconsideration of an alternate route or project bypassing entirely the Latvian Church and Center is the only proper way to save this cultural heritage gathering place from destruction.

Thank you,

David C. Johnson, J.D.  
8168 Cultus Bay Rd.  
Clinton, WA 98236

### **I-177-001**

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

### **I-177-002**

Sound Transit acknowledges your comment stating your preference for design-bid-build procurement method for construction of the Lynnwood Link Extension project. A final decision on this issue may be expected soon after Sound Transit makes a final decision on the selected alternative following the publication of the Final EIS. Irrespective of the method of procurement, Sound Transit will continue to conduct community outreach activities.

### **I-177-003**

Since the publication of the Lynnwood Link Extension Draft EIS in June 2013, additional engineering was undertaken to reduce adverse effects on the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church property and facilities. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall (also called the cultural center). Access to the property and its functions will be maintained, but involve a street realignment.

### **I-177-004**

A detailed Noise and Vibration Technical Report was prepared in support of the EIS to assess potential noise and vibration impacts on the Church and other projects. Since publication of the Draft EIS in June 2013, additional engineering has been undertaken to refine the Segment A alternatives and avoid or further minimize adverse effects on the Church. With the engineering design refinements to the Segment A alternatives, additional updated noise and vibration analysis was conducted to re-assess potential noise and vibration impacts on the Church. See Section 4.7 in the Final EIS and the technical report

included with the Final EIS. If noise and/or vibration impacts are predicted, Sound Transit has identified mitigation.

**I-177-005**

The Final EIS describes the results of additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE which avoids the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained, although a portion of land on the edge of the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative and other at-grade alternatives. Elevated alternatives would also require a portion of the church property.

Several sections in the Final EIS have been updated to address these changes: Section 2.5.1 describing the refined alternatives for Segment A; Section 4.1 describing the acquisition impacts; Section 4.4 describing impacts to community facilities and neighborhoods. In addition, Appendix F presents revised conceptual engineering plans for the refined Segment A alternatives; Appendix I-4.1 contains detailed maps and tables concerning acquisition, displacement, and relocation requirements for each Segment A alternative, and Appendix G has visual simulations. As noted in Section 4.1, any acquisition of property, including portions of a property, would require fair compensation to the property owner in accordance with Sound Transit policy and federal and state law.

**I-177-006**

Thank you for your comment stating your preference that an alternate Segment A route for the proposed Lynnwood Link Extension project that would entirely bypass the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. As noted above, a design modification to maintain access avoids the potential for displacing the church.

**I-178-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your preference of Alternative C3 because of reduced impacts to parklands.

---

**From:** Garry Kampen <kampen@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 03, 2013 3:43 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Rail routes C1-C3

**I-178-001** | After reviewing the DEIS, I'm convinced that route C3 is the best. It connects directly to the Park-and-Ride & adjoins the Transit Center. **Most important:** It does not destroy valuable and irreplaceable park space and green space. Light rail should serve the cities it connects, and not destroy their livability.  
Dr. Garry Kampen

---

**From:** llockeman@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 05, 2013 2:31 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Comment c/o Lauren Swift

**I-179-001**

I strongly favor alternative C-3 which is the only alternative that doesn't unbelievably take a wetland set-aside bought with conservation futures based on its resource value to the region of a perpetual nature.

One would think such a flaunting of condemnation procedures would be challenged up to the Supreme Court for affecting an in-perpetuity easement for the public good.

Public set-asides particularly close to urban centers are of high value to the population in addition to their importance for the good of the planet.

If option C-3 is the one passing close to hotels, a station stop should be designed to accommodate hotel customers to use transit to arrive and conduct business or travel to recreational opportunities.

I would like to be added to the mailing list for information pertaining to this decision.

George Lockeman, 2430 81st Pl SE, Everett, WA 98203 Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

### **I-179-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your strong preference for Alternative C3 due to reduced impacts to the nearby wetlands and avoidance of direct impacts to Scriber Creek Park. Thank you for your suggestion that easy access to the light rail transit station should be provided to nearby hotels. The Preferred Alternative includes pathways as well as street and sidewalk improvements to improve connectivity in the area.

---

**From:** Michael Manderscheid <mbmander@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 02, 2013 7:30 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Lynnwood Light Rail DEIS

**I-180-001** | I support a light rail station at NE 130th Street. It will be useful for trips from Lynnwood to Lake City and also to parts of SR99, assuming reasonably good bus connections. I actually would occasionally use a light rail stop at 130th to get to Krispy Kreme on SR99 before work, and to Lake City Gyros after work; these are just two examples of the many new connections that would open up.

Options A7 and A11 seem too expensive, so I would support A5 or A10.

**I-180-002** | Extending light rail to an Alderwood Mall station as soon as possible is very important, although I realize this is beyond the scope of Options C1/C2/C3.

Mike Manderscheid  
Lynnwood

### **I-180-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your support for a light rail transit station at NE 130th Street and Alternatives A5 and A10. Regarding bus service at the new light rail transit stations, changes to bus services will be considered by Sound Transit, King County Metro, and Community Transit as the project approaches operation. Initial plans used in the EIS analysis anticipate improved east-west connections to the station areas with connections to other north-south corridors.

### **I-180-002**

Thank you for your support of Sound Transit's light rail extension program and your particular interest in a future light rail station at the Alderwood Mall to the north along the I-5 corridor.

**I-181-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your Segment A Alternative preferences.

---

**From:** Dave Ness <dave@prayingforamerica.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 02, 2013 10:02 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Comments on Lynnwood Link Extension

Hello,

I attended one of the public hearing meetings, considered the different proposals for the A segment of the extension, and would like to give you my preferences for this project.

My first choices would be either A1 or A3---both are fine with me.

If the decision is made to put a station at 130<sup>th</sup>, my preference would be Option A7.

Thank you. I thought you did an excellent job of presenting all the possible information needed, and did a gracious and professional job of dealing with all the questions and comments.

Pastor Dave Ness  
North Seattle Church of the Nazarene  
13130 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE  
Seattle, WA 98125

I-181-001

---

**From:** Allison Ostrer <aostrer@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 03, 2013 10:10 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Cc:** savescrubercreekpark@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Don't destroy the creek!

**I-182-001** | I oppose destroying Scriber Creek for the light rail. I DO support light rail and want to see it extended, but it should go through already developed properties, not a preserved wetland.

Sincerely,  
Allison Ostrer  
Seattle, WA

**I-182-001**

Thank you for your comment. This project will abide by all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations protecting wetlands. Sound Transit's policy [Executive Order No. 1, Establishing a Sustainability Initiative for Sound Transit (2007)] on ecosystem mitigation is to avoid impacts to environmentally sensitive resources to the maximum extent practicable and to provide adequate mitigation to ensure there is no net loss of ecosystem function and acreage as a result of agency projects.



---

**From:** Kyle Phillips <kylejphillips@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 06, 2013 8:58 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Lynnwood Link Extension DEIS Comments

September 6, 2013

To whom it may concern:

I am a resident of the Ridgcrest neighborhood in Shoreline, Washington and live near the intersection of NE 148<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. As such, I will focus my comments on the light rail impacts to that immediate area.

I look forward to having Sound Transit Link Light Rail service extended to the area and hope the future station will be thoughtfully designed to complement the existing character of the quiet residential neighborhoods nearby.

Below are a few of my observations on information provided in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

1. Preferred Alternative Segment A:

I-183-001

a). A1: At-grade/elevated to NE 145<sup>th</sup> and NE 185<sup>th</sup> east side stations.

I-183-002

b). Referencing the DEIS Appendices Figure G-34 and G-35 Viewpoint 10: Less elevated tracks along Jackson Park golf course indicated in Figure G-34 are more consistent with scale of surroundings, especially when compared to figure G-35. Same is true when comparing DEIS Appendix Figures G-31 and G-32 Viewpoint 9.

I-183-003

c). Minimize disruption to current tree canopy/ forested character/ Thornton Creek wetland zone at east side of I-5 as experienced when driving north past 130<sup>th</sup> towards Shoreline. Currently appears as a transition from the less forested areas south of 130<sup>th</sup> to much more densely forested zone- this character should be maintained as much as possible.

I-183-004

d). Current Northbound 145th street off-ramp/ 5th Ave NE interchange creates a dangerous weaving traffic pattern. Elevated light rail and parking garage at 145th will only increase the congestion at this interchange. Any solution will require major improvement to the traffic flow through the intersection. 5th Ave NE is also the only reasonable access from the Ridgcrest neighborhood to Northgate, so maintaining this local access route is critical.

I-183-005

e). Major improvements needed to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in the area to improve safety of station users traveling to and from the station, especially along 145th and along 5th Ave NE (South of 145th).

2. NE 145<sup>th</sup> Station Layout comments:

a). Station Layout Option 1 (Preferred)

-Seems to maintain existing traffic flow at 145th while filtering new congestion created by Park and Ride Garage users.

-Maintain existing 20' +/- swath of mature trees along 5th Avenue NE at current Park and Ride entrance!! Consider a more compact parking structure with additional level (similar to Option 2) to accommodate this. Would preserve tree canopy character entering into Ridgcrest neighborhood and provide a

### I-183-001

Thank you for your comment noting that the lower elevation alternatives are more visually consistent with the surrounding area.

### I-183-002

This project will abide by all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations. Sound Transit's policy [Executive Order No. 1, Establishing a Sustainability Initiative for Sound Transit (2007)] on ecosystem mitigation is to avoid impacts to environmentally sensitive resources to the maximum extent practicable and to provide adequate mitigation to ensure there is no net loss of ecosystem function and acreage as a result of agency projects.

Sound Transit will also abide by the tree replacement policies of WSDOT and local ordinances.

### I-183-003

Mitigation measures for increased traffic congestion as a result of the station at 145th will be included as part of the project. 5th Avenue NE access will be maintained similar to today. Please see potential mitigation included in Chapter 3 and Mitigation Plan.

### I-183-004

The Preferred Alternative's NE 145th Street Station includes improved sidewalks and bike lanes along 5th Avenue NE and portions of NE 145th Street; please see Section 2.4 for other standard elements of the stations.

### I-183-005

Your comments stating your preferences for the two layout options for the NE 145th Street Station are noted. The Preferred Alternative has updated the design based on Option 2.

I-183-005

natural visual/acoustic buffer to the parking garage. There is an especially nice grove of mature trees in and around the current park and ride at the east and north edges.

-Plaza landscaping at corner of NE145th should reflect character of entering a residential neighborhood. Natural vegetation, rain gardens, pedestrian scale all important. Appreciate possibility of detention pond indicated in Option 2 working as a rain garden/place marker/white noise buffer to the freeway noise. Work with City of Shoreline on goals for this plaza.

-Existing northbound on-ramp location creates hazard for pedestrians heading to/from the Park and Ride from cars turning onto the ramp. This hazard will only increase with increased pedestrian and vehicle activity in the area. Crosswalk should be well marked and signed. Consider eliminating Bus flyer off ramp to reduce width that pedestrians must cross and to reduce undue traffic complexity.

-Scale of retaining walls at plaza seems excessive- consider gradually transitioning landscape to mimic flowing landscape that currently exists.

-Provide acoustical separation at platform level so that noise from freeway is not overwhelming while waiting for train. Current freeway bus flyer stops are extremely unpleasant to stand at- would hope to avoid the same downfall with the light rail stations.

b). Station Layout Option 2-

-Seems to create a more compact/clearly defined Station Area with the northbound onramp at the north edge of the station zone. Concern is that it may only exacerbate the current congestion at the intersection. Park and Ride exit location would appear to cause additional congestion at peak hours.

-I like how this layout has more presence along NE 145<sup>th</sup> as a beacon- it may help reduce perceived distance for residential commuters living across 145<sup>th</sup> west of I-5.

-Like how it pulls the station to the edge of the Ridgecrest neighborhood for fewer potential noise/visual conflicts. Maintains residential buffer at NE 148th street- trees should be preserved in this zone if possible.

c) General Comments about 145th station-

I-183-006

- Hope that Sound Transit station design team would work closely with the adjacent neighborhoods (especially Ridgecrest and Parkwood) during the design phase to create a welcoming, appropriately scaled, thoughtfully designed station and parking garage that fits with the neighborhood character.

Thank you for your time in considering my comments.  
I am looking forward to a consistently reliable form of public transit for the region!

Sincerely,

Kyle Phillips

206-282-2488  
[kylejphillips@gmail.com](mailto:kylejphillips@gmail.com)

## I-183-006

The Sound Transit Design Team is committed to working with local jurisdictions and neighborhoods in designing functional and attractive facilities that are as consistent as possible with neighborhood scale and character. The Section 4.5.6 of the Final EIS includes additional discussion of potential mitigation measures for station and parking garage visual impacts.

**I-184-001**

Sound Transit has identified potential cut-through traffic as a potential impact for station area neighborhoods, and identifies mitigation in Section 3.65, which describes measures that could be developed in coordination with the local jurisdiction.

---

**From:** karen summers <klsomm@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 30, 2013 7:52 AM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Lynnwood Link Extension in Shoreline

Hello,

I was unable to attend the recent meeting you had at the Shoreline Center due to working. My husband attended and brought home materials which I've read through.

**I-184-001**

I have one question/comment. We live on 188th St. between 10th Avenue and 15th Avenue NE. I see this street as one of the routes people will use to get to the parking area/garage for the light rail. Our street has no side walks. It has a hill and a curve on it. It is posted currently with a 25 mph speed limit which is way too fast to be going around a blind curve in a residential area. We already have difficulty getting out of our garage and drive during the "rush hour"

times. We have children who use the street, and elderly people crossing to get their mail. Some people drive irresponsibly through this hill and curve area.

If we are to have increased traffic, then we need speed bumps - not humps but actual bumps. Posting signs won't do anything to change behavior.

My husband told me that the person he talked to at the meeting said that Perkins Way will be the main route to the light rail. How will this be enforced? Our street would be the quicker cut through from Lake Forest park area and areas north of 15th.

As a driver I know that I don't always follow "arterial" signs, or signs saying "To \_\_\_\_\_" if I know a quicker way to get there or a way that has less traffic on it. I would suspect I'm not the only one to do this.

I would appreciate more details in future meetings about who is determining this traffic pattern, EXACTLY how it will be marked and enforced. And I want to talk about major deterrents to using other routes.

Thank you for your work on this. I hope to be at the next meeting - work permitting.

Karen Summers

---

**From:** Sharla Unruh <sunruh76@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 04, 2013 3:54 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Scriber creek park

**I-185-001**

My husband, Ryan, and I believe that the citizens of Lynnwood would be better served if the third alternative ( C-3) were to be chosen which affects six to twenty properties, eliminates one business and runs along I5 at the cost of \$340 million.

Fewer people would be displaced and the park which was funded by a group (Conservation Futures) who designated it for conservation would be retained for thousands of people. People from outside the city of Lynnwood use the park as well. We have enjoyed the park a few times a year for over twenty years and would really miss it.

We think those two reasons alone make the C-3 decision the only correct one.

Thanks,  
Ryan & Sharla Unruh  
14525 81<sup>st</sup> Ave NE  
Kenmore, Wa 98028

**I-185-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your preference for Alternative C3 due to fewer displacements and impacts to Scriber Creek Park. Alternative modified C3 is the Preferred Alternative, which avoids the park property.

**I-186-001**

Your preference for Alternative C3 due to its avoidance of Scriber Creek Park is noted. Modified C3 is the Preferred Alternative, which avoids Scriber Creek Park.

---

**From:** Shelley Weyer <sweyer1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 05, 2013 9:34 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Comment

**I-186-001**

Please consider the C-3 plan for the new light rail to Lynnwood. This is the most honorable choice since you will not be destroying a conservation park.

Sound Transit has made some very foolish choices with their planning in recent years. If you want the voters to continue to fund ST then it is highly suggested you pay attention to the voting public. They could underfund ST by voting against any new money's that are requested.

Please take the high road and leave the conservation park option alone.

Thank you,

Shelley Weyer  
Everett, WA

---

**From:** Wirta, Mari  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 03, 2013 9:43 AM  
**To:** lindaatsea@yahoo.com  
**Cc:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** RE: Lynnwood Link  
**Attachments:** 130807MariWirtaFollowupToLindaWillemarck-LynnwoodLinkInput.pdf;  
130715MariWirtaResponseToLindaWillemarck-LynnwoodLinkAlternativePreferen....pdf

Good morning Ms. Willemarck,

Just a quick note to let you know that I have forwarded your most recent comments to [lynnwoodlinkdeis@soundtransit.org](mailto:lynnwoodlinkdeis@soundtransit.org) to ensure they are included in the official record of DEIS comments. Your message will be taken into consideration as the Board identifies a preferred alternative later this year.

Regards,

**Mari Wirta** | Correspondence Management Coordinator  
Sound Transit | Union Station | 401 S Jackson Street | Seattle, WA 98104  
[mari.wirta@soundtransit.org](mailto:mari.wirta@soundtransit.org) | [www.soundtransit.org](http://www.soundtransit.org)

---

**From:** Linda At Sea [<mailto:lindaatsea@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 02, 2013 2:05 PM  
**Subject:** Lynnwood Link

My name is Linda Willemarck. I live at 4900 200<sup>th</sup> St SW in Lynnwood. Since learning about the Sound Transit's Alternatives for the Lynnwood Link, a mere 3 months ago, I have spent a great deal of time trying to understand what properties are involved and what impacts it will have.

I-187-001

As you know, both the C1 and C2 Alternatives would be going down 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave West/Cedar Valley Road. In my research I found a very compelling document that really puts into perspective the importance of this area. The document reads, quote "...an established single family neighborhood containing hundreds of affordable homes and is in close proximity to several affordable housing apartments and condominium complexes, all of which would be adversely impacted by light, noise, property values, and other impacts ..."

"directly impacts hundreds of affordable homes when there are other sites available, raises social justice issues..."

"...located adjacent to significant city recreational resources of Scriber Creek and associated wetlands, and the city's Scriber Creek Park, that provide places to experience nature in close proximity to Lynnwood's City Center and regional Interurban Trail, both of which would be negatively impacted..."

## I-187-001

Thank you for your comment expressing concerns about the adverse effects of Alternatives C1 and C2, including citations from the City of Lynnwood Resolution #2012-07 requesting elimination of routes along 52nd Avenue W and Cedar Valley Road from further consideration.

While the alternatives are evaluated in the Final EIS, they are not the Preferred Alternative. Section 4.4 of the Final EIS includes a detailed analysis of potential impacts to the 52nd Avenue West area, and it also summarizes the Environmental Justice analysis contained in Appendix C. The analysis does not identify impacts at the levels the City's resolution describes.

In November 2013, the Sound Transit Board identified a Preferred Alternative based on Alternative C3 with some modifications to its alignment as it enters the Lynnwood Transit Center. Please see the Final EIS for the description of the Preferred Alternative, which was developed in collaboration with the City of Lynnwood, and which avoids direct impacts to Scriber Creek Park and avoids running along 52nd Avenue W.

**I-187-001**

"...Therefore, the City Council of the City of Lynnwood does hereby resolve and request the Sound Transit Board to remove from its potential sites and evaluations list the Lynnwood 52nd Avenue West/Cedar Valley Road site..."

....that such site not be included in any environmental analysis, due to its many significant and unresolvable and irreparable impacts upon the City of Lynnwood, its residents and businesses and upon the Edmonds School District."

These quotes were taken from Resolution No. 2012-07 of the City of Lynnwood, Washington, regarding issues concerning the potential siting by Sound Transit. It was signed by Mayor Gough of Lynnwood on 10/22/2012.

**I-188-001**

Thank you for your comment stating your preference for Alternative C3.

---

**From:** LindaZopfi@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 03, 2013 4:06 PM  
**To:** Lynnwood Link DEIS  
**Subject:** Option C-3, please!

I have not been able to attend the past Lynnwood Sound Transit meetings because of work conflicts, however, in reading the Seattle Times article today, I felt I MUST voice my opinion on the proposals, after having been a homeowner in the effected neighborhood for 24 yrs.

**I-188-001** Both of the C-1 and C-2 routes would severely impact the tranquil, peaceful nature of my home and home-based business, which is completely unacceptable to me. PLEASE only consider option C-3 when deciding where to place the Sound Transit route through Lynnwood. I'm all for mass transit, however, not at the expense of our wetlands, parks and neighborhoods!

Melinda Zopfi  
20026 53rd Place West  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Best,  
Linda

Linda Zopfi  
A Zopfi Production LLC  
PO Box 1998  
Lynnwood, WA 98046  
425-670-1220  
[www.facebook.com/AZopfiProductionLLC](http://www.facebook.com/AZopfiProductionLLC)

Exclusive Entertainment Producer for [The Groupon Bite of Seattle](#) and [The Emerald Queen Taste of Tacoma](#)



1 MR. CAMERON: Hello. My name is Michael Cameron,  
2 M-I-C-H-A-E-L, C-A-M-E-R-O-N. I live at 20035-12th Avenue  
3 Northeast, Shoreline.

4 That property butts right up against the Exit 177  
5 offramp going north.

6 Conceptually, I'm a big supporter of the project.  
7 I think it's a good thing for the region. I think it's  
8 probably what the region needs, overall. But that  
9 enthusiasm's tempered a little bit by reaction to some of  
10 the current designs of the plan. And I'm hoping that some  
11 of those can be addressed in the final EIS. Those are going  
12 to be recommendations today.

13 Specifically, the design issues that I have are  
14 how they directly impact me, as a private property owner,  
15 and our house, specifically, with regards to noise and the  
16 visual impacts.

I-189-001 17 I'm encouraged by the numbers that I read in the  
18 draft EIS with regards to noise and the impacts that the  
19 mitigation plans in place will have. Sounds like -- no pun  
20 intended -- that the mitigation plans will be able to deal  
21 with much of the sound in the area.

22 I'm a little bit skeptical of them, however,  
23 because the microphone locations that they used were quite a  
24 distance from my house and the neighborhood, so it's --  
25 there's a lot of topography changes, hills, valleys, trees

**I-189-001**

Thank you for your comment. We have added noise monitoring sites in your area, including one near your home at 20039 12th Ave or 20041 12th Ave for use in the Final EIS analysis. The analysis considers topography, vegetation, and noise barriers; more specific details are given in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report for the Final EIS, which identifies mitigation by address. During final design, mitigation definitions will be further evaluated to ensure they achieve the noise reduction required to be below the impact threshold.

I-189-001 1 and things, some of the trees that will be removed, that I  
 2 think need to be taken into account with those. So my hope  
 3 is that the study would be repeated, a least with a couple  
 4 additional microphones, sort of in my neighborhood, to make  
 5 sure that the estimate of sound impact on the final EIS is  
 6 appropriate for the location.

I-189-002 7 All of -- the next issue is that the current draft  
 8 EIS identifies the visual impact of -- on my house, on my  
 9 property, as low. I take issue with that. All the designs  
 10 for the light rail have the track less than a hundred feet  
 11 from my property. They are elevated 25 feet above the I-5  
 12 offramp. Adding another 12 feet for the train, 5 to 10 feet  
 13 of superstructure indicates a structure three to four  
 14 stories high a hundred feet from my house. That's not a low  
 15 impact.

16 So I'd like to see a reevaluation of the visual  
 17 impact on my property. I'd like to get a good idea of how  
 18 many trees will remain as this will mitigate some of my  
 19 visual concerns. Currently, when I look out the window, I  
 20 just see filtered light through a bunch, you know, of  
 21 evergreens that definitely won't be there.

22 I'd like to see an artist's rendering on how the  
 23 track is expected to look from the neighborhoods,  
 24 specifically my neighborhood, as opposed to I-5, which  
 25 doesn't really impact people when they're driving by it at

**I-189-002**

The Final EIS includes an updated assessment of impacts of the elevated structure in your area, but the Draft EIS was not intended to define visual impacts parcel by parcel, but rather for larger areas or viewsheds. It is accurate that some locations, particularly those immediately near the facility, could have higher localized impacts. Mitigation measures could include replacement plantings, but clearing and visual impacts are likely unavoidable in some locations. Sound Transit's tree clearing policies for elevated light rail provide for clearing within 30 feet of the centerline of the structure, or about 15 feet from the edge of the structure. The Final EIS, Section 4.5.6, identifies visual impact mitigation measures for the project, but the detailed definition of plantings in specific locations would be accomplished during final design. Replacement trees would be considered where space was available, but likely would take time to mature to replace the screening.

I-189-002 60 miles an hour. Knowing the visual impact with an artist  
2 rendering from property is much more useful.

I-189-003 3 And finally, I'd like to see a consideration of  
4 keeping the train at ground level at that location. I think  
5 that would go a long way. And perhaps placing the track  
6 between the offramp where it splits from the main I-5, that  
7 is, moving it west about 20 feet, such that the track would  
8 cross the offramp 500 feet further south than is currently  
9 planned.

10 That's it. Thank you.

11 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

12 I don't have anyone else signed up to speak. But  
13 if there is someone who would like to address us, this would  
14 be a perfectly appropriate time. So is there anyone else  
15 who would like to speak tonight to us?

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

**I-189-003**

Sound Transit has reviewed your suggestions to consider whether they have the potential to avoid potential impacts near your property. As the light rail profile approaches the property from the south, it is coming out of a cut into the hillside adjacent to I-5. To lower the profile through this area would require cutting even further into the hillside. At about 800 feet south of the property, the existing ground drops about 40 feet. Traveling north, the ground continues to drop further as it becomes adjacent to wetlands and State Route 104. Heading north from there, the next major connection point is the elevated Montlake Terrace Transit Station at 236th St. SW. To maintain a light rail profile meeting established design criteria based on safety and efficiency and to minimize the most negative impacts through this area, an elevated structure maintaining a minimum height over the southern-most State Road 104 exit ramp is needed. The elevation has been refined for the Final EIS, and the visual impact information in this area was updated. Also, there are a number of design constraints that require maintaining the light rail alignment in the approximate location as shown in the Draft EIS and now in the Final EIS. Based on design guidelines for the use of the I-5 right-of-way between Sound Transit and WSDOT, the light rail project footprint is outside of an approximately 94 foot section reserved for the freeway and potential future improvements. The horizontal alignment is also constrained by a more narrow width of existing right-of-way between NE 185th St. to north of NE 195th St. To provide a horizontal design as shown in your Figure 2a-b, while still meeting the project's light rail design standards, would require further encroachment beyond the right-of-way and upon more properties and homes in this area. Therefore, Sound Transit is continuing to propose the Preferred Alternative design rather than your suggested alternative.

1 MR. CIRCEINIS: My name is Edvins Circenis. That's  
2 spelled, first name, E-D-V-I-N-S; last name,  
3 C-I-R-C-E-N-I-S. I live at 6834-40th Avenue Northeast in  
4 Seattle, ZIP code 98115.

I-190-001

I'm also a member of the Seattle Latvian Lutheran  
6 church. The church was built primarily by a volunteer  
7 workforce. And I provided, without compensation, the  
8 conceptual and detailed design drawings for the construction  
9 of this church. The Latvian Lutheran church has been  
10 notified, prior to the DEIS publication, that our property  
11 at 11710 Third Avenue Northeast has been identified as one  
12 that Sound Transit may need to partially or fully acquire in  
13 order to construct the project under one or more  
14 alternatives.

15 Recognizing the seriousness of how this project  
16 may impact the Latvian Lutheran church and North Seattle  
17 communities, I am proposing, for your consideration, an  
18 option that, when properly executed, will save a number of  
19 properties from acquisition in the vicinity of Northeast  
20 117th Street.

21 Looking at the satellite map, you will notice that  
22 the Latvian Lutheran church is right here and the freeway  
23 runs real close to our property. However, on the west side,  
24 there is a lot of room. So what I am proposing, to provide  
25 space for the needed Sound Transit, I'm proposing that

**I-190-001**

The Final EIS describes the results of additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE, which avoids the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained, although a portion of land on the edge of the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative and other at-grade alternatives. Elevated alternatives would also require a portion of the church property.

Please see Chapter 2, sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 for a description of the factors that led Sound Transit to place light rail east of I-5 rather than west of the freeway in this area.

I-190-001 | the -- that the I-5 be relocated as needed, to the west, and  
2 | the existing right-of-way as shown in my revised -- revised  
3 | map in there. I revised it a little bit and moved the lanes  
4 | to the west, and there still seems like maybe some room left  
5 | on the west side as well. So depends on how much space we  
6 | need. I don't think we need too much to do this.

7 | I know that it's easier to condemn private  
8 | property than it is to deal with federal government. But if  
9 | you feel in your heart that it is worth saving Latvian  
10 | Lutheran church, which is also a center for the Baltic  
11 | communities in the Northwest, I sincerely hope that the  
12 | Sound Transit board will give the alternative proposal its  
13 | utmost consideration.

14 | Thank you.

15 | MR. ROBERTS: Next person is Inte Wiest.

16 | ///

17 | ///

18 | ///

19 | ///

20 | ///

21 | ///

22 | ///

23 | ///

24 | ///

25 | ///

1 MS. FAULDS: I would.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Please.

3 MS. FAULDS: Good evening. My name is Phoebe  
4 Faulds. My last name is F-A-U-L-D-S. And my family's house  
5 is at 1008-190th Northeast in Shoreline, Washington.

I-191-001 | 6 And I see that the project is affecting not just  
7 my house, but the community around it. I see that it  
8 affects the community center here. It's just over at the  
9 station but -- at the stadium, but it will affect a lot more  
10 than just the ball field. It will affect the communities  
11 that are having programs here, from dance lessons to swim  
12 lessons. And this is one of the only places that you can  
13 get a scholarship to get those service in Shoreline. Many,  
14 many low-income families use these services because they  
15 would not get these services any other way.

16 If you change this up, they won't get these  
17 services. You say that you're doing this for low-income  
18 housing around the area. But if you add low-income housing  
19 without services to low-income people, then you lose  
20 community and you make it less safe.

21 Once you lose community, it's really hard to get  
22 it back. So I hope that you'll reconsider the area, make  
23 sure that you keep these services in place, and reconsider  
24 anything that you might be taking away from the community.

25 Thank you.

**I-191-001**

Thank you for your comment on community impacts associated with the proposed NE 185th Street light rail station. Throughout project planning, Sound Transit has worked to minimize impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods. Sound Transit recognizes the importance of maintaining the many community activities and services currently housed at the Shoreline School District property adjacent to the proposed transit station site. Property acquisition has been minimized to partial parcel acquisitions to preserve these community amenities. The impacts of Alternative A1 and the Preferred Alternative involves an edge of the stadium parking area and an auxiliary track. All of the existing programs and services would be able to continue operation at the stadium and the school district site. See Section 3.4.17 for more details.

1 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.  
2 Is there anyone else that would like to address us  
3 tonight?  
4 Yes, please.  
5 ///  
6 ///  
7 ///  
8 ///  
9 ///  
10 ///  
11 ///  
12 ///  
13 ///  
14 ///  
15 ///  
16 ///  
17 ///  
18 ///  
19 ///  
20 ///  
21 ///  
22 ///  
23 ///  
24 ///  
25 ///

1 MR. JACOBY: Good evening. My name is Dan Jacoby,  
2 J-A-C-O-B-Y. I'm at 1243 North 160th Street.

3 I want to talk about, kind of, the future. And as  
4 you continue to plan, this is going to become more and more  
5 important. And that is, I straddle two generations, the  
6 baby boom, Gen X. I notice big differences between the two.  
7 And you look at the next generations, and you see even more  
8 big differences that impact, directly, what we're doing  
9 here.

10 The younger generations, it -- to me, the car was  
11 a status symbol. When I was in high school, getting a car  
12 was a big deal. Nowadays, kids don't really care so much.  
13 They'll ride mass transit. And the reason that that's more  
14 important is they got a lot of more of these gadgets,  
15 iPhones, smart phones, tablets, you name it.

16 To them, driving a car to work, to go home, to go  
17 out, they become disconnected. And they don't like that  
18 very much. If they ride the bus, if they ride the train,  
19 they can stay connected. And to them, even if it's a longer  
20 trip, it's still a better move.

21 I-192-001 | When you're planning this, I think you can look  
22 at -- and especially, this will become important when Metro  
23 gets involved in terms of their bus lines -- making sure  
24 that there is plenty of connection via mass transit. I  
25 don't think you're going to need as many parking spaces as

**I-192-001**

While parking is an element of the access plans for the stations, Sound Transit anticipates that most patrons will arrive by connecting transit, walking, and biking. The alternatives under consideration provide additional parking for transit users compared to today. They were sized based on estimates of demand, which also account for an increased demand for travel using other modes to reach stations, including connecting transit. This also reflects Sound Transit Board direction, consistent with their adopted System Access Policy.



I-192-001 | you might think because I think you're going to find a lot  
2 | of people, especially the younger people, are not going to  
3 | take the car to the train; they're going to take the bus to  
4 | the train, if only there's a bus available.

5 |           This will help a lot. You know, he was talking  
6 | about footprint. This could reduce footprint if you don't  
7 | need as many parking spaces. But I think, also, it looks at  
8 | not just the light rail, but what's next after that.

I-192-002 |           I'll tell you, if I wanted to make a gazillion  
10 | dollars and I were an engineer, right now, I'd design buses  
11 | and I'd design train cars where there's some way for a  
12 | person getting into the bus or getting into the train to  
13 | have a table top or something they can put their tablet on  
14 | and continue to work. Because people are going to be  
15 | showing up to work at ten o'clock, and they're going to be  
16 | leaving at four. But they're going to be at work from nine  
17 | to five because they're going to be on your train, and  
18 | they're going to be on the buses.

19 |           So it's just something to think about as you go on  
20 | and -- and, you know, start to solidify your plan, that  
21 | you're going to see a greater demand for mass transit and a  
22 | lower demand for cars as this goes on.

23 |           Thank you very much.

24 |           MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

25 |           Next, Michael Cameron.

**I-192-002**

Thank you for your comment. Sound Transit will be working with local transit operators to develop refined transit service plans as the project nears operation.

1 MR. PETERSONS: Thanks, Paul. I've got to make  
2 this quick because I've got to go to birthing classes with  
3 my wife.

4 Hello. My name is Lukas Petersons. I am a member  
5 of the Seattle -- oh, should I start with my name and stuff?  
6 Sorry.

7 Lukas Petersons, L-U-K-A-S, P-E-T-E-R-S-O-N-S. I  
8 reside at 3009 North 130th Street, Unit 1201. And I  
9 represent the Latvian Lutheran church and center located at  
10 117th and Third Avenue Northeast.

11 All right. So I'm a member of the Seattle Latvian  
12 community. And my parents are the caretakers of the Latvian  
13 church and community center, and they have been for the past  
14 20-plus years.

**I-193-001**  
15 Sound Transit's DEIS is proposing to run the North  
16 Link extension through our church's property, and a couple  
17 other alternatives are calling to eliminate our center  
18 altogether.

19 I wanted to speak on record to explain how much  
20 this church and community center means to myself and our  
21 greater Latvian community.

22 First, our church and community center serves as  
23 a living family tree. Our Seattle Latvian community's  
24 family tree is not only something replicated on a piece of  
25 paper. It is a living, breathing part of this community.

**I-193-001**

Thank you for your comments describing the cultural importance of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church. The Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS and all other alternatives now avoid displacing the church or church hall. The Final EIS describes the primary modifications for these alternatives in Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered.

I-193-001 | The center provides a gathering place for Latvian children,  
2 | teens, adults, and seniors alike. It is a place that is so  
3 | important to our community and Latvian families. It is a  
4 | family tree that cannot and, please, will not be uprooted.

5 |         Second, the DEIS understates the significance and  
6 | importance of our church and community center. The service  
7 | serves -- the center serves our Latvian community as a  
8 | church, a gathering place, a school, and a facility to many  
9 | Latvian community groups that exist in our state and also  
10 | along the West Coast. In addition, it also serves as a  
11 | gathering place for other Seattle Baltic communities,  
12 | including the Lithuanians and the Estonians.

13 |         Now I'd like to speak on a couple items that are  
14 | important to me in the church. I moved here when I was  
15 | 8 years old, from Alaska, and my parents were asked to  
16 | caretake the church. And one of the alternatives in the  
17 | DEIS is basically going to tear down my childhood home along  
18 | with the entrance to our church, so we would have no way to  
19 | get in or out of our church.

20 |         Second, I also attended the Latvian school. I  
21 | graduated there. And I really feel that preserving our  
22 | cultural being is very important to us and the future  
23 | generations. As I said, my wife's pregnant, and I would  
24 | really love for my baby girl to be able to go to Latvian  
25 | school and be able to folk dance and sing. And without the

I-193-001 center there, that won't be possible.

2 I graduated from the Latvian school. I taught the  
3 4- and 5-year-olds there for four years. I folk danced in  
4 the Latvian troupe for over seven years and all our  
5 practices are held there at the center.

6 I have participated in many things there,  
7 volunteering at our annual Latvian rummage sale -- which is  
8 a huge success, and a lot of Seattle residents like that --  
9 and along with our annual Christmas bazaar.

10 So in conclusion, I'd like to say that the Seattle  
11 Latvian Lutheran church and community center is and has been  
12 an important part of my life. It is a place that was  
13 designed, built, maintained, and loved by Latvians. It has  
14 helped shape my life and serves as a symbol of strength to  
15 all of us. Our community strongly stands together to  
16 protect the heart of our community.

17 Thank you, and I appreciate your time.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. Thank you. Lucas, if  
19 you have to get up and leave, we won't take it personally.

20 MR. PETERSONS: Thank you.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Next, we have Gunars Sreibers.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1 MR. RAISTERS: My name is Eric Raisters. That's  
 2 E-R-I-C, last name is R-A-I-S-T-E-R-S. And I reside at  
 3 10507-64th Place West in Mukilteo. I'm also the  
 4 vice-president of the Latvian Lutheran Evangelical church.  
 5 I dance folk dance with the Latvian community. I've sung in  
 6 the choir. And I've put two sons through that school.

7 That said, I voted for all the Sound Transit  
 8 measures. And now I am a daily user of the Sounder North  
 9 Line train to get to work every day. So I do support mass  
 10 transit. I'm not against mass transit. I think it's a  
 11 great idea. And I will continue to support mass transit  
 12 where it makes both fiscal and traffic engineering sense.

**I-194-001** 13 But I am commenting with regard to the effect that  
 14 the -- all of the eight options will have on the Latvian  
 15 church community center that's located just north of  
 16 Northgate. It's interesting to see that in the other two  
 17 sections, the B and C sections of the line, commenters were  
 18 given multiple options on the route that the tracks would  
 19 take.

20 In the A section, the only spatial difference  
 21 between all of the options for the Latvian center is about  
 22 6 feet spatially. That's not much.

23 Apparently all of the other spacial options were  
 24 apparently eliminated by the Sound Transit board in the fall  
 25 of 2011 with no consultation or opportunity to comment by

**I-194-001**

Following the Draft EIS, the Sound Transit Board directed Sound Transit to develop a Preferred Alternative that would avoid displacing the church. The Final EIS describes the additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE and avoid the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained, although a portion of land on the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative and other at-grade alternatives. Elevated alternatives would also require a portion of the church property.

Several sections in the Final EIS have been updated to address these changes: Section 2.5.1 describes the Preferred Alternative and the refinements in other alternatives for Segment A; Section 4.1 describes the acquisition impacts; Section 4.4 describes impacts to community facilities and neighborhoods. In addition, Appendix F presents revised conceptual engineering plans for the refined Segment A alternatives; Appendix I-4.1 contains detailed maps and tables concerning acquisition, displacement, and relocation requirements for each Segment A alternative, and Appendix G has visual simulations.

As noted in Section 4.1, any acquisition of property, including a portion of a property, would require fair compensation to the property owner in accordance with Sound Transit policy and federal and state law.

I-194-001 | the owners of the center.

2 |           This means that either the property will be  
3 | completely taken or, at best, severe limitations on access  
4 | and severe impacts to the use of the property will occur  
5 | unless Sound Transit can come up with acceptable  
6 | mitigations.

7 |           As has been stated by many other commenters -- I'm  
8 | not going to repeat a lot of this stuff -- this is a unique  
9 | and culturally-significant facility. And the next closest  
10 | similar centers in the United States are in San Francisco  
11 | and Los Angeles. In Canada, it's Toronto. So we're a long  
12 | distance away. We're covering a lot of territory.

I-194-002 |           I wonder if we would even be here commenting on  
14 | this if the church belonged to a protected minority. There  
15 | are probably less than ten million speakers of the three  
16 | Baltic languages worldwide, and less than a million of those  
17 | are in the U.S. But we're not offered the protections of  
18 | the other protected minorities.

19 |           Finally, as a scientist by education and an  
20 | engineer by profession, I avoid making decisions when facts  
21 | and data are not known to me. In the four public meetings  
22 | that Sound Transit has held so far for the comments -- and  
23 | I've attended all four of them -- only three of the 17 Sound  
24 | Transit voting board members who will be making the decision  
25 | on the preferred route were present. And I would like to

**I-194-002**

The Sound Transit public outreach activities leading up to the publication of the Draft EIS did alert members of the Latvian and Baltic populations of the proposed alternatives for the Lynnwood Link Extension project and community members did become involved. Chapter 6 describes the public outreach for the project.

Although many of the Sound Transit Board did not attend the public meetings, the Sound Transit staff who did attend regularly, and who are the ones who interact most closely with concerned citizens, update the Board on the pertinent issues that should be considered on a regular basis. The Board was given the Draft EIS comments before they identified the Preferred Alternative and gave direction to modify all the Segment A alternatives so that none would require the displacement of the facility. Please find the updated description of the Segment A alternatives in the Final EIS Chapter 2, Alternatives Considered.

I-194-002

thank Councilman Roberts, Mayor Earling, and Snohomish  
County Executive Lovick for attending those sessions.  
Nobody from King County was there, nobody from the City of  
Seattle who represents our center.

This is less than a quarter of the board who have  
gathered the facts and the data required to make an  
intelligent decision. I hope, but have serious  
reservations, that the remaining members of the board will  
spend the necessary time to familiarize themselves with the  
probably hundreds of pages of comments and testimony so that  
they can also make an informed and intelligent decision.  
Sadly, the track record for this point for Sound Transit  
probably doesn't indicate that.

Finally, if the taking of the Latvian church  
should come to pass, the Sound Transit board will have the  
dubious distinction of matching what the Soviet Union did to  
the Baltic people, taking our land away twice, this time by  
the government of the land of the free and the home of  
brave.

Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

Is there anyone who else wishes to address us  
tonight for the hearing? Anyone else?

Well, then I want to thank all of you for your  
comments. I want to let you know -- find my little notes

1 MR. RALSTON: Hello. My name is Kenneth Ralston,  
2 R-A-L-S-T-O-N. And my concern is more a private-property  
3 ownership.

4 MR. ROBERTS: And your address?

5 MR. RALSTON: 18313 Seventh Avenue Northeast.

6 My property butts right up against Fifth Avenue  
7 and then the freeway, so the train would go right behind us.  
8 And so there is a big concern -- there was a big concern  
9 until we started talking to Sound Transit officials who -- I  
10 don't remember the gentleman's name that my wife talked to.  
11 And I'm certainly not as well-prepared as these folks. But  
12 we've lived there a long time and got our house paid off and  
13 want to retire there and stay there.

I-195-001

14 Our concern was, how big is the footprint? And  
15 where we sit, back on the plat of properties that will be  
16 annexed, apparently, even the worst-case scenario, only the  
17 back portion of our property will be taken up.

18 I've have talked to a neighbor, and he says that  
19 if they -- one of the scenarios, if they bring the train  
20 from elevated level down to street level egress, that his  
21 property will be boxed in. He won't be able to get out of  
22 his property. We suggested that they were not aware --  
23 they, being the officials -- aware that there's an easement  
24 that goes through our properties, one of my neighbors.

25 And so my proposal or suggestion is for people to

**I-195-001**

At this stage in project planning, the property impacts are estimates and use map-based parcel information. Detailed land surveys and property assessments would be conducted during final design and subsequent real estate transactions. However, the project staff have conducted multiple field visits and surveys as part of the design and environmental process.

If access to a property is lost due to the project, that property becomes a full acquisition because Sound Transit cannot leave a property owner with no access to their property. That is one factor considered when the agency determines what type of acquisition (full or partial) is needed.



**I-195-001** | come out there and take a physical look at the properties a  
2 | lot -- a lot stronger than they have. When you're doing an  
3 | environmental study, you really need to come out and look at  
4 | the property a little bit better.

5 |           Our property, for instance, we're -- we've got it  
6 | registered as a wildlife sanctuary and planting, you know,  
7 | natural flora, like it was a hundred years ago. We're  
8 | moving back and back and trying to get rid of all the  
9 | blackberries that we haven't taken out.

**I-195-002** |           So the worst-case scenario that we were cited with  
11 | was ground-level parking would -- and then I also heard  
12 | about bringing the train to street level would force  
13 | construction in such a fact -- manner that they would have  
14 | to reconfigure Fifth Avenue that goes behind our property.  
15 | And I don't support that configuration. That would be on  
16 | ground-level parking that was spread out and take a lot of  
17 | real estate.

18 |           So also, I am a supporter of the project. I am a  
19 | supporter of light rail. It's been a long time coming,  
20 | needs to happen. But again, like the gentleman said,  
21 | reevaluation of how the land is configured and what you need  
22 | to take as a footprint should have a lot of physical, you  
23 | know, study. Come out and look at those properties.

24 |           This is all relative to the 185th Street station,  
25 | by the way. I don't think I mentioned that.

**I-195-002**

Thank you for your comment stating your overall support for the Lynnwood Link Extension project and your concerns about potential adverse effects of station parking and reconfiguration of Fifth Avenue NE. Please see the updated conceptual design drawings in Appendix F. The Preferred Alternative would realign Fifth Avenue, but it does not feature ground level parking.

1           So anyway, that's pretty much all I have to say.

2           Thank you for your time.

3           MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

4           I think this is a good opportunity to remind and  
5 repeat that staff will be here until eight o'clock. I think  
6 the -- for instance, the concerns that Mr. Ralston raised  
7 would be good concerns to make sure -- and I suspect you  
8 already have -- to be talking with the staff about those.

9           So I invite, at any point following our testimony,  
10 you to please raise these concerns with the staff and have  
11 dialogue there as well. Next is Dan Jacoby.

12        ///  
13        ///  
14        ///  
15        ///  
16        ///  
17        ///  
18        ///  
19        ///  
20        ///  
21        ///  
22        ///  
23        ///  
24        ///  
25        ///

1 MR. SREIBERS: My name is Gunars Sreibers. That's  
2 G-U-N-A-R-S, S-R-E-I-B-E-R-S. And I'm representing the  
3 Latvian Lutheran church and community center at 11710 Third  
4 Avenue Northeast.

I-196-001

Well, here we are at Workshop 4 here --  
6 Workshop 4, Hearing 4 for this project. I've attended every  
7 one of those workshops, every one of these hearings and made  
8 comments at every one of these. I think it's noteworthy  
9 that if you look at the attendance sheets for these last  
10 four open houses and workshops that it has had a large  
11 participation by members of the Baltic community, if you  
12 look at the names on that list.

13 Many have already commented on this project as  
14 part of this process, but many more are going to comment  
15 before the end of this period -- comment period. This  
16 project is -- really cuts at the heart of the Baltic  
17 community and Latvian community here the Seattle -- Pacific  
18 Northwest.

19 I think it's also important to note that if you  
20 look at the attention at the open houses, it was primarily  
21 Baltic people. But also we had an informational meeting,  
22 before these open houses even happened, at the Baltic -- at  
23 the Latvian center. Over 200 people attended that  
24 information session, and that was on short notice in the  
25 middle of summertime when people were on vacation. In fact,

**I-196-001**

Following the Draft EIS, the Sound Transit Board directed Sound Transit to develop a Preferred Alternative that would avoid displacing the church. The Final EIS describes the results of additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE and avoid the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained, although a portion of land on the edge of the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative and other at-grade alternatives. Elevated alternatives would also require a portion of the church property.

1 a large part of the community was in Latvia celebrating a  
2 national celebration there. So there is a big deal and has  
3 gotten the attention of all of us.

4 The church and the center are extremely important  
5 the us both culturally and socially. We think that it  
6 should also be important to sound transit.

7 We're extremely disappointed, obviously, that the  
8 draft EIS failed to acknowledge the social and cultural  
9 aspects of our church and our center and its role here in  
10 the Pacific Northwest.

I-196-001

11 I think there's one other thing I'd like to make  
12 clear, we do not oppose this project. We -- if you talk to  
13 members of our community, we're very supportive of the light  
14 rail project and really feel that it's a project that needs  
15 to be built. We just strongly believe that any option  
16 selected can be modified in such a manner that the Latvian  
17 center can continue to function during construction and  
18 continue to function in its current location after  
19 construction. We truly believe that's the case if people  
20 are willing to look at options creatively.

21 I also want to remind folks -- and this is very  
22 ingrained in our community -- the fact that we have been  
23 subjected to eminent domain, the taking of our property,  
24 once before. We had to rebuild this center once before. We  
25 do not feel that it is fair to be subjected to that one more

I-196-001

time again. We just want to exist at our current location  
and continue to do what we're doing right now, support the  
light rail project. Anything else short of allowing us to  
exist at our current location, continue to exist as a  
cultural hub and a social hub for the Baltic communities  
here in the Northwest would just be unacceptable to us.

Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Gunars.

Next, I have Edvins Circenis. And if I -- I'm  
sure that name will sound better when you say it and spell  
it than what I just did to it.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

1 MS. WIEST: Inte.  
 2 MR. ROBERTS: Inte.  
 3 MS. WIEST: And actually, it's Wiest.  
 4 My name is Inte Wiest, I-N-T-E, W-I-E-S-T. I live  
 5 at 2030-151st Place Southwest, Lynnwood, Washington. I also  
 6 am a member of the Latvian Lutheran church and Latvian  
 7 community. I'm the vice president of the Latvian  
 8 Association of the State of Washington and the secretary of  
 9 the Ladies League of the Latvian Lutheran church and the  
 10 assistant librarian at the library at our center.

11 Along with Edvins and many other Latvians, my  
 12 father and brother, who, by the way, lived in Shoreline,  
 13 worked many, many hours to help build this church on  
 14 evenings, after work, on weekends.

I-197-001

15 I cannot begin to tell you how important this  
 16 center is to me personally and to the whole Latvian  
 17 community and to many, many members of the Estonian and  
 18 Lithuanian communities as well.

19 People of all ages from prekindergarten children  
 20 who study at the Saturday school to pensioners who attend  
 21 services at the church and meet regularly at the center for  
 22 lunch and cultural programs, the young people who practice  
 23 folk dancing and give performances there, and people of all  
 24 ages singing in the choir, this is a vital place. Much of  
 25 our time away from our work and duties at home is spent at

**I-197-001**

Thank you for your concerns about the potential displacement or relocation of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and for highlighting its significance to the region's Baltic community. Following the Draft EIS, the Sound Transit Board directed Sound Transit to develop a Preferred Alternative that would avoid displacing the church. The Final EIS describes the additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE and avoid the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained.

I-197-001 center. It is a vital part of our existence and defines who  
2 we are as Latvian Americans.

3 If we lose our church and community center a  
4 second time, we lose part of ourselves. We need to find a  
5 solution that lets us keep our church and community center  
6 and allows Sound Transit to build the rail line to Lynnwood.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. ROBERTS: Dave Earling is going to pick up the  
9 map so that we can provide them.

10 The next person listed to speak is Kenneth  
11 Ralston.

12 ///

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

I-198-001

1 MR. DOLAN: My name is Chuck Dolan,  
2 D-O-L-A-N. I live at 1220 Northeast 97th Street,  
3 Seattle, Washington, 98115. I'm here as the membership  
4 vice president of Horton Creek Alliance, and I'd like  
5 Horton Creek Alliance to become a party of record for any  
6 further communications on Section A and alternative  
7 thereof.

8 A couple things I'd like to say is basically I'd  
9 like to have the comment period extended. I think it's a  
10 little bit brief for the massiveness of the document  
11 considering I didn't really even know it had been  
12 released until I saw notice of this meeting late last  
13 week.

14 So I think extending the comment period for the DEIS  
15 would be appropriate. And at this time, I think that's  
16 all I'd like to say at this point. Thank you.

17 MR. LOVICK: Thank you.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**I-198-001**

Sound Transit does not have a party of record designation for those interested in the project. Your address has been added to the project's mailing list, per this request. The public comment period for the Draft EIS was for an extended period of 60 days (45 days are required) from July 26, 2013 to September 23, 2013 to allow greater opportunity for public comment.



1 MR. LOVICK: The next person is Imants  
 2 Holmquist. Come forward, please.  
 3 MR. HOLMQUIST: My name is Imants Holmquist.  
 4 That's I-M-A-N-T-S, H-O-L-M-Q-U-I-S-T. I live at 1712  
 5 44th Avenue Southwest, Seattle, Washington, 98116.  
 6 I'm a member of the Latvian community. I attended  
 7 the Latvian School there for about 10 years in the '80s.  
 8 My grandmother is here. She left Latvian in 1941.  
 9 I was a member on the National Latvian Youth  
 10 Association's Board. We met regularly at the Latvian  
 11 Center here at the Lutheran Church.

**I-199-001** I just want to express that the regional and  
 13 cultural significance of the church is something that is  
 14 invaluable, not just to Seattle, but also regionally and  
 15 nationally.

**I-199-002** Many of the people tonight that will express  
 17 comments will start to talk about some of the impacts  
 18 it's had on the West Coast affiliations with the  
 19 Latvians, and some of the impacts that the track would  
 20 bring would be noise, of course.  
 21 It's a church. It's also a school. I have a 2- and  
 22 4-year-old, two daughters who attend the Latvian School  
 23 every Saturday, and I'd like for them to be able to hear  
 24 their classroom instruction. It'd be great if when they  
 25 join the choir or join the dance group, they could

**I-199-001**

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

**I-199-002**

The noise analysis for the Lynnwood Link uses the FTA impact criteria and Sound Transit mitigates noise impacts to levels below these criteria. Sound Transit's policy is to mitigate moderate or severe impacts as per FTA criteria. Potential mitigation measures for noise are described in Section 4.7.7 of the Final EIS.

The church was considered a noise-sensitive property, and the residences around the church are also noise-sensitive. For this reason, sound walls are planned for all alternatives in this area, either at-grade or elevated, as mitigation for the light rail impacts. In addition, any existing WSDOT noise walls removed as part of the project will be replaced.

I-199-002 1 actually hear those activities as I did and as  
2 generations before did.

I-199-003 3 There's an issue about ingress and egress that I  
4 think needs to be worked around. I'd like it if the  
5 committees and powers that be took a look at alternatives  
6 to making it a viable route that preserves the Latvian  
7 Community Center in its present state and allows for  
8 continued use, whatever mitigation is required and  
9 regardless of tracks you put in there, whether that will  
10 be requiring additional property for ingress and egress  
11 or installing different remediations and sound mitigation  
12 strategies.

I-199-004 13 There isn't a way to express what this means to me,  
14 and I think several other people here tonight will  
15 express this as well, having watched our ancestors leave  
16 Latvia under duress and come here and build a community  
17 center in the '60s that was also taken for a park.

18 And now watching this process, we're eager to  
19 cooperate, but we're also very eager to keep our  
20 traditions, our heritage, and what is a great asset to  
21 not only the city of Seattle, but the Northwest and this  
22 country. Thank you.  
23  
24  
25

**I-199-003**

Following the Draft EIS, the Sound Transit Board directed Sound Transit to develop a Preferred Alternative that would avoid displacing the church. The Final EIS describes the results of additional engineering Sound Transit undertook to realign 3rd Avenue NE and avoid the potential displacement of the church. As a result, none of the Segment A alternatives evaluated in the Final EIS would displace the church or the church hall. With the realigned street, access to the property has been maintained, although a portion of land on the edge of the church property would be acquired for the Preferred Alternative and other at-grade alternatives. Elevated alternatives would also require a portion of the church property.

**I-199-004**

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