

Appendix O

Draft EIS Comment Summary and Response to Comments

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix O. Draft EIS Comment Summary and Responses to Comments

This appendix includes a summary of all comments received on the WSBLE Draft EIS during the WSBLE Draft EIS comment period (January 28, 2022 to April 28, 2022), full comment submittals received that pertain specifically to the West Seattle Link Extension or to both West Seattle Link Extension and Ballard Link Extension, and responses to those comments. Comments that pertain to both the West Seattle Link Extension and Ballard Link Extension will also be addressed in the Ballard Link Extension environmental review process. Comments specific to the Ballard Link Extension will be responded to as part of the environmental review process for the Ballard Link Extension Project.

Appendix O.1 provides a summary of all comments received on the WSBLE Draft EIS. This summary was prepared and published in May 2022 following the public comment period.

Appendix O.2 contains comment submittals that are specific to the West Seattle Link Extension or that are project-wide (as described above) and responses to comments contained in these submittals. For viewing electronically, each PDF file has bookmarks that can be used to find a specific submittal. For agencies, businesses, and organizations, the bookmarks are for the name of the entity. For individuals, the bookmarks are for the form letter name or comment submittal number.

The comment submittals are organized into the following categories:

- Appendix O.2.1, Tribes and Tribal Organizations
- Appendix O.2.2, Agencies and Elected Officials. These are separated into the following sub-categories:
 - Federal agencies
 - State agencies
 - Regional agencies
 - County agencies
 - Local agencies, commissions, boards, or elected official submittals.
- Appendix O.2.3, Businesses and Business Organizations
- Appendix O.2.4, Community and Arts Organizations
- Appendix O.2.5, Individuals. These are separated into the following subcategories:
 - Form letters: Form Letters are letters for which at least 10 identical or near-identical comment submittals were received. The comments within these letters are summarized in a table as a representative submittal, along with corresponding responses. The table is then followed by a list of all parties that submitted that form letter in order of receipt and copies of their comment submittals.
 - Individuals: Comment submittals from individuals that did not fall into any of the above categories are grouped into 11 volumes of approximately 100 letters each. These submittals are provided in order of date received. Each volume has letters provided in numeric order by submittal number. For example, Volume 1 contains letters 0001 through 0100. An index is provided at the beginning of this section (Section O.2.5) that is organized alphabetically by commenter last name and can be used to find the individual submittal(s) and the corresponding unique submittal number (assigned by date) and volume number. Once the volume and submittal number are identified for a given submittal, the commenter can then look in that volume for their comment submittal and responses to their comments.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix O.1
WSBLE Draft EIS Comment Summary

This page is intentionally left blank.

West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions Public and Agency Comment Summary Report

June 2022

Sound Transit

This page is intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes comments received by Sound Transit and the Federal Transit Administration on the West Seattle and Ballard Link Extension Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS). Almost 5,200 communications were received on the Draft EIS, including comments from Tribes and Tribal organizations, government agencies, elected officials, businesses and business organizations, community and arts organizations, and individual members of the public. All of the comments received are appended to this report and are arranged by these categories.

This executive summary provides an overview of the report structure as well as common themes for each overall extension and each segment.

The summary report is organized into three sections:

Section 1 of the report provides an overview of the project and the Draft EIS comment period.

Section 2 of the report summarizes the comments received from the following:

- Tribes and tribal organizations
- Government agencies
- Elected officials
- General Public (includes businesses and business organizations, community and arts organizations, and individuals)

These comments are arranged by those pertaining to the entire project, and then by project segment. Comments for businesses, business organizations, and community and arts organizations are summarized for each business or organization. Comments from individuals are summarized by segment as well as the following groupings:

- Environmental Concerns (arranged by element of the environment: acquisitions and displacements, air, noise and vibration, water, etc.)
- Other categories that are more general and not specific to an extension or segment
- Suggestions for other alternatives

Late comments received after the close of the 90-day comment period are also noted.

Section 3 of the report describes the public involvement process Sound Transit used to engage the public in the comment process, including the following:

- Engagement approach
- Engagement tools and resources
- Draft EIS publication and distribution
- Engagement activities

It also describes ongoing consultation with Tribes and coordination with federal, state, and local agencies.

The information in this report and the comments received will be considered by the Sound Transit Board as it works to identify a preferred alternative for each of the project segments. In some segments, the Board may confirm or modify the preferred alternative identified in the Draft EIS. In other segments the Board will identify a preferred alternative for the first time. The Final EIS will analyze the preferred alternative in all segments along with the other proposed light rail alternatives and the No Build Alternative. The Final EIS will also include responses to the comments on the Draft EIS. Following issuance of the Final EIS, the Sound Transit Board will make a final decision on the alignment and station locations to be built for the West Seattle Link and Ballard Link extensions.

ES.1 Draft EIS Comment Period

A Notice of Availability for the West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions Draft EIS was published in the *Federal Register* and in the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Register on January 28, 2022. The comment period for the Draft EIS was 90 days and ended on April 28, 2022. Public notification was provided through a variety of methods including project mailers; project update emails; traditional, social, and in-language ethnic media; press releases; radio; social media posts; online community calendars; and a notification through the project website. Sound Transit also displayed posters at community gathering places throughout the project area. Hard copies of the Draft EIS were available for public viewing at public libraries and community-based organizations in the project area. Digital copies of the Draft EIS were available on Sound Transit's website and Online Open House website.

One in-person public open house event and four virtual public meetings were conducted during the 90-day comment period. The virtual meetings included public hearings. An Online Open House website was accessible for the duration of the comment period and included the Draft EIS as well as the information shared at the virtual and in-person events. Comments were accepted by mail, email, online and hard copy comment forms, and transcribed phone messages, and via a court reporter at the in-person open house and virtual hearings. Comments provided in languages other than English were translated.

Over 400 people attended the four virtual public meetings/hearings and there were over 19,500 unique views on the Online Open House website during the comment period. Sound Transit received almost 5,200 individual communications (where each communication may contain one or more comments) in various formats. Many letters were received in support of comments made by specific organizations, including The Urbanist, the Cascade Bicycle Club, and the Magnolia Community Council. In the Chinatown-International District Segment, numerous comments supported the letter submitted by the Wing Luke Museum as well as expressed support for some specific businesses in the neighborhood. Many other comments were submitted in support of specific potentially impacted businesses and organizations in other segments as well. These included BladeGallery in the Duwamish Segment, Alki Beach Academy and Transitional Resources in the Delridge Segment, the Civic Hotel in the Downtown Segment, and Dusty Strings and the Ballard Food Bank in the Interbay/Ballard Segment. Online petitions were also submitted in support of a gondola in West Seattle (about 1,500 signatures) and in support of the 4th Avenue South alternatives in the Chinatown-International District Segment (over 700 signatures).

ES.2 West Seattle Link Extension

Frequent common themes for the overall West Seattle Link Extension included the following:

- Concern about property acquisitions, displacements, noise and vibration, and construction period roadway closures.
- Concern about potential road closures associated with the project adding to business impact from closure of the West Seattle Bridge.
- Building a gondola instead of light rail to reduce cost, shorten the project schedule, minimize greenhouse gas emissions, and minimize impacts.

The following sections further summarize the major comment themes by project segment.

ES.2.1 SODO Segment

- Similar support from individuals for at-grade and mixed profile alternatives. Support for Alternative SODO-2 was mostly related to preserving the SODO Busway.
- Support from businesses and business organizations for Alternative SODO-1b to have SODO Station closer to South Lander Street.
- Interest in avoiding the United States Postal Service Carrier Annex and Distribution Center/Terminal Post office at 4th Avenue South and South Lander Street.
- Concern about freight access and mobility, maintaining the SODO Trail, and stadium event traffic during construction.
- Concern about property acquisition and business displacements.

ES.2.2 Duwamish Segment

- Support from individuals for Alternative DUW-2 to avoid or minimize residential and employee displacements and impacts to the West Duwamish Greenbelt (including impacts to herons) from Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b.
- Support from Port of Seattle, Northwest Seaport Alliance, and most businesses and business organizations for Preferred Alternative DUW-1a or Option DUW-1b due to reduced impacts on port, marine, and industrial facilities along Alternative DUW-2.
- Concern about impacts to the West Duwamish Greenbelt from Preferred Alternative DUW-1a or Option DUW-1b and Terminal 25 planned restoration site from Alternative DUW-2.
- Concern about direct and indirect impacts on the maritime industrial sector from business displacements and freight movement.
- Concern about maintaining bike trail connections during construction.

ES.2.3 Delridge Segment

- General support for lower height alternatives that would lead to tunnels in the West Seattle Junction Segment to minimize neighborhood impacts.
- Opposition to tall guideway structures that feel out of character with the existing neighborhood context and would result in visual and noise impacts.
- Most support for Alternative DEL-6 to reduce residential displacements and visual impact to the Youngstown neighborhood.
- Opposition to Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6, particularly due to displacement of one or more Transitional Resources facilities and Alki Beach Academy. Other reasons provided include residential displacements, access to residences after construction, neighborhood impacts, construction impacts, and impacts to greenbelts and wetlands.
- Concern about freight traffic and station access near Nucor Steel for Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6.
- Opposition to residential displacements, especially on the north side of Southwest Genesee Street and along 32nd Avenue Southwest.
- Concern about overall loss of affordable housing in this area.
- Concern about impacts to the West Seattle Golf Course.
- Concern about impacts to Longfellow Creek.
- The need for efficient, easy transfers to/from buses, especially for low-income and minority populations connecting from the south.
- Support for equitable transit-oriented development (TOD) at the Delridge Station, regardless of alternative.

ES.2.4 West Seattle Junction Segment

- General support for tunnel alternatives to minimize neighborhood impacts.
- Interest in station locations closer to Alaska Junction.
- Some support for removing Avalon Station to save cost.
- Concern about residential displacements, especially removal of new multi-family buildings with elevated alternatives.
- Concern about impacts to businesses and planned development during construction.
- Desire that designs consider future extensions to the south.

ES.3 Ballard Link Extension

Frequent common themes for the overall Ballard Link Extension included:

- Concern about property acquisitions, displacements, noise and vibration, and construction period roadway closures.
- Concern about station access and multi-modal connections.

The following sections further summarize the major comment themes by project segment.

ES.3.1 Chinatown-International District Segment

- Support from individuals, community organizations, and some businesses for the 4th Avenue South alternatives and/or opposition to the 5th Avenue South alternatives primarily due to business displacements and construction impacts to the Chinatown-International District neighborhood.
- Support from individuals, community organizations, and some businesses for the 4th Avenue South alternatives station location because it would be closer to King Street Station and Pioneer Square.
- Support for a shallow tunnel station and many requests for the station to be made shallower.
- Some opposition to all the alternatives or to the project in the Chinatown-International District.
- Concern about direct, indirect, and cumulative neighborhood, community, and economic impacts. Concern about past harm to the Chinatown-International District community and minimizing impacts to communities of color and low-income populations.
- Concern about constructability and feasibility challenges of 4th Avenue South alternatives from some businesses.
- Support for improving connectivity between the Chinatown-International District and Pioneer Square neighborhoods and interest in re-activating Union Station and plaza.
- Concern about surge events from stadiums and community events.
- Concern about roadway closures, detours, transit impacts, and pedestrian circulation during construction.
- Interest in historic and cultural preservation.
- Interest in meaningful engagement on mitigation.

ES.3.2 Downtown Segment

- Support by individuals for Preferred Alternative DT-1 primarily because of station location.
- Support for the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Midtown and Westlake station locations because they are closer to key destinations.

- Support from multiple businesses for the Alternative DT-2 Denny Station and Preferred Alternative DT-1 South Lake Union Station in South Lake Union neighborhood. Support for the Alternative DT-2 Denny Station was primarily related to the interest in avoiding closure of Westlake Avenue during construction.
- Support from some agencies and organizations for the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Denny Station. Support for the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Denny Station was primarily due to better multi-modal access and proximity to key destinations.
- Concern about streetcar/bus effects during construction on Westlake Avenue for Denny Station with Preferred Alternative DT-1.
- Support from individuals for a more centrally located South Lake Union Station.
- Concern about impacts to arts organizations at the Seattle Center and support for avoiding or minimizing impacts to these.
- Concern about access to deep stations, including requests to make stations shallower because of travel time and accessibility concerns.

ES.3.3 South Interbay Segment

- Similar support for Preferred Alternative SIB-1 and Alternative SIB-3.
- Support for the Smith Cove Station with Preferred Alternative SIB-1 because it would be closer to multiple destinations.
- Requests for a tunnel alternative through Interbay to minimize environmental and economic impacts.
- Concern about visual, freight, and traffic impacts on Elliott Avenue West and 15th Avenue West for Preferred Alternative SIB-1 and Alternative SIB-2.
- Concern about arterial crossings for bus connections at the Smith Cove Station.
- Concern about steep slope, park, and noise impacts for Alternative SIB-2 and Alternative SIB-3.
- Concern about business displacement and access to businesses and residences during construction.

ES.3.4 Interbay/Ballard Segment

- Support for an Interbay Station closer to Magnolia, but concern about impacts to businesses and facilities in this area.
- Support for tunnel alternatives due to reduced environmental impacts and comparable cost compared to the elevated alternatives.
- Support for a Ballard Station at 15th Avenue Northwest rather than 14th Avenue Northwest.

- Concern about freight and traffic impacts on 15th Avenue West.
- Concern about residential, business, and employee displacements.
- Concern about access to the Ballard Food Bank during construction, as well as access to businesses in general.
- Concern about impacts to maritime businesses, including Fishermen's Terminal.
- Requests for a tunnel alternative with the Ballard Station located west of 15th Avenue Northwest in the existing Ballard business district.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

	ES.1 Draft EIS Comment Period.....	ES-2
	ES.2 West Seattle Link Extension	ES-3
	ES.3 Ballard Link Extension	ES-5
1	INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
2	COMMENT SUMMARY.....	2-1
	2.1 Comments from Tribes and Tribal Organizations	2-1
	2.2 Comments from Government Agencies	2-1
	2.3 Comments from Elected Officials	2-14
	2.4 Comments from General Public	2-15
	2.5 Late Comments	2-101
3	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	3-1
	3.1 Engagement Approach	3-1
	3.2 Engagement Tools and Resources	3-1
	3.3 Draft EIS Publication and Distribution	3-1
	3.4 Engagement Activities	3-4
	3.5 Increased Accessibility and Focused Engagement with Communities of Color, Limited English Proficiency and Low-Income Populations.....	3-12
	3.6 Tribes.....	3-13
	3.7 Agencies.....	3-13

Tables

Table 2-1.	Summary of Comments from Government Agencies	2-2
Table 2-2.	Summary of Business and Business Organization Comments – Project-wide	2-16
Table 2-3.	Summary of Business and Business Organization Comments – West Seattle Link Extension	2-20
Table 2-4.	Summary of Business and Business Organization Comments – Ballard Link Extension	2-28
Table 2-5	Summary of Project-wide Community and Arts Organization Comments	2-54
Table 2-6	Summary of West Seattle Link Extension Community and Arts Organization Comments	2-60
Table 2-7	Summary of Ballard Link Extension Community and Arts Organization Comments	2-63

Table 2-8.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to SODO Segment	2-77
Table 2-9.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Duwamish Segment	2-78
Table 2-10.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Delridge Segment	2-78
Table 2-11.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to West Seattle Junction Segment	2-80
Table 2-12.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Chinatown-International District Segment	2-82
Table 2-13.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Downtown Segment	2-84
Table 2-14.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to South Interbay Segment	2-87
Table 2-15.	Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Interbay/Ballard Segment.....	2-88
Table 2-16.	Summary of Comments from Individuals on Environmental Concerns	2-91
Table 2-17.	Summary of Other Categories of Comments from Individuals	2-96
Table 2-18.	Summary of Comments from Individuals on Other Alternatives.....	2-97
Table 3-1.	WSBLE Draft Environmental Impact Statement Virtual Public Meetings/Hearings	3-4
Table 3-2.	Community Advisory Group Virtual Meetings Held During the Draft EIS Comment Period	3-6
Table 3-3.	Engagement Meetings, Briefings, Workshops, and Tours (January 28 through April 28, 2022)	3-6
Table 3-4.	Tabling, Door-to-Door, Peer-to-Peer, and Information Sharing (January 28 through April 28, 2022)	3-9

Appendices

Appendix A	Tribes and Tribal Organizations
Appendix B	Agencies and Elected Officials
Appendix C	Businesses and Business Organizations
	C1 - Projectwide Businesses and Business Organizations
	C2 - West Seattle Link Extension Businesses and Business Organizations
	C3 - Ballard Link Extension Businesses and Business Organizations
Appendix D	Community and Arts Organizations
	D1 - Projectwide Community and Arts Organizations
	D2 - West Seattle Link Extension Community and Arts Organizations
	D3 - Ballard Link Extension Community and Arts Organizations
Appendix E	Individual Public Comments

1 INTRODUCTION

The Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) is proposing to expand Link light rail transit service from Downtown Seattle to West Seattle and Ballard. The West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions (WSBLE) Project is an 11.8-mile corridor in the city of Seattle in King County, Washington, the most densely populated county of the Puget Sound region (Figure 1-1). The WSBLE Project consists of two extensions: the West Seattle Link Extension and the Ballard Link Extension. The West Seattle Link Extension would be about 4.7 miles and include stations at SODO, Delridge, Avalon, and Alaska Junction. The Ballard Link Extension would be about 7.1 miles from Downtown Seattle to Ballard's Northwest Market Street area. It would include a new 3.3-mile light-rail-only tunnel from the Chinatown-International District to South Lake Union and Seattle Center/Uptown. Stations would serve the following areas: Chinatown-International District, Midtown, Westlake, Denny, South Lake Union, Seattle Center, Smith Cove, Interbay, and Ballard. While both extensions are evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), they are standalone projects that have independent utility from each other.

The WSBLE Project is part of the Sound Transit 3 Plan of regional transit system investments (Sound Transit 2016), funding for which was approved by voters in the region in 2016. Sound Transit and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published the Draft EIS for the WSBLE Project on January 28, 2022, starting a 90-day public comment period that ended on April 28, 2022. The project conducted four virtual public meetings/hearings (March 15, 22, 24 and 30, 2022) and an in-person public open house on March 17, 2022. An Online Open House was accessible for the duration of the comment period and included the Draft EIS as well as the information shared at the virtual and in-person events. The project focused on virtual engagement for the hearings out of consideration of the ongoing global novel coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, but wanted to provide at least one in-person public open house for people who prefer to engage in-person. Sound Transit held the in-person event outdoors and followed public safety protocols to limit the risk of the transmission of the COVID-19 virus.

This report summarizes comments received by Sound Transit and FTA from Tribes and Tribal organizations, agencies, elected officials, and the general public during the comment period. It also describes the ways that Sound Transit and FTA advertised the Draft EIS availability and publicized the public virtual meetings/hearings, public in-person open house event, and other public involvement opportunities. The Final EIS for the project will include the comments received during the Draft EIS comment period with responses from Sound Transit and FTA.

The Draft EIS virtual public meetings/hearings and the in-person open house event were designed for the public to learn more about the project and provide comments. The virtual public meetings/hearings and in-person open house allowed participants to provide oral comments recorded by a court reporter. Comments could also be submitted in writing using forms at the public open house, by email, by mail, directly to Sound Transit's offices, by phone, or online. Comments provided in languages other than English were translated. All methods of providing comments were advertised.

This page is intentionally left blank.

2 COMMENT SUMMARY

2.1 Comments from Tribes and Tribal Organizations

The Suquamish Tribe Natural Resources Department submitted comments regarding protection of their treaty-reserved natural resources and cultural resources. They clarified their applicable treaty rights in the project area and identified the need for further coordination on how potential conflicts and/or impacts to Tribal treaty fishing rights will be addressed. They commented on work near Longfellow Creek and noted they do not generally support stream buffer reductions. They requested that any use of the Terminal 25 restoration site or any other Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) site to be clearly defined, as well as mitigation options. In addition, technical comments on the ecosystems technical analysis methodology regarding stream typing and survey methods were provided.

The Duwamish Cultural Preservation Committee submitted comments recommending an archaeological review for the project prior to construction and requesting notification of any archaeological work to be performed. They recommended that alternatives with the least environmental impacts be given the most consideration. For the West Seattle Link Extension, they supported the North Crossing Alternative (DUW-2) in the Duwamish Segment, the Andover Street Lower Height Alternative (DEL-6) in the Delridge Segment, and the Medium Tunnel 41st Avenue Station Alternative (WSJ-5) in the West Seattle Junction Segment. For the Ballard Link Extension, they supported the Prospect Street/15th Avenue Alternative (SIB-2) in the South Interbay Segment and the Preferred Tunnel 15th Avenue Station Option (IBB-2b) in the Interbay/Ballard Segment. In addition, the Duwamish Cultural Preservation Committee requested that any landscaping should only include native vegetation, that any construction near Longfellow Creek consider opportunities for daylighting, and that care be given to maintaining salmon migration and habitat.

FTA and Sound Transit are engaged in ongoing Government-to-Government Consultation with Consulting Tribes on the project. This includes review of the Draft EIS, as well as other individual consultation activities where important and sensitive information is discussed. The Draft EIS comment letters provide input on the technical analyses of the project and were written on behalf of Tribal staff. These letters do not represent a comprehensive collection of Tribal input and interests.

Full reproductions of communications received are available in Appendix A, Tribes and Tribal Organizations.

2.2 Comments from Government Agencies

Table 2-1 summarizes comments from government agencies, organized by federal, state, regional, county, and local agencies. Full reproductions of communications received are available in Appendix B, Government Agencies and Elected Officials.

Table 2-1. Summary of Comments from Government Agencies

Agency	Comments
Federal Agencies	
U.S. Coast Guard	<p>The U.S. Coast Guard, a NEPA cooperating agency, submitted comments outlining information to be provided as part of the Final EIS in order for them to adopt the Final EIS for bridge-related portions of the project. This information includes consultation or coordination with other regulatory agencies regarding the Clean Water Act, Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), Coastal Zone Management Act, Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Act, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and Marine Mammals Protection Act, as well as adding 100-year floodplain limits to project drawings.</p> <p>They also provided comments on the project purpose and need related to navigation and presentation of navigational clearance information and suggested edits on discussions of navigation impacts and mitigation in Chapter 3.</p> <p>The U.S. Coast Guard stated they “favor alternatives with the least impact to navigation and preservation of navigation access to marine facilities.” For the Duwamish Segment, they stated that Preferred Alternative DUW-1a appears to have the least impact. Any crossing of the West Waterway must meet the minimum clearances they provided in their January 4, 2022, Preliminary Navigation Clearance Determination for the Duwamish Waterway.</p> <p>For the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they referenced their February 9, 2022 Preliminary Navigation Clearance Determination for the Lake Washington Ship Canal and noted that any bridge alternative would need to meet the minimum navigational clearances of 205 feet vertical and 290 feet horizontal for the Lake Washington Ship Canal. They stated that the tunnel alternatives compare very favorably against the bridge alternatives, would avoid or reduce impacts in several categories of environmental impacts, would reduce or eliminate several federal regulatory requirements, and would not impact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-maintained navigation channel in the Lake Washington Ship Canal.</p>
U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service	<p>The U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service submitted comments acknowledging that properties in the project area funded by the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Urban Park and Recreation Recovery fund would not be affected. They had no further comments on the Section 4(f) evaluation and did not identify any concerns with the Section 4(f) evaluation.</p>
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency submitted comments supporting the “project’s goals of expanding mobility in the region to include transit-dependent people, low-income populations, and communities of color”, as well as preserving and promoting a healthy environment and economy. They noted that while impacts are likely to remain, the project would overall reduce environmental impacts compared to the No Build Alternative.</p> <p>They recommended close coordination with them on work within the Superfund sites in the Duwamish Segment, and they support bridge design features that minimize or eliminate the in-water placement of bridge supports. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recommended the Final EIS include a great blue heron management plan for work within the great blue heron management zone in the Duwamish Segment. They encouraged continuing to incorporate feedback from Tribes, and in addition to ongoing consultation, to consult with Tribes regarding impacts to the Indian Child Welfare Office in the Delridge Segment. They also recommended consulting with the Federally Recognized Tribes in the Aleutian/Pribilof Islands region of Alaska due to the potential impacts to these communities related to the potential impacts on Coastal Transportation in the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They noted that Coastal Transportation provides critical lifeline services to these communities. They recommended FTA consider whether the Preferred Tunnel 14th Avenue Alternative (IBB-2a) is a viable option for this segment to avoid these impacts, as well as to avoid impacts to other maritime businesses and residences, in-water impacts, and navigation channel impacts.</p>

Agency	Comments
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (cont.)	<p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency provided information on additional resources to consider in the environmental justice analysis and request discussion be added to the Final EIS of how the alternatives in the Duwamish Segment could affect subsistence fishers that use the Duwamish Waterway. They recommended including specific measures related to compensation and relocation assistance for low-income and minority residences and businesses that could be acquired, displaced, and relocated by the project. They also recommended additional information on impacts and mitigation measures for temporary or long-term loss of services to low-income and minority communities provided by community organizations that could be affected by the project, as well as to identify how conflicts with residents and businesses that might refuse relocation offers would be addressed.</p> <p>They also recommended the Final EIS clarify the status and potential of “third-party” funds for Preferred Alternatives with Third-Party Funding.</p>
U.S. Postal Service	<p>The U.S. Postal Service, a NEPA cooperating agency, submitted comments on their continued concerns about temporary closures of driveway access affecting operation of the U.S. Postal Service Seattle Vehicle Maintenance Facility at 2450 4th Avenue South under Preferred Alternative SODO-1a and the alternative’s staggered station configuration in the SODO Segment. They submitted comments from an architect on the proposed Lander Street overpass that stated the overpass “should not pose any functional hardship to the [U.S. Postal Service] daily operations or impact of operations as long as the clear height of said structure has a minimum of 16 feet in the clear.” In the South Interbay Segment, they noted that Alternative SIB-3 would displace their Interbay Carrier Facility at 2010 15th Avenue West, and that they have concerns about impacts from Alternative SIB-2 at the same facility. The loss of parking stalls and revisions to access with Alternative SIB-2 would “render their carrier location unusable for Postal operations and would require the relocation of this carrier annex.”</p>
State Agencies	
Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation	<p>Acting as the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for Consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation provided comments about continuing coordination and Consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. They anticipated being consulted on a revised Area of Potential Effect once a preferred alternative has been identified. They requested the Area of Potential Effect sufficiently consider “physical, auditory, visual, cumulative, environmental, socio-economic, and similar effects, all of which directly relate to historic properties.” They encouraged FTA to “ensure the agency sufficiently considers and incorporates the comments and concerns provided by other consulting parties as the project progresses” and requested more frequent consultation.</p>
Department of Ecology	<p>The Department of Ecology (Ecology) provided comments noting the project would likely require both Section 401 Water Quality Certification and Coastal Zone Management Consistency decision. They also commented regarding their coordination with Sound Transit on stormwater runoff and noted that their 2024 Final Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington will clarify whether light rail guideway is a pollutant generating impervious surface based on all available credible information, including data from Sound Transit. Ecology recommended Sound Transit “be prepared to design and install stormwater runoff for [the Sound Transit 3] project not yet in design and which are scheduled to be completed between 2030 and 2041,” in the event that stormwater runoff from light rail guideway does become classified as pollutant generating.</p>
Department of Natural Resources	<p>The Department of Natural Resources submitted comments regarding state-owned aquatic lands in Salmon Bay and the Duwamish Waterway. They noted that mitigation would be required for any authorized expansion of overwater cover or any authorized in-water work within state-owned aquatic lands. They provided information on the requirements for easements on and over their properties and clarified the categories of state-owned aquatic lands that occur in the project area. They noted both waterbodies are listed on Ecology’s 303(d) list of impaired and threatened waters and that they will need to review any project components that will disturb the sediment in these waterbodies during construction. They requested that a plan set be provided to them to review prior to application submittal and noted that before they can issue an easement or right of entry, all environmental permits will need to be submitted for review.</p>

Agency	Comments
Department of Transportation	<p>The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) submitted comments regarding the interaction of the project with their facilities and properties, including Interstate 90, Interstate 5, the SODO Busway, and maintenance facilities. They stated the “project aligns with WSDOT’s vision of providing a sustainable and integrated multimodal transportation system.” They provided clarification on requirements for utility work within their right-of-way and for stormwater discharging to their system. They requested use of their latest applicable manuals, some of which have been updated since publication of the Draft EIS.</p> <p>They provided comments regarding removal of contaminated soil from within their right-of-way and about contamination at Superfund sites within the Duwamish Segment. They provided comments about impacts to their maintenance facility at 450 South Spokane Street and noted that it is critical for maintenance and operation of Interstate 90, Interstate 5, and State Route 520. Technical comments were provided for Draft EIS Appendixes H, K, J, and N1.</p> <p>They requested further coordination on other WSDOT-owned properties that are proposed for use by the project, including parking areas and the SODO Busway. They suggested additional information that could be added to the purpose and need and to the transportation analysis. They provided information on additional approvals that would be needed from them. They noted that they have not yet agreed to any roadway or ramp closures that affect their facilities and noted that demolition and replacement of the 4th Avenue South viaduct in the Chinatown-International District Segment could cause major impacts to Interstate 90 operations.</p>
Recreation and Conservation Office	<p>The Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office identified the Recreation and Conservation Office- funded properties in the project study area and indicated future steps for impacted properties that have been purchased with these funds. They noted there are no Land and Water Conservation Fund-funded projects affected by the project.</p>
University of Washington	<p>The University of Washington (UW) submitted comments of general support for the project, and specific concerns related to potential impacts on their properties in South Lake Union and Downtown Seattle. UW Medicine has six research and laboratory buildings in South Lake Union, several with equipment and experiments that are highly sensitive to vibration and electromagnetic interference. For this reason, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 in the Downtown Segment. They were also concerned about roadway closures in the South Lake Union neighborhood during construction and emphasized the importance of bus transit connectivity in station area planning.</p> <p>In the Downtown neighborhood, where they own property known as the Metropolitan Tract, they also expressed concern about roadway closures during construction as well as the potential for noise and vibration impacts on businesses during operations and construction. They acknowledged that the Draft EIS did not identify any impacts, but if impacts were to occur, they would need to be mitigated.</p>
Regional Agencies	
Port of Seattle and Northwest Seaport Alliance	<p>The Port of Seattle, a NEPA cooperating agency, and Northwest Seaport Alliance submitted comments that reiterated their primary objectives for Sound Transit 3 projects and provided feedback on potential impacts to Port and Alliance facilities in the Duwamish, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segment. They stated they support the Sound Transit 3 program, which includes WSBLE, as “it improves regional transportation for personal and workforce mobility, while protecting maritime and industrial land uses and freight mobility.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the SODO Segment, they had concerns about the effects to truck traffic from new vertical grades, intersection performance, construction-related detours, and the traffic congestion impacts of buses diverted from the SODO Busway. They also had concerns about business access to spur rail lines. • In the Duwamish Segment, they had concerns about impacts to Terminals 18, 25, 102, 103, and 104, as well as the BNSF Railway tracks connecting throughout the industrial areas and container terminals, particularly Terminal 5. They were also concerned about impacts to the marinas on Harbor Island. Concerns about alternatives in this segment included access to terminals, roadway closures, and loss of parking.

<p>Port of Seattle and Northwest Seaport Alliance (cont.)</p>	<p>They stated that Alternative DUW-2, and to a lesser extent Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b, have “the potential to create significant negative impacts on cargo operations and water-dependent logistic functions, with resulting negative economic effects across several industries, far beyond the Seattle harbor and King County.” They were concerned that the 5-year construction period could damage international container cargo operations and “significantly contribute to truck and other traffic in the already congested Spokane Street corridor.” They are concerned these impacts, particularly for Alternative DUW-2, cannot be mitigated. They suggested the Final EIS “address how operational and long-term impacts to maritime cargo operations on and near international terminals in the Duwamish Segment are avoided.”</p> <p>They requested additional information about impacts from Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b on the Harbor Island Corporate Center, Harbor Island Marina, and Jim Clark Marina during both construction and operations, as well as additional detail about mitigation for these impacts. Regarding the displacement of water-dependent facilities, they stated “The proposed mitigation measures must be improved to ameliorate the impacts on dislocated water-dependent and industrial businesses and dislocated maritime and industrial workers to the maximum extent feasible.”</p> <p>They also requested more information in the Final EIS about impacts from Alternative DUW-2 on their 9-acre habitat restoration site on Terminal 25, for which design was authorized in February 2022. They provided additional information for the Section 4(f) analysis, both about economic impacts in the Duwamish Segment and impacts to this habitat restoration site. They noted they support the proposed finding of <i>de minimis</i> for Preferred Alternative DUW-1a at the West Duwamish Greenbelt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the South Interbay Segment, they had concerns about impacts to Terminal 91 and noted it is important to maintain access to this facility as even closures of less than 9 months could impact an entire cruise or fishing season. They provided clarification on the volume of passengers that access this terminal during the cruise season and noted that up to 16,000 passengers may disembark or embark in 1 day. They also noted planned development of two 50,000-square-foot light industrial buildings at Terminal 91 to support maritime manufacturers and fishing industry suppliers, and stated they may develop additional buildings in the future. • In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they stated they cannot support Alternative IBB-3 because of impacts to Fishermen’s Terminal and stated that “the two bridge alternatives (IBB-1 and IBB-3) and associated construction activities could affect a wide range of cargo, fishing and other industrial operations, hamper freight movement and ultimately result in a loss of jobs in our community.” The Port stated that because of the broad ecosystem of support businesses and supply chain links, these businesses cannot be considered in isolation. They also had concerns about Elliott Avenue West and 15th Avenue West with Alternative IBB-3 and Option IBB-1b. They also commented on the potential for consolidating the Smith Cove and Interbay stations and noted that further study was warranted to understand the benefits or risks this concept would present to nearby communities. • Regarding the displacement of maritime businesses, they urged Sound Transit to further examine the potential to relocate these businesses, as well as if the potential impacts to businesses from impacts to freight mobility, including rail, can be mitigated in the Duwamish and SODO segments. They requested the regional priorities in the Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2050 plan related to the industrial sector be added to the Final EIS. • In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they recognized the potential impacts to freight mobility associated with the 4th Avenue alternatives but also the potential impacts to the community with the 5th Avenue alternatives. They also suggested the environmental justice analysis consider impacts on truck drivers serving their facilities, of which two-thirds are people of color and almost 40 percent do not speak English as their first language. Their comments requested additional information about what additional facilities would be needed for the minimum operable segment (M.O.S.) on the Ballard Link Extension and recommended that Interbay be considered for this terminus instead of Smith Cove. They encouraged the Final EIS to better highlight the connection of the system to SeaTac Airport for travelers, employees, and visitors. They commented on the importance of coordinating on the vision for what development around stations in manufacturing and industrial centers would look like and how it could support industry. • Technical comments were also provided on the following EIS sections: executive summary, purpose and need, transportation, acquisition, displacement, and relocation; land use, economics, social resources, community facilities, and neighborhoods, air quality, noise and vibration, hazardous materials, cumulative impacts, public involvement, and environmental justice.
---	---

Agency	Comments
Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency submitted comments in support of the project and stated the project would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and criteria and air toxics pollutants due to reduced motor vehicle trips. They noted these motor vehicle emissions are associated with potential cancer risk and other adverse health outcomes and are more likely to impact communities of color and lower income neighborhoods that live along major highways. They identified potential air quality and health impacts associated with construction emissions and requested that Sound Transit detail in the Final EIS how the cleanest construction equipment possible will be used. They noted the Chinatown-International District and Duwamish Valley neighborhoods already face disproportionate impacts and have more sensitive health outcomes.
Puget Sound Regional Council	Puget Sound Regional Council provided comments stating that expansion of high-capacity transit, including the WSBLE Project, is fundamental to the success of their VISION 2050 long-range plan. Their review found consistency with long-range planning documents, and they agreed with the methods used to evaluate impacts and benefits. They provided recommendations for the Final EIS, including incorporation of more information about TOD and door-to-door travel times, further analysis of displacement risk, relocation potential, and impacts on tenants using Housing Choice vouchers; and information on opportunities to increase availability of affordable housing by extending subsidy programs. They encouraged further support of businesses owned by marginalized communities that may be impacted by these projects.
County Agencies	
King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks	<p>The King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks submitted comments clarifying their role as a utility provider and about conflicts with utilities managed by their Wastewater Treatment Division. They provided detailed comments about locations of major utilities in relation to Draft EIS alternatives in the SODO, Duwamish, Delridge, Chinatown-International District, Downtown, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments. Concerns in these segments included potential impacts to the structural integrity, service life, and operation and maintenance of these facilities. They stated that during and after construction, they must be able to maintain access to all of their facilities.</p> <p>Of “significant concern” to them were potential impacts to the Elliott Wet Weather Treatment Station in the South Interbay Segment, where they stated that Preferred Alternative SIB-1 “would adversely impact vehicle ingress/egress” from Elliott Avenue West. They also noted this alternative would have guideway columns on their property to the south, which they intend to use for expansion in the future. They also stated that permanent impacts to this area would affect their “ability to use this property for future expansion.” They also expressed concern about locating Preferred Alternative SIB-1 and Alternative SIB-3 near their 96-inch Elliott Bay Interceptor pipeline, both during construction and operations, noting the proximity “would pose a substantial risk to the structural integrity, service life, and operation and maintenance of this crucial regional conveyance facility.” They requested a vibration analysis of this facility and well as their proposed odor control facility near their Interbay Pump Station, which is also near these alternatives. Other concerns about constructing these alternatives in this area include the stability of the slope on the west side of Interbay Golf Course as well as the release of methane gas from the landfill under the golf course. They also noted the close proximity of Preferred Alternative IBB-2a and Option IBB-2b in the Interbay/Ballard Segment to the Elliott Bay Interceptor facility, and have similar concerns about structural integrity, service life, and operation. They requested that the design increase the distance from this facility to these alternatives.</p> <p>In the Duwamish Segment, they commented on in-water work in the Superfund sites within the waterway and requested to be involved in coordination regarding siting and construction of work in these areas. They noted that effects on cleanups in these Superfund sites should be minimized and efforts should be taken to minimize the project footprint in areas that could be used as habitat restoration sites for Natural Resource Damage Act claims. They also stated that impacts of stormwater runoff from light rail should be identified and minimized for all water crossings, “especially those that relate to sediment cleanups that are underway or anticipated.”</p>

Agency	Comments
King County Metro	<p>King County Metro (Metro) submitted comments supporting development of high-quality and high-capacity light rail that provides “excellent transit integration, station design, and public access.” Their key concerns included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Metro facilities and mitigation measures: They expressed concern about Metro facilities, including the SODO Busway and their bases in the Chinatown-International District Segment that could be affected by one or more alternatives. They requested formation of an interagency mitigation coordination team immediately after identification of the preferred alternative, to allow for time to design, approve, and implement mitigation prior to the start of project construction and to develop a construction traffic management plan. They requested that the Final EIS better define the impacts to transit and proposed mitigation, as well as disclose any secondary impacts from the mitigation. They also requested detailed reroute plans for Metro and the City of Seattle to review, modify, and approve. These plans should identify any speed and reliability treatments, new trolley wire infrastructure, and pavement improvements needed. <p>They noted that Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b in the Chinatown-International District Segment would “result in considerable delays and disruptions for tens of thousands of daily transit riders, resulting in higher costs for additional operating service hours and a substantial increase in the number of buses needed to deliver the same level of service for an extended period due to the magnitude of intersection/roadway closures.” The areas of major service disruption identified include routes on 4th Avenue South and South Jackson Street, and service to and from nearby Metro bases. They noted that construction activities would result in increased travel time and transit operating costs project-wide. They also noted that full closure of transit pathways with no alternative transit pathways, such as full closure of Delridge Way Southwest, must be disclosed.</p> <p>They identified types of infrastructure where they would like additional information on construction impacts, and would like specific mitigation identified for the displacement of Ryerson Bus Base with Option CID-1b in the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that “given that full replacement of Ryerson base appears infeasible, either due to schedule or cost, we request that [Option] CID-1b be removed from consideration as Sound Transit identifies a preferred alternative in the Final EIS.” They noted that they would be electrifying their bases prior to 2035 and are concerned about disruptions or reduction in capacity during construction of both projects affecting the cost and feasibility of this electrification.</p> • Transfer facilities: They provided an assessment of the bus-rail integration at each station as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Alaska Junction: The tunnel stations would have the best transit integration/transfer, and Alternative WSJ-2 would provide the poorest connectivity. – Avalon: No preferred station location. – Delridge: Alternatives with a station at Dakota Street Southwest would have better transit integration, alternatives with a station at Delridge Way Southwest would also provide seamless transfers with station entrances on the east and west side of Delridge Way Southwest, and those with a station at Andover Street would have the most challenging connectivity. They were also concerned about interactions between transit vehicles and pedestrians with large vehicles and trucks accessing Nucor Steel with the station at Andover Street. – SODO: Option SODO-1b and Alternative SODO-2 would have better transit integration. – Chinatown-International District: All alternatives would provide a similar transit integration experience. They noted that while Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b “would offer a more seamless southbound transfer...this benefit is greatly outweighed by the operational and facility impacts to Metro.”

Agency	Comments
King County Metro (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Midtown, Westlake, Denny, South Lake Union, and Seattle Center: Preferred Alternative DT-1 would provide better transit integration at these stations. – Smith Cove: All alternatives would provide a similar transit integration experience. – Interbay: All alternatives would provide a similar transit integration experience. – Ballard: Stations on 14th Avenue Northwest would provide a better transit integration experience than those on 15th Avenue Northwest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum Operable Segment (M.O.S.): They stated that if the M.O.S. is identified as the preferred alternative, more detailed network development will be required and should be included in the Final EIS. • Station and alignment refinement: They stated that the concepts of eliminating the Avalon Station and consolidating stations (Denny and South Lake Union, Smith Cove and Interbay) that have been explored would result in a more challenging transit integration than the conditions analyzed in the Draft EIS and could increase travel times for some riders. <p>Metro also provided several technical comments on Draft EIS Appendix N.1, Transportation Technical Report.</p>
Local Agencies	
City of Seattle	<p>The City of Seattle, a NEPA cooperating agency and consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, voiced their strong support of the project and provided extensive comments on a number of issues from 15 City departments. Their comments did not express a preference for any specific alternatives in any segment.</p> <p>Their key comment topics included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They found the environmental justice analysis incomplete for measuring and mitigating impacts and benefits to minority and low-income populations. Because of this, they “find it difficult to confirm a preferred alternative in [Racial Equity Toolkit] communities.” They requested additional information from the Acquisitions, Displacements, and Relocations, Economics, Social Resources, Community Facilities, and Neighborhoods, and Cumulative Impacts sections of the EIS be added to the environmental justice analysis. They also requested the study area for the Delridge Segment be expanded; more information on social resources and their clients served be provided; and more analysis of affordable housing, shelters, unsheltered people, air quality, pedestrian level of service, relocation opportunities, and indirect economic and cultural impacts. They disagreed with the findings of the environmental justice analysis and would like to work with Sound Transit on additional public engagement, specifically in the Chinatown-International District and South Delridge areas. They also requested to work with Sound Transit, the community, and other relevant stakeholders and partner agencies on a comprehensive mitigation plan in advance of the Final EIS that “considers strategies to mitigate impacts to [Racial Equity Toolkit] populations throughout the entire system, including but not limited to, strategies to reduce displacement of low-income households and provide support to small businesses during construction.” • They saw several instances in which compliance with local regulations is unclear, and raised concerns that, “if not adequately addressed and resolved in the Final EIS, will likely result in additional analysis and mitigation at the time of permitting.” Areas of concern included whether stormwater runoff from guideways was considered pollution-generating, guideway height, noise, historic preservation, Shorelines, Environmentally Critical Areas such as wildlife habitat and steep slopes, visual quality and aesthetics, protection and repair of features in public places, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines.

<p>City of Seattle (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They noted sections of the Draft EIS where they felt that information on impacts and/or mitigation was missing, or they disagreed with the methodology. Examples included demographic information for residential and business displacements, impacts to social resources and community cohesion in the Chinatown-International District, land use and TOD, parking, impacts to specific public views, changes in transportation standards, and design related to earthquakes. Other places where they felt the analysis underestimated impacts or mitigation proposed was inadequate include transportation, Section 106 impacts, Section 4(f) impacts, business and residential displacements, and impacts to city assets and properties. They provided comments on the methodologies for transportation, seismic design, visual quality, and air quality. • They noted several concerns about the transportation analysis, including proposed road closures, non-motorized study area and mitigation, impacts on emergency services, impacts on the streetcar system, and the timing of construction with the Center City Connector project. They stated this streetcar project should not be assumed to be complete when WSBLE construction starts and the EIS will need to be updated to identify impacts and mitigation for the streetcar project. Other areas of concern related to transportation include modifications to the roadway right-of-way, removal of commercial and ADA load zones, and station access and transit integration. They requested more information on detour routes during construction and analysis to determine the adequacy of these routes to accommodate increased traffic. • They requested more information about impacts to city assets and facilities and requested that impacts to the Seattle Animal Shelter in the South Interbay Segment be discussed in the EIS. Comments were also received regarding City-owned utilities and use of public right-of-way. • They requested more information on impacts and mitigation in parks and stated they do not concur with the Section 4(f) finding of <i>de minimis</i> for impacts to the West Duwamish Greenbelt for Preferred Alternative DUW-1a or Option DUW-1b in the Duwamish Segment, or for impacts to the Seattle Center from Preferred Alternative DT-1 in the Downtown Segment. • They stated they feel that the historic and archaeological resources analysis did not adequately evaluate impacts to historic resources, specifically to Union Station, historic districts, areaways, and the Seattle Center. They also stated that regulations regarding referral to the Landmarks Preservation Board for potentially eligible resources were not adequately addressed. They noted they have not yet concurred with the project Area of Potential Effect and stated it is important for the Area of Potential Effect to “capture all areas that will be impacted both permanently and during construction.” They have specific concerns regarding the Area of Potential Effect in the Chinatown-International District, Pioneer Square, and the Seattle Center. They also requested information about Traditional Cultural Properties be included. • They requested more information on mitigation for displaced businesses that are highly location-dependent or would be difficult to relocate and expressed safety concerns about residential and commercial units being left vacant prior to demolition or during construction. They noted that the potential inability to relocate some maritime businesses is not acceptable to the City and requested more economic analysis to “fully evaluate the impact of losing these businesses, and to determine potential mitigation measures and costs associated with each alternative.” They also requested additional mitigation for businesses that are cultural anchors in the Chinatown-International District. • They provided comments regarding impacts to the Seattle Center and noted that while the 2008 Seattle Center Master Plan supported multi-modal forms of transportation, they have found Preferred Alternative DT-1 to be inconsistent with other fundamental principles of the plan. They felt that the long-term impacts to the property, its business, and tenants from construction have not been adequately evaluated, and the mitigation has not been fully vetted. They requested additional information related to transportation, property acquisition, displacements, and relocation, economics, noise and vibration, parks and recreation, Section 4(f), and social resources related to this facility. They stated the “City and Sound Transit should codevelop a mutually acceptable outline for collaboration between the D[raft] EIS and F[inal] EIS on the further study of feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives for the Seattle Center Station.”
------------------------------------	---

Agency	Comments
City of Seattle (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They requested further study of station access and transit integration and provided examples of stations on the existing Link system that they feel are more successful and less successful. • They felt there is not sufficient information in some places to confirm or modify the preferred alternative for the Final EIS, including the Chinatown-International District Segment, South Interbay, and the Seattle Center. They stated they would like to partner with Sound Transit, the community, and other partners in the Chinatown-International District on a broader community development strategy that goes beyond project mitigation to address cumulative impacts and historic harm. • They suggested a mitigation program be “co-developed with impacted communities, and should explore a wide range of mitigation tools and strategies, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Develop mitigation funding programs – Utilize multi-faceted community stabilization tools – Support community-driven, equitable transit-oriented development” • They stated the City has heard “a need from the community for greater transparency, collaboration, and accountability” in community engagement moving forward and they felt the Draft EIS did not clearly demonstrate what Sound Transit heard from the community and how they will respond in project decision making. They suggested adding a community engagement goal to “explicitly reflect engagement findings and demonstrate how community feedback will be incorporated in the development of the project.”
City of Seattle Freight Advisory Board	<p>The City of Seattle Freight Advisory Board submitted comments focused on the SODO, Duwamish, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments. They noted that the impacts of construction in the Draft EIS “are not described in adequate detail to understand the long-term impacts on freight movement” and requested that Sound Transit commit to working closely with the City and freight interests to minimize impacts to the efficient movement of freight and goods and in the development of final designs to resolve issues. They stated that navigation issues, both rail and waterways, “must be resolved or avoided in the Duwamish Waterway, the Elliott Bay Harbor and the Lake Washington Ship Canal.”</p> <p>In the SODO Segment, they stated proposed grade separations at Lander and Holgate streets should minimize the effects of steep grade on freight and requested study of impacts to freight movement on 4th and 6th avenues from additional buses and bikes related to the closures of the SODO Busway, both during construction and operations.</p> <p>In the Duwamish Segment, they requested Sound Transit consider “all opportunities to minimize and mitigate impacts” of Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b and requested Sound Transit “not proceed with (Alternative) DUW-2 which would displace businesses and impact the region’s container terminals.” They support the international trade gateway in this segment and noted that changes “to and near Major Truck Streets such as Spokane Street and West Marginal Way carry outsized impacts to goods movement.”</p> <p>In the South Interbay and Interbay/Ballard segments, they requested consideration of access to properties in the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing and Industrial Center (BINMIC) from new piers along Elliott Avenue West and 15th Avenue West. They noted the proposed land use changes to Maritime and Industrial Lands Zoning and asked how this would affect freight circulation around proposed stations in the Ballard area.</p>

<p>City of Seattle Planning Commission</p>	<p>The Seattle Planning Commission provided comments supporting the project and noting specific concerns and recommendations on a number of topics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They urged Sound Transit “to evaluate the benefits and impacts of the WSBLE project through a lens that considered a hundred-year horizon, well beyond the short-term construction timeline for this project,” and stated the EIS should “clearly identify how the many factors considered in the analysis will be weighed and balanced in the final selection” as well as “clarify what thresholds were used to determine what was considered an impact to be raised in the analysis.” They noted that anticipation of future light rail extensions will likely lead to land use changes and increased density around the stations, and that all station areas are unique in current use and past histories. They requested that where mitigation measures are explained by referring to a policy or document external to the EIS, greater detail should be included within the body of the EIS to summarize the measures that result from the referenced policies or regulations. • Regarding equity and environmental justice, they noted particular attention should be paid to minimizing, if not avoiding, potential negative impacts in the Chinatown-International District and Delridge neighborhoods. They requested additional information on mitigation for these neighborhoods, both for relocation of businesses as well as maintaining access to businesses, services, and public spaces during construction, and suggested going beyond the minimum construction mitigation in these neighborhoods. They suggested additional measures should be considered for “high-risk” businesses. They requested more discussion in the Final EIS about the potential costs the City and/or other third parties would “need to absorb to make the Fourth Avenue alignment more feasible,” and also asked Sound Transit to work with the City to “find new partnerships with communities and repair past harms.” They also requested that more information shared by communities through the Racial Equity Toolkit process be included in the EIS. • Regarding climate change, they raised concerns about the impacts of climate change and environmental health in industrial areas and asked that the EIS identify actions to plan for and mitigate sea level rise and flooding impacts. They noted that the SODO and Interbay stations are low in elevation and at “high risk of sea level rise” and requested more information on the project Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment. They asked for the EIS to “clearly demonstrate how Sound Transit will address sustainability and climate resiliency goals for the WSBLE project,” and that if climate related analyses show different sustainability outcomes between alternatives, that should be identified in impact comparisons. They also requested more information on mitigation actions for future stations in industrial areas with contaminated soils. • Regarding TOD, they requested more information in the EIS about how “each alternative will impact the urban fabric when compared to current and future land use maps” and asked Sound Transit to be intentional about selecting an alignment that supports the potential for TOD in station areas. They noted the development potential of remnant parcels as important, and that leaving oddly shaped or scattered parcels after construction be avoided. • Regarding stations in industrial areas, they expressed concern about displacement of industrial businesses, impacts to freight corridors, and economic, transportation, and construction effects in these areas. They stated Sound Transit should consider the “potential for land use and resulting ridership changes associated with the various industrial zoning scenarios proposed in the City’s Industrial and Maritime Strategy” and stated the EIS should clearly identify how future light rail stations will interact with surrounding or adjacent industrial and maritime lands. They recommended that the final preferred alternative minimize or avoid impacts to the “long-term viability of Seattle’s industrial lands” and requested that proactive mitigation to prevent economic impact or business closures in these areas be identified. They would have also liked to see “a more robust analysis that recognizes the need for balanced use of arterial streets around stations in industrial areas for freight mobility and multi-modal transportation for workers connecting to job centers.” • Regarding transportation, transit, and multi-modal connections, they requested the EIS clearly identify “how each alternative would affect transit access and efficiency, especially for transit-dependent populations and BIPOC [Black, Indigenous, and People of Color] communities.” They requested more detail on transit re-routing plans during construction and recommended evaluating transit integration and non-motorized access at each of the proposed station locations. They requested Sound Transit coordinate with Metro and the City of Seattle regarding transit restructuring to ensure most of the city is within a short walk of frequent transit.
--	---

Agency	Comments
City of Seattle Planning Commission (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding housing and displacement, they requested listing the specific businesses displaced in the Chinatown-International District and Delridge segments and an assessment of their “relative ability to withstand relocation.” They requested further analysis of the potential impacts of indirect displacement, including mitigation strategies to minimize displacement, as well as discussion of the “disruption to social cohesion when residents and culturally significant businesses are forced to move.” They requested information from the Racial Equity Toolkit that compares the number of businesses lost with the number and types of businesses that could be accommodated by new development. They noted this should include measures to ensure new commercial spaces meet the needs of the community. Regarding visual impacts, they requested additional visualizations and stated, “the existing visual representations provided by Sound Transit do not sufficiently demonstrate the anticipated cumulative effects of the various elevated guideways and stations.” They would have liked to see visualizations from a greater number of viewpoints and from ground-level pedestrian perspective, and also feel that community members should be involved in determining or assessing the documented visual impacts.
City of Seattle Transit Advisory Board	<p>The City of Seattle Transit Advisory Board submitted comments in support of the project and stated they would like to ensure that climate, equity, and safety goals are at the forefront of the WSBLE Project. They suggested that when choosing the alignment, the project should “focus on alignments and design that maximize ridership; well-sited and abundant station entrances as well as sufficient vertical conveyances are integral to an experience that will attract riders.”</p> <p>For the West Seattle Link Extension, they supported Alternative SODO-1a in the SODO Segment, Alternative DEL-5 or Alternative DEL-6 in the Delridge Segment, and Alternative WSJ-5 in the West Seattle Junction Segment. These choices were based on providing the best transfer experience between modes while minimizing impacts on the community and allowing for future expansion.</p> <p>For the Ballard Link Extension, they supported Alternative CID-1a in the Chinatown-International District Segment to minimize impacts on the community, but also supported a shallower version of this alternative that “can result in cost savings and faster transfers.” They also commented on the need for mitigation for displacements in this community. In the Downtown Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1, “unless a DT-3 plan is created as an improvement on DT-2.” They felt the Seattle Center Station needs to be sited as close to the Seattle Center as possible and that siting it away from Republican Street would require additional mitigation to ensure pedestrian safety. Regarding the potential cost-savings concept of consolidating the South Lake Union and Denny stations, they recommended “considering whether the significant cost savings is worth it (~ \$575 million) vs. long-term reduced ridership and mobility access (~ -10,000 riders).” In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported Option IBB-2b as a “better fit for transit users, the community, business owners, residents, and future growth planning.” They would support a station closer to 20th Avenue Northwest over a station on 15th Avenue Northwest if this location is reconsidered.</p>
Seattle Center Advisory Commission	<p>The Seattle Center Advisory Commission submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment, specifically the Seattle Center Station and the tunnel alignment under the Seattle Center campus. They stated they continue to support the project and its ability to help people access their campus. They have reconsidered their 2019 position regarding the preferred location for the Seattle Center Station and no longer prefer Preferred Alternative DT-1 for this station. They requested further study of the proposed refinements of connecting the Preferred Alternative DT-1 South Lake Union Station to the Alternative DT-2 Seattle Center Station, or of shifting the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station farther west.</p>

Agency	Comments
Seattle Center Advisory Commission (cont.)	<p>They provided specific comments on the transportation analysis, including needing more information for mitigation of road closures during construction, and analysis of surge crowds at the Seattle Center and mitigation for those impacts. They suggested that mitigation for construction impacts should include investments in the Monorail. They also provided comments on the property acquisition, economic, and park impacts to their campus (including the numerous businesses and organizations that reside on or use their campus) during construction and operations and requested more detail on mitigation strategies for these impacts. They requested mitigation for the removal of mature Legacy Trees on the campus and stated the Final EIS should contain an expert valuation of the trees and the ecosystem benefits they provide. They disagreed with the proposed finding of <i>de minimis</i> under Section 4(f) and do not believe that Sound Transit “has done all possible planning to minimize harm to the Seattle Center property or its tenants resulting from the proposed use,” and also state that “they cannot support the DT-2 Seattle Center station alternative as a least harmful alternative.”</p> <p>They provided detailed comments on the noise and vibration analysis, including comments from a consultant, that stated the Draft EIS is missing sensitive receivers and fails to identify and propose mitigation for the full adverse effects of construction noise and vibration. They also disagreed with the application of FTA impact criteria at some locations and noted that proposed mitigation may not be adequate. While they supported further study of connecting the Preferred Alternative DT-1 South Lake Union Station to the Alternative DT-2 Seattle Center Station, they noted that study will need to identify mitigation needed for a number of facilities on their campus.</p> <p>The Seattle Center Advisory Commission also provided comments on the conceptual design drawings (Draft EIS Appendix J) and noted that the design of the Preferred Alternative DT-1 east entrance building is inconsistent with their planning and design principles adopted in the 2008 Seattle Center Century 21 Master Plan. They noted that if an entrance is built within the boundaries of the Seattle Center campus, the architecture must be designed in collaboration with the Seattle Center and is subject to successful review by the Seattle Design Commission. They noted that “moving the station entrance further from the intersection of August Wilson Way/2nd Ave North would reduce impacts to the use of the roadways, intersection congestion, and the Seattle Rep’s lobby space and emergency exits. The mass of the station entrance should be broken up, and the design should not place back-of-house uses including ventilation in prominent public spaces.”</p> <p>They noted the following information requested in their 2019 scoping letter was missing from the Draft EIS: a schedule of recreational activities at the Seattle Center that could be disrupted or displaced by construction activities, a detailed inventory of curb space around the campus, and modeling of large event-related crowd surges.</p>
Seattle Public Schools	<p>Seattle Public Schools submitted comments requesting additional analysis regarding impacts to their facilities throughout the project corridor. They noted the alternatives in the SODO Segment have the potential for transportation, noise, vibration, and dust impacts during construction at the Stanford Center, the district headquarters. They expressed concern about tunneling under Memorial Stadium with Preferred Alternative DT-1 in the Downtown Segment, and the potential for restrictions on future redevelopment of the stadium. They also noted that the parking lot to the east of the stadium has been considered for development of a high school and they are concerned that tunneling under the property could preclude future development of the property. They shared the concerns raised by Seattle Center stakeholders and supported the Seattle Center Foundation’s request for a new station location and route alignment for the Seattle Center Station.</p> <p>They expressed concern about access to Cooper Pathfinder School during construction on Delridge Way Southwest in the Delridge Segment, as well as potential noise, vibration, and dust impacts and pedestrian and bike safety during construction. They expressed similar concern for noise, electromagnetic fields, vibration, dust, transportation, and pedestrian and bike safety at other public schools in the project area. They requested additional information on construction means and methods, construction routes, and road closures. They requested specific mitigation measures be identified now and an opportunity for public comment be provided. They stated these mitigation measures must be available to the Sound Transit Board prior to them rendering a final decision on the project.</p> <p>They requested Sound Transit and FTA “further explore the Alternatives, study additional alternatives, and issue a supplemental D[raft] EIS and commit to additional site-specific environmental review as part of a phased review.”</p>

2.3 Comments from Elected Officials

Seattle City Councilmember Lisa Herbold submitted comments on the West Seattle Link Extension reflecting what she has heard from her constituents as the councilmember for District 1, which includes areas of the West Seattle Link Extension project area. She stated that while she hears support for the project, there continues to be concern about impacts with some alternatives, and she requested additional visual representations be included in the Final EIS. In the Duwamish Segment, she noted the trade-offs between the alternatives but did not state that a preference has been voiced by the community. She also noted that the Duwamish Waterway crossing needs to account for the eventual replacement of the West Seattle Bridge.

In the Delridge Segment, she noted that transfer times will be very important at the Delridge Station because most riders will access it via transfers. She noted that Alternative DEL-6 would have the lowest number of displacements and would not directly cross the Youngstown community, and encouraged study to improve the transit integration for this alternative for commuters from the south. She also noted that it is important to consider how the station would operate with truck access to Nucor Steel, and she appreciates the pedestrian overpass refinement proposal for accessing this station. For alternatives on Southwest Genesee Street, the height of the guideway is a concern and, if an alternative on that roadway is considered, she strongly encourages a lower height alignment that connects to a tunnel. She also suggested examining the ability of connecting different alternatives between the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments.

In the West Seattle Junction Segment, she noted very strong community support for a tunnel to minimize impacts to the neighborhood and businesses. She noted there would be impacts from an elevated guideway in this segment that could not be mitigated and that an elevated line on Fautleroy Way Southwest would make completion of the Fautleroy Boulevard Project infeasible. She stated she has heard a variety of perspectives regarding the Avalon Station, with some feeling that keeping the station is important due to the type and level of existing and future development on Avalon Way Southwest, while others could support removing it, but “only if it results in a commensurate benefit to the West Seattle community, such as a longer tunnel.” She also noted that the High Point community would most likely access the project at the Avalon Station and eliminating this station would require planning for timely access from this community and others on the 35th Avenue Southwest corridor.

Seattle City Councilmember Andrew Lewis submitted comments on the Ballard Link Extension reflecting what he has heard from his constituents as the councilmember for District 7, which includes areas of the Ballard Link Extension project area between Pioneer Square and Salmon Bay. He stated that while he hears support for the project, there continue to be concerns about impacts with some alternatives. He expressed opposition to potentially consolidating the Smith Cove and Interbay stations because of reduced accessibility and efficiency. He stated support for Preferred Alternative DT-1 for the Midtown, Westlake, and South Lake Union stations, and support for Alternative DT-2 for the Denny Station, “conditioned on refinements to provide station access” and the Seattle Center Station, “conditioned on the need to avoid, minimize, or fully mitigate impacts to Seattle Center Campus and its resident organizations.” He also stated support for Preferred Alternative SIB-1 in the South Interbay Segment but noted that it “will require significant refinement due to transportation and visual impacts in this important freight corridor.” In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, he supports Preferred Option IBB-2b, although he also supports a Ballard Station west of 15th Avenue Northwest.

Full reproductions of communications received are available in Appendix B, Government Agencies and Elected Officials.

2.4 Comments from General Public

2.4.1 Businesses and Business Organizations

Tables 2-2 through 2-4 summarize the comments submitted from businesses and business organizations during the public comment period. Table 2-2 includes comments submitted from businesses and business organizations that pertain to the entire project corridor or for multiple segments in both extensions. Table 2-3 includes comments submitted about the West Seattle Link Extension, and Table 2-4 includes comments submitted about the Ballard Link Extension. Comments regarding the SODO Segment are discussed in Table 2-3 for the West Seattle Link Extension, even though portions of this segment would be in the Ballard Link Extension. Full reproductions of communications received are available in Appendix C, Businesses and Business Organizations, and are further subdivided into project wide, West Seattle Link Extension, and Ballard Link Extension comments. Within each extension, the letters are listed in alphabetical order and are bookmarked in the PDF.

Table 2-2. Summary of Business and Business Organization Comments – Project-wide

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
American Waterway Operators	<p>American Waterway Operators, which advocates for the tugboat, towboat, and barge industry, submitted comments regarding the Duwamish and Interbay/Ballard segments. In the Duwamish Segment, they supported comments provided by the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association and oppose Alternative DUW-2 because it would “interrupt operations at Terminal 5 and displace important maritime businesses.” They felt that Preferred Alternative DUW-1a would be less disruptive to maritime operations and that obstructions that disrupt maritime companies should be avoided.</p> <p>In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they opposed all elevated alternatives because they would create obstructions to navigation in the Lake Washington Ship Canal that would harm their members located east of the Ballard Bridge. They stated that impeding marine traffic in this area would “damage Washington’s thriving export trade and impair delicate supply chains.” They also noted these alternatives would “cause undue harm to communities in Alaska” and that the Final EIS should consider impacts to greenhouse gas emissions from shifting freight from barges to rail. They strongly supported the tunnel alternatives for this segment.</p>
BNSF Railway	<p>BNSF Railway submitted comments on the SODO, Duwamish, Chinatown-International District, Downtown, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments. They provided general comments about their concerns where the WSBLE Project would be located in close proximity to their facilities, including affecting their operations and maintenance, limiting future expansion, and geotechnical considerations. They stated that any structures over their right-of-way must clearly span it and meet the BNSF and United Pacific guidelines for grade separation projects. BNSF Railway also referenced their guidelines and policies for shoring and utility relocations in their right-of-way.</p> <p>In the SODO Segment, they noted potential encroachment on their right-of-way with all alternatives. In the Duwamish Segment, they noted concerns for all alternatives accessing the Operations and Maintenance Facility, with the Preferred Alternative DUW-1a crossing of the West Waterway near their movable bridge, and with Alternative DUW-2 crossing their mainline twice. They noted Alternative DUW-2 would be “more restrictive and likely more disruptive to BNSF operations than the other options.”</p> <p>In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they stated that Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b “appear to be quite impactful to BNSF track structure and tunnel and present feasibility and constructability issues,” and they supported Alternative CID-2a. In the Downtown Segment, they were concerned about impacts from Preferred Alternative DT-1 related to “ventilation shaft and entrance structures that appear to be in close proximity to BNSF tunnel.” In the South Interbay Segment, they had concerns about Preferred Alternative SIB-1 and Alternative SIB-3 being near their right-of-way due to potential property encroachments and limits on their future expansion, and they supported Alternative SIB-2. They also expressed concern about the potential for changes to surface traffic patterns and increased trespassing activity in this segment. In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they were concerned about the proximity of Preferred Alternatives IBB-1a and IBB-2a and Preferred Option IBB-2b to their right-of-way and supported Option IBB-1b or Alternative IBB-3.</p>
McCullough Hill Leary	<p>McCullough Hill Leary submitted comments regarding the entire project corridor “on behalf of numerous property owners, investors, tenants, users, developers and businesses in Seattle.” They commented on sufficiency of the document under State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and stated Sound Transit should prepare a Supplemental Draft EIS before final decisions are made.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
McCullough Hill Leary (cont.)	<p>They stated that due to the limited level of design and analysis completed for the Draft EIS, it “does not truly constitute a ‘proposal’” under SEPA. They noted that if this is because the project could be constructed as a design-build project, it “runs entirely counter to the objective of the SEPA review process.” They felt this project is better suited for a phased review under SEPA, or that Sound Transit should analyze a worst-case scenario for the Draft EIS. They were concerned about mitigation decisions being deferred and for public review of the mitigation measures before SEPA review is complete. They requested more analysis of impacts from induced growth related to the project, and more information on construction sequencing.</p> <p>They provided detailed comments on transportation impacts during construction, the potential for security issues and blight in construction areas, noise and economic impacts, urban design, displacement of future development, and loss of affordable housing. They provided specific suggestions for mitigation related to transportation, urban design, noise, vibration, business impacts, and security. They also provided suggestions for a construction management plan, monitoring and outreach during construction, and enforcement of mitigation measures.</p>
NAOIP Washington State Chapter	<p>NAOIP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, Washington State Chapter, submitted comments regarding the entire project corridor. They requested more information on construction transportation impacts to better understand the cumulative impacts of road and transit closures and changes. They requested more information on how businesses would be impacted and proposed mitigation and noted “Sound Transit and the City of Seattle need to go beyond business as usual and traditional practices when considering a robust mitigation program.” They were concerned about access to businesses, impacts to pedestrian and bike facilities, and detours required by road closures. They requested that business owners, residents, property owners, and stakeholders be involved in developing mitigation and support a Steering Committee for this effort.</p> <p>They requested more analysis of cumulative impacts with other construction projects that would be occurring throughout the project corridor during WSBLE construction. They raised concerns about housing affordability between when residential displacements would occur and when affordable TOD would be available. They requested more analysis of different construction methods, including a single-bore method for tunneling downtown, and to have differences in impacts between construction methods disclosed. They requested that findings regarding decisions on construction methods be made public.</p> <p>They requested consideration of the City of Seattle’s Industrial Land Draft EIS (published in December 2021) and future projects and density in the study area related to this effort. They urged the Downtown Segment stations be designed to better integrate into the existing environment, avoid displacements, explore opportunities for public/private partnerships, and minimize their footprints to “support a dense urban core environment.”</p>
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association	<p>The Pacific Merchant Shipping Association submitted comments regarding the SODO, Duwamish, and Interbay/Ballard segments. They noted the project will travel through the “maritime trade, commercial fishing and manufacturing spine of the region.” In the SODO Segment, they requested more analysis on impacts to freight mobility and of cumulative impacts to the interconnectedness of the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center with the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center. They did not support a specific alternative in the SODO Segment. In the Duwamish Segment, they supported Option DUW-1b because it would avoid impacts to Terminals 5 and 18 as well as the headquarters of SSA Marine, which operates the terminals. In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative IBB-2b because it would be similar in cost to the preferred elevated alternative.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Seattle Marine Business Coalition	<p>The Seattle Maritime Business Coalition submitted comments regarding the SODO, Duwamish, and Interbay/Ballard segments. They noted the project will travel through the “maritime trade, commercial fishing and manufacturing spine of the region,” which generates thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in economic impact and that many of these operations are water-dependent and cannot be relocated elsewhere in the region. In the SODO Segment, they requested more analysis on impacts to freight mobility and of cumulative impacts to the interconnectedness of the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center with the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center. They did not prefer a specific alternative in the SODO Segment. In the Duwamish Segment, they oppose Alternative DUW-2 due to impacts on port, marine, and industrial facilities along this route, including Terminals 5 and 18, and their surrounding network of maritime and industrial facilities. They noted that Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b still have impacts that should be further evaluated and addressed as design progresses, including impacts to BNSF facilities, marine facilities, in-water columns, and the West Duwamish Greenbelt. They urged “all possible design modifications to minimize or mitigate these impacts.” In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported Preferred Option IBB-2b because it would avoid disruption and displacement of maritime businesses on Salmon Bay. They also noted it is important to preserve the current freight and transportation capacity on 15th Avenue West/Northwest, which “serves as a critical lifeline for the City’s manufacturing and industrial sector.”</p>
Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce	<p>The Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce submitted comments regarding the entire project corridor. They stated support for the project and that all voter-approved stations should continue to be included.</p> <p>In the SODO Segment, they supported Option SODO-1b, and recommended Sound Transit “work proactively with the federal government to identify ways to avoid or mitigate” the impacts to the United States Postal Service Carrier Annex and Distribution Center/Terminal Post Office. They also requested more analysis on impacts to the freight network.</p> <p>In the Duwamish Segment, they did not support Alternative DUW-2 due to impacts on port, marine, and industrial facilities along this route, including Terminals 5 and 18, and their surrounding network of maritime and industrial facilities. They noted that Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b still have impacts that should be further evaluated and addressed as design advances, including impacts to BNSF facilities, marine facilities, in-water columns, and the West Duwamish Greenbelt.</p> <p>In the Delridge Segment, they did not recommend a preferred alternative but noted there are several important issues to be addressed for each alternative. They noted the potential operational impacts to Nucor Steel with Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 that would need to be mitigated. For the other segment alternatives, they noted the trade-offs between opportunities and impacts and stated that Sound Transit should prioritize good bus-to-rail transfers, develop a robust program to address potential displacements, mitigate any impacts to Longfellow Creek, and ensure that TOD opportunities reflect the community’s desires.</p> <p>In the West Seattle Junction Segment, they supported Alternative WSJ-5, but suggested exploring opportunities to extend the tunnel to 42nd Avenue Southwest and that the “design and location of the Avalon Station may need to be reconsidered to improve outcomes for the Delridge segment station.”</p>

<p>Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce (cont.)</p>	<p>In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they noted the harm the community has experienced from past projects and more recently the COVID-19 pandemic, hate crime, and public safety issues. They stated that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle “have the responsibility to address past harms by identifying ways that the new proposed light rail station can provide benefits to both communities and co-creating a mitigation and community development approach with the community.” They did not feel there is enough information in the Draft EIS to recommend a preferred alternative, but they did not support the deep station options because of the elevator-only access and the impacts to the Ryerson Bus Base (for Option CID-1b). They believed that the Chinatown-International District and Pioneer Square Historic District neighborhoods should recommend the preferred alternative to Sound Transit for this segment. They also noted that whichever alternative is selected, Sound Transit and the City of Seattle “must develop a robust and unprecedented program to reduce cultural displacement in the station area during and after construction.”</p> <p>In the Downtown Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 because it would provide better connections to transit routes, major employment centers, and existing light rail. They provided the following comments on DT-1 stations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midtown and Westlake: They were concerned with the depth of these stations and urged Sound Transit “to consult with outside experts on ways to address these unique challenges.” • Denny: They were concerned about the length of the proposed Westlake Avenue closure and consider this a permanent impact. • South Lake Union Station: They recommended more work is needed to develop construction approaches and mitigation plans that maintain neighborhood access and circulation for all modes and promote high-quality station access. • Seattle Center Station: They suggested the City of Seattle and Sound Transit should work to identify another location that provides access while minimizing impacts on the current tenants and facilities. <p>In the South Interbay Segment, they did not recommend a preferred alternative because they feel that Preferred Alternative SIB-1 does not provide good access to employers in this area and would remove capacity from Elliott Avenue West, while Alternative SIB-2 and Alternative SIB-3 would have permitting and constructability challenges. They requested Sound Transit “develop new alternatives or refine the existing alternatives in this segment to provide better connections to the major destinations and employment centers and avoid or minimize impacts on Elliott Avenue West and the Queen Anne hillside.” They also noted that the “City of Seattle must be an active partner with Sound Transit to resolve the future of the Magnolia Bridge and the potential replacement alternatives to allow for Sound Transit to develop a South Interbay Station and alignment alternative that serves this area for the next 100 years.</p> <p>In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported Preferred Option IBB-2b because it would avoid disruption and displacement of maritime businesses on Salmon Bay. They support the Ballard Station on 15th Avenue Northwest, closer to the “heart of the Ballard neighborhood.” They provided general comments about station design, noting that Sound Transit should “embrace density, activity, safety features and easily understood access” and that Sound Transit should look for opportunities “to standardize station design to the extent possible in order to realize efficiencies during construction and possible cost savings.” They expressed concern about the length of construction in the Downtown Segment and felt the impacts from both alternatives would be unacceptable and that these impacts could not be mitigated. They requested more analysis of different construction methods, including a single-bore method for tunneling downtown, and to have differences in impacts between construction methods disclosed. They requested that findings regarding decisions on construction methods be made public. They requested more information on mitigation plans to share with the public before the Final EIS is prepared, including mitigation for transit impacts, closures of major streets, and impacts on businesses, social services providers, and housing. They noted “Sound Transit and the City of Seattle need to go beyond business as usual and traditional practices” for mitigation. They cited the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Program mitigation program as a good example. They would have also liked to see a detailed construction management plan. They also noted that additional design could result in further cost refinements and that Sound Transit should “explore all options to improve the agency’s financial capacity, reduce project affordability gaps, and deliver projects in a timely manner.”</p>
---	---

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce (cont.)	They recognized the unique characteristics of the Chinatown-International District and Delridge communities and that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle should “not only adequately mitigate project impacts but go beyond by providing additional investments and support that ensure these communities and neighborhoods are well positioned to realize the opportunities and benefits presented by this project.” They cited the Sound Transit Rainier Community Development Fund and the Washington Station Convention Center community development program as examples. They encouraged engaging youth, community organizations, and Indigenous communities more in the process. In the Chinatown-International District, they encouraged partnering with the City on the “Jackson Hub” concept and reimagining Union Station.
Washington Maritime Federation	The Washington Maritime Federation submitted comments regarding the SODO, Duwamish, and Interbay/Ballard segments. They noted the project will travel through the “maritime trade, commercial fishing and manufacturing spine of the region” which generates thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in economic impact and that many of these operations are water-dependent and cannot be relocated elsewhere in the region. In the SODO Segment, they requested more analysis on impacts to freight mobility and of cumulative impacts to the interconnectedness of the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center with the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center. They did not support a specific alternative in this segment. In the Duwamish Segment, they opposed Alternative DUW-2 due to impacts on port, marine, and industrial facilities along this route, including Terminals 5 and 18, and their surrounding network of maritime and industrial facilities. They noted that Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b still have impacts that should be further evaluated and addressed as design progresses, including impacts to BNSF facilities, marine facilities, in-water columns, and the West Duwamish Greenbelt. They urged “all possible design modifications to minimize or mitigate these impacts.” In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative IBB-2b because it would avoid disruption and displacement of maritime businesses on Salmon Bay. They also noted it is important to preserve the current freight and transportation capacity on 15th Avenue West/Northwest, which “serves as a critical lifeline for the City’s manufacturing and industrial sector.”

Table 2-3. Summary of Business and Business Organization Comments – West Seattle Link Extension

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Multi-Segment	
West Seattle Chamber of Commerce	The West Seattle Chamber of Commerce submitted comments related to the West Seattle Link Extension. They stated that because they have members that could be impacted by each alternative, they are not taking a position on any specific alternative. They requested Sound Transit spend more time engaging the West Seattle small business community, and “find a better and more consistent approach in engaging the small business community, especially with respect to those businesses that do not own their spaces and have any likelihood of being impacted by any of the alternatives.” They wanted to make sure that businesses understand how they could be impacted so they can plan their futures as best as possible. They also expect that Sound Transit will compensate businesses affected during long construction periods.
SODO Segment	
2700 4th Avenue South Limited Partnership	The 2700 4th Avenue South Limited Partnership submitted comments on the SODO Segment. They noted their property could be acquired and requested more information on impacts to their tenants during construction. They were concerned about effects on their property value.

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Esquin Wine & Spirits and Esquin Wine Storage	Esquin Wine & Spirits and Esquin Wine Storage submitted comments on the SODO Segment. They are located at 2700 4th Avenue South and noted they were relocated to this site in 1998 for construction of the Seattle Mariners ballpark. They described the economic impact this had on their business, which has now expanded to include wine storage, and the challenges of relocating their business again. They requested finding a “less disruptive alternative to taking the 2700 4th Avenue South building” for the project.
Main Street Equity Partners	Main Street Equity Partners submitted comments regarding stations project-wide as well as the SODO Station in the SODO Segment. They encouraged the City of Seattle to “establish and confirm land uses and zoning that enables and promotes high-density mixed-use around all stations in the proposed system” and encouraged Sound Transit to “commit to and work with the City, business interests, and stakeholders to ensure such high-density transit-oriented development supports equitable job creation.” They supported road, access, and safety improvements in station areas and noted that Option SODO-1b would provide the type of community and access improvement they support. They suggested that an office be established in each community during construction where “impacted parties can gain access to support and leadership to respond to the needs of business and community during the expected years of disruption.” They also suggested additional studies to support development of TOD in station areas.
Pacific Iron and Metal	Pacific Iron and Metal, whose property also includes Pacific Fabrics and Seattle’s Doorhouse, is located at 2230 4th Avenue South, and submitted comments on the SODO Segment. They recycle metal, specializing in non-ferrous metal, for a number of public agencies as well as private businesses and require close proximity to the interstate highway systems as well as Port of Seattle terminals. They noted that they would be affected by all SODO alternatives during construction and provided comments in support of Option SODO-1b because it would have the least impact on their property. The southern portion of their property contains a complex, state-of-the art stormwater system permitted by King County that allows them to recycle metal at this facility. They were concerned with their ability to modify this permit if their property is affected, and therefore their ability to continue operating at this location. They also noted the cost of permitting a similar facility if they had to relocate and that Pacific Fabrics and Seattle’s Doorhouse are heavily subsidized by them and likely could not survive independently if relocated.
Rainier Pacific Company	Rainier Pacific Company submitted comments regarding the SODO Segment. They own over 5 acres of properties with a dozen tenants in the SODO Segment and note that many of them would be displaced. They expressed concern with the decision-making process and “lack of transparency.” They were opposed to proposed overpasses and South Lander and Holgate streets, because they would block views of properties and require detours during construction. They would have liked to see a parking garage at the SODO Station, and better access for cars and transit. They continued to support an “all-elevated station at Lander” which they proposed during the Alternatives Development phase.

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
SODO Business Improvement Area	<p>The SODO Business Improvement Area submitted comments regarding the SODO Segment. They supported Option SODO-1b as the best option for accessing employment centers on 1st Avenue South and would remove the United States Postal Service Carrier Annex and Distribution Center/Terminal Post Office, which they have heard is a public safety concern for pedestrians accessing the current station and they also feel is a barrier to community cohesion. They noted how they feel the SODO Segment has been overlooked in the planning process and has not been a “focus of concern.” They described how the existing station has been “an underperformer” in terms of ridership, and that the “primary concern among SODO property owners, businesses, and workers is public safety, and the current SODO station has failed to provide a location for riders to feel safe.” They expressed frustration with the community engagement process that required them to participate in two different community advisory groups, and that this “negatively impacted SODO’s ability to equitably participate in the ST3 [Sound Transit 3] planning process.”</p> <p>They objected to any SODO businesses being displaced out of the neighborhood, particularly small businesses that have been there for decades. They requested a “premier station with amenities like drop-off and pick-up areas, ambassadors, restrooms, circulator buses, sidewalks, and safe pedestrian routes to major destinations and beyond.” They requested more technical assistance during planning and construction, including a multi-disciplinary team to “support SODO businesses and workers, solve traffic problems, provide relocation assistance, and create a premier station.” They requested a Memorandum of Agreement to protect their businesses, workers, residents, and commuters, and described what they would like this to include.</p> <p>They listed specific mitigation measures they would like to see, including a mitigation fund, replacement of the SODO Trail during and after construction, completing the missing Georgetown to SODO bike/pedestrian link, installing a stoplight at 4th Avenue South and South Forest Street, creating safe pedestrian routes to light rail, and supporting other economic development activities.</p> <p>They provided technical comments on the project purpose and need, alternatives considered, transportation, acquisitions, displacements, relocations, cumulative impacts, and alternatives evaluation sections of the Draft EIS. They requested further analysis related to ridership, non-motorized access, safety, and travel times. They also provided a detailed list of additional information they are requesting related to design, ridership, funding, transportation facility closures, transportation impacts, and property acquisition.</p>
Duwamish Segment	
3450 4th Avenue South	<p>The owners of the building at 3450 4th Avenue South submitted comments regarding the Duwamish Segment. They were concerned about impacts to their business and their tenant from construction of either Preferred Alternative DUW-1a or Option DUW-1b. They were specifically concerned with damage to their building, damage to utilities, noise, vibration, and access during construction. They described impacts to their building and property that occurred from nearby construction of the expanded Spokane Street viaduct. They supported Alternative DUW-2 because they felt it would have less impact on their tenant.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Sixth Avenue South Property LLC	<p>Sixth Avenue South Property LLC owns the property at 2901 6th Avenue South and submitted comments regarding the Duwamish Segment. The property is leased to Franz Bakery, who has been there since 1997. They were concerned about impacts to operations of the bakery facility from the connection of Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b to the Operations and Maintenance Facility Central, located to the east. They provided details about the operations of the business, which runs 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, and how each part of their property is used. They noted there are approximately 200 truck trips per day from their south parking lot, where columns for the proposed Operations and Maintenance Facility connection would affect truck turning and circulation. They also receive flour by five rail cars per week, making their location on a rail line important. They manufacture 1.8 million pounds of products that are shipped all over the northwest, and their location near freeways and railways is very important to them. They felt that the impacts to their property as designed, as well as proposed road closures of 6th Avenue South, would make the facility inoperable and they would need to be relocated. They also felt that a relocation site that meets all of their needs would not be possible to find, either temporarily or permanently. They proposed a revised alignment to access the Operations and Maintenance Facility Central that would be located farther south along South Horton Street in order to reduce impacts to their operations and request that Sound Transit reconsider the design of this connection.</p>
Alaskan Copper Works	<p>Alaskan Copper Works, located at 3223 6th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Duwamish Segment. They are a metal product manufacturer and fabricator. They are located next to the Operations and Maintenance Facility Central, and part of their property was acquired in the 1990s for this facility. They described how access to and circulation on their property would be adversely impacted by the connection from Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b to the Operations and Maintenance Facility. These connections would cross block circulation paths and may make “shipping, receiving, storage and other essential materials handling functions at the facility extremely difficult, or impossible” and stated this could force them to relocate their entire operation. They noted this may not be economically possible in the Seattle area; therefore, this could result in permanent job losses of 50 to 70 employees. They noted these are “family wage” industrial jobs and that “most of the employees who might be affected are represented by unions and about 60% of our employees reflect the diversity of southern Seattle and are racial minorities.”</p> <p>Alternative DUW-2 would also cross their campus but appears to be less impactful and they supported this alternative.</p>
Blade Gallery Epicurean Edge	<p>Blade Gallery/Epicurean Edge, located at 3638 East Marginal Way South, submitted comments on the Duwamish Segment. Their facility houses a showroom, workshop, and office space and includes a custom knifemaking forge and teaching studio, as well as a temperature- and humidity-controlled warehouse. They provide sharpening services to customers and support over 600 artisans from around the world. Their showroom draws customers from around the region, country, and world.</p> <p>They opposed their potential displacement by Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b, and requested an alignment be selected or designed that does not displace them. They commented that if their business was to be acquired, it would be a financial hardship that would force them to close and lay off their employees. Comments were received from over 200 of their customers around the world in opposition to their displacement and repeated the concerns that the business stated in their letter.</p>
International Longshore and Warehouse Union Local 19	<p>The International Longshore and Warehouse Union Local 19 submitted comments on the Duwamish Segment. They supported the “South Crossing Alternative.” They strongly opposed the “North Crossing Alternative” due to impacts to jobs and port operations.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Jim Clark Marina	<p>Jim Clark Marina, located on the southwest edge of Harbor Island, submitted comments on the Duwamish Segment. They requested more information in the Final EIS on how they would be impacted. For Preferred Alternative DUW-1a, they requested more information about parking and utility impacts and disposition of their lease for access from the Port of Seattle. For Option DUW-1b, they wanted more information about the specific impacts to their marina and to see if mitigation might be available that would avoid displacement. If they were displaced, they requested alternative moorage be identified.</p>
SSA Marine	<p>SSA Marine, a global marine and rail cargo handling operator with headquarters on Harbor Island, submitted comments regarding the Duwamish Segment. They operate out of three buildings on the south side of the West Seattle Bridge, two of which they own. They supported Option DUW-1b as the least impactful to their facilities and operations. They stated that both Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b would require relocation of their offices to keep all of their offices together and accessible. They did not support Preferred Alternative DUW-1a because it would disrupt terminal operations north of the alignment and they did not support Alternative DUW-2 because they did not feel the impacts from it to Terminals 5 and 18 can be mitigated.</p> <p>They emphasized the importance of the “5-leg intersection” on operations for both Harbor Island marine terminal operations and their corporate campus access. They noted that even “short-term weekday, weekend and night closures can have a significant impact on freight mobility and marine terminal operations” and that “continuous, uninterrupted access of the BNSF railway to the Terminal 5 on-dock rail yard is absolutely critical to our operations.” They also noted that construction impacts should consider the relationship between water-dependent marine terminals, truck, rail, transloading, and warehouse activities. They requested more information on navigation impacts to shoreside business from Alternative DUW-2, potential truck detour routes, and traffic management during construction.</p>
Riverside Mill LLC	<p>Riverside Mill LLC, located at 3800 West Marginal Way Southwest, submitted comments regarding the Duwamish Segment. They own a large property with six industrial tenants with long-term leases, most of which are water-dependent businesses. They also have two contracts for floating moorage on the Duwamish Waterway, and the 120-foot dock is also used by tenants for loading and unloading from the property. There are currently three access points to the property (north, mid, and south) but the mid access point will be closed by the Port of Seattle for their Terminal 5 improvements and the south access is limited as it is an easement on BNSF Railway property. The north access point (directly under the West Seattle Bridge) will become their main access point once the mid access is closed.</p> <p>They provided information on their tenants and impacts to them from Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b. Each alternative would affect different buildings on the property, but most businesses would either be displaced or need to relocate for construction of either alternative, which would limit access to the property, and likely would not return. They requested that if either of these alternatives is chosen, that their full property be acquired.</p>
Delridge Segment	
Alki Beach Academy	<p>Employees of Alki Beach Academy, located at 2414 Southwest Andover Street, submitted comments regarding the Delridge Segment. They oppose Alternatives DEL-5 and DEL-6 which would displace this childcare facility. They noted it has plans for expansion which will make it the largest childcare facility in the city. They stated that after their expansion they will “make up 1 in 5 licensed child care slots in 98106 (the most racially diverse and lowest income zip code in West Seattle).” They also noted the property where it is located is owned by the Frye Art Museum and revenue from the property is used to “fund the museum and keep it free and accessible.”</p> <p>About 60 comments from supporters of this business requesting that Sound Transit avoid displacement of this business were submitted.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
Delridge Development LLC	<p>Delridge Development LLC, which owns an office building at 4000 Delridge Way Southwest, submitted comments regarding the Delridge Segment. They supported Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 because all other Delridge Segment alternative would displace them. They also noted that Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 cost less and have fewer residential and business displacements and fewer noise, vibration, parks, historic resources, and neighborhood impacts. They noted that most of their employees live in West Seattle. They stated that they are willing to work through traffic impacts during construction in order to keep their building.</p>
Development Services of America	<p>Development Services of America, which owns an office building at 4025 Delridge Way Southwest, submitted comments regarding the Delridge Segment. They stated they support the project but are concerned the Draft EIS does not describe potential impacts or mitigation for impacts on their property or the Delridge neighborhood. They stated the preliminary plans for various project alternatives appear to pass close to their building, but they feel there is not enough information in the Draft EIS for them to understand the impacts. They were concerned about the proximity of permanent support columns to their building, as well as traffic, congestion, noise, vibration, dust, and odor during construction. They requested consideration of alternatives to extended road closures and that the Final EIS include mitigation for these closures.</p> <p>They described groundwater issues on the property that affected their construction of the building and noted the “geotechnical character of the area around the Property includes substantial fill areas” which could “amplify vibration and structural support issues for our building.” They were concerned about the lack of parking in the area for a station and that “surface parking and related enforcement on our parking lots will put an unnecessary strain on our resources” and that because of the lack of pedestrian infrastructure and activating uses in the area, a station could “exacerbate local issues of crime and security.” They provided copies of view easements they have from properties on the north side of Southwest Andover Street that preserve views from their building of Elliott Bay and Downtown Seattle. They suggested a supplement to the Draft EIS to cover these impacts.</p>
Nucor Steel Seattle	<p>Nucor Steel Seattle, located at 2424 Southwest Andover Street, is a steel mill in Delridge that provides steel for construction projects throughout the region, and it is also the largest recycler in the state. They have over 300 employees and indirectly support more than 1,000 industrial, maritime, and transportation jobs in the region. They provided comments supporting the project but expressing two major concerns. One concern was related to the location of the Delridge Station and guideway with Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6, which would involve use of their property for guideway columns and would cross over their heavily used truck entrance from Southwest Andover Street. They were also concerned that pedestrian, bicycle, and transit traffic associated with this station would increase traffic congestion and conflicts with their trucks. They noted that their entrance would need to be replaced, and they would need a dedicated freight corridor connecting to either the West Seattle Bridge or West Marginal Way for their over 100 trucks per day that access the site.</p> <p>Their second concern was related to the construction period roadway closures proposed for Delridge Way Southwest that would occur with all Delridge Segment alternatives. Closures of this roadway at any time could affect their operations because they operate 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. They requested a dedicated truck and freight route throughout construction.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
West Seattle Junction Segment	
Alki Lumber	<p>Alki Lumber, located at 4406 36th Avenue Southwest and 4440 Fauntleroy Way Southwest, submitted comments about their planned future development on their parcels (Sweeney Blocks Project) and their concern about Preferred Alternatives WSJ-1 and WSJ-2 due to disruption to transportation, as well as the aesthetic, noise, vibration, and neighborhood cohesion impacts. They provided details on how each of these alternatives would affect development of their project, either through direct use of the property or affecting access. Their project, which will have 500 transit-oriented residences and a new retail core along 36th Avenue Southwest, has advanced in design and permitting in the last year and the Master Use Permits could be issued in the next few months.</p> <p>They expressed support for the tunnel alternatives due to the avoidance of many of these impacts, with a preference for Preferred Alternative WSJ-3a. They were concerned about placement of a flow control vault for the tunnel alternatives on their property and requested more information on how this could affect their development. They also requested information on whether tiebacks or shoring would be needed on their property. They suggested this vault be further engineered and potentially relocated. They requested additional information and analysis on the cumulative impacts on transportation of roadway closures, impacts to businesses from construction impacts, aesthetic, noise, vibration, neighborhood cohesion, and scenic routes, as well as more information on mitigation.</p>
HB Management	<p>HB Management, a business and investment management entity that has developed several affordable and market-rate residential projects near existing Sound Transit light rail stations, submitted comments on the West Seattle Junction Segment. They are currently in a partnership with the owners of Alki Lumber for development of their site, and support the comments provided by Alki Lumber. In addition, they opposed removal of the Avalon Station and feel the ridership reported in the Draft EIS was understated. They stated they have property interests and partnership plans at four additional sites, representing approximately 600 additional units, within a quarter mile of the proposed Avalon Station. They requested these units be considered in the Final EIS analysis. They also stated that removing the Avalon Station would affect “lower income and predominantly BIPOC communities farther up 35th Avenue such as in High Point,” because these communities would likely access the light rail system at the Avalon Station.</p> <p>They suggested that if the Avalon Station is removed, a tunnel Alaska Junction Station location north of Alaska should be considered “either near the Trader Joe’s or the Les Schwab Tire Center that would better serve Triangle, Junction, and Upper 35th Avenue residents.” They stated these additional alternatives should be studied in a supplement to the Draft EIS and the public provided an additional comment period prior to the Final EIS and Sound Transit Board action on the alignment.</p>
Maris Apartments	<p>Legacy Partners and USAA Real Estate Group, who recently completed the Maris Apartment project at 4722 Fauntleroy Way Southwest submitted comments regarding the West Seattle Junction Segment. They expressed opposition to Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 which would displace this apartment building, which includes 244 market-rate units and 64 affordable, income-restricted units. They support a station closer to the Alaska Junction.</p>
The Grove West Seattle Inn	<p>The Grove West Seattle Inn, located at 3512 Southwest Alaska Street, submitted comments on the West Seattle Junction Segment. They had concerns regarding transportation, displacement, aesthetic, noise, vibration, and neighborhood cohesion impacts from Preferred Alternative WSJ-1 and supported Preferred Alternative WSJ-3a because it would reduce these impacts. They requested more analysis of road closures (permanent and temporary) and cumulative impacts, and more information on mitigation.</p>

Business/ Business Organization	Comments
The Whittaker Apartments	The Whittaker Apartments, a 389-unit apartment building located at 4755 Fauntleroy Way Southwest, submitted comments on the West Seattle Junction Segment. They were concerned about noise and vibration impacts from Preferred Alternative WSJ-2, as well as street and sidewalk access to their building, truck trips, and on-street parking impacts around their building during construction. They also felt it would have the most impacts to the neighborhood, in part because of the large number of residential displacements. They requested further analysis of impacts from this alternative and mitigation. They requested additional information on impacts on/around their property to supplement the Draft EIS.
West Seattle Junction Association	The West Seattle Junction Association submitted comments on the West Seattle Junction Segment. They opposed Preferred Alternative WSJ-1 because of the number residential and business displacements, undevelopable areas under the guideway, and the elevated tail track in a residential neighborhood. They opposed Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 because it would be too far from the “heart of the Junction” and too close to the Avalon Station. They supported Preferred Alternative WSJ-3a, Option WJS-3b, or Alternative WSJ-5 because they all “offer station locations that serve the Junction far better than the elevated options without taking wide swaths of the neighborhood.”

Table 2-4. Summary of Business and Business Organization Comments – Ballard Link Extension

Business/Business Organization	Comments
<i>Chinatown-International District Segment</i>	
American Hotel Management	<p>American Hotel Management manages the historic American Hotel building at 520 South King Street and submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They commented that their building is occupied by 16 locally owned and operated tenants, including the 289-bed Hostelling International Seattle, one of two remaining hostels in Seattle. They supported alternatives on 4th Avenue South in the Chinatown-International District Segment to minimize impact to their building and businesses. They commented that the 5th Avenue South alternatives in this segment would be highly disruptive to the businesses in the building due to construction vibration, noise, and lack of access. They stated that the major tenants in the building would be unable to temporarily move to another location and that construction could affect the long-term viability of the businesses.</p>
ARE-Seattle No. 35 LLC	<p>ARE-Seattle No. 35 LLC, which owns the property at 1010 4th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They are in the process of planning for redevelopment of this site (the former Salvation Army) as an office and research and development campus and plan to start applying for permits later this year. They stated that the 4th Avenue South alternatives would prevent the generation of thousands of jobs at the property because it would instead be used for construction staging and/or a traction power substation (TPSS), a stormwater vault, and ventilation facilities. They also stated their project would generate “several million dollars in fees for affordable housing development” and would improve the pedestrian environment on 4th Avenue South, and that the Final EIS should address the indirect impacts from these lost opportunities.</p> <p>They provided geotechnical information on the property, noting the high groundwater conditions that could cause migration of contaminants in this area and affect the foundations of other nearby buildings. They requested more information on street closure impacts and mitigation and suggested that a phased review of the project under SEPA would be more appropriate.</p>
CID Business Improvement Association	<p>The CID Business Improvement Association submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They noted that most small businesses in the Chinatown-International District are family-owned and operated, and they are often immigrants or refugees with limited English proficiency and limited digital literacy. They also noted the role of the neighborhood as a cultural hub for the regional Asian-American community.</p> <p>They did not support Alternative CID-2a or Option CID-2b because the impacts from these would put their community priorities at risk. They stated, “unless Sound Transit can identify another option that moves the construction impacts away from the cultural spine of the [Chinatown-International District] and/or identifies substantial mitigation to avoid or greatly minimize these impacts, we do not believe the Fifth Avenue Alternative and options are acceptable.” Impacts of concern included street closures, noise, dust, truck traffic, visual changes, use of outdoor spaces, and loss of on-street parking. Regarding potential TOD, they stated the “community would need assurance in the form of explicit legal commitments that these opportunities would be limited to those who could ensure retention of community ownership of properties and not make us more vulnerable to displacement and gentrification.” They also were concerned that these alternatives would reduce visibility and accessibility of the Historic Chinatown Gate, as well as affect the structural stability of the gate during construction.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
<p>CID Business Improvement Association (cont.)</p>	<p>They supported Alternative CID-1a because it would have direct connections to both Pioneer Square and Chinatown-International District neighborhoods and “would facilitate more direct connections between transit modes such as Sounder, Light Rail, Amtrak, and private buses.” They felt there would be more opportunity to realize “long-held community goals and regional benefits” with this alternative. They noted that additional analysis, including visual analysis of station entrances, improvements, and ventilation facilities, of Alternative CID-1a should be conducted to help understand some of the benefits and impacts of the project. They requested recognition of the Chinatown-International District and Pioneer Square “as a complete, cohesive, neighborhood.” They supported re-activating Union Station as part of this alternative and stated it could act as an entry point to the Chinatown-International District, Pioneer Square, and Downtown.</p> <p>They did not support either of the deep station options (Options CID-1b and CID-2b) because of required elevator access would be challenging during large events, make access and transfers more difficult, and could be a deterrent for attracting riders to their neighborhood if riders choose to access the light rail at a different station.</p> <p>For all alternatives, they requested more consideration of the “cumulative harm caused by decades of public infrastructure projects sited and constructed without centering the voices of people of color” in the environmental justice analysis. They requested more clarity on activities within the construction footprint and staging areas. They asked for analysis of operational noise for residential properties and more analysis of parking impacts on the community, including conducting further public engagement with residents and small business owners on this topic.</p> <p>For Alternative CID-1a, they stated, “there appears to be more opportunity to minimize and mitigate traffic impacts through design, construction phasing and staging, and other engineering technologies” and they hoped that Sound Transit will take “the opportunity to better understand and address adverse effects” on the Chinatown-International District and Pioneer Square neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Gateway King LLC</p>	<p>Gateway King LLC, which owns buildings at 605 and 625 5th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that alternatives in this segment must maintain pedestrian and vehicle access points for their buildings, on- and off-street parking, full capacity of major transportation corridors (including 4th and 5th avenues south), and full capacity of nearby transit. They requested further study of construction traffic impacts and mitigation, as well as “alternatives that limit the construction period and footprint of impact to our buildings.” They requested more information about noise, vibration, air quality, and other impacts during construction in the Final EIS.</p>
<p>International Community Health Services</p>	<p>International Community Health Services, located at 720 8th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. International Community Health Services provides medical services to over 10,000 patients annually, and these patients are primarily medically underserved communities, the majority of which are people of color, low-income, and prefer to speak a language other than English. They supported expanded public transportation but had concerns about negative effects from the proposed station not addressed in the Draft EIS. They requested more analysis in the Final EIS of the inequitable burden on the community from major construction projects, the potential for additional indirect residential and small business displacements, impacts of Metro trolley lines on their patient and client access and services, noise and visual assessment, and acknowledgement of the impacts of COVID-19 and anti-Asian bias crime on the community. They noted the economic and social impact of even temporary loss of businesses and human services on the neighborhood. They provided details about the multiple uses that occur on 8th Avenue South related to their facilities and expressed concern about other construction anticipated in the area that would compound impacts from the trolley line relocation. They described the stress that seniors have experienced related to the pandemic and hate crimes, and stated that “forcing street closures, traffic reroutes, and transit relocations on a mobility compromised population that is already fearful about moving through their own neighborhood should not be undertaken lightly.”</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
International Community Health Services (cont.)	They requested a “full analysis on the scope of impacts, both immediate and downstream, that the 5th Avenue alternatives will have on the [Chinatown-International District]” and to bring the “updated analyses to [Chinatown-International District] community stakeholders for public review and feedback prior to completing and issuing the Final EIS.”
International Model Toys	International Model Toys, located at 524 South King Street, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They did not have a preference between alternatives in this segment but would like the station built as soon as possible because the project could bring business opportunities. For the Alternative CID-2a diagonal configuration, which could require their temporary relocation for less than a year, they preferred to be compensated for the loss of business. They did not feel it would be economical to relocate for less than a year.
KOBO Gallery and Shop	<p>KOBO Gallery and Shop, located at 605 South Jackson Street, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They felt that while all options in this segment would be harmful to the Chinatown-International District neighborhood, the 4th Avenue South alternatives would be the least harmful. They were opposed to the 5th Avenue South alternatives due to impacts to the historic district, business displacements, road closures, rerouted traffic, pollution, environmental harm, and economic impacts. They noted the neighborhood has “already been threatened in the face of gentrification and development, along with the pandemic and the rise of anti-Asian racism.”</p> <p>They expressed concern about the extent of outreach to their community and feel “Sound Transit has not adequately communicated to our community how the expansion would affect the physical landscape of the area permanently, and how the construction project would create road closures in the heart of the [Chinatown-International District], reroute traffic, affect parking and impact the economic viability of the [Chinatown-International District].” They felt that more outreach to recruit for the Community Advisory Group should have been done and that the group “also seems to have little influence and advisory group’s concerns have not been adequately addressed.” They requested that the City Council and Sound Transit Board “approach this project from a racial equity perspective.”</p>
Louisa Hotel	Louisa Hotel, located at 669 South King Street, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They felt that while all options in this segment would be harmful to the Chinatown-International District neighborhood, the 4th Avenue South alternatives would be the least harmful. They did not support the 5th Avenue South alternatives because they believe these alternatives would be harmful to the community and noted recent community struggles with the pandemic and hate crime. They requested that the history and culture of the neighborhood be protected. They requested Sound Transit “continue to explore further ramifications of all its options” and “continue the dialogue and research.”
Martin Smith Incorporated	Martin Smith Incorporated, which owns office and retail properties in the Pioneer Square historic district, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that impacts from any of the Chinatown-International District Segment alternatives would affect their properties and the historic districts of Pioneer Square and the Chinatown-International District. They requested more information on impacts to the Pioneer Square neighborhood and supported comments submitted by the Alliance for Pioneer Square. They supported further study of Alternative CID-1a because they felt it would better meet long-term regional transit needs, and they felt that “further study can help to reduce impacts to transit and traffic, seek to shorten construction duration, and reduce costs.” They also noted this would “center the new light rail station within the existing transportation hub, closer to more existing transportation, transit, and event facilities, offering greater opportunity for connectivity and infrastructure development that benefits the whole Puget Sound region, not just Seattle.”

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Oasis Tea Zone	<p>Oasis Tea Zone, located at 519 6th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They provided comments about being potentially displaced and expressed frustration at the potential for over a decade of construction and change to the Chinatown-International District neighborhood from property acquisition, redevelopment, and gentrification. They felt the government often has made more expensive and difficult choices for other projects and policies, but “when it comes to the Chinatown ID community, cost and timelines all of the sudden become a critical component.” They requested “collaboration in finding a solution that meets the transportation needs but does not turn Chinatown into a modern tourist zoo.”</p>
Ping’s Dumpling House	<p>Ping’s Dumpling House, located at 508 South King Street, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They requested “reasonable compensation” for loss of business due to traffic, pollution, and other disruptions during construction for alternatives on 4th Avenue South. For alternatives on 5th Avenue South that would displace them, they stated they “will accept a negotiated one-time displacement fee.”</p>
Sairen Gallery	<p>Sairen Gallery, located at 600 South Jackson Street, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They supported the 4th Avenue South alternatives and are opposed the 5th Avenue South alternatives because they would displace Asian-owned businesses and have construction impacts that would affect the entire neighborhood. They expressed concern for safety and security, noting problems with this in recent years and requesting support for businesses in the neighborhood in the form of grants or allocations for security.</p>
Seattle Mariners	<p>The Seattle Mariners, the professional baseball team that plays at T-Mobile Park, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They provided comments primarily related to transportation and construction impacts. They requested analysis of the pedestrian routes and experience that would occur with the 2-year closure of the Stadium Station for construction of Alternative CID-1a. They were concerned about how attendees would access the park from other stations during this closure, as well as the potential for increased driving to events and the effect this would have on their Transportation Management Plan and parking availability. They were also concerned about the proposed 6- to 7-week closure of light rail in this area with the same alternative and the effect this would have on access to the park. They requested clarification about whether the Weller Street Bridge would remain open during construction of Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b and noted that this bridge would be an important pedestrian connection during the closure of the Stadium Station as more riders would access the park from the existing International District/Chinatown Station.</p> <p>They requested additional transportation analysis for event surges including during simultaneous events with Lumen Field as well as for surge events during construction, including potential impacts for pedestrian routes and facilities, transit, and parking. They requested additional analysis on freight, transit, and parking impacts related to extended road closures during construction. They noted that in the future condition there will not be a stop at that Stadium Station for both lines and requested analysis of how this will impact visitors to T-Mobile Park.</p> <p>They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to include the City’s update to the industrial land use code that is expected to be adopted in 2023, as well as the list of future development projects. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for the WSBLE Project.</p> <p>They provided a list of recommended mitigation related to wayfinding and pedestrian enhancements and additional transit and parking options during construction. During operation, they suggested mitigation related to wayfinding from the SODO and International District/Chinatown stations and related to event surges.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Union Station Associates	<p>Union Station Associates, which owns the Union Station Garage at 550 5th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They were concerned about access to their building and parking garage under all alternatives and requested additional analysis of traffic, parking, and pedestrian impacts during construction. They were concerned that access impacts for vehicles as well as other modes will affect their employee’s ability to access the building as well their ability to attract and retain tenants. They were particularly concerned about Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b due to the length of construction and the removal of the southbound left-turn lane into their parking garage. They noted that 40 percent of vehicles accessing this 1,150-stall garage use that lane, and that removing this lane will create a longer route for drivers to access the garage, adding to traffic and greenhouse gas emissions. They were also concerned about the potential closure of the Weller Street Bridge with these alternatives, and pedestrian safety related to sidewalk closures.</p> <p>They requested more analysis regarding businesses that could be indirectly displaced during construction and the economic impact of lost parking revenue. They provided a geotechnical memorandum regarding the soils under both alignments, which found that “it appears the shallow tunnel along Fifth Avenue will be preferable to Fourth Avenue from a geotechnical perspective.” They requested analysis of alternatives to maintain access to the Weller Street Bridge and retain full vehicular and pedestrian access to their garage during construction, shorten the construction duration, and avoid permanent parking loss in this segment.</p>
Urban Visions (6th Avenue)	<p>Urban Visions, a development corporation with multiple planned developments along 6th Avenue South between Seattle Boulevard South and Royal Brougham Way South submitted comments on the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that access to multi-modal transportation is an advantage for these sites. They supported an alternative that avoids conflict with their site and identified Alternative CID-1a as their “primary preferred option” and Option CID-2b as their secondary preferred option. They supported Alternative CID-1a because it avoids conflicts with their sites, the ability to connect the Pioneer Square and Chinatown International District neighborhoods, and it would avoid impacts to historic properties in the Chinatown neighborhood. They also supported rebuilding the 4th Avenue South viaduct. They suggested looking at improvements to other roadway infrastructure along the 4th Avenue South corridor as part of the project, and to further study the ventilation building proposed for the northwest corner of Union Station plaza.</p> <p>They supported Option CID-2b because it would not conflict with their site, it would be within the project budget, and would have the shortest construction period. They did suggest alternative station access or high speed, large capacity elevators due to the station depth.</p> <p>They did not support Option CID-1b because of the station depth and the displacements of Ryerson Bus Base. They did not support Alternative CID-2a because of the emergency egress proposed on one of their properties, conflicts with tiebacks for their proposed buildings, the need to rebuild 6th Avenue South, the degree of utilities relocations, and impacts to the Chinatown-International District community and historic structures.</p> <p>They suggested that Sound Transit continue to look at investments to the Union Station plaza and to maintain the viability of properties for TOD where surface features occur for tunnels. They requested more study of tunnel construction noise and vibration impacts and mitigation, as well as more information on staging areas. They suggested further study of stadium events in the transportation analysis and noted that the International District/Chinatown Station should have accessible and easy-to navigate transfers between light rail, Sounder, and Amtrak.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Urban Visions (Weyerhaeuser)	<p>Urban Visions also submitted comments on behalf of the Weyerhaeuser Company building at 200 Occidental Avenue South, regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They noted that all the alternatives in this segment would affect the Pioneer Square neighborhood and support comments submitted by the Alliance for Pioneer Square. They expressed concern that “the above-grade facilities that will be constructed to support the tunnel infrastructure are not clearly defined in location or scale within the urban fabric” and that “the loss of businesses due to ongoing construction will continue to push new tenants to other adjacent neighborhoods.” They requested that these issues be addressed more clearly for the project and mitigation identified.</p> <p>They supported further study of Alternative CID-1a to “reduce impacts to transit and traffic, seek to shorten construction duration, and reduce costs.” They felt this alternative better meets the long-term regional transit needs for the region.</p>
Uwajimaya	<p>The Uwajimaya corporation, which owns a mixed-use building that includes Uwajimaya Asian Food and Gift Market and Uwajimaya Village at 600 5th Avenue South as well as other properties in the neighborhood, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that their properties “contribute to the cultural and historic vitality of the [Chinatown-International District]” and they are “part of a fabric of numerous businesses, neighbors and community organizations who will experience significant adverse impacts from the WSBLE [Chinatown-International District] Station Alternatives.” They also noted they have begun design and feasibility studies for two of their parking lot properties to redevelop them as mixed-use projects that could provide new housing and commercial space. They supported the transit mission of the project, and requested Sound Transit extend the timeline for identifying a preferred alternative and “use the additional time to conduct a more thorough, inclusive analysis of impacts.” If Sound Transit moves forward with a decision on their current timeline, they supported Alternative CID-1a.</p> <p>They described the unique demographics and health disparities of the neighborhood, as well as past infrastructure projects that have adversely impacted them, and stated that based on these demographics, “the decision regarding where to locate the [Chinatown-International District] station is an equity decision.” They feel that Sound Transit should “select an alternative that considers and accounts for these equity issues and avoid selecting an alternative that creates greater disparity and further harm to this historically under-resourced community.”</p> <p>They requested more information on the benefits of the 4th Avenue South alternatives be included in the Final EIS, including information from station planning reports that describe the connectivity provided by these alternatives and how these alternatives would help achieve the community’s Jackson Hub vision. They also felt that rebuilding the 4th Avenue South viaduct is an opportunity “to reduce overall construction costs and impacts to a community” and that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle should further explore this potential benefit.</p> <p>They requested more information on the business displacements for the 5th Avenue South alternatives and expressed concern about the loss of properties owned by community members. They requested air quality and noise analyses be completed for the neighborhood, and more analysis of the community as a historic resource. They were also concerned about covering the Historic Chinatown Gate during construction and that this would “strip this unique community of its historic identity.” They wanted Sound Transit to work with the community to better understand the impacts to the neighborhood and define “specific and meaningful mitigation,” and “incorporate more coordinated and inclusive planning into the [Chinatown-International District] Alternatives.” They volunteered to help convene a work group of key community stakeholders to “review and advise on Sound Transit’s analysis in focused conversations.”</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
505 Union Station LLC	<p>505 Union Station LLC, which owns the office building at 505 5th Avenue South, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They felt that “there is not an acceptable option for the [Chinatown-International District] Segment that has been studied” and they “encourage Sound Transit to go back to the drawing board to figure out how to reduce the construction duration in the [Chinatown-International District] Segment and come up with another alignment alternative that maintains intact downtown’s primary transportation corridors and preserves the integrity of the [Chinatown-International District] neighborhood.”</p> <p>They were concerned about access to their building and parking garage under all alternatives and requested a traffic analysis for construction that shows the predicted alternate vehicle and bus routes and the level of service for intersections and transit routes in the project area. They were concerned that access impacts for vehicles as well as other modes will affect their employee’s ability to access the building as well their ability to attract and retain tenants. They were particularly concerned about Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b due to the length of construction and the removal of the southbound left-turn lane into their parking garage. They noted that 40 percent of vehicles accessing this 1,150-stall garage use that lane, and that removing this lane will create a longer route for drivers to access the garage, adding to traffic and greenhouse gas emissions. They were also concerned about the potential closure of the Weller Street Bridge with these alternatives, and pedestrian safety related to sidewalk closures. For Alternative CID-1a, they were also concerned about the closure of the Stadium Station for 2 years and shutting down the light rail system in this area for 6 to 7 weeks. They requested more information on the assumptions in the transportation analysis and on the design of the 4th Avenue South viaduct.</p> <p>They requested more analysis on construction noise impacts on local employers, neighborhood parks and open spaces, and office tenants and their workers and an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses or residents who close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested analysis for cumulative construction noise, vibration, and structural impacts to their building, and noted they are in a liquefaction-prone area. They were concerned about safety risks to residents and organizations in the Chinatown-International District neighborhood from increased truck traffic during construction, as well as effects on air quality and quality of life.</p> <p>They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to include the City’s update to the industrial land use code that is expected to be adopted in 2023, as well as the list of future development projects. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for the WSBLE Project. They suggested mitigation related to transportation, impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Vulcan (Yesler Terrace)	<p>The Vulcan ownership group for Yesler Terrace submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They noted the importance of the WSBLE Project to the community and that it will “advance equity, connectivity, and environmental goals that make Seattle and the Puget Sound region stronger.” They expressed concern over closures of the Seattle Streetcar line in the Chinatown-International District Segment. They described the importance of the streetcar to residents of the mixed-use, mixed-income Yesler Terrace development, particularly those living in affordable housing or using mobility devices. They also noted it is a “crucial form of transportation for medical workers and patients traveling to and from medical offices in the First Hill neighborhood” and that “ridership is anticipated to grow exponentially with the completion of the Center City Connector and connection of the two existing lines.” They requested that Sound Transit “avoid any closure of the Seattle Streetcar and study alternative approaches to avoid closures.” Where closures are found to be unavoidable, they requested minimizing the closures to no more than 6 months. They requested the Final EIS analyze impacts of the streetcar closure on patrons living in Yesler Terrace and “mitigation to ensure Seattle Streetcar patrons are equipped with the necessary, accessible, and reliable tools to still reach their destinations.”</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
<p>Washington State Ballpark Public Facilities District</p>	<p>Washington State Ballpark Public Facilities District, the entity that developed and owns T-Mobile Park, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They provided comments primarily related to transportation and construction impacts.</p> <p>They requested additional transportation analysis for event surges, including during simultaneous events with Lumen Field, as well as for surge events during construction, including potential impacts for pedestrian routes and facilities, transit, and parking.</p> <p>They requested analysis of the pedestrian routes and experience that would occur with the 2-year closure of the Stadium Station under Alternative CID-1a. They were concerned with this closure and how attendees would access the park from other stations, as well as the potential for increased driving to events and the effect this would have on their Transportation Management Plan and parking availability. They were also concerned about the proposed 6- to 7-week closure of light rail in this area with the same alternative and the effect this would have on access to the park.</p> <p>In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they were concerned about the depth of stations and elevator-only access for Options CID-1b and CID-2b and feel that the “impacts and usability of the station caused by the reliance on these elevators (and the associated concerns with maintenance of this equipment) outweigh any short-term advantages provided by the deep tunnel options.”</p> <p>They stated the Final EIS should study methods to reduce the construction duration under all alternatives and disclose any sequencing/phasing decision in order to fully understand the impact of the construction duration. They provided a list of recommended mitigation related to wayfinding and pedestrian enhancements and additional transit and parking options during construction. During operation, they suggested mitigation related to wayfinding from the SODO and International District/Chinatown stations and related to event surges.</p>
<p>Washington State Public Stadium Authority and First and Goal Incorporated</p>	<p>Washington State Public Stadium Authority and First and Goal Incorporated (FGI) submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. The stadium authority is the public agency that owns Lumen Field and Event Center, and FGI is the master tenant and operator of this facility.</p> <p>They were “concerned that Sound Transit has not yet taken the required ‘hard look’ at the environmental impacts of its proposed light rail line, particularly on the surrounding historic neighborhoods (specifically the Chinatown International District (“CID”), Pioneer Square, and SODO) and on Lumen Field.”</p> <p>They noted that their Master Use Permit for the stadium requires them to provide 5,774 protected parking spaces for event patrons at parking garages at and around Lumen Field, and they meet this condition through agreements with several parking garages and lots. They also noted that traffic for events is not only related to attendees, but also for move-in/move-out of large concerts and consumer show, and disruption to their access could lead to the inability of them to host these major events.</p> <p>They requested additional analysis on access to parking, particularly areas covenanted to meet their parking requirements, pedestrian access and connectivity, and impacts to businesses and residents. They also requested additional analysis of how construction road closures would affect event attendance, and how they would affect access to garages where they have agreements to provide parking for events. They noted transportation impacts during construction could affect the efficacy of the transportation management plan required by their Master Use Permit. They wanted more information on diverted traffic volumes, available capacity of detour routes, and traffic impacts on those routes, as well as evaluation of multiple modes and type of vehicles combined. They requested more analysis of impacts on pedestrian trips to their facility during construction and would like clarification about whether the Weller Street Bridge would remain open during construction of Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Washington State Public Stadium Authority and First and Goal Incorporated (cont.)	<p>They stated they did not support Options CID-1b or CID-2b because of reliance on elevators for accessing the deep stations. They “do not consider this a reasonable alternative as elevators are not adequate to move the large volumes of passengers who would one day use light rail to access events at Lumen Field” and they feel this access would be a disincentive to use light rail.</p> <p>They requested the environmental justice analysis be updated to provide more information on impacts by alternative and further analyze impacts on small businesses in the Chinatown-International District. They would also like analysis of dust, noise, vibration, and utility impacts on events and maintenance at Lumen Field during construction.</p> <p>They provided suggested mitigation for impacts to pedestrian movement, parking, and environmental justice communities and suggested that Sound Transit identify ways that it can “contribute to the vibrancy of the communities around the [Chinatown-International District] segment that exceed the minimum SEPA and NEPA [National Environmental Protection Act] requirements.” They requested to be included in development of the mitigation plan.</p>
Downtown Segment	
Allen Institute	<p>Allen Institute, located at 615 Westlake Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They support analysis of an alternative that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue rather than the Preferred Alternative DT-1 to avoid impacts from a multi-year closure of Westlake Avenue. They oppose routes with a South Lake Union Station on Mercer Street, which could negatively impact multiple research organizations, including the Allen Institute. They also support the comments provided by the Mercer Stakeholders Group.</p>
Allen Institute-Washington Builders LLC	<p>Washington Builders LLC, which owns the property at 615 Westlake Avenue North (Allen Institute), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They requested additional transportation analysis of the Denny Station located on Westlake Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1 and noted its importance as the main corridor into and through South Lake Union for multiple modes of transportation. They supported the Denny Station location for Alternative DT-2 on Terry Avenue and the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1 on Harrison Street.</p> <p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested additional analysis of electromagnetic and construction vibration impacts on sensitive uses in their building, as well as further assessment of mitigation measures. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Amazon	<p>Amazon, with multiple locations in the Downtown and South Lake Union neighborhoods, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They noted that about 75 percent of their employees get to work via “non-drive alone methods.”</p> <p>For the Westlake Station, they were concerned with roadway closures of Pine Street and 4th Avenue and noted that pedestrian access to offices and ground-level retail in this area must be preserved. They were also concerned with safety in the 3rd Avenue and Pine Street area and requested further study of how WSBLE construction would affect public safety efforts in this area for both Downtown Segment alternatives.</p> <p>They were concerned with the multi-year closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station with Preferred Alternative DT-1 and noted this and adjacent street closures would affect access to three Amazon buildings where more than 15,000 Amazon employees and vendors work. They requested additional study of the Denny Station located on Terry Avenue associated with Alternative DT-2, including if construction can be staged to avoid closures of Denny Way and the Seattle Streetcar. If the Denny Station on Westlake Avenue continues to be preferred, they requested additional study to minimize closures.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
<p>ARE-Seattle No. 45 Owner LLC</p>	<p>ARE-Seattle No. 45 Owner LLC, which owns the property at 400 Dexter Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They noted most of their building is occupied by bioscience laboratory space. They supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 because it would have less impact to their building than Alternative DT-2. They supported the Harrison Street location for the South Lake Union Station because it would have higher ridership and fewer community impacts, but they requested more information regarding roadway and sidewalk closures next to their building. They requested further analysis of vibration and electromagnetic field impacts and mitigation to their building, using additional data collected from recently opened extensions on the Sound Transit system. They wanted more analysis of construction vibration impacts and of potential business displacement due to construction impacts.</p> <p>They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, vibration, and business impacts.</p>
<p>ARE-Seattle No. 32 Owner LLC</p>	<p>ARE-Seattle No. 32 Owner LLC, which owns the property at 601 Dexter Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They are in the process of pursuing entitlements to develop this building as a life sciences laboratory and office space. They expect to receive their Master Use Permit by the end of 2022 and expect to start construction in early 2023. They offered to share project documents and plans to support vibration and electromagnetic analyses for this building.</p> <p>They supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 and its Harrison Street location for the South Lake Union Station because it would have higher ridership and fewer community impacts. They were concerned about potential operational and construction vibration impacts to their building with Alternative DT-2. They requested more information regarding the tunnel depth next to their building and to make sure the WSBLE design accounts for their parking garage, utility infrastructure, and groundwater issues. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, vibration, and business impacts.</p>
<p>ARE-Seattle No. 33 Owner LLC</p>	<p>ARE-Seattle No. 33 Owner LLC, which owns the property at 701 Dexter Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They began construction to develop this building as a life sciences laboratory and office space in late 2021 and expect to be completed in in early 2024. They requested vibration and electromagnetic analyses for this building.</p> <p>They supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 and its Harrison Street location for the South Lake Union Station because it would have higher ridership and fewer community impacts. They were concerned about potential operational and construction vibration impacts to their building with Alternative DT-2. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, vibration, and business impacts.</p>
<p>BGO Plaza 600 JV LLC</p>	<p>BGO Plaza 600 JV LLC, which owns the property at 600 Stewart Street (Plaza 600), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned about traffic congestion from road closures during construction affecting the ability of downtown employees and residents to reach their jobs and homes, and as well as noise, vibration, and security related to nearby construction. They requested that Sound Transit “find ways to integrate the station entrances into the existing built environment” rather than having free-standing station houses. They were also concerned about their ability to redevelop their property in the future if a tunnel is underneath it and would like this analyzed in the EIS.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Bosa Development	Bosa Development, which owns the property at 601 4th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They have started construction on development of the Civic Square project on this block. They were concerned about the street closures during construction near their building and noted that the only vehicular drop-off and loading area for their building will be on Cherry Street. They requested Sound Transit evaluate the impact of these closures and propose mitigation.
Boston Properties Limited Partnership	Boston Properties Limited Partnership, which owns the building at 1001 4th Avenue (Safeco Plaza), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned that the street closures during construction near their building may affect accessibility, use, and leasing of their building. They requested additional information on the location, sequence, and duration of street closures and proposed mitigation to ensure maintenance of access in this area.
BPP 800 Fifth Property Owner LLC	BPP 800 Fifth Property Owner LLC, which owns the property at 800 5th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned that construction noise, staging, and congestion from street closures will create “an environment inhospitable to pedestrians in the one location Downtown where pedestrian quality is critical.” They requested more information on these impacts and proposed mitigation. They wanted to see more attention paid to the urban design and pedestrian activation for light rail structures downtown.
BPP 1420 Fifth Property Owner LLC	BPP 1420 Fifth Avenue Owner LLC, which owns the property at 1420 5th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. Preferred Alternative DT-1 proposes to integrate a station entrance for the Midtown Station into this building, and they were concerned about adverse impacts of this station entrance to the use, operation, and leasing of their building during and after construction. They wanted to understand what other alternatives were considered. They requested the Final EIS include more information about impacts to and mitigation for their property. They also requested more information about street closures in the vicinity and mitigation for impacts related to these closures.
Business Owners Management Association	The Business Owners Management Association, which represents the owners and managers of most of the high-rise commercial buildings in Downtown Seattle, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They provided suggestions on siting station locations and property acquisitions. They requested consideration of non-motorized users, accessibility, and mitigation for lost parking. They were concerned about impacts during construction, including street closures, maintaining access to businesses, noise, vibration, and pest control. They felt that due to the length of construction, many impacts will not be temporary and that “the risks to the economic health of downtown are high.” They did not feel there was enough detailed information to “make an informed choice regarding the alternatives.” They noted they would be happy to facilitate coordination between Sound Transit and building owners and managers.
Civic Hotel	<p>The Civic Hotel, located at 325 7th Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They noted they are a family and BIPOC-owned hotel, and they were converted into an emergency shelter during the COVID-19 pandemic. They were opposed to being displaced for the South Lake Union Station under Preferred Alternative DT-1. They also noted construction of this station would exacerbate existing traffic congestion that occurs from traffic entering and exiting State Route 99. They suggested exploring a station location at 5th Avenue North and Harrison Street, or 7th Avenue North and Thomas Street.</p> <p>About 300 comments from supporters of this business requesting that Sound Transit avoid displacement of this business were submitted.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Climate Pledge Area	<p>Climate Pledge Area, located at 334 1st Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They noted support for the project and hope that the timeline for delivery can be moved back to 2035. They were concerned that the Draft EIS “has not fully considered how to design the Uptown/Seattle Center station to allow for more efficient use of the station by Climate Pledge Area patrons” and that more work is needed to capture the existing conditions of, impacts to, and mitigation for this property. They supported the concept of shifting this station west on Republican Street to reduce impacts on the arena and Seattle Center and suggested adding pocket tracks to the station to help manage major events. They suggested working with the City to provide “festival street treatment on Republican between 1st Avenue North and Queen Anne Avenue” to help with post-event queuing space.</p> <p>They requested more analysis of surge events and schedule changes to accommodate surges, analysis of potential impacts to their structure’s integrity, vibration, and noise. They requested more information on construction means and methods, as well as development of transportation management plan and a passenger flow/crowd management plan (in conjunction with the Seattle Center and the City of Seattle Department of Transportation).</p>
Downtown Seattle Association	<p>The Downtown Seattle Association, which represents both businesses and residents of Downtown Seattle, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They noted their support for the project but also “concern that construction methodologies be properly explored to minimize impact on businesses, residents, workers and visitors and that those impacts which are unavoidable are adequately mitigated.” They requested more information on construction phasing and timing, street closures and durations, and detours for vehicles, transit, and pedestrians. They requested that Sound Transit study a single-bore construction method for the downtown tunnel to see if this would reduce construction impacts and/or station profiles and stated if “Sound Transit has already studied all possible construction methods we ask that the findings be made public and information shared on how the Agency landed on dual-bore as the only feasible option.” They also requested that Sound Transit examine ways to better integrate station entrances into the existing built environment, find ways to “turn necessary new infrastructure into community and/or property assets as an alternative to full condemnation” and “ensure configuration and footprints are tailored specifically to support a dense urban core environment.”</p> <p>They suggested Sound Transit work with the community to develop performance standards for construction impacts and convene a committee of downtown stakeholders to make mitigation recommendations and/or respond to proposed mitigation. They requested Sound Transit update the mapping and list of permitted projects to inform the impact analysis and mitigation development. They requested that the unique needs of arts, cultural, and entertainment venues be considered during analysis of construction impacts and development of mitigation, due to their higher use during weekends and increased sensitivity to noise and other disruptions.</p> <p>At the Midtown Station, they requested Sound Transit “explore the feasibility of accessing the Midtown Station via a horizontal tunnel and assess how this method would change other aspects for the Midtown Station construction and profile.” At Westlake Station, they noted they are responsible for management of Westlake Park through an agreement with Seattle Parks and Recreation and requested that Sound Transit “take a holistic view when planning construction areas and street closures on 4th Avenue and Pine Street,” so as not to hamper “recent public safety and activation efforts by isolating one of our city’s most challenging areas from the rest of the downtown retail core.” They also asked, “how this station could integrate into and bring additive benefit to the park.” At Denny Station, they did not support a multi-year closure of the Seattle Streetcar or other transit service on Westlake Avenue with Preferred Alternative DT-1 and requested a detailed plan for managing traffic and maintaining transit if this continues to be the preferred station location. They supported further study instead of using the Denny Station on Terry Avenue associated with Alternative DT-2 and supported the South Lake Union Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Essex Queen Anne (Expo Apartments)	Essex Queen Anne, which owns the Expo Apartments at 118 Republican Street, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned about noise, vibration, dust, light and glare, geotechnical, transportation, and parking impacts associated with construction of the Seattle Center Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1, which would be directly adjacent to their building. They requested further analysis of these impacts, as well as study of additional alternatives for the Downtown Segment. They requested more analysis of indirect displacement of businesses due to the “lengthy and disruptive construction period” and noted they share many of the concerns voiced by Seattle Center arts organizations and support comments provided by these organizations. They felt that the Draft EIS does not have sufficient detail to understand impacts to their properties or what mitigation would be and suggested that a phased review of the project under SEPA would be more appropriate.
Fifth and Pine LLC	Fifth and Pine LLC, which owns multiple properties and tax parcels at 1513 5th Avenue, provided comments on the Downtown Segment. They requested more information on how their property would be impacted by the project and are concerned about their ability to lease the property if there is uncertainty about its future. They were also concerned about the potential for disinvestment and “pre-condemnation blight” in downtown if businesses do not feel confident investing in their businesses. They requested more information on construction impacts around their property, related to transportation (both congestion and transit service), noise, crime, business income, and property values. They requested supplemental environmental review with additional project details and additional information on impacts.
Fortuna Sequitar	Fortuna Sequitar, located at 233 Westlake Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They stated their support for the comments submitted by the Downtown Seattle Association, and strongly supported Preferred Alternative DT-1. They were concerned that Alternative DT-2 could affect future redevelopment of their property and requested this be analyzed in the EIS. They also requested more analysis of the multiple street closures around their property as well as noise, vibration, and other construction impacts, and that more specific mitigation measures be provided for these impacts.
Fourth and Columbia LLC	Fourth and Columbia LLC, which owns the building at 701 4th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They stated they currently have a permit application pending with the City for development of a 1,000-foot-tall project with 1,000 apartment units, office space, and a hotel. They requested more information about how their property would be impacted by the project and were concerned about their future development of the property. They noted if they are not able to complete their project, this will result in a loss of housing as well as payments to the City for new affordable housing. They were concerned about how long-term street closures around their property will affect construction of their project. They requested Sound Transit evaluate these impacts as well as suggest mitigation.
Fourth and Madison LLC	Fourth and Madison LLC, which owns the building at 925 4th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned about the street closures during construction near their building and noted one of the benefits of their building is the ease of accessibility to Interstate 5 and destinations to the north, south, and east. They requested Sound Transit conduct a worst-case evaluation of these closures and propose mitigation.
GC Columbia LLC	GC Columbia LLC, which owns the property at 701 5th Avenue (Columbia Center), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned about street closures near their building, particularly Cherry Street and 4th Avenue, and would like the location, sequence, and duration of these closures better defined. They also requested analysis of closures in this area on accessibility to offices in this area.

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Kassel and Rebecca Goldstein Company and LAC Investments	Kassel and Rebecca Goldstein Company and LAC Investments, which own the property at 413 Pine Street, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They requested more information on how their property would be impacted by the project and were concerned about the future use and value of the property. They requested more information on construction impacts around their property related to transportation (both congestion and transit service), noise, crime, business income, and property values. They requested supplemental environmental review with additional project details and additional information on impacts.
Kilroy Realty Corporation	Kilroy Realty Corporation, which owns seven properties along the proposed alternatives, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They felt that the Draft EIS does not have sufficient detail to understand impacts to their properties or what mitigation would be and suggested that a phased review of the project under SEPA would be more appropriate. They were concerned about traffic congestion, street closures, noise, vibration, and other construction impacts at their property, as well as the potential acquisition of one property and impacts to garage access at another.
KWP, Incorporated	KWP Incorporated, which owns the property at 201 Terry Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They own this property as an investment and are concerned about the ability to redevelop it in the future if there is a tunnel underneath it. They were also concerned about roadway closures that “will impose extraordinary hardships on nearby businesses, residents, and projects.” They requested analysis of this impact in the EIS. They requested further analysis of these issues and that this additional information be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.
KRE 300 Pine LLC	KRE 300 Pine Owner LLC, which owns the property at 300 Pine Street (former Bon/Macys), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned about traffic congestion from road closures during construction as well as noise, vibration, and security related to nearby construction. They wanted to ensure that road closures around the property do not isolate it and exacerbate existing security and public concerns in this area of downtown. They suggested Sound Transit “provide security and invest mitigation resources in the 3rd Avenue corridor to ensure these impacts do not occur.” They requested that Sound Transit “find ways to integrate the station entrances into the existing built environment” rather than having free-standing station houses.
Mack Real Estate Development	Mack Real Estate Development (MUI Terry LLC), which owns the property at 1001 John Street/124 Terry Avenue North, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They have received a Master Use Permit for a 47-story, 415-unit apartment building at this site, and expect building permits to be issued this year. They were concerned about construction of the Denny Station for Alternative DT-2 on Terry Avenue North, and that street closures around this station will affect their future building. They were concerned about vehicle, pedestrian, and loading access for their building, and that road closures could affect construction of their building. They were also concerned about dewatering, drilling, and vibration directly next to their foundation and impacts to the datacenter at 1000 Denny Street. They requested more information on staging areas, the timing, duration, and location of street closures, and other temporary and permanent impact to their property and neighborhood. They stated that if the project is proposed for design-build construction, the Draft EIS should include “performance standards, minimum guidelines and specific requirements on design-build contractors to ensure the environmental impacts of the project are fully mitigated.” They requested study of the businesses, jobs, and housing that would not occur in the future due to property acquisition for stations. They felt this project is better suited for a phased review under SEPA and requested additional information on impacts and mitigation be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Mercer Stakeholders Group	<p>The Mercer Stakeholders Group, a collection of organizations and businesses in the South Lake Union, Uptown, and Denny Triangle neighborhoods, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They supported the Denny Station location for Alternative DT-2 on Terry Avenue and the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1 on Harrison Street and requested analysis of connecting these stations. They also suggested looking for better opportunities to connect pedestrians and vehicles across State Route 99 with the South Lake Union Station. They requested more analysis of alternative construction methodologies, road closures and detours, and impacts on transit.</p> <p>At the Seattle Center Station, they stated that “Sound Transit must consider other station locations that are not immediately adjacent to the Seattle Center’s Northwest Rooms (Republican Street) or Seattle Rep” but wanted to ensure any other locations can connect to the South Lake Union Station on Harrison Street. They also requested analysis of specific construction activities for noise and vibration impacts on sensitive uses at the Seattle Center as well as how to better connect pedestrians and vehicles “from Queen Anne Avenue to Seattle Center and along Mercer Street.”</p> <p>For all stations, they requested development of robust transportation management and mitigation plans for all modes, further analysis of road and sidewalk closures and detours, consideration of alternative construction methods and mitigation techniques, construction sequencing, and a business access plan. They requested that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle establish a Construction Coordination Committee to develop a plan to minimize construction impacts and provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to businesses and venues, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Ninth and Lenora LLC	<p>Ninth and Lenora LLC, which owns the property at 2101 9th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They questioned the need to remove buildings for a station entrance and requested that Sound Transit study how to better integrate station entrances into the existing and future built environment.</p> <p>They expressed concern about the multi-year closures of Westlake and 9th avenues and requested alternatives to these closures be explored. They were concerned about the effects of these closures, along with construction noise, vibration, security, park, truck traffic, parking, and staging area impacts on the tenants of their 396-unit mixed-use building. They requested further evaluation of these impacts and that this additional information be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.</p>
Silverstein Westlake Owner LLC	<p>Silverstein Westlake Owner LLC, which owns the property at 801 Blanchard Street, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They have a permit application pending for future development of a 440-foot-tall, 418-unit apartment building on the property. They questioned the need to impact their properties for a station entrance and requested that Sound Transit study how to better integrate station entrances into the existing urban environment to minimize the number of buildings removed.</p> <p>They also expressed concern about the multi-year closure of Westlake Avenue and the effects this would have on nearby businesses, residents, and projects. They requested further evaluation of alternatives to this closure and that this additional information be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.</p>
Urban Vision (Net Seattle)	<p>Net Seattle LLC, which owns the property at 801 3rd Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They have received their Master Use Permit and building permits for construction of a new office building at this site. They were concerned that the street closures during construction may impact construction of their project. They requested additional information on street closures and mitigation for impacts “to ensure maintenance of access through this area of Downtown.”</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Vulcan (Blocks 41 and 48a)	<p>Vulcan (City Investors XC LLC and City Investors IV LLC), the owner of the properties at 230 Westlake Avenue North (Block 41) and 2211 Westlake Avenue North (Block 48a), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They noted that 230 Westlake Avenue North is currently a surface parking lot and would be needed for the Alternative DT-2 Denny Station, and 2221 Westlake Avenue North is landscaped and would be needed for the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Denny Station. They stated they “would be willing to work collaboratively with Sound Transit to facilitate an acquisition of Block 41 if it would support the Alternative DT-2 Terry Avenue station.”</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Vulcan (Block 46)	<p>Vulcan (City Investors XXVIII LLC), the owner of the property at 912 9th Avenue North (Block 46), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They are in process of developing this site in the South Lake Union neighborhood as a biomedical research building, with construction starting later this year and expected to be complete in 2025. They requested analysis of vibration and electromagnetic equipment that will be housed in the building and noted the proximity of Preferred Alternative DT-1 to this property.</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They supported the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1, but would like more information on construction traffic, noise, vibration, and road closures.</p> <p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They requested more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Vulcan (Block 48)	<p>Vulcan (City Investors IV LLC), the owner of the properties at 111 Westlake Avenue North and 110 9th Avenue North (Block 48), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They are in process of permitting the site at 111 Westlake Avenue North as an office and laboratory tower and the site at 100 9th Avenue North as a residential tower, with construction expected to start in early 2020 and expected to be completed in 2026. They requested analysis of vibration and electromagnetic equipment that will be housed at this property.</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They supported the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1, but requested more information on construction traffic, noise, vibration, and road closures.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Vulcan (Block 48) (cont.)	<p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Vulcan (Block 55)	<p>Vulcan (City Investors XII LLC), the owner of the property at 530 Dexter Avenue North (Block 55), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They are in the process of permitting this site for a laboratory building, with construction starting in 2024 and expected to be complete in 2026. They requested analysis of vibration and electromagnetic equipment that will be housed in the building.</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They supported the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1, but requested more information on construction traffic, noise, vibration, and road closures.</p> <p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Vulcan (Block 56)	<p>Vulcan (City Investors XXII LLC), the owner of the properties at 401 8th Avenue North and 433 8th Avenue North (Block 56), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They are in the process of permitting the site at 401 8th Avenue North as a residential tower and the site at 433 8th Avenue North as a midrise residential structure, with construction starting in 2024 and expected to be complete in 2026. They requested analysis of vibration for these buildings and noted the proximity of Preferred Alternative DT-1 to this property.</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They supported the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1, but requested more information on construction traffic, noise, vibration, and road closures.</p> <p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Vulcan (Block 57)	<p>Vulcan (City Investors XXIX LLC), the owner of the property at 300 Dexter Avenue North (Block 57), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They are in the process of permitting this site for a commercial tower that could include laboratory space, with construction starting in 2023 and expected to be complete in 2025. They requested this site not be considered for WSBLE staging and the EIS should “acknowledge and analyze the possibility that the Proposed Project will include sensitive laboratory space.”</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They supported the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1, but requested more information on construction traffic, noise, vibration, and road closures.</p> <p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>
Vulcan South Lake Union Ownership Group	<p>An affiliated ownership group of 11 properties in South Lake Union submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. Three of these are developed as residential buildings; two are developed for office, commercial, and/or retail; two are in permitting (one residential and one laboratory, office, and retail); and four are in development (one residential and three laboratory, office, and retail). They are concerned about impacts to “accessibility, transportation, retail vibrancy, pedestrian safety, and the availability of amenities, particularly during WSBLE construction.”</p> <p>They expressed concern with the extended closure of Westlake Avenue for construction of the Denny Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They noted the importance of this street for cars, buses, streetcar, pedestrians, and bikes. They requested more analysis of the impacts to all modes, and suggested analysis of a “hybrid” alternative for the segment that would use the Denny Station associated with Alternative DT-2 at Terry Avenue for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They supported the South Lake Union Station location for Preferred Alternative DT-1, but requested more information on construction traffic, noise, vibration, and road closures.</p> <p>They requested an expanded displacement analysis to account for businesses, residents, and organizations that close or move away due to construction impacts. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous construction of projects and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They provided suggested mitigation related to transportation, potential impacts to their building, and impacts to the neighborhood.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
WaFd	<p>WaFd, located at 425 Pike Street, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They requested more information on impacts to their property and suggest the project should be on another corridor. They were concerned the proposed road closures and surface construction will impact the urban environment, businesses, residents, and economy of the area, and would further delay recovery of this district. They requested more information on the timing, duration, and location of street closures and the effects of these on building access and traffic on detours. They requested study of the businesses, jobs, and housing that would not occur in the future due to property acquisition for the project. They encouraged study of “more opportunities and options for farebox pay to occur at locations below street level, so that those street level spaces may be persevered for uses that contribute to the urban environment.” They suggested study of the Third Avenue transit tunnel construction as a case study and requested more information on mitigation measures. They felt this project is better suited for a phased review under SEPA, or that Sound Transit should analyze a worst-case scenario for the Draft EIS.</p>
Brookfield	<p>Brookfield Properties, which owns the property at 400 Pine Street (Westlake Center), submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They were concerned the Draft EIS did not sufficiently evaluate impacts to their property and neighborhood and noted “the retail core is extremely fragile and has undergone an ordeal during COVID.” They do not support the proposed Westlake Station entrance for Preferred Alternative DT-1 on their property due to effects on pedestrian quality, visibility of retailers, and the duration of construction. They requested more information on above-grade structures and the location and duration of construction activities, as well as analysis of impacts to the retail core and specific mitigation for impacts. They requested further evaluation of these impacts and that this additional information be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS. They suggested Sound Transit “work with the City of Seattle to develop a new zoning vision for the retail core, one that provides greater opportunities for housing and jobs near Westlake Station.”</p>
Windsor Cirrus LLC and Windsor Advisors 2030 Eighth Avenue LLC	<p>Windsor Cirrus LLC and Windsor Advisors 2030 Eighth Avenue LLC, which own the property at 2030 8th Avenue, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They questioned the need to remove buildings for a station entrance and requested that Sound Transit study how to better integrate station entrances into the existing and future built environment.</p> <p>They expressed concern about the multi-year closures of Westlake and 9th avenues and requested alternatives to these closures be explored. They were concerned about the effects on these closures, along with construction noise, vibration, security, park, truck traffic, parking, and staging area impacts on the tenants of their 355-unit mixed-use building. They requested further evaluation of these impacts and that this additional information be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.</p>
Wright Runstad and Company	<p>RSQ Tower LL and WRC 400 University LLC, affiliates of Wright Runstad and Company, which own Rainier Square Tower at 1301 5th Avenue and 400 University Tower at 400 University Street, submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. Preferred Alternative DT-1 would be adjacent to Rainier Square Tower, and they requested more information on construction means and methods, monitoring, and mitigation. They were concerned about subsidence that could affect their building and noted the subsidence monitoring during construction of the State Route 99 tunnel would be a good example of what they would like to see. They were also concerned about roadway closures near their buildings and noted that Alternative DT-2 would have fewer closures in this area. They would like more analysis of concurrent roadway closures and the economic impacts to businesses when access is impaired, as well as a plan for maintaining walking, driving, and transit routes. They requested site-specific information on the expected vibration levels from tunnel construction and operations. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to reflect new projects proposed in the area and consider cumulative impacts on traffic, noise, air quality, public services, and other elements of the environment.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
South Interbay Segment	
Elliott Ave 1 LLC	<p>Elliott Ave 1 LLC, which owns properties on multiple tax parcels at 1465 Elliott Avenue West, 1435 Elliott Avenue West, 1425 Elliott Avenue West, and 1419 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. These properties have several buildings that house commercial tenants, and they requested more information about specific impacts on their properties and the associated buildings. They expressed concern about their ability to lease their property, as well as broader disinvestment in downtown Seattle at properties identified as potentially affected between the Draft EIS and when properties would be acquired, and the potential associated economic effects.</p> <p>They requested more information on construction impacts around their property and in the Smith Cove area, related to transportation (both congestion and transit service), noise, crime, business income, and property values. More information was also requested related to road closures and mitigation for those closures. They requested this additional information on impacts on/around their property be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.</p> <p>They commented that the alternatives on the east side of Elliott Avenue West would provide better TOD opportunities than those on the west side of the roadway.</p>
Elliott Way Partners	<p>Elliott Way Partners, which owns the property at 1405 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. This property is currently vacant, and they are actively planning for development of the property. They noted that Preferred Alternative SIB-1 “would have the effect of preventing our Project and eliminating the opportunity for transit-oriented development opportunities along Elliott Avenue.”</p> <p>They requested more information on temporary and permanent impacts to the neighborhood, more analysis of and mitigation for street closures, evaluation of the City’s update to the industrial land use code that is expected to be adopted in 2023, and analysis of impacts to future potential development. They requested supplemental environmental review for refinements that have been considered since the publication of the Draft EIS, as well as for additional information on impacts and mitigation.</p>
Greenwood Cider Company	<p>Greenwood Cider Company, located at 1445 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. They rent space from Hays Elliott Properties and were concerned about being displaced by Preferred Alternative SIB-1. They were concerned about the timeline of relocation, as they need federal and state permits for operation as a cidery and are unsure about compensation.</p>
GPG&C Investment Group	<p>GPG&C Investment Group, which owns the properties at 901 Elliott Avenue West, 921 Elliott Avenue West, and 945 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. They also operate a business on one of the properties. They were concerned about partial closures of Elliott Avenue West during construction of alternatives in this segment affecting access to the businesses on their properties, all of which are only accessible from this roadway. They requested more transportation analysis on impacts related to access and safety for all modes (car, transit, pedestrian, and bike) on these properties both during construction and operations as well as proposed mitigation.</p> <p>They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to include the City’s update to the industrial land use code that is expected to be adopted in 2023 and noted the potential for their properties and others in this area to be upzoned, which will affect future vehicular, transit, and pedestrian volumes in the area. They wanted more analysis of simultaneous road closures in adjacent segments and requested more information on the construction sequencing for WSBLE. They requested analysis of construction and operational vibration impacts to future uses of their properties, as they intend to redevelop them “with a mix of laboratory, research and office uses after the industrial lands upzone is adopted.” They provided a list of recommended mitigation related to wayfinding and pedestrian enhancements, potential vibration impacts, access changes for businesses, and for multiple transportation modes during construction.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Hays Elliott Properties	Hays Elliott Properties, which owns properties on the west side of Elliott Avenue West including 1465 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. They are opposed to Preferred Alternative SIB-1, which would acquire their properties and displace a number of small businesses. They supported the other South Interbay Segment alternatives that would avoid these displacements. They also noted the uncertainty of the project affects their ability to sell the property and their tenant’s sense of security.
Holy Mountain Brewing Company	Holy Mountain Brewing Company, located at 1421 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. They were concerned about being displaced by Preferred Alternative SIB-1 and supported Alternative SIB-3 because it would displace far fewer residents and businesses. They noted that they are a gathering place for Queen Anne residents and Expedia employees and requested Sound Transit consider Alternative SIB-3 to preserve small businesses in this area.
Lighthouse Uniform Company	Lighthouse Uniform Company, located at 1532 15th Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. They have been in their current location for 70 years and manufacture uniforms for the armed services and other public service agencies around the country and world. Most of their employees live nearby, and they were concerned about potential displacement (for the M.O.S.), their ability to relocate in the same area, and the impacts a relocation would have on their employees and families. They hoped that “Sound Transit can find a way to proceed without needing this location.”
SVAP III Elliott Plaza	<p>SVAP III Elliott Plaza, which owns the property at 1523 Elliott Avenue West, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. This property would be impacted by Preferred Alternative SIB-1, but they requested more information on impacts to their property. They felt that this alternative and the Smith Cove Station location would have limited TOD opportunities and a station on the east side of Elliott Avenue West would have more opportunities. They requested analysis comparing TOD opportunities between the alternatives.</p> <p>They expressed concern about “pre-condemnation blight” until an alternative is selected and properties are acquired, as owners will not want to invest in them. They requested more information on temporary and permanent impacts to the neighborhood, more analysis of and mitigation for street closures, and analysis of impacts to future potential development of their parcel. They requested supplemental environmental review for additional information on impacts and mitigation.</p>
West Garfield LLC and Clark Barnes LLC	West Garfield LLC and Clark Barnes LLC, which own the property at 1401 West Garfield Street, submitted comments on the South Interbay Segment. This property would be acquired and the business on it displaced for the M.O.S. They requested evaluation of other locations for the facilities associated with the M.O.S. They also requested additional analysis of lost opportunities for TOD due to property acquisition in the area; construction traffic, noise, vibration, light and glare, and dust impacts to their property; and permanent visual, light and glare, shadow, and noise impacts to their property. They felt that the Draft EIS does not have sufficient detail to understand impacts to their properties or what mitigation would be and suggested that a phased review of the project under SEPA would be more appropriate.
<i>Interbay/Ballard Segment</i>	
Artful Ashes	Artful Ashes, located at 3450 16th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They supported Option IBB-1b or the modifications proposed by the owners of Dusty Strings, from whom they lease building space, to avoid displacement of their business as well as of Dusty Strings.

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Ballard Alliance	<p>The Ballard Alliance, which represents businesses and residents in Ballard, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They requested Sound Transit prioritize a tunnel alternative for this segment and noted how Preferred Option IBB-2b reduced construction, displacement, maritime business, and environmental impacts. They supported a Ballard Station on 15th Avenue Northwest or farther west and requested study of additional station locations to the west. They did not support Preferred Alternative IBB-1a because the station would be too far from the residential and retail core of Ballard, threaten the maritime and industrial businesses in this area, and would impact “the brewery and maker’s spaces, as well as the new Ballard Food Bank.”</p> <p>They requested more information on temporary and permanent impacts to the neighborhood, an evaluation of the City’s update to the industrial land use code that is expected to be adopted in 2023, and analysis of impacts to development projects that are permitted but not yet constructed. They requested supplemental environmental review for refinements that have been considered since the publication of the Draft EIS and suggested that a phased review of the project under SEPA would be more appropriate.</p>
Ballard Business and Residential Community Letter	<p>A coalition of Ballard business leaders, business owners, residents, and workers submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They requested Sound Transit prioritize a tunnel alternative for this segment and noted how Preferred Option IBB-2b reduced construction, displacement, maritime business, and environmental impacts. They supported a Ballard Station on 15th Avenue Northwest or farther west and requested study of additional station locations to the west. They did not support Preferred Alternative IBB-1a because the station would be too far from the residential and retail core of Ballard and would impact “the brewery and maker’s spaces, as well as the new Ballard Food Bank.”</p>
Bedrock Industries	<p>Bedrock Industries, located at 4021 13th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They were concerned about being displaced by the project and hope that Sound Transit would help them move if they were displaced. They also supported study of a Ballard Station on 20th Avenue Northwest because it would have less disruption to traffic during construction and would be in a more central location for Ballard.</p>
Coalition of Ballard Avenue Businesses	<p>A coalition of 19 small businesses and organizations in Ballard submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They supported study of a station at 20th Avenue Northwest to better serve the core of the Ballard Hub Urban Village between 15th and 24th avenues northwest. They felt that a station on 14th or 15th avenues northwest is “too far away from Central Ballard to effectively serve the majority of residents, businesses, and nightlife.” They also noted that the industrial zoning and jobs around 14th or 15th avenues northwest should be preserved and requested that Sound Transit build the Ballard Station for future extensions to the north and east.</p>
Dusty Strings	<p>Dusty Strings, located at 3450 16th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They own the building, which was purpose-built for their business of manufacturing string instruments, and were concerned about being able to find a suitable relocation site if they are displaced. They supported Option IBB-1b because it would avoid displacing them as well as other small businesses in this area. They also provided a suggested modification to Preferred Alternative IBB-1a, Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, and Preferred Option IBB-2b that would shift these alignments west and north of their property. They noted that the property owner to the north has shared with them that they intend to move their business.</p> <p>About 100 comments from their customers requesting that Sound Transit avoid displacement of this business were submitted.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Interbay Rising West, LLC	<p>Interbay Rising West LLC, which owns the tax parcel at 1616 West Bertona Street, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. This property is being developed as the new headquarters and practice facility for the Seattle Storm. They provided comments regarding the specific impacts of the WSBLE Project on their properties and wanted to know more about how their property would be affected.</p> <p>They requested more information on construction impacts around their property, related to transportation (both congestion and transit service), noise, crime, business income, and property values. More information was also requested related to road closures and mitigation for those closures. They requested this additional information on impacts on/around their property be provided as a supplement to the Draft EIS.</p>
Keller Supply	<p>Keller Supply, located at 3205 17th Avenue West, 3209 17th Avenue West, and 3210 17th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. Two of their three buildings would be displaced for the preferred Interbay Station, and they stated it would be “impractical to retain occupancy” at the third because the buildings all operate together. They stated they would need to relocate in the same area, because they already have branches to the east, north, and south. They stated that if they could not be relocated in central Seattle, they would likely close, resulting in the loss of about 100 jobs. They requested Sound Transit find an alternate location for the station.</p>
Kidspace	<p>Kidspace, located at 3837 13th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They support the tunnel alternatives for this segment because they would be displaced by Preferred Alternative IBB-1a or Option IBB-1b. They noted their displacement would exacerbate the limited childcare options in Seattle and that relocating a childcare facility is difficult due to unique regulatory requirements. They also noted that moving to another location may result in families driving farther to access childcare, which affects traffic and air quality. They requested impacts to their facility be specifically analyzed in the EIS, both for displacement as well as potential air quality, noise, vibration, and construction roadway closures for the other alternatives in this segment.</p>
MAK Management LLC	<p>MAK Management LLC, which owns “several properties in Seattle’s industrial zones in the Ballard/Interbay/Magnolia areas,” submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They noted they have been “instrumental in building out and leasing space to many small businesses in East Ballard as well as breweries within the nationally recognized East Ballard Brewery District.”</p> <p>They were concerned about impacts from both elevated and tunnel alternatives on 14th Avenue Northwest that could affect this as a transportation route for the Ballard Brewery District and the businesses of East Ballard. They requested discussion of specific impacts to the brewery district, and they are concerned that roadway closures, noise, dust, and other construction impacts would put many breweries in this area out of business. They wanted more information on the station area needed for bus transfers and construction staging areas. They requested an alternate location be identified for the flow control vault that would displace Reuben’s Brews. They requested the cumulative impacts analysis be updated to include the City’s update to the industrial land use code that is expected to be adopted in 2023 and more project coordination with beer industry owners and leaders so that they can make decisions about near term investments, improvements, and leases.</p> <p>They supported Preferred Alternative IBB-2b, both for the station location and because they preferred a tunnel. They also supported improving pedestrian connectivity between East and West Ballard. They requested Sound Transit reduce roadway closures, develop construction mitigation plans to “make beer gardens and all outdoor space used by the Ballard industrial neighborhood usable throughout Sound Transit construction,” and suggested use of “known Ballard brownfields” for the project instead of acquiring property from operating businesses.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
<p>McDonalds Corporation, (franchise owner David Santillanes), Ballard Location</p>	<p>McDonald's, located at 5400 14th Avenue Northwest, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They have been at this location since 1962 and were concerned that alternatives on 14th Avenue Northwest would negatively impact their restaurant. They wanted to better understand impacts to their property, specifically if permanent acquisition would be required and how the restaurant's ingress and egress and drive-through may be impacted. They commented that the drive-through has always been extremely valuable to their business. They commented that the restaurant could be a partner to Preferred Alternative IBB-1a or Alternative IBB-2a in the Interbay/Ballard Segment, providing a well-lit business with extended operating hours. They also asked how passengers would enter and exit the station and if there is a scenario for Option IBB-1b or Preferred Alternative Option IBB-2b that allows the Safeway to remain open.</p>
<p>North Seattle Industrial Association</p>	<p>The North Seattle Industrial Association submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They support inclusion of an alternative with an underground Ballard Station at 17th Avenue Northwest in a Supplemental EIS. Of the alternatives studied in the Draft EIS, they support Preferred Option IBB-2b. They submitted technical comments regarding the project purpose and need and the transit, parking, traffic, safety, freight, property acquisition, and alternatives evaluation analyses for multiple project segments. They requested use of updated regional forecasts that are expected in 2023, requested more information on the transportation analysis, and suggested mitigation for construction period impacts, including a construction management plan.</p>
<p>QA Canal LLC</p>	<p>QA Canal LLC, which owns the property at 3837 13th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They are actively planning for development of the property for multi-family housing and retail uses, and the property would be impacted by Preferred Alternative IBB-1a and Option IBB-1b. They supported a tunnel alternative for this segment.</p> <p>They requested more information on temporary and permanent impacts to the neighborhood, more analysis of and mitigation for street closures, and analysis of impacts to future potential development. They requested supplemental environmental review for refinements that have been considered since the publication of the Draft EIS as well as for additional information on impacts and mitigation.</p>
<p>Reuben's Brews</p>	<p>Reuben's Brews, located at 5010 14th Avenue Northwest, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They opposed placement of a flow control vault on their property, which would displace their business.</p>
<p>SBFP Corporation</p>	<p>SBFP Corporation, which owns two parcels at 1521 Northwest 50th Street, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They strongly supported the tunnel alternatives in this segment and opposed Alternative IBB-3, which would acquire their property and displace the businesses that operate on it. Although the uses of their property are not maritime-related, they were concerned about potential impacts to family-wage jobs in Ballard and Seattle as a whole, as well as the broader industrial and maritime business sector. They requested more thorough analysis of impacts to the industrial and maritime industries, noting the importance of these industries to Ballard's economy and culture. They provided information on additional businesses to be considered as maritime-dependent, and noted the difficulty of replacing manufacturing, industrial, and trade jobs in the city. They requested use of other datasets for the land use conversion analysis, noting that the City's Future Land Use 2035 dataset "does not truly account for which industrial businesses have held out despite economic pressures and which parcels have already been effectively converted despite their zoning." They also commented on the navigation constraints Alternative IBB-3 would create at Fishermen's Terminal and requested analysis of businesses affected by displaced moorage as well as the broader regional maritime economy. They requested more analysis on whether impacts to maritime businesses can be mitigated and what the regional effects would be. They also were concerned about potential impacts from all the bridge alternatives on fish habitat, treaty-protected fishing rights, visual impacts, and community cohesion.</p>

Business/Business Organization	Comments
Seattle Storm	<p>The Seattle Storm submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. Their comments were provided on behalf of the property at 1616 West Bertona, which is under contract for the new Seattle Storm headquarters and practice facility. They provided comments regarding the specific impacts of the WSBLE Project on this property and wanted to know more about how the property would be affected.</p> <p>They requested more information on construction impacts around their property and in the Smith Cove area related to transportation (both congestion and transit service), noise, and crime, as well as cumulative impacts. More information was also requested related to road closures and mitigation for those closures, and they expressed concern about maintaining traffic on West Dravus Street.</p> <p>They requested that Sound Transit and the City of Seattle establish a Construction Coordination Committee to develop a plan to minimize construction impacts. They requested that Sound Transit coordinate with Metro regarding transit integration, as well as consider planned bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the Interbay Station area. They requested that Sound Transit study alternatives to avoid their property and to explore opportunities for building TOD in this neighborhood in conjunction with the project. They suggested a station farther north and west on Thorndyke Avenue and 17th Avenue West. They also requested evaluation of other construction methods besides cut-and-cover to reduce construction noise. They wanted to see more information on impacts to specific properties and an analysis and comparison of TOD opportunities.</p>
Specialty Vet Path	<p>Specialty Vet Path, located at 3450 16th Avenue West, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They expressed concern about preferred alternatives (Preferred Alternative IBB-1a, Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, and Preferred Option IBB-2b) in the Interbay/Ballard Segment disrupting their business and asked about compensation. They expressed support for Alternative IBB-3 but are concerned about construction noise, vibration, and air quality and noted they have sensitive equipment. They also commented they would support Option IBB-1b or the modifications proposed by the owners of Dusty Strings, from whom they lease space.</p>
Texas Good Home Development Incorporated	<p>Texas Good Home Development Incorporated, which owns property at 3420 15th Avenue, submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They are in the process of developing a 39-unit apartment building for this property and were concerned about the property being needed for some of the Interbay/Ballard Segment alternatives. If their property is not needed, they wanted to know more about potential noise impacts or other impacts to livability of tenants in their future apartment building, and their effect on the value of the property.</p>

2.4.2 Community and Arts Organizations

Tables 2-5 through 2-7 summarize the comments submitted on behalf of community and arts organizations during the public comment period. Table 2-5 includes comments submitted from community and arts organizations that pertain to the entire project corridor or for multiple segments in both extensions. Table 2-6 includes comments submitted about the West Seattle Link Extension and Table 2-7 includes comments submitted about the Ballard Link Extension. Full reproductions of communications received are available in Appendix D, Community and Arts Organizations, and are further subdivided into project-wide, West Seattle Link Extension, and Ballard Link Extension comments. Within each extension, the letters are listed in alphabetical order and are bookmarked in the PDF.

Table 2-5 Summary of Project-wide Community and Arts Organization Comments

Community Organization	Comments
Allied Arts	<p>Allied Arts submitted comments in support of tunnel alternatives in the West Seattle Junction Segment and expressed concerns about the height of elevated guideway and station alternatives in both the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments. They felt these would be out of scale with these neighborhoods. They also stated that the outreach in the Delridge community was too limited. In the Chinatown/International District Segment, they supported an alternative on 4th Avenue South over those on 5th Avenue South to reduce impacts on the neighborhood, create better multi-modal connections with other light rail lines and the Sounder commuter rail, and to “return Union Station to its original function as a transit hub.” In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they support tunnel alternatives and a Ballard Station closer to “downtown” Ballard.</p>
Cascade Bicycle Club	<p>The Cascade Bicycle Club submitted comments encouraging Sound Transit to collaborate with the City of Seattle on improving bike access to stations through the System Access Fund. They suggested funding projects that are gaps in the multi-modal network that are beyond the “station envelope” but would increase the number of people able to bike to stations. They encouraged study of seamless connections to existing separated bike trails along the project corridor, including the Burke-Gilman Trail, the Ship Canal Trail, the Elliott Bay Trail, the SODO Trail, the West Seattle Bridge Trail/Waterfront Trail, and the Center City Bike Network. They encouraged upgrading facilities for physical separation from cars and stated that these types of improvements could increase the bike mode share at multiple stations along the project.</p> <p>They also encouraged advancing design of detours of existing bike routes during construction in the next phase, to make sure safe facilities can be designed and constructed ahead of closures. Examples included the SODO and West Seattle Bridge trails. Lastly, they requested further study of bike parking needs and the needs of those who take bikes on trains. They suggested studying “bike hubs” in Downtown, rather than smaller amounts of bike parking at each station and stated that bike parking should be free and abundant. They noted that bike parking on mezzanines is impractical, and that deeper stations could create additional challenges for riders who need to bring their bikes on the train.</p> <p>Approximately 300 form letters were received repeating the requests made by Cascade Bicycle Club.</p>
Commute Seattle	<p>Commute Seattle submitted comments noting the importance of the WSBLE Project in connecting communities and combating climate change. They stated the system should be built for the most vulnerable users. They requested Sound Transit invest in alternatives with stations as close to the surface as possible, as well as using multiple access points to handle ridership capacity and include ultra-high-speed elevators where necessary. They also requested Sound Transit invest in transportation demand management (TDM) strategies in all phases of the project, and that construction mitigation plan be devoted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing community-centered coordination communities for each station area centered around BIPOC voices in outreach and engagement • Maintaining and prioritizing sidewalk accessibility • Avoiding impacts to transit • Communicating the project to employers, residents, and visitors and incentivizing transit ridership • Requirements for maintaining access to venues and businesses in construction contract documents and marketing ideas to promote these venues and businesses

Community Organization	Comments
Commute Seattle (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing real-time and advance notice information on traffic movement, detour routes, and access • Working with the maritime and freight industry to define suitable alternate routes <p>They provided suggestions for building community confidence in the project including communications and marketing plans, community building efforts, and a land bank program for surplus properties.</p>
Feet First	<p>Feet First, a statewide organization advocating for pedestrians and walkability, submitted comments focused on station access. In the West Seattle Junction Segment, they supported a station close to the junction and feel an elevated guideway in this area would have “negative effects on the urban design this investment is intended to support.” In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they preferred Alternative CID-2a if community impacts can be successfully avoided or mitigated, and are opposed to alternatives with a deep station. If the impacts from Alternative CID-2a are found to be unacceptable, they suggested “Sound Transit should consider other tunnel options that do not require deep stations and allow for easy transfers to connecting services.” In the Downtown Segment, they wanted to see further justification for a second tunnel and suggest further analysis of operational techniques that could avoid the need for a second tunnel. If a second tunnel is needed, they preferred shallower stations for better access and transfers. For the South Lake Union Station, they supported Seattle Subway’s suggestion to locate this station on Westlake Avenue. In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported a station at Northwest Market Street and 20th Avenue Northwest to better serve the existing commercial district and residences in this area.</p>
Historic Seattle	<p>Historic Seattle, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments opposing the 5th Avenue alternatives in the Chinatown-International District Segment due to the removal of two historic buildings, effects on the Seattle Chinatown National Register Historic District and the local International Special Review District, and the economic effects on the neighborhood. They noted that Pioneer Square would also be notably impacted and support the comments submitted by the Alliance for Pioneer Square and Historic South Downtown (see summaries in Table 2-7). They also expressed concern about the demolition of specific buildings that could be demolished in the Delridge, Downtown, and South Interbay segments, and requested meaningful mitigation for these impacts. As a Section 106 consulting party, they will continue to provide input throughout the process.</p>
Seattle Arts Commission	<p>A commissioner for the Seattle Arts Commission submitted comments requesting clear and transparent communication with impacted communities to help them understand the planning process and how they could be impacted and provided suggestions on how to do so. They also encouraged more youth involvement in the planning process, such as youth forums or internships, particularly in the Delridge neighborhood. They expressed concern about the potential displacements of arts and community organizations, particularly on the Seattle Center campus, as well as for the potential displacement of residential and cultural businesses in the Chinatown-International District. They opposed the 5th Avenue alternatives in this segment due to these displacements and support the 4th Avenue alternatives for their ability to connect to other modes of transportation and the potential opportunities for Union Station. They suggested station planning and related development consider affordable commercial, community-gathering, and cultural space activation during the early planning process and that TOD “should be owned and/or managed by an entity with a mission of programming cultural space so those spaces can be appropriately used and accessible to the public” as mitigation for loss of neighborhood cohesion.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Seattle Audubon	Seattle Audubon submitted comments noting the role that public transportation plays in reducing carbon emissions and providing comments focused on ecosystems and habitat. They requested the Final EIS include areas of expected tree removal and canopy cover loss for each alternative and to include this as a performance metric. They suggested a 4 to 1 replacement ratio for removed trees and to use the largest species appropriate for the area, with a preference for large conifers and native species. They requested that tree removal between February and August be avoided to avoid impacts during nesting and chick-rearing periods for birds and to use bird safe glass or collision deterrent treatments or design strategies at stations to reduce bird glass collisions. They suggested looking for opportunities to remove impervious surfaces and replace them with planting areas, and they requested evaluating options to reduce noise, dust, and lighting during construction to minimize impacts to birds and wildlife.
Seattle Green Spaces Coalition	The Seattle Green Spaces Coalition submitted comments opposing all alternatives in the Duwamish Segment due to impacts to the West Duwamish Greenbelt (Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b) or impacts to the proposed habitat restoration site at Terminal 25 (Alternative DUW-2). They supported the No Build Alternative or a route or alternate mode that would avoid ecosystem damage. They were concerned about noise, vibration, and vegetation removal on Pigeon Point, as well as the soil conditions on Pigeon Point and along the Duwamish Waterway. They also noted concern about vegetation removal along Longfellow Creek. They requested more analysis of the ecosystem services provided and lost by the trees that would be removed, as well as the greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles delayed by congestion during construction. They also requested a comparison of greenhouse gas emission output during construction for other high-capacity transit options such as bus rapid transit and gondola. They stated that the “long-term loss of natural capital is an equity issue for the Duwamish Tribe and the Pigeon Point community” and they wanted to see more analysis to show that post-mitigation cumulative impacts would be minor or adequate to replace losses.
Seattle Housing Authority	The Seattle Housing Authority submitted comments expressing concern about the potential loss of nine low-income housing units they own in the North Queen Anne neighborhood with Preferred Alternative IBB-1a and Option IBB-1b. They noted that they only have 13 other units of public housing serving this “high-opportunity” neighborhood, and the cost of rehabilitating replacement units to agency standards is about \$400,000 in 2021 dollars, in addition to other property acquisition and relocation costs.
Seattle Subway	<p>Seattle Subway submitted the following general comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design the project to accommodate future expansion, including designing stations to handle additional passenger loads from future extensions. • Design underground stations should be as shallow as possible and deep stations should have fast elevators that are direct from surface to platform, with no mezzanine. • Reduce the distance riders need to travel to transfer between buses and light rail. They suggested that bus service hours be reallocated to improve frequency of routes feeding the light rail line. • Avoid siting stations and entrances adjacent to major, high-speed roadways that are barriers for pedestrians. • Ensure elevators and escalators are fast and have ample redundancy to handle passenger volumes in the event of equipment failures and special event crush loads. • Analyze ridership differences between alternatives due to longer transfer times at deeper or taller stations, or additional pedestrian travel time to cross adjacent major arterials. • Include all stations promised to voters in Sound Transit 3 , no stations should be eliminated or consolidated. • Provide more information regarding the reasons for the depth and height of stations of deeper and taller stations.

Community Organization	Comments
<p>Seattle Subway (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider conducting a Supplemental Draft EIS on portions of the project that still have unresolved questions while moving forward with other portions of the project. <p>In the SODO Segment, they noted the importance of designing to accommodate future extension south toward Georgetown, South Park, and south King County. They supported Alternative SODO-2 because it would preserve the SODO Busway, does not include the South Lander Street overcrossing, and would have a direct transfer experience. They also suggested studying shifting the station farther north to avoid the U.S. Postal Service facility.</p> <p>In the Delridge Segment, they supported Alternative DEL-6 with further study to optimize bus transfers at this important bus transfer station.</p> <p>In the West Seattle Junction Segment, they supported Alternative WSJ-5, but suggested shifting the station west from 41st Avenue Southwest to be closer to the commercial core of the Junction. They emphasized the importance of future extension in this corridor. They also supported further study of the Avalon Station for this alternative to reduce the barrier effect to pedestrians from being adjacent to the end of the West Seattle Bridge.</p> <p>In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they supported Alternative CID-1a, but modified to be shallower and at the same level as the existing International District/Chinatown Station for fast and easy transfers. They noted the importance of this station as a hub for transfers between the WSBLE line and other light rail lines as well as Sounder and Amtrak. They also pointed out the opportunity Alternative CID-1a presents to improve the 4th Avenue Viaduct.</p> <p>In the Downtown Segment, they suggested further work to get the Midtown Station as shallow as possible. They also suggested studying direct passenger connections between the station and 2nd and 3rd avenues to facilitate transfers to other transit lines. In addition, Seattle Subway suggested designing Midtown Station to accommodate future extension of a rail line east along the Madison Street corridor. For the Westlake and Denny stations, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1, but suggested further study of station designs to make the stations shallower and to improve the transfer experience. They noted the high number of light rail to light rail transfers at Westlake and emphasized the importance of making those transfers fast and easy. For the South Lake Union Station, they suggested studying a new station location closer to the heart of South Lake Union along Westlake Avenue to better serve the neighborhood and provide a better pedestrian environment for station access. For the station locations under Preferred Alternative DT-1, they suggested more study of station access for pedestrian, bicycle, and bus transfers. For the Seattle Center Station, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 because it would better serve the Seattle Center campus and the adjacent Seattle Center organizations. They noted concerns with the Alternative DT-2 Denny, South Lake Union, and Seattle Center stations due to depth and access issues.</p> <p>In the South Interbay Segment, they supported Alternative SIB-1 because it would avoid the cost and constructability challenges associated with the other alternatives along the Southwest Queen Anne hillside and because it would offer a more direct connection to buses serving Magnolia. They suggested further refinement to include a pedestrian overcrossing to serve the Expedia campus and the cruise ship terminal and further access improvements to minimize safety issues along Elliott Avenue.</p> <p>In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they raised concerns about pedestrian safety for the 15th Avenue West Interbay Station location with Option IBB-1b and Alternative IBB-3. They supported the Interbay Station for Preferred Alternative IBB-2a and Option IBB-2b due to the better pedestrian and bus transfer environment. For the Ballard Station they supported Preferred Option IBB-2b because it would be closer to higher density of jobs and housing in the central core of Ballard that is west of 15th Avenue Northwest. They also supported continuing to study Ballard station locations closer to the core of downtown Ballard, including 17th Avenue, 20th Avenue, or 22nd Avenue Northwest. They supported studying these options in a Supplemental Draft EIS, which could enable the rest of the project to proceed.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Seattle Subway (cont.)	<p>They suggested eliminating the 14th Avenue alternatives, IBB-1a and IBB-1b from further consideration due to its location farther from the core of downtown Ballard and closer to the edge of industrial zoning and suggested elimination of IBB-3 from further consideration due to reliability concerns associated with a moveable bridge. They also asked whether the higher bridge clearance for Preferred Alternative IBB-1a and Option IBB-1b required by the U.S. Coast Guard in their Preliminary Navigation Clearance Determination would result in higher costs.</p>
Sierra Club	<p>The Sierra Club Transportation and Land Use Committee submitted comments noting the importance of the project for providing clean transit connecting residential and job centers and emphasized the need for the project to maximize ridership through station siting and access, ensure a convenient and user-friendly passenger experience, design for expandability, and maintain the project timeline to not further delay mitigation of climate impacts. They noted that Sound Transit should seek alternatives that improve cost effectiveness and avoid cost escalation, while building for long-term urban viability.</p> <p>In the SODO Segment, they supported the Preferred Alternative SODO-1a staggered station configuration to preserve the USPS facility as well as Alternative SODO-2 if it can also avoid the USPS facility and preserve the SODO Busway. In the West Seattle Junction Segment, they supported Alternative WSJ-5 because of the shallow stations as well as TOD potential, and it is well positioned for future extension.</p> <p>In the Chinatown-International District Segment, they supported Alternative CID-1a and Alternative CID-2a because of the shallow stations and requested a convenient and easily-navigated pedestrian connection between the multiple stations in this area. They also supported study of the shallower 4th Avenue alternative proposed by Seattle Subway. In the Downtown Segment, they support stations as shallow as possible and emphasized the need for quick and easy transfers between lines at Westlake Station. They suggested study of shifting the South Lake Union Station either south to Thomas or John Street or east to 8th or 9th Avenue North. They supported the Denny and Seattle Center station locations associated with Preferred Alternative DT-1. In the South Interbay Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative SIB-1 because it would avoid impacts to the Southwest Queen Anne Greenbelt, and noted the proposal to consolidate the Smith Cove and Interbay stations has merit due to also avoiding the greenbelt and the TOD potential at the Armory site. In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported the station access on the west side of 15th Avenue Northwest, regardless of the station location, and stated the best alignment for future extension “should line up with 15th Avenue Northwest.” They suggested Sound Transit should “push back against the Coast Guard assertion that at least 205 feet of vertical clearance is necessary” and they believed the moveable bridge alternative (IBB-3) should be dropped. They supported further study of a fixed span bridge on 14th Avenue Northwest (no higher than the Aurora Avenue Bridge) and a tunnel with a station on 15th Avenue Northwest.</p> <p>They urged Sound Transit to require use of electrically powered equipment be used to the extent possible for construction activities, and for propane to be used when electric equipment is not possible. They also suggested use of three-platform design that separates arriving and departing passengers at stations where substantial growth is expected in the future.</p>
The Urbanist	<p>The Urbanist submitted a comment letter making the following general points for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on ease of use for passengers, optimize efficient access and transfers at stations, reduce station and simplify vertical circulation, particularly at the major transfer stations at Westlake and Chinatown-International District. • Site stations as close as possible to population, job, activity centers, and transit connections to maximize ridership. • Design with future extensions in mind, including south from West Seattle, north or east from Ballard, and north along Aurora from South Lake Union. • Site stations to maximize TOD potential.

Community Organization	Comments
The Urbanist (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary construction impacts, such as roadway closures, should not outweigh long-term alignment and station location and design decisions that will last for centuries. • Control costs to avoid schedule delays. <p>In the SODO Segment, they supported Alternative SODO-2 to preserve the SODO Busway and supported shifting the station north to avoid the need to acquire the United States Postal Service Carrier Annex and Distribution Center/Terminal Post Office.</p> <p>In the Delridge Segment, they supported Alternative DEL-6 but requested further study to shift Delridge Station further south to improve walk access and TOD opportunities, while maintaining the ability to connect to WSJ-5.</p> <p>In the West Seattle Junction Segment, they supported Alternative WSJ-5 because the Alaska Junction Station would be closer to the core of the junction and the Avalon Station would be shallower. They also supported continuing to study the Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 to look for ways to reduce property acquisitions and residential displacements. They did not support removing Avalon Station due to the need to serve new residential growth in the surrounding neighborhood.</p> <p>In the Chinatown/International District Segment, they supported Alternative CID-1a with a preference for it to be shallower to improve station access and transfer times for this important transfer hub.</p> <p>In the Downtown Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 for the Midtown, Westlake, and Denny stations, but with further study to reduce the station depths, simplify vertical circulation and improve access and transfer times. For the South Lake Union Station, they supported studying shifting the station closer to Westlake to better serve the core of the South Lake Union neighborhood. For the Seattle Center Station, they supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 because it is a shallower depth and closer to Seattle Center and Climate Pledge Arena than Alternative DT-2.</p> <p>In the South Interbay Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative SIB-1 due to its lower cost and better connections to South Magnolia, the Elliott Bay Trail, and Expedia. They noted the other alternatives would affect the Southwest Queen Anne Greenbelt, cost more, and require a large retaining wall.</p> <p>In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they proposed an Interbay Station on 15th Avenue West, but with a narrowed 15th Avenue West that would lead to a light-rail-only crossing of Salmon Bay, while relocating Ballard Bridge traffic to a new roadway bridge to the east aligned with 14th Avenue Northwest. They cited better walk access and better TOD opportunities for an Interbay Station at 15th Avenue West. Other suggestions in this segment included studying a retained-cut Interbay Station on Thorndyke paired with a tunnel under Salmon Bay, including the 20th Avenue Northwest Ballard Station/Thorndyke Tunnel Portal alignment. They noted a station entrance on the west side of 15th Avenue Northwest would address the barrier this roadway poses to pedestrian movement. They also suggested studying a high bridge with a 15th Avenue Northwest Ballard Station.</p> <p>The Urbanist comments also requested more details about how passengers would circulate within the stations and why the stations are as deep as they are.</p> <p>Approximately 450 letters from individuals as well as a petition with about 100 signatures were received supporting the positions above.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Transportation Choices Coalition, Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County, Cascade Bicycle Club, and Washington Environmental Council	The group of organizations submitted comments supporting the project and requested that Sound Transit not make short-sighted cost-cutting decisions that could affect station access or equitable TOD opportunities, including removal of voter-approved stations. They reiterated comments made by the Cascade Bicycle Club (summarized above) and suggested that Sound Transit revisit third-party funding considerations. They did not express a preference for an alternative in the Chinatown-International District Segment but requested more community coordination and recognition of historic harm from government and past infrastructure projects. They stated that “Sound Transit must be ready to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to the greatest extent possible, and must be willing to present specific mitigation measures as well as demonstrate how they can deliver on such promises in order to allow community members to weigh in with full information, while ensuring an excellent transfer and access experience for all riders. They also supported comments provided by the Wing Luke Museum, summarized in Table 2-7. They also requested Sound Transit strive for voter-approved timelines and noted that “substantially pushing out already extended timelines threatens our regional mobility, access to opportunity, and impact on climate change.”
Washington Trust for Historic Preservation	The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments opposing the 5th Avenue alternatives in the Chinatown-International District Segment due to the number of business and employee displacements, construction impacts on the community, and demolition of historic buildings. They recommended further study of displacements with the 4th Avenue alternatives and impacts on the quality of life for community members adjacent to the 5th Avenue alternatives. They noted they do not feel there is sufficient information at this time to fully support the 4th Avenue alternatives.

Table 2-6 Summary of West Seattle Link Extension Community and Arts Organization Comments

Community Organization	Comments
Avalon Neighbors Coalition	The Avalon Neighbors Coalition, a group of homeowners, renters, and businesses located in the vicinity of Avalon Way Southwest, submitted comments regarding the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments. In the Delridge Segment they supported a station south of Southwest Andover Street and a lower height station (Preferred Alternative DEL-2a or Alternative DEL-4). They did not support Alternative DEL-5 or Alternative DEL-6 because of displacement of residences and Transitional Resources, access to remaining residences, construction impacts, the more limited walkshed, transit integration, and less desirable TOD potential. In the West Seattle Junction Segment they supported a longer tunnel (Preferred Alternative WSJ-3a or Preferred Option WSJ-3b) and opposed the medium and short tunnel alternatives (Alternative WSJ-4 and Alternative WSJ-5) due to the displacements and construction impacts in the Avalon neighborhood. They encouraged study of long tunnel alternatives that do not require third-party funding and noted they could support WSJ-4 or WSJ-5 if the tunnel portal was located east of Avalon Way Southwest and would support removal of the Avalon Station in order to fund the longer tunnel. They also encouraged further study of the “Pigeon Point Tunnel Alternative” studied during the Alternatives Development phase.

Community Organization	Comments
Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association	<p>The Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association submitted comments regarding the Duwamish and Delridge segments. In the Duwamish Segment, they supported Alternative DUW-2 because it would avoid park and biodiversity impacts to the West Duwamish Greenbelt as well as residential displacements and would have fewer employee displacements. In the Delridge Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative DEL-2a because of the high opportunity for TOD, the increased accessibility of a lower height station, and better transit integration for bus routes from the south. They noted that impacts to the West Seattle Golf Course from DEL-2a are preferable to impacts to Longfellow Creek from alternatives on the north side of Southwest Genesee Street. They also noted an opportunity for Sound Transit to remove the culvert under this roadway for mitigation and further restore Longfellow Creek. They also requested investments to improve safety in the Delridge Station area, including lighting and hillside staircases.</p>
Duwamish Alive	<p>Duwamish Alive submitted comments regarding the Duwamish and Delridge segments. In the Duwamish Segment, they supported Alternative DUW-2 because it would avoid the West Duwamish Greenbelt, the Great Blue heron rookery, and residential displacements. In the Delridge Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative DEL-2a because it would avoid impacts to the Longfellow Creek Natural Area. They also suggested removal of the culvert under Southwest Genesee Street to increase spawning habitat for fish in Longfellow Creek.</p>
SkyLink	<p>SkyLink, a “citizen group advocating for better transit for West Seattle,” submitted comments requesting that Sound Transit commission gondola experts to conduct a technical engineering study on “using a gondola as the West Seattle connection to the Link light rail spine.” They wanted the results of this study used to compare the gondola against light rail alternatives for decision making. They felt that a gondola would better meet the transportation needs for West Seattle faster and for less cost, displacement, disruption, and embodied carbon. They provided a link to an online petition supporting these points with over 1,500 signatures.</p> <p>About 100 letters were received supporting the SkyLink proposal.</p>
Transitional Resources	<p>Transitional Resources submitted comments opposing Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 in the Delridge Segment due to the impacts these alternatives would have on their facilities from displacement of one or more of their buildings. They have four buildings on Southwest Avalon Street and one on Southwest Yancy Street which provide supportive housing and behavioral health services for people with the highest behavioral health needs in the community and stated that “co-location of all of our facilities is paramount to our clients’ mental health and housing stability.” Their facilities also provide service to individuals throughout West Seattle. They noted their clients are not temporary and that rebuilding and/or relocation to other properties would be almost impossible due to the costs of property, construction, and labor, and relocation would be “incredibly disruptive” to their clients, creating a risk that they may return to homelessness or hospitalization. They also noted there are covenants in place from construction of two of their properties “dictating that land usage must continue operations for the intended purpose of providing low-income housing for a number of years (40-75 years).” For these reasons, they supported Preferred Alternative DEL-2a or Option DEL-2b in the Delridge Segment and Preferred Alternative WSJ-3a or Option WSJ-3b in the West Seattle Junction Segment.</p> <p>About 50 letters were received voicing opposition to impacts on Transitional Resources facilities.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
<p>West Seattle Bike Connections</p>	<p>West Seattle Bike Connections submitted comments regarding impacts to walking, biking, and other non-motorized transportation facilities in the West Seattle Link Extension project area. In general, they noted that tunnel alternatives would have the least impact on these facilities, while elevated guideway columns could have impacts to these facilities if they are on the side of roadways. They suggested single-post in-roadway supports should be used whenever possible. They had concerns with at-grade and retained-cut areas related to safety and connectivity of routes and requested at-grade only be used where separated right-of-way is possible. For retained cuts, bridges for pedestrian and bike routes over the rail should be provided. At stations, they requested there be sufficient elevator capacity for wheelchairs, bikes and other mobility devices; that bike parking provide convenient access to platforms; and that vehicle drop-off/pick-up zones be separated from designated bike routes. During construction they requested feasible and comfortable detours be provided. They also requested more analysis of impacts on existing and planned bike facilities in the EIS, as well as how route impacts and station design could affect station mode of access.</p> <p>In the SODO Segment, they requested more information on bike and pedestrian access from the proposed South Lander Street overpass (Preferred Alternative SODO-1a and Option SODO-1b), and to demonstrate ADA accessibility. They suggested the EIS compare impacts on non-motorized transportation and accessibility between alternatives.</p> <p>In the Duwamish Segment, they noted the impacts from all alternatives on heavily used bike routes to and from West Seattle. They highlighted the proximity of Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b to the Pigeon Point connector from Delridge to the Spokane Street Bridge and noted it is the “highest volume bike route in West Seattle.” They were concerned about available detours during construction and said feasibility of mitigation should be demonstrated to ensure continuous bike and walking access on this route.</p> <p>In the Delridge Segment, they expressed concern over impacts to 26th Avenue Southwest with the Dakota Street Station alternatives due to potential conflicts between modes during operations and the lack of a feasible detour during construction. For all alternatives, they were concerned about impacts of guideway columns on the Southwest Andover Street and Delridge Way Southwest intersection. They are also concerned about conflicts between modes accessing the station with Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6.</p> <p>In the West Seattle Junction Segment, they noted the Avalon Station alternatives were “generally positive for minimizing impact to Avalon Way protected bike lanes and future Fauntleroy Boulevard Project bike lanes” but that construction would severely disrupt existing bike routes and pedestrian access. They wanted the EIS to show feasible detour routes and felt that the full closure of Avalon Way Southwest for one year was of special concern. They supported the tunnel alternatives in this segment because they are better for separating bike, auto, and bus traffic and stated that the Alaska Junction Station for Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 would be “too far from the West Seattle Junction to support the business district at the junction and provide a walkable environment.”</p>
<p>West Seattle Transportation Coalition</p>	<p>The West Seattle Transportation Coalition provided comments regarding alternatives for the West Seattle Link Extension. In the Delridge Segment, they urged further consideration of Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 due to fewer residential displacements and avoidance of the Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families office and the West Seattle Golf Course. They supported further study of deferring one of the three stations in West Seattle or combining the Avalon and Delridge stations with either Alternative DEL-5 or Alternative DEL-6.</p> <p>They also strongly encouraged reconsidering alternatives previously studied during the Alternatives Development phase, including the “long tunnel” option along Yancy alignment” and the “Purple Line” alternative, which they felt could reduce some impacts.</p> <p>They expressed concern about the height of some proposed stations in the Delridge Segment due to accessibility and potential maintenance issues with elevators and escalators. They also had questions about Metro’s future route planning and ridership projections based on “post-pandemic changes to the way we go about our daily lives.”</p>

Table 2-7 Summary of Ballard Link Extension Community and Arts Organization Comments

Community Organization	Comments
<i>Chinatown-International District Segment</i>	
4Culture	<p>4Culture, also known as the Cultural Development Authority of King County, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They noted that the Chinatown-International District neighborhood is not only an asset to the community within it and to the city, but to the county and state as well. Due to the history of impacts on this community from “multiple major, disruptive public projects” they were concerned about the impacts from the 5th Avenue alternatives on this community, particularly from displacement of small businesses important to the community. They requested that Sound Transit conduct more in-depth analysis of these impacts and stated that “these impacts must be more holistically understood, and community voices heard, to fairly mitigate impacts to the neighborhood.” They also requested Sound Transit “put greater emphasis and weight on both the physical, historic fabric of the [Chinatown-International District] as well as its intangible cultural heritage and neighborhood cohesion.” They requested more analysis of displacement and disruption for 4th and 5th Avenue alternatives, so that “the mitigation measures can be developed that comprehensively consider the unique and highly significant cultural community of the [Chinatown-International District].”</p>
Alliance for Pioneer Square	<p>The Alliance for Pioneer Square, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They recognized the importance of the project for both the city and the region, and that the “choice of the preferred alternative may positively or negatively impact Pioneer Square for the next hundred years” and provided input on the benefits and challenges of the alternatives in this segment and the types of mitigation that will be needed. They feel that Alternative CID-1a would better achieve their priorities of connecting the Pioneer Square and Chinatown-International District neighborhoods and improving transit access to and through these neighborhoods. This alternative would provide the most direct physical connections between light rail, Sounder, and Amtrak modes, as well as be closer to the ferry system and within the existing Jackson Hub planning footprint. It would also provide more opportunity for activation of Union Station and enhancement of the Union Station plaza. In addition, they noted that several bridge structures abutting the 4th Avenue South viaduct are under study for replacement and they would rather all this construction disruption occur at once. They requested that “Sound Transit advance the Fourth Avenue Shallow station alternative for more design and study, meaningfully seek to reduce the estimated time for construction, further study the extent and need for roadway and bridge rebuild along [4th] Avenue, and evaluate minimizing the impacts to traffic, Metro bus bases, and parking resources identified as important to meeting the Stadium District Master Use Permit conditions.”</p> <p>They felt that Alternative CID-2a and its diagonal configuration would separate access to the various transit modes in this area too much, and it would be a lost opportunity “for the region to center regional transportation improvements closer to job centers and regional attractions.” They noted concern for the construction effects and potential gentrification risk from this alternative, and that while alternatives on 5th Avenue may provide more opportunity for TOD and “public realm investments” in the Chinatown-International District, “it remains unclear in the public discourse if those opportunities are considered a benefit relative to the cost incurred by the [Chinatown-International District] neighborhood.” They also noted that Alternative CID-2a would affect parking resources required by the Stadium District and would affect Metro operations.</p> <p>They expressed opposition to the deep alternatives on both 4th and 5th avenues (Options CID-1b and CID-2b) due to the dependence of these stations on elevators, particularly for a station that will experience surge events.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Alliance for Pioneer Square (cont.)	<p>They requested more information on specific mitigation measures and stated, “additional analysis of what mitigation is possible is required before the Sound Transit Board can make a final decision on the alternative for the [Chinatown-International District] segment.” Types of mitigation they proposed include protection of street level businesses through maintained access both around the construction site but between the neighborhood and the existing light rail, Sounder and Amtrak stations; resources to communicate they are open to the public, communicate changes frequently and by property, modify construction schedules for key events, and pay businesses to close temporarily if needed. The Alliance noted they could serve as a two-way conduit for communication between Sound Transit and the neighborhood to facilitate this communication but would need resources to do so. They also requested the city and county put a moratorium on other public projects in right-of-way in and adjacent to the Pioneer Square neighborhood during major WSBLE Project construction periods.</p> <p>They requested the urban design of facilities, including ventilation structures, and restoration of disturbed area be consistent with and sensitive to the neighborhood. They also requested expansion of the Area of Potential Effects under Section 106 be expanded to include the entire Pioneer Square historic district.</p>
CID Coalition	<p>The CID Coalition, a multi-generational group of people who live, work, worship, and have cultural ties in the Chinatown-International District neighborhood submitted comments on the Chinatown-International District Segment and requested a 90-day extension of the Draft EIS public comment period. They noted that their neighborhood is 63% minority, 54% low-income, and has many people with limited to no English proficiency and/or access to online resources. They also noted the past disruption to the community from public projects, which have caused displacement and negative environmental impacts. They requested more outreach and community forums to educate the many residents, small business owners, and non-profits in the neighborhood about “how the project and each of the proposed alternatives may impact their lives and livelihoods, and what, if any, mitigation will be proposed.”</p>
Chief Seattle Club	<p>The Chief Seattle Club submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They noted the alternatives in this segment would directly affect their interests in Pioneer Square and that their “members, local partners and staff will feel the disproportionate impact of this proposed project for years to come, stunting the ability for us to properly serve our community as one of the largest housing and human services institutions in King County.” They echoed the comments provided by Alliance of Pioneer Square and support further study of Alternative CID-1a. They encouraged Sound Transit to look for ways to reduce impacts to transit and traffic, as well as reduce the construction period and cost. They felt this alternative “meets more of the regional long-term transit needs than the other alternatives.”</p>
Chinese American Civic Association	<p>The Chinese American Civic Association submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that the placement of a transit station serving the Chinatown-International District neighborhood would be beneficial, but the project has the potential to permanently change the neighborhood as well. They believed that Alternative CID-2a and Option CID-2b would impose severe impacts on Chinatown businesses, residents, and social organizations, a community that has been adversely affected by past government actions and more recently the COVID-19 pandemic and hate crimes. They recommended Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b because they would have the least impact on Chinatown, both temporary and long-term. They also requested an extension of time to provide feedback due to the language barrier that exists in the community.</p>
Chinese Information and Service Center	<p>The Chinese Information and Service Center submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They provide services for many residents in the Chinatown-International District, in particular older adults and those with disability and mobility challenges. They were concerned about how the project “will impact the quality of life for youth, families, and older adults who live, work, and socialize in this unique cultural neighborhood.” They did not believe there is currently an “option that is highly desirable,” and they preferred the alternatives on 4th Avenue South “since the anticipated impacts to the [Chinatown-International District] would be less than the 5th Avenue options.”</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Chong Wa Benevolent Association	<p>Chong Wa Benevolent Association submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that the placement of a transit station serving the Chinatown, Japantown, and Little Saigon neighborhoods is welcomed, and they supported the alternatives on 4th Avenue South as the least impactful options. They were concerned about the displacements and disruptions to local businesses and to elderly residents, and state “many of the local businesses cannot survive years of construction disruption, exacerbated by the pandemic and recent hate crimes against Asian-Americans.” They requested the public comment period deadline be extended by 30 days to provide more time for input from limited English proficiency community members.</p> <p>Comments were also received from board members Brien Chow and Betty Lau on behalf of the organization. These comments expressed concern about construction road closures and health and noise impacts. They also expressed concern about outreach to their community for limited English speakers and noted that “a way has not been found by ST to engage the limited English speakers regarding the D[raft] EIS so they cannot meaningfully participate in making comments.” They also noted that the Draft EIS was too technical for use of Google Translate, and that the inaccuracy of using it is frustrating.</p>
Friends of Chinatown-Seattle	<p>Friends of Chinatown-Seattle submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They stated that the placement of a transit station serving the Chinatown-International District neighborhoods would be beneficial, but the construction and subsequent redevelopment may have unwanted impacts to the neighborhood. They supported Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b because they would have the least impact on Chinatown, a community that has been adversely affected by past government actions and more recently the COVID-19 pandemic and hate crimes.</p>
Friends of Inscape	<p>Friends of Inscape submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They cannot support any of the alternatives presented due to impacts to the community, which is a regional neighborhood that is “essential to the health of the region’s diverse Asian communities.” They noted escalating property values in the neighborhood that have affected their efforts to maintain their building (the former INS building) as a community neighborhood space. They noted the “unfair economic and social burden on the [Chinatown-International District] and South Downtown neighborhoods” from past government planning and projects, and that the Draft EIS fails to address these.” They requested Sound Transit “redefine their approach to this process with a commitment to truly listen to the communities this development will impact.”</p>
Friends of Little Saigon	<p>Friends of Little Saigon submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They described the challenges facing their community, Little Saigon, which is within the larger Chinatown-International District, including harm from past public infrastructure projects and more recently the COVID-19 pandemic, hate crimes, and public safety issues. They also noted the high displacement pressure in their neighborhood due to redevelopment and limited organizing capacity. They have “advocated directly to the City, Sound Transit, and King County (along with partners) to review past outreach outcomes to understand what community members have identified in the past 20 years about our interests, needs, concerns and priorities,” which include retaining/increasing community ownership of properties; acknowledging and addressing historic racism that impacts the community; increasing connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods; minimizing cumulative harm to and displacement of businesses, residents, and organizations; supporting a place-based small business economy; enhancing the public realm; and enhancing public health and well-being.</p> <p>They supported Alternative CID-1a because it would offer the “greatest potential to achieve the community priorities, create direct connections between Pioneer Square and Chinatown-International District neighborhoods, and improve transit connections between modes.” They noted that additional analysis, including visual analysis, of the Alternative CID-1a should be conducted to help understand some of the benefits of the project. They also requested discussion of environmental health, neighborhood, and economic impacts from diverted traffic during construction for this alternative. They stated, “there appears to be more opportunity to minimize and mitigate traffic impacts through design, construction phasing and staging, and other engineering technologies than have been studied for Fourth Avenue to date.”</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Friends of Little Saigon (cont.)	<p>They did not support either of the deep station options (Option CID-1b and Option CID-2b) due to elevator access that would be challenging during large events, make transfers more difficult, and that could be a deterrent for attracting riders to their neighborhood if riders choose to access the light rail at a different station instead. They did not support Alternative CID-2a or Option CID-2b because the impacts from these alternatives would put their community priorities at risk. They stated, “unless Sound Transit can identify another option that moves the construction impacts away from the cultural spine of the [Chinatown-International District] and/or identifies substantial mitigation to avoid or greatly minimize these impacts, we do not believe the Fifth Avenue Alternative and options are acceptable.” Impacts of concern include street closures, noise, dust, truck traffic, visual, use of outdoor spaces, and loss of on-street parking. Regarding potential TOD, they noted the “community would need assurance that community ownership of properties would be prioritized in any TOD opportunity associated with this project” and this must be in the form of explicit legal commitments.</p> <p>For all alternatives, they wanted more information on operational noise and visual impacts, and these should be reconsidered for the environmental justice and cumulative impact analyses. They requested more information on minimization and mitigation strategies to better inform decision making. They recommended Sound Transit engage the community in discussion about these issues well before the Final EIS.</p>
Historic Chinatown Gate Foundation	<p>The Historic Chinatown Gate Foundation submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They commented that they have spent a lot of time and money on revitalizing the Chinatown-International District, and that the Historic Chinatown Gate (gate) and the recently expanded Hing Hay Park are the entry to and heart of the neighborhood. They expressed concern about the impact of Alternative CID-2a and Option CID-2b on businesses and residents. They supported Alternative CID-1a because it would have the least impact on the neighborhood from noise, air pollution, blocked streets, loss of parking, minority property ownership transfers and displacement of immigrant businesses, tenants, and residents. They also stated that Alternative CID-1a would better serve the Pioneer Square community and suggested Sound Transit collaborate with the City on the 4th Avenue South viaduct rebuild to save time and money.</p> <p>They expressed concern about the soil conditions between 5th and 6th avenues for constructing Alternative CID-2a and Option CID-2b and noted that the Historic Chinatown Gate could require shoring/support during nearby excavation. They were concerned that wrapping the gate to protect it during construction could cause damage to it. They provided requirements for protecting the gate during construction and stated that the design, means, and methods of protecting it would need to be approved by them.</p>
Historic South Downtown	<p>Historic South Downtown, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment, which includes the Chinatown-International District and Pioneer Square neighborhoods. They supported the extension of light rail in the project area and noted the project has “the potential to create a more connected, accessible regional transportation hub.” They described their concerns over the potential damage to the Chinatown-International District that could occur with the 5th Avenue South alternatives and the potential for development of a “vibrant, connected regional transit hub” with the 4th Avenue South alternatives. They requested the Sound Transit Board “center the priorities and needs of the equity-seeking communities of color in South Downtown.”</p> <p>They provided additional context about the communities they represent and requested more detailed recognition of the ways the neighborhoods, particularly the Chinatown-International District, have suffered from past government policies and projects. They identified priorities for these communities that were established through coordination with Sound Transit, the City of Seattle, and King County, which include: retaining/increasing community ownership of properties; improving public safety; enhancing community vitality and sustainability; encouraging economic development; enhancing public health and well-being; acknowledging and addressing historic racism that impacts the community; minimizing cumulative harm to and displacement of businesses, residents, and organizations; activating common areas; increasing economic diversity in businesses and residents; improving mobility and connectivity; retaining historic and cultural character; supporting a small business economy; and ensuring that people across Seattle and the region continue to visit the neighborhoods, even during construction.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
<p>Historic South Downtown (cont.)</p>	<p>They felt that Alternative CID-2a, Option CID-2b, and the Alternative CID-2a diagonal would “break the promises and stated goals” of the Racial Equity Toolkit (RET) and question whether all impacts from these alternatives could be mitigated. They emphasized the interconnectedness of economic and social impacts in the Chinatown-International District and noted these impacts cannot be considered separately. They did not support either of the deep station options because they would be less user-friendly and would not meet the community goals of connectivity.</p> <p>They supported Alternative CID-1a because it would “distribute the impacts equitably across the region, be primarily economic, and suited to the current mitigation guidelines.” They felt a station on 4th Avenue South would “support implementation of significant parts of the Jackson Hub Concept Plan” and explained how this alternative would help meet community goals, which would have lasting benefits to both neighborhoods. They requested additional analysis of Alternative CID-1a, suggesting “aggressive refinement” to “right-size the 4th Ave[nue] S[outh] alignment and station within budget and apply design strategies to shrink the cost.” They provided questions for additional study for both Alternative CID-1a and the 5th Avenue South alternatives as well as examples of “transformational mitigation.” They suggested additional analysis on cumulative effects and provided supporting information to inform that analysis. They provided detailed comments on property acquisition, visual, historic resources, cumulative effects, economics, environmental justice, cost estimates, construction footprints, noise, transportation, social resources, and the RET documentation. They also provided a matrix of how Alternative CID-1a, Alternative CID-2a, and the diagonal station configuration would perform against their community priorities.</p>
<p>InterIm Community Development Association (CDA)</p>	<p>InterIm CDA, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. Their greatest concern is about the potential for indirect displacement in the Chinatown-International District. While they “support expanded light rail over reliance on car or even buses for meeting our transportation needs,” they had concerns for all alignments.</p> <p>They requested analysis of the potential for indirect economic and cultural displacement not just during and after construction but decades into the future, as well as a community-based affordable housing plan and commercial space plan to “mitigate displacement harms.” They requested reconsideration of access to transit and job centers as an “offsetting benefit” in the environmental justice analysis, as well as conclusions related to cumulative impacts. They requested this analysis be updated using a full list of policies and practices that have harmed the Chinatown-International District community that they provided.</p> <p>They requested operational noise and visual analyses, accounting for stadium events in the transportation analysis, and more analysis of parking losses. For construction, they “would like to see a pedestrian safety plan that include multi-lingual and senior-friendly signage as well as direction giving staff” and to allow for important bus-based connections for people to continue to access the “services, work, or other cultural activities they seek.” They also wanted to see a construction traffic mitigation plan that ensures cars, buses, and emergency vehicles “can freely move about the area as needed, and that any detours are clearly marked in ways that are culturally and linguistically accessible to the [Chinatown-International District] community.” For the 5th Avenue alternatives, they wanted to see a relocation plan that allows them to stay in the Chinatown-International District or to relocate to another chosen location.</p> <p>They wanted to see stations designed for the safety of their community and help to prevent physical attacks, as well as include opportunities for community driven public art. They stated that because the International District/Chinatown Station will be a high-volume station, the “deep tunnel options reliant on elevators do not align with our community’s 100-year vision” and to make these acceptable, other non-elevator ways of moving people would need to be added. They stated that while “the 5th Avenue shallow or diagonal options brings more direct and immediate harm by displacing many neighborhood businesses, much more analysis of both the 5th Avenue and 4th Avenue alignments is required in this EIS process for Sound Transit plus other government entities to achieve the stated RET goals and satisfy our own Equitable Development Criteria.” They also stated that “Refinements to the preferred alignment alternatives must be developed to address indirect displacement impacts.”</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Japanese American Citizens League, Seattle Chapter	The Japanese American Citizens League, Seattle Chapter submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They supported the request by the Chinatown-International District Coalition to extend the public comment period by 90 days to allow for more discussion and understanding of the project within the community. They were concerned about additional impacts to their community that has been impacted by multiple past government actions and projects, although they were not opposed to “public works projects that support equitable urban planning.” Areas of concern include the loss of buildings, businesses and residents; disruption to traffic, parking and transit; and air, noise, ground/groundwater, and vibration pollution. They currently supported Option CID-1b as the best for the neighborhood but note it “is difficult to make an intelligent choice without knowing what kinds of mitigation programs are possible, planned, and funded to alleviate the many impacts.” Based on the current information, they disagreed with the findings of the environmental justice analysis.
Korean Student Association of Central Washington University	The Korean Student Association of Central Washington University submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They requested the project not be built through the Chinatown Historic District due to disruptions to local businesses and the loss of land owned by immigrants.
Low Income Housing Institute	The Low Income Housing Institute submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They supported an alternative on 4th Avenue South and stated that “partial destruction of Seattle’s historic Chinatown-International District because a road closure is inconvenient” is not ok.
OCA-Asian Pacific American Advocates Greater Seattle Chapter	The OCA-Asian Pacific American Advocates Greater Seattle Chapter submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They requested acknowledgement of the impacts of past government actions on the Chinatown-International District neighborhood and have concern about differential treatment of BIPOC communities by Sound Transit. They requested a 120-day extension of the comment period for more outreach and engagement of the community, including focus groups, work with neighborhood media outlets and in-language media, and pay of community-based organizations to conduct outreach to their members. They proposed study of additional alternatives that do not involve any residential or commercial displacement and include the use of Union and/or King Street stations. They suggested a “Community-Benefits Agreement” to include free Orca cards for all Chinatown-International District small businesses, employees, and residents; monetary compensation for small businesses and residents affected by construction; an increase in the Chinatown-International District tree canopy; and a plan to contract women and minority-owned businesses for the construction of the project and any related TOD.
One World Now	One World Now submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They supported the alternatives on 4th Avenue South to minimize impacts to businesses, particularly small businesses. They noted that the Chinatown-International District neighborhood is already at “high risk for gentrification and displacement” and has “historically bore the brunt of large-scale infrastructure projects.” They had heard a lot of fear in the community that the neighborhood would be “irreparably harmed” with the 5th Avenue alternatives, and they were concerned about traffic impacts from construction affecting access and safety for students attending their programs in the neighborhood.

Community Organization	Comments
<p>Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda)</p>	<p>SCIDpda, a consulting party under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They noted that the neighborhoods in the Chinatown-International District are “at an exceptionally vulnerable point” in their over 100-year history due to the COVID-19 pandemic, hate crimes, and public safety concerns. These impacts follow decades of impacts from other public infrastructure projects. They stated they had “advocated directly to the City, Sound Transit, and King County (along with partners) to review past outreach outcomes to understand what community members have identified in the past 20 years about our interests, needs, concerns and priorities,” which include retaining/increasing community ownership of properties, acknowledging and addressing historic racism that impacts the community, increasing connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods, minimizing cumulative harm to and displacement of businesses, residents, and organizations, supporting a place-based small business economy, enhancing the public realm, and enhancing public and well-being.</p> <p>They noted that additional analysis, including visual analysis, of the Alternative CID-1a should be conducted to help understand some of the benefits of the project. They also requested discussion of environmental health, neighborhood, and economic impacts from diverted traffic during construction for this alternative. They would also like recognition of the Chinatown-International District and Pioneer Square “as complete, cohesive, and interconnected neighborhoods.” They requested more information on mitigation and stated that “Sound Transit must propose appropriate mitigation measures to address impacts associated with the Fourth Avenue alternatives so that the community can weigh the alternatives and their benefits, impacts and mitigation strategies, against our own community priorities.”</p> <p>They did not support either of the deep station options (Option CID-1b and Option CID-2b) due to elevator access that would be challenging during large events, make transfers more difficult, and that could be a deterrent for attracting riders to their neighborhood if riders choose to access the light rail at a different station instead. They did not support Alternative CID-2a or Option CID-2b because the impacts from these would put their community priorities at risk. They stated, “unless Sound Transit can identify another option that moves the construction impacts away from the cultural spine of the [Chinatown-International District] and/or identifies substantial mitigation to avoid or greatly minimize these impacts, we do not believe the Fifth Avenue Alternative and options are acceptable.” Impacts of concern include street closures, noise, dust, truck traffic, visual, use of outdoor spaces, and loss of -on-street parking. They noted that the mitigation discussed is inadequate and that “fundamentally different construction plans need to be developed to vastly reduce the impacts.” Regarding potential TOD, they stated the “community would need assurance that community ownership of properties would be prioritized in any TOD opportunity associated with this project” and this must be in the form of explicit legal commitments.</p> <p>For all alternatives, they wanted more information on operational noise and visual impacts, and these should be reconsidered for the environmental justice and cumulative impact analyses. They requested reconsideration of access to transit and job centers as an “offsetting benefit” in the environmental justice analysis. They requested accounting for stadium events in the traffic and ridership analyses, and more analysis of parking losses. They wanted more clarity on activities within the construction footprint and assumptions for the low-and high-cost project scenarios.</p> <p>They stated that Alternative CID-1a would be the least impactful option for the Chinatown-International District. They recommended that Sound Transit “advance design and study of the Fourth and Fifth Avenue shallow alternatives (CID-1a and [CID-]2a diagonal) with the goal of further minimizing the cost, the time, and area needed for construction and the impacts.” They recommended Sound Transit engage the community in discussion about these issues well before the Final EIS and encouraged Sound Transit to “take the initiative to find solutions in areas we have not yet commented on.”</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Seattle Aquarium	<p>The Seattle Aquarium submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. Their comments are focused on potential impacts to their recently established Animal Care Facility near the south end of this segment. They supported Alternative CID-1a, which would likely have the least potential for permanent impact to their facility. The other segment alternatives would likely require relocation, which would be challenging based on their need of being within 20 minutes of the Aquarium and of a size large enough for their specialized equipment and tanks. They requested further study of alternatives that could avoid impacts to their facility, as well as analysis of potential noise, vibration, and electromagnetic field impacts on animals at their facility. They also requested more extensive construction traffic analysis to understand how access to their facility would be affected and to ensure they would still be within 20 minutes of the Aquarium, and evaluation of impacts to species at their facility that are listed Threatened and Endangered species. They encouraged further study of additional alternatives within the Chinatown-International District neighborhood as well, with more community input and more information on neighborhood impacts and mitigation.</p>
Seattle Asian American Film Festival	<p>The Seattle Asian American Film Festival submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They supported the comments provided by the Wing Luke Museum and requested more information in the Draft EIS about operational noise impacts, visual quality impacts, transportation impacts, and the environmental justice analysis. They requested more information on resources for businesses and the community and feel that the cumulative impacts on their neighborhood from past projects and action are not fully reflected. They requested compensation and resources for all impacted businesses, not just those displaced. They expressed concerns about health impacts for residents in the project area, which include many low-income and senior residents, and noted the existing poor air quality in the neighborhood as well as that it is “one of the lowest tree canopy districts in Seattle in addition to no green spaces.” They requested better community outreach and feel that the community was not adequately informed of the project or the planning process. They wanted to see Sound Transit work with community partners “who know C-ID and the community, who have a wealth of resources and experience with planning, and can help build connections and bring more invested interest in providing feedback on the future of public transportation.” They noted that while they are “supporters of public transportation advancement,” they felt that the current alternatives should not be the only ones considered.</p>
Transit Equity For All	<p>Transit Equity For All submitted a petition with over 700 signatures requesting Sound Transit “Move Forward on 4th” in support of Alternative CID-1a. They also provided comments on the Draft EIS regarding impacts to community programs for the elderly (including over 1,200 elderly, non-English-speaking immigrants in the community) and impacts to language, martial arts, and arts schools in the neighborhood.</p>
Wing Luke Museum	<p>The Wing Luke Museum submitted comments regarding the Chinatown-International District Segment. They provided background on their museum and noted that they are the second largest economic driver for the Chinatown-International District, a Smithsonian Institution affiliate, and a National Park Service affiliated area. They requested further discussion and analysis in the Final EIS of the cumulative impacts from past public policies and actions, of historic and archaeological resources, of unique neighborhood conditions, and more detail about construction impacts. They provided input on historic considerations for the cumulative impact analysis and requested more specific information on the number of people, businesses, and organizations displaced or impacted. They noted that descriptions of these ongoing losses/impacts will help provide Sound Transit and communities with “fuller information to evaluate strategies and base decisions.”</p> <p>Regarding historic and archaeological impact analysis, they stated the identification of what is “historic” is “flawed, and concurrently, what is not, is faulty because of this flawed data.” They felt the analysis of impacts does not take into consideration the interconnectedness of historic properties and noted the absence of two heritage trails in the neighborhood created in partnership with the National Park Service. They also noted that the neighborhood itself as their “largest exhibit” and their visitor surveys indicate that “the experience of the [Chinatown-International District] overall as an authentic, immersive cultural destination is of primary importance to our visitors.” They were concerned that any “disintegration of the cultural, historic fabric” of the neighborhood will have direct impacts on museum attendance, revenue, and sustainability.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Wing Luke Museum (cont.)	<p>They disagreed with the Draft EIS findings regarding impacts on neighborhood cohesion in the Chinatown-International District and requested more attention to this analysis. They requested further clarification on construction impacts for all alternatives, including re-routing of traffic and buses, transportation impacts of stadium events, parking loss, and noise, vibration, and visual impacts. Due to the direct impacts in the Chinatown-International District neighborhood from the 5th Avenue South alternatives, they found these alternatives unacceptable and requested “exploration of options for refinements to the proposed alternatives beyond what typically occurs from a D[raft] EIS to Final EIS that will not result in displacement within the [Chinatown-International District].” They also “call for additional study by external consultants, working with community partners, to address the numerous requests for additional information or exploration.”</p> <p>About 40 individuals also submitted comments in support of the Wing Luke Museum comments.</p>
Downtown Segment	
A/NT Gallery	<p>A/NT Gallery submitted comments regarding the Seattle Center Station in the Downtown Segment. It is a volunteer, co-op arts organization and is free to the public. While they generally supported a light rail station serving the Seattle Center, they did not support a station on the campus itself. They described the challenges and impacts they experienced during construction of Climate Pledge Arena, including groundwater damage, window damage, vibration impacts, unplanned closures, and access points and windows blocked for extended periods. During this period their walk-in patronage dropped by almost 50 percent and retaining their volunteer staff became more difficult. They requested more information on potential construction impacts and more direct communication from Sound Transit. They requested financial mitigation for impacted businesses during construction, to allow for preemptive marketing letting people know they are still open. They were also concerned about maintaining emergency access and safe bicycle routes to their part of campus during construction.</p> <p>They supported the comments of other arts organizations on the campus, including the Seattle Repertory Theatre, KEXP, the Vera Project, and SIFF. They expressed concern about potential negative effects of putting a station on campus, including the loss of heritage trees, safety, hygiene, crowd control, and the general impact to the “culture and feel of the campus.” They requested that more research be done to the potential station refinements presented on April 8, 2022.</p>
Fifth and Madison Condominiums Homeowners Association	<p>The Fifth and Madison Condominiums Homeowners Association submitted comments regarding the Midtown Station in the Downtown Segment. Their building has 125 units with about 200 residents and would be located directly adjacent to the north Midtown Station entrance for Preferred Alternative DT-1. They were concerned about impacts to their access, parking, utility spaces, service tunnel and the outdoor plaza adjacent to their building during construction. They wanted to see access for emergency services, utilities, deliveries, emergency egress, and loading areas for their building during construction addressed in the Final EIS. They noted that if these issues are not addressed, these impacts “will reduce the habitability” of their building and would like to see clearer Sound Transit commitments regarding maintaining access.</p> <p>They also noted how many of the proposed road closures could affect accessing their building and that some closures could result in detours of up to 10 blocks based on the current street direction configurations. They wanted to see preliminary traffic management concepts and feasibility studies in the Final EIS and provided some suggestions for roadway revisions to reduce the need for long detours. They also expressed concern for cleanliness, noise, air quality, and other environmental issues during construction and operation of the station. The provided comments about hours and levels of construction and operational noise, exhaust from ventilation stacks, and the need to monitor the building for movement or damage during construction, noting that construction could occur on three sides of their building. They requested regular updates and community engagement on traffic issues and general construction.</p> <p>Approximately 20 condominium owners in this building also provided comments supporting these comments.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
KEXP	<p>KEXP submitted comments regarding the Seattle Center Station in the Downtown Segment and also support comments provided by the Seattle Center Foundation. Their facilities include multiple noise and vibration sensitive spaces as well as public gathering spaces. They were supportive of light rail in the Uptown neighborhood and the regional benefits it would provide. Their concerns are related to the location of the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Seattle Center Station that would be constructed directly next to, and partly beneath, their facilities. That stated that “unless fully mitigated, the impacts of the WSBLE Project will render the operations of KEXP at its current home infeasible.” They conducted a site-specific analysis that showed that both airborne and groundborne noise during construction would render most of their space unusable, and they felt that the proposed mitigation measures would not be effective. They noted that relocation of their purpose-design space would be expensive, and that temporary relocation is not an option. They stated that the “synergy KEXP enjoys at Seattle Center cannot be replicated at another location.” They were also concerned about access and transportation impacts during construction, given that Republican Street is their principal access point and load zone for performing groups and other events there. They were concerned about the effects to transit and general traffic circulation in the area that would affect access for employees and attendees. They requested the Final EIS include more on mitigation for traffic and access impacts, as well as the final condition post-construction of Republican Street and the station entrance. They requested further study of the station location on Mercer Street and also consideration of creating affordable TOD, noting the need for affordable housing in this area. They noted the limited amount of design information available at this point and suggested future decisions would benefit from SEPA review later in design.</p>
MoPop	<p>MoPop submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment and stated support for comments provided by the Seattle Center Foundation. While they supported expanded transit in the area, they had concerns about impacts of the project on their facility from nearby station construction as well as tunnel boring under their facility. They noted construction-related impacts that occurred during construction of the SR 99 tunnel and Climate Pledge Arena nearby, including vibration and increased rodent activity. They requested a detailed vibration study of their facility, both because of its specialized steel and glass construction as well as performance and recording spaces inside the museum. They noted both their museum and administrative building have sensitive facilities. They were concerned about traffic and parking impacts during construction affecting attendance and the ability of visitors to reach them. They also noted the Harrison Street roundabout west of 5th Avenue North is their sole loading dock and “restricted access would have operational ramifications.” They requested that transit service, including the Monorail, be preserved during construction and listed specific access routes that must remain open for them to successfully operate. They were concerned about sufficient marketing regarding public access to the Seattle Center and its venues and suggested a marketing campaign similar to the one used for the State Route 99 project. They also commented on the reduction in vehicle miles traveled with the project and questioned the need for the project. They requested that Sound Transit establish a Construction Coordination Committee for north downtown with representatives from South Lake Union, Uptown, and the Seattle Center to develop a plan to minimize impacts and provided specific suggestions for what a detailed construction management plan should cover.</p>
Pacific Northwest Ballet, Seattle Opera, and KING FM	<p>Pacific Northwest Ballet, Seattle Opera, and KING FM submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment and support comments provided by the Seattle Center Foundation. These three organizations operate out of buildings on the south side of Mercer Street, including McCaw Hall, and their comments were focused on potential impacts to the organizations from Alternative DT-2. They described the challenges Pacific Northwest Ballet and the Seattle Opera experienced during past major construction projects on Mercer Street, and how it adversely affected their attendance. They provided results from a survey of lapsed ticket buyers conducted in March 2022 that showed that traffic and parking were the most common concerns after health and COVID-19 related concerns. They stated that Mercer Street “must be maintained with two lanes of traffic flowing in both directions-without impediments, detours or closures-along the Seattle Center campus route.” They suggested mitigation strategies for construction on Mercer Street and requested further study of impacts to their operations and facilities from the potential alignment connecting the Preferred Alternative DT-1 South Lake Union Station to the Alternative DT-2 Seattle Center Station. They also provided a study outlining how they were adversely affected during the Mercer Street construction projects.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Seattle Center Foundation	<p>The Seattle Center Foundation submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. The Seattle Center Foundation and the resident organizations welcome light rail and a station that serves the Seattle Center. However, they were concerned that impacts from Preferred Alternative DT-1 are greater than described in the Draft EIS and that impacts could not be fully mitigated. They described how Republican Street is a critical access point for organizations in the Northwest Rooms building and that 1st Avenue North is used for school bus parking, while August Wilson Way and 2nd Avenue North are important for access to the Seattle Rep and Cornish theaters. They were concerned about the duration of construction and construction impacts associated with both alternatives, commenting that it is a long time for nonprofit arts and cultural organizations to be closed or have their operations limited. They noted that the various businesses and organizations at the Seattle Center function like an ecosystem, and “the loss of one or two organizations can cause the entire ecosystem to fail.”</p> <p>They felt that more information needs to be provided regarding the impacts from Alternative DT-2 and that additional alternatives in the Downtown Segment that provide access from the south side of the Seattle Center should be studied. They provided detailed comments on and requested further analysis of groundwater seepage, transportation, economics (particularly for smaller organizations and festivals), social resources, air quality, noise and vibration (for multiple organizations and spaces), historic resources, parks, and Section 4(f) resources in relation to the Seattle Center campus. They also provided a number of technical comments on the Noise and Vibration Technical Report for KEXP and the Seattle Repertory Theatre.</p> <p>They requested evaluation of alternative construction techniques to avoid or minimize impacts on the campus and resident organizations. They felt there was not adequate information in the Draft EIS for the Sound Transit Board to decide at this time.</p>
Seattle Children’s Theatre	<p>Seattle Children’s Theatre (SCT) submitted comments regarding the Seattle Center Station in the Downtown Segment. They were supportive of light rail at the Seattle Center but expressed concern that construction activities, particularly for Preferred Alternative DT-1, would impact the ability of Seattle Center visitors to enjoy the arts, culture, science, and sports that bring them to the center. They were concerned about impacts to their organization and that impacts to traffic, parking, and access during construction, as well as noise, dust, and litter from the construction, will be a deterrent to attendees of events at their facilities. They wanted to ensure access to and the safety of their critical drop-off points, including for school buses, throughout the week. They were also concerned about increasing costs of parking for attendees if parking becomes more limited during construction, and noted their attendees are less able or willing to pay escalated prices. They requested “further exploration of alternate sites as well as deeper research and data around traffic and congestion during the many years of disruption.” They requested robust marketing regarding events and public access to the Seattle Center and its venues, as well as financial assistance for anticipated or actual economic impacts during construction. They requested Sound Transit work with them and the Seattle Center “to collaboratively develop and analyze mitigation measures that effectively minimize the potentially devastating effect of this project on SCT, and on the community it serves.”</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Seattle International Film Festival	<p>Seattle International Film Festival (SIFF) submitted comments regarding the Seattle Center Station in the Downtown Segment and support comments provided by the Seattle Center Foundation. They commented that two of SIFF’s three venues, the Film Center at the Seattle Center and the Uptown Cinema on Queen Anne Avenue North would be directly impacted by construction of the Seattle Center Station for Preferred Alternative DT-1 and indirectly impacted during construction due to road closures and traffic. They requested additional construction and operational noise and vibration analysis of both of their facilities, as well as additional historic property, air quality, traffic, pedestrian, transit integration, and surge event analysis.</p> <p>They had concerns about the potential shift of the station for DT-1 to the west, off of the Seattle Center campus, because it would put construction closer to and directly next to their SIFF Uptown Cinema, where noise, vibration, access, and emergency egress are concerns. They supported the Seattle Center Station for Alternative DT-2, but request consideration of alternative construction methods to reduce traffic impacts. They also suggested shifting the station entrance to the “former postal building” as well as an alignment south of the Seattle Center (on Harrison or Thomas streets). They requested information on how the locations of crossovers were chosen for the Downtown Segment alternatives.</p> <p>They requested development of a detailed construction management plan and direct involvement of stakeholders in the design process moving forward. They provided a number of technical comments on the Noise and Vibration Technical Report.</p>
Seattle Repertory Theatre	<p>The Seattle Repertory Theatre submitted comments regarding the Seattle Center Station in the Downtown Segment and support comments provided by the Seattle Center Foundation. They supported bringing light rail to the Seattle Center, because it will improve access to the Seattle Center campus for everyone in the community and region. However, they were concerned about being able to maintain operations, the public’s ability to access the theatre and other nearby venues during construction, and impacts to interior and exterior spaces at their facility. Their greatest concerns are related to Preferred Alternative DT-1, but they also felt there is not enough information provided in the Draft EIS to evaluate the impacts of Alternative DT-2 on their facility. They requested analysis of a station location off of the Seattle Center campus. They noted the extended hours they operate and that activity in their building occurs all days of the week, which will make it harder for them to avoid being impacted during construction. They requested additional construction and operational noise and vibration analysis of their facilities, including analysis of additional spaces, revisions to thresholds, and consideration of the building construction. They provided a number of technical comments on the Noise and Vibration Technical Report. They also requested more information on impacts to property and campus access, identification of additional mitigation, and consideration of other, less disruptive construction techniques.</p> <p>They asked that Sound Transit continue to work with them and other Seattle Center organizations on solutions to construction impacts.</p>
The 5th Avenue Theatre	<p>The 5th Avenue Theatre submitted comments regarding the Downtown Segment. They supported light rail and a station that brings employees and patrons into Downtown Seattle. However, they expressed concern that road closures, noise and vibration, and other construction impacts associated with Preferred Alternative DT-1 would discourage audience members from seeing a performance at the venue. They wanted more information on mitigation measures that are sensitive to their performance schedule. They were concerned about the cumulative economic impact to the arts community in downtown and the Seattle Center during construction.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Uptown Alliance	<p>The Uptown Alliance submitted comments primarily on the Downtown Segment. They noted that it will be important for the Uptown neighborhood to continue to function as a vibrant neighborhood and regional center, both as an Urban Center and as an Arts and Culture District. Maintaining access to businesses, many of which are small businesses, during construction will be important, along with maintaining transit and pedestrian connections. They requested that Sound Transit coordinate with other transit modes in this area, so they are complimentary to each other during operation and to maintain access to the neighborhood and the Seattle Center during construction.</p> <p>They provided comments on station naming, signage and wayfinding, and opportunities for TOD. They requested more information on cumulative construction period impacts and establishment of a Construction Coordination Committee with the City to develop a construction management plan. They requested more analysis of construction traffic impacts and potential mitigation for Alternative DT-2 on Mercer Street, event surge impacts for the station, residential and business displacements, and construction impacts on historic buildings. They also requested evaluation of alternate construction methods for the Seattle Center Station as well as other station options including connecting the Preferred Alternative DT-1 South Lake Union Station to the Alternative DT-2 Seattle Center Station and shifting the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Seattle Center Station to the west. They wanted to better understand impacts to the hillside in Kinnear Park in the South Interbay Segment, the impacts from the potential tunnel portal locations, and the TOD potential for each alternative.</p>
South Interbay and Interbay/Ballard Segments	
Ballard Food Bank	<p>The Ballard Food Bank submitted comments regarding the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They were opposed to alternatives that would require closure of 14th Avenue Northwest during construction, including Preferred Alternatives IBB-1a and IBB-2a and Option IBB-1b. This road closure would affect access to the location they moved to in the fall of 2021, both for customers and for deliveries, potentially requiring them to close. This facility serves over 7,000 individuals and families and includes the food bank, a café, and a community resources hub where clients can receive mail and connect with a variety of social services. The loss of on-street parking in this area during construction would also affect parking for their customers and volunteers. They supported either Option IBB-2b or Alternative IBB-3.</p> <p>Almost 100 comments from individuals were received opposing alternatives that would affect the food bank.</p>
Magnolia Community Council	<p>The Magnolia Community Council submitted comments regarding the South Interbay and Interbay/Ballard segments. In the South Interbay Segment, they supported Preferred Alternative SIB-1 but suggested tunneling under Elliott Avenue West. They requested that all bus pick-up and drop-off occur on the west side of the roadway. In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported the Interbay Station location for Preferred Alternative IBB-2b, due to the proximity to Magnolia, and requested all pick-up and drop-off areas be located north of West Dravus Street. For the Ballard Station, they requested reconsideration of a station at 20th Avenue Northwest for better TOD opportunity and increased ridership. They also suggested assessing the Ballard-Interbay Regional Transportation System (BIRT) study plans for retrofitting or reconstructing the West Dravus Street and West Emerson Street bridges.</p> <p>For all station locations, they requested that Metro buses “run at frequencies to connect with light rail schedule, and respond to demand,” to minimize the transfer time from transit to platform, and to avoid plans that require pedestrian crossings of major thoroughfares. For cost savings, they suggested minimizing the size of stations, and also suggested continuation of the tunnel “from Seattle Center through Smith Cove, Interbay to Ballard” to avoid environmental impacts.</p> <p>Approximately 70 comments from individuals were received that supported one or more statements made by the Magnolia Community Council.</p>
National Nordic Museum	<p>The National Nordic Museum submitted comments on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. They supported study of a station at 20th Avenue Northwest to better serve the core of the Ballard Hub Urban Village that is between 15th and 24th avenues northwest. They felt that a station on 14th or 15th avenues northwest is “too far away from Central Ballard to effectively serve the majority of residents, businesses, and nightlife.” They also noted that the industrial zoning and jobs around 14th or 15th avenues northwest should be preserved.</p>

Community Organization	Comments
Northwest Seattle Coalition	<p>The Northwest Seattle Coalition, a collection of neighborhood and business groups from the Uptown, Queen Anne, Interbay, Magnolia, and greater Ballard neighborhoods submitted comments regarding the South Interbay and Interbay/Ballard Segments. They described their communities as “at the eye of the growth storm and favor aggressive delivery of reliable transit to relieve current congestion and help meet the mobility needs of future population growth.” In the South Interbay Segment, they opposed the consolidation of the Smith Cove and Interbay stations, noting that both stations are important for riders south of the Ship Canal to access the system. They requested that Sound Transit “develop new alternatives or improve the existing alternatives in this segment to provide better connections to the major destinations and employment centers, maintain cost effectiveness, and avoid impacts on Elliott Avenue West.” In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, they supported the Interbay Station location for Preferred Option IBB-2b to allow for a tunnel connection to Ballard and to avoid freight, bus, and vehicle traffic impacts to 15th Avenue West. For the Ballard Station, they supported Preferred Option IBB-2b, but request study of a station at 20th Avenue Northwest because it would be closer to population and job density, provide better access for pedestrians and people with limited mobility, and have better TOD potential.</p>
Queen Anne Historical Society and Preservation Committee	<p>The Queen Anne Historical Society and Preservation Committee submitted comments regarding the Downtown and South Interbay segments. In the Downtown Segment, they supported the Seattle Center Station for Alternative DT-2 to avoid impacts to historic properties on Republican Street, including the Northwest Rooms, the U.S. Postal Service Station, and the Inn at Queen Anne. They had concerns, however, about construction period impacts to historic apartment buildings on West Mercer and Roy streets from Alternative DT-2. In the South Interbay Segment, they supported the consolidation of the Smith Cove and Interbay stations in order to avoid historic properties on or near Elliott Avenue West, including the 14th Avenue West Group, Wilson Machine Works and the Western Pacific Chemical Company building.</p>

2.4.3 Individuals

2.4.3.1 General Project

Major comment themes that applied to the entire project included the following:

- General support for transit and the project.
- Support for tunnel alternatives due to reduced impacts.
- Requests to build light rail faster.
- Elevated stations are too tall.
- Tunnel stations are too deep.

2.4.3.2 West Seattle Link Extension

Comments from individuals are summarized by project segment in Tables 2-8 through 2-11. The full content of communications received is available in Appendix E, Individuals, organized by date received.

SODO Segment

Table 2-8 summarizes comments received from individuals on the SODO Segment for both the West Seattle Link Extension and Ballard Link Extension. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-8. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to SODO Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Alternatives	<p>Some comments stated support for Alternative SODO-2, primarily because it would maintain the SODO Busway during operations. A few comments stated support for Preferred Alternative SODO-1a as the preferred alternative, often because of the ease of transfers. A few comments supported the Preferred Alternative SODO-1a staggered station configuration to avoid the cost of relocating of the United States Postal Service Carrier Annex and Distribution Center/Terminal Post office at 4th Avenue South and South Lander Street. A few comments also supported Option SODO-1b due to ease of transfers at the station. Approximately 450 additional comments in support of Alternative SODO-2 were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5.</p>
Suggested Modifications	<p>Comments suggested modifications related to station locations, cross-platform transfers, and extension of the interim terminus for the West Seattle Link Extension.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the station for Alternative SODO-2 north to avoid the cost of relocating the United States Postal Service Carrier Annex and Distribution Center/Terminal Post office at 4th Avenue South and South Lander Street. • Shift the Alternative SODO-2 station north to preserve the SODO Busway, with an entrance at South Stacy Street. • Consolidate the SODO and Stadium stations because they felt the stations were close enough to walk between them. • Provide for cross platform transfers, construct the northbound West Seattle Link Extension guideway in an underpass under the existing light rail line near South Forest Street. Keep the existing SODO Station and construct the new northbound platform in the space currently used for the SODO Trail. • Place the northbound track for both lines parallel to each other and the southbound tracks for both lines parallel to each other.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Suggested Modifications (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow trains to continue from West Seattle Link Extension onto the existing Link light rail tracks and tunnel. <p>Extend the West Seattle Link Extension interim terminus to the International District/Chinatown Station or the Stadium Station (both are in the Chinatown-International District Segment) because bus lines already go to the existing SODO Station, there are not many transfer options at SODO, and SODO is not a major destination.</p>
Future Extension	One comment requested new tail tracks south on Marginal Way toward Georgetown to accommodate future southward expansion. Approximately 450 additional comments suggested that the SODO alignment allow for future expansion south to Georgetown, South Park, SeaTac, and Renton based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5.

Duwamish Segment

Table 2-9 summarizes comments received from individuals on the Duwamish Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-9. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Duwamish Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Alternatives	Most comments from individuals favoring a specific alternative in the Duwamish Segment supported Alternative DUW-2 because it impacted fewer residences, parks, employees, and had no impacts to herons. A few comments were in support of Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b. Approximately 200 Blade Gallery customers wrote in opposition to Preferred Alternative DUW-1a and Option DUW-1b because that business would be displaced with those alternatives (see the discussion in Table 2-3).
Suggested Modifications	One comment requested a light rail station on Harbor Island.

Delridge Segment

Table 2-10 summarizes comments received from individuals on the Delridge Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-10. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Delridge Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Lower Height Alternatives	Many comments expressed support for the lower height alternatives in Delridge (Preferred Alternative DEL-2a, Option DEL-2b, Alternative DEL-4, and Alternative DEL-6) due to ease of access to stations (which is discussed later in this table), less visual change, and less of an impact to the neighborhood than the higher height alternatives. Reasons also included that the elevated guideway would decrease nearby home values, would not fit with the existing scale and character of the neighborhood, and would physically divide the neighborhood. A few comments stated support for the M.O.S. in Delridge if there is not enough funding to build the lower height alternatives that connect to a tunnel alternative in the West Seattle Junction Segment.
Alternatives and Station Location	As described as follows, most comments from individuals favoring a specific alternative in the Delridge Segment supported Alternative DEL-6, and many supported Alternative DEL-5, although many opposed these alternatives as well. Support for other alternatives generally favored Preferred Alternative DEL-2a and other lower height alternatives.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
<p>Alternatives and Station Location (cont.)</p>	<p>Reasons provided for supporting Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 included reduced impacts to the Youngstown neighborhood and Southwest Genesee Street; especially visual, noise, parks, and property acquisition impacts. Comments noted that these alternatives were close in cost to the other alternatives in Delridge. Comments stated that these alternatives would have a station farther from the center of Delridge but that the benefits of minimized impacts outweighed the distance to the station. About 100 people submitted similar form letters, with support for Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 because they would avoid impacting the West Seattle Golf Course. They thought Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 would avoid impacts of other Delridge alternatives such as: loss of revenue at the West Seattle Golf Course, and loss of recreation opportunity, risk of golf balls hitting the trains, impacts to Longfellow Creek and fish, and loss of mature trees. They thought the West Seattle Golf Course was especially important because it is the only golf course that serves the West Seattle community and is protected by a city ordinance limiting conversion of park property to other purposes. In addition, approximately 450 comments in support of Alternative DEL-6 were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5.</p> <p>Most comments from individuals that opposed Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 were related to displacement of Alki Beach Academy and Transitional Resources. Comments noted that Alki Beach Academy is an affordable quality preschool education and childcare facility in an area without a lot of childcare options and mentioned this as an environmental justice concern. Others noted that Transitional Resources provides behavioral health treatment and housing to vulnerable adults with severe and persistent mental illness and impacting Transitional Resources would affect not only those they serve but the greater community if recipients could no longer receive housing or services. Other commenters who were opposed to Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 thought that the station had a small walkshed, lower TOD potential because it would be next to Nucor Steel, poor compatibility with the racial equity tool kit, and lower quality transit integration. These commenters also stated that these alternatives were added after the scoping process. Other reasons provided in opposition to Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 include residential displacements along 32nd Avenue Southwest, access to residences after construction, neighborhood impacts, construction impacts, and impacts to greenbelts and wetlands. A few comments were opposed to acquisition of new multi-family residential buildings with Alternative DEL-5.</p> <p>Numerous comments were opposed to the higher height alternatives on Southwest Genesee Street (Preferred Alternative DEL-1a, Option DEL-1b, and Alternative DEL-3), mostly due to impacts to the surrounding neighborhood such as noise, construction road closures, acquisitions, effects to property values, visual impacts, and because they would be out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. Some comments were opposed to the lower height alternatives (Preferred Alternative DEL-2a, Option DEL-2b, and Alternative DEL-4) mostly because they noted that Southwest Genesee Street is a main thoroughfare and disrupting this roadway would be problematic for the community.</p> <p>Many comments also supported Preferred Alternative DEL-2a because it would connect to a tunnel in the West Seattle Junction Segment, has a lower height station and guideway, and uses land on the golf course side of Southwest Genesee Street instead of acquiring residences on the north side of the street. Supporters of Preferred Alternative DEL-2a also thought that the station was centrally located.</p> <p>Numerous comments stated support for Option DEL-2b and Alternative DEL-4 due to their lower station and guideway heights and a centrally located station. Supporters for Option DEL-2b favored acquisition of homes over impacting the golf course while supporters for Alternative DEL-4 favored golf course impacts over residential acquisitions. Those in support of Alternative DEL-4 also thought that having a station over Delridge Way Southwest would be less disruptive to Youngstown than the station location for the Dakota Street Station alternatives (Preferred Alternatives DEL-1a and DEL-2a, Option DEL-1b, and Option DEL-2b).</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Station Access	<p>Some comments indicated that the Delridge Station would be too high and were concerned about the reliability of elevators and escalators. Some comments mentioned concern with ease of bus transfers. A few comments suggested express bus service connect the project's light rail stations with White Center, Roxhill, Arbor Heights, and other areas, while a few other comments suggested including park-and-rides at stations. Some comments stated that the Delridge Station for Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 was too far on the edge of the Delridge neighborhood to attract many riders. One suggestion to improve station access for Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 was to move access to Nucor Steel to the north/northeast side of their property to avoid conflicts with light rail users. Another suggestion was to include a pedestrian overpass connecting lower Avalon Way Southwest to the Alternative DEL-5 or Alternative DEL-6 Delridge Station. A few comments stated that the Delridge Station needed to be accessible from both sides of Delridge Way Southwest. A suggestion to improve access was to include a pedestrian overpass over Delridge Way Southwest. A few others commented that sidewalks in the walkshed of the Delridge Station need to be improved so that pedestrians could access the station and that these improvements should be considered in the cost. A suggestion to improve station access in the walkshed was to build a pedestrian- and bicycle-only connection along 28th Avenue Southwest between Southwest Nevada Street and Southwest Genesee Street.</p>
Suggested Modifications	<p>Suggested modifications in the Delridge Segment were focused on improving station access and moving the station and guideway.</p> <p>The following modifications were suggested for station locations and guideway heights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the Alternative DEL-6 Delridge Station closer to the center of Delridge to improve bus connectivity and pedestrian connections. • Place the Delridge Station for Alternative DEL-6 over Delridge Way Southwest. • Build a station as far south as possible with good bus connections to communities to the south to serve low-income and minority populations. • Move the station for Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6 to the west so that it is more accessible for pedestrians and could have better TOD potential on nearby vacant parcels. • Approximately 450 comments requested further study to shift the Alternative DEL-6 Delridge Station further south to improve walk access and TOD opportunities based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5. • Lower the heights of the Alternative DEL-3 and Alternative DEL-4 stations, so they are similar to the height of Alternative DEL-2a and Option DEL-2b. • An elevated light rail guideway entirely within the existing roadway right-of-way so that residential property acquisitions are not needed. • Alternative DEL-6 with a longer tunnel that has a tunnel portal east of Avalon Way Southwest.

West Seattle Junction Segment

Table 2-11 summarizes comments received from individuals on the West Seattle Junction Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-11. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to West Seattle Junction Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Tunnel Alternatives	<p>Many comments stated support for the tunnel alternatives (Preferred Alternative WSJ-3a, Preferred Option WSJ-3b, Alternative WSJ-4, and Alternative WSJ-5,). Support for these tunnel alternatives was based on reduced visual, noise, and traffic impacts; fewer property acquisitions; and less change to the existing neighborhood character. Some felt that tunnel stations would be better suited for TOD and that tunnels would better allow for future extensions to the south.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Tunnel Alternatives (cont.)	<p>Many comments mentioned that a tunnel would be worth the additional cost, although numerous comments noted that the cost of Alternative WSJ-5 was similar to elevated alternatives while having all of the benefits of the other tunnel alternatives. Comments noted that the cost of the tunnel alternatives was not much higher than the elevated alternatives because the tunnel alternatives would avoid many property acquisition costs. West Seattle residents commented that they should get the same type of investment in tunnel stations seen in other areas of the city such as Capitol Hill and Beacon Hill.</p> <p>Approximately 450 additional comments in support of Alternative WSJ-5 were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5.</p>
Elevated Alternatives	<p>Numerous comments were in favor of Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 due to its lower cost, location on a major arterial, and because it would not go through as many residential areas as other alternatives in this segment. Comments that supported this alternative generally thought that it had the least amount of change to the existing West Seattle Junction area. Some comments supported the elevated Preferred Alternative WSJ-1, mostly because of cost savings and because it would have a station close to the junction. A few commenters were concerned that elevated Preferred Alternative WSJ-1 would end with a station and elevated tail track in a location that would be incompatible with adjacent single family residential homes.</p> <p>Comments that were opposed to the elevated alternatives were concerned that the guideway would decrease nearby property values, create shadows, and divide neighborhoods.</p>
Station Location	<p>Some comments requested having a station as close to the Alaska Junction as possible. A few noted that the Alaska Junction Station for Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 was too far away from the Alaska Junction.</p>
Station Access	<p>A few comments stated that the tunnel stations in the West Seattle Junction Segment were too deep and had concern with Sound Transit maintaining escalators and elevators to reach them. A few comments were concerned about the lack of parking at the Alaska Junction Station.</p>
Suggested Modifications	<p>Suggested modifications were submitted on both stations in the West Seattle Junction Segment. The following modifications were suggested for the Avalon Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the Avalon Station because it would be close to the Alaska Junction Station, and removing the Avalon Station could lower costs. Comments mentioned that the two stations were within the same walkshed and removing the Avalon Station could help pay for a tunnel in this segment. Numerous comments asked to keep the Avalon Station to allow fast access to/from buses along 35th Avenue Southwest, including those from White Center and Burien, and to allow for access from large multi-family residential buildings nearby. • Consolidate the Avalon and Alaska Junction stations near Trader Joe's. • Move the Avalon Station to the vacant field of the West Seattle Stadium to activate more public space and improve pedestrian safety on Southwest Avalon Way. • Place the station in a tunnel immediately adjacent to the West Seattle Bridge. • Move the station to Rotary Viewpoint Park and do not continue closer to the Alaska Junction. Comments stated that this modification would reduce displacements, serve bus connections well, and allow for future extensions along 35th Avenue Southwest. <p>The following modifications were suggested for the Alaska Junction Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the station to the Southwest Edmunds Street/Erskine Way Southwest/California Avenue Southwest intersection to reduce cumulative impacts to available street parking on 41st Avenue Southwest. • Do not build the Alaska Junction Station to save on costs and minimize neighborhood impacts; instead extend light rail to reach low-income and minority communities to the south. <p>One comment suggested that the alignment continue past California Avenue Southwest. It was also suggested to locate elevated light rail entirely within the street right-of-way to avoid acquisition of large new apartment buildings.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Future Extensions	Numerous comments suggested that the alternative should be selected with future extensions to the south in mind. A few thought that continuing the alignment in the future down Fauntleroy Way Southwest with Preferred Alternative WSJ-2 would make sense because Fauntleroy Way Southwest is a major arterial. Some thought that tunnels would be best positioned to have future extensions through residential neighborhoods underground.

2.4.3.3 Ballard Link Extension

Comments from individuals are summarized by project segment in Tables 2-12 through 2-15.

SODO Segment

Section 2.4.3.2, SODO Segment, summarizes comments from individuals on the SODO Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Chinatown-International District Segment

Table 2-12 summarizes comments received from individuals on the Chinatown-International District Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-12. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Chinatown-International District Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Alternatives and Station Location	<p>Most comments from individuals favoring a specific alternative in the Chinatown-International District Segment either expressed opposition to the 5th Avenue South alternatives and/or expressed support for the 4th Avenue South alternatives because of impacts to the Chinatown-International District neighborhood and community in the station area. Many comments expressed support for the 4th Avenue South station location to avoid the impacts from the station on 5th Avenue South. Concerns expressed about the 5th Avenue South alternatives primarily consisted of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local business displacements and disruption during construction and the associated economic impacts • Adverse cultural and community impacts primarily from the displacement of local businesses that are important gathering places in the community and years of construction disruption • Environmental justice impacts and concern that the project would contribute to cumulative impacts to the neighborhood • Road closures and associated traffic, parking, and emergency egress impacts during construction • Removal of historic properties and impacts to the Seattle Chinatown Historic District • Noise, vibration, and air quality impacts with the 5th Avenue South station location • Impacts to community facilities such as retirement homes, schools, and daycares • Subsequent redevelopment around a 5th Avenue South station location would cause further gentrification of the neighborhood and indirectly displace residents and businesses

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Alternatives and Station Location (cont.)	<p>Other reasons provided for supporting a 4th Avenue South station location included the potential to improve connectivity between Pioneer Square and the Chinatown-International District, better stadium access, better transfers between light rail and other transit modes, and the potential to reactivate Union Station. In addition, about 450 comments in support of the Alternative CID-1a station location to be shallower were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5.</p> <p>Some comments expressed support for the station to be located on 5th Avenue South because it would cost less, they believed it would have the best connection to the existing light rail line, they believed ridership and transit transfers would be better, it would be more central to the Chinatown-International District and facilitate development of the community, and it is close to the Chinatown Gate entrance to the community. A few comments expressed support for the Alternative CID-2a diagonal station configuration because of the shorter construction duration, reduced construction impacts, and because they believed it would cost less.</p> <p>Some comments expressed support for alternatives for reasons other than station location. Comments expressed support for the 4th Avenue South alternatives because they align with the transportation corridor along 4th Avenue South, and they would be constructed in conjunction with the 4th Avenue South viaduct replacement. A few comments expressed support for the 5th Avenue South alternatives to preserve the space under 4th Avenue South for future high speed rail use, avoid impacting 4th Avenue South, which is a major thoroughfare, and because of the lower cost.</p>
Oppose Project and/or all Alternatives in Chinatown-International District	<p>Many comments expressed opposition to the Project in the Chinatown-International District Segment primarily due to concerns about neighborhood impacts; cultural and community impacts; economic impacts of business displacements; impacts to the Seattle Chinatown Historic District; and the duration and impact of construction. While not opposed to the Project, many comments oppose all the alternatives in the Chinatown-International District, and some requested that other alternatives be explored that do not impact the neighborhood. Many comments also opposed the project or all the alternatives because of environmental justice impacts and concern that the project would contribute to cumulative impacts to the neighborhood, which in the past has been moved several times and impacted by construction of infrastructure projects including Interstate 5, First Hill Streetcar, and the sports stadiums (refer to Table 2-16 for further information).</p>
Station Access	<p>Many comments expressed support for a shallow station rather than a deep station due to concerns about making travel time, transfers, and access to the stations as efficient and convenient as possible.</p> <p>A few comments were concerned that ridership would be lower with deeper stations. Some comments were about deep stations having elevator-only access, specifically concerned about passenger experience, the increased travel time to wait for and use an elevator, and the potential for elevators to break down. A few comments were particularly concerned about the ability of elevator-only access to accommodate riders during events at the stadiums.</p> <p>Some comments stated that short-term construction impacts are an acceptable trade off considering the long-term benefit of light rail and having shallower stations.</p> <p>In addition to comments about the depth of stations, a few comments were made about designing a safe and attractive pedestrian concourse between the new station, the existing station and King Street Station and facilitating seamless transfers between Amtrak, Sounder, bus, and streetcar for Alternative CID-1a. A few comments were made about incorporating clear wayfinding.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Reactivation of Union Station	Some comments suggested that Union Station be reactivated to integrate regional transit services as a hub and renew the station’s intended use, bringing it back to life as an important active place in the community.
Suggested Modifications	<p>Many comments suggested modifications related to station access, station location, multi-modal connections, and tunnel vent locations.</p> <p>Most of the comments from individuals on station access suggested that the shallow stations be made even shallower, similar to the depth of the existing station.</p> <p>Numerous comments suggested modifications to station locations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put the new station under Union Station or incorporate more of Union Station into the new station to reactivate it. • Shift the International District/Chinatown Station to the south, closer to the stadiums or old immigration building, and further south in SODO. • Put the new platform underneath an extended 4th Avenue South viaduct at the same level as the mainline rail tracks for Alternative CID-1a. • Construct the Alternative CID-2a station so that it could be combined with the existing International District/Chinatown Station; one comment specifically suggesting a stacked cross-platform interchange configuration to improve passenger transfer between the lines. • Construct the new station adjacent to or under the existing station. <p>A few comments suggested that the Alternative CID-1a station have underground connections to Union Station, King Street Station, and Sounder platforms or combine these stations and the existing light rail station into a “super station.” Another suggested the alternatives use King Street Station.</p> <p>A comment suggested putting the new tunnel over the existing Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel for Alternative CID-1a and continuing above the existing tunnel to Midtown Station in the Downtown Segment.</p> <p>A comment asked if the tunnel vent shaft structure for Alternative CID-1a and Option CID-1b on the entrance plaza to Union Station could be moved or designed to be less intrusive.</p> <p>A comment suggested that the West Seattle Link Extension and Ballard Link Extension both connect to Stadium Station.</p>

Downtown Segment

Table 2-13 summarizes comments received from individuals on the Downtown Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-13. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Downtown Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Alternatives and Station Location	<p>Many comments expressed support for alternatives, primarily because of their station location as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midtown Station. Some comments supported the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station location because they felt it would be more central, is closer to existing Link light rail stations, and would be better for connections to bus transit. Some comments were received from residents of the Fifth and Madison Condominium who either did not support the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station location or expressed concern primarily about construction impacts, structural stability, and safety during operation of the station (Table 2-7 provides additional information). A few comments supported the station location for Alternative DT-2 because of closer proximity to First Hill.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
<p>Alternatives and Station Location (cont.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westlake Station. Some comments supported the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station location because it is closest to the existing Link light rail station at Westlake. • Denny Station. Some comments supported the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station location because they believe it would have better connections to other modes of transit (bus and the streetcar) and is closer to major employment centers. A few comments stated that the Preferred Alternative DT-1 Denny Station would be too close to the South Lake Union Station. A few comments supported the Alternative DT-2 station location because it would encourage further development along Terry Avenue North. • South Lake Union Station. Some comments supported the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station location because they believe it would have better proximity to businesses in South Lake Union and pedestrian access. A few comments supported the station location for Alternative DT-2 because it would be closer to the Queen Anne neighborhood, it could have better TOD potential, and would improve pedestrian and bike connections across Mercer Street. Some comments did not support the station location for either alternative because they are too far west in an area that is not pedestrian friendly and not central to the South Lake Union neighborhood. • Seattle Center Station. Some comments supported the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station location because it would serve Uptown and would be closer to the Seattle Center, Climate Pledge Arena, and cultural institutions such as McCaw Hall. However, a few of the comments that supported this station location also expressed concern about impacts to these organizations and asked that impacts be mitigated. Some comments did not support this station location because of impacts to arts and cultural organizations at the Seattle Center. A few comments supported the Alternative DT-2 station because it is located off the Seattle Center campus, is in the center of Uptown and the Queen Anne neighborhood, and they believed it has better TOD potential and inter-modal transit connections. Other comments did not support this location because of the traffic impacts associated with partial closure of Mercer Street during construction, it would be further from the Seattle Center, and because of concerns that the station would be less optimal for pedestrians and bikes. <p>In addition, about 450 comments supported Preferred Alternative DT-1 for the Midtown, Westlake, Denny, and Seattle Center stations, based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway. These comments also stated opposition to the South Lake Union Station location for both alternatives as summarized in Table 2-5.</p> <p>Comments expressed support for the alternatives for reasons other than station location. Numerous comments expressed support for Alternative DT-2 because it would have less impact on arterial roadways and the streetcar during construction and it connects to Alternative SIB-3 in the South Interbay Segment. Some of these comments were submitted by residents of the Luxe Condominium who were concerned primarily about the impacts on access to their parking garage from the South Interbay Segment alternatives that connect to Preferred Alternative DT-1.</p>
<p>Station Access</p>	<p>Many comments expressed concern that the stations would be too deep, making travel time, transfers, and access to the stations less efficient and convenient. Some comments expressed concern that the deep stations would deter riders from using light rail. Numerous comments were about deep stations having elevator-only access, specifically concerned about passenger experience, the increased travel time to wait for an elevator, the potential for elevators to break down, and emergency access/egress. Some comments requested that stations be designed with express elevators and escalators and ample redundancy in these systems to efficiently accommodate riders during peak travel times.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Station Access (cont.)	<p>Some comments stated that short-term construction impacts are an acceptable trade off considering the long-term benefit of light rail and having shallower stations. In addition to comments about the depth of stations, some comments were made about incorporating clear wayfinding and good multi-modal connections such as pedestrian and bike connections in the station area to other transit modes.</p>
Suggested Modifications	<p>Many comments suggested modifications to station locations and station access. Many of the comments on station access suggested that stations be shallower. In addition, about 450 comments requesting shallower stations were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway (refer to the following discussion and as summarized in Table 2-5).</p> <p>Suggested modifications to the stations were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midtown Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Preferred Alternative DT-1 station entrance located at 4th Avenue and Madison Street and that the north station entrance could have a hybrid station entrance and retail. • Denny Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Move the station location to Lenora Street, Denny Way and Minor Avenue, or between Denny Way and Pine Street. – Have station entrances on both sides of Denny Way to improve multi-modal transfers. – Eliminate Denny Station or consolidate the Denny and South Lake Union stations to reduce cost. • South Lake Union Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Move the station to be more central to the South Lake Union neighborhood and to better serve riders. Most of these comments suggested the station be moved east, many specifically suggesting a north-south orientation along Westlake Avenue North for both alternatives. In addition, about 450 comments supporting the station be shifted closer to Westlake Avenue North were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway (see the discussion as follows and summarized in Table 2-5). Other suggested locations to the east included a block away from State Route 99 and further east at 8th Avenue and Fairview Avenue North, at 8th Avenue North and Harrison Street, between 9th Avenue North and Boren Avenue North, and closer to Lake Union Park. – Move the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station west around Harrison Street and 5th Avenue North. – Move the station south for both alternatives such as at Dexter Avenue North (near Denny Park). – Eliminate South Lake Union Station or consolidate the Denny and South Lake Union stations to reduce cost. • Seattle Center Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Move the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station further into the Seattle Center campus, specifically closer to or on the Seattle Center Fountain Lawn and near the MoPop and Memorial Stadium parking area. – Move the Preferred Alternative DT-1 station a block or two west to align with connecting bus routes on 1st Avenue North and Queen Anne Avenue North. – Locate the Alternative DT-2 station at the corner of Mercer Street and Queen Anne Avenue North to improve multi-modal transfers and provide additional station entrances at the corners of the block bounded by Mercer Street, Queen Anne Avenue North, West Republican Street, and 1st Avenue West. <p>A few comments suggested locating tunnel station entrances in street right-of-way. Numerous comments supported a mix of station locations between the two alternatives.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Future Extension	Numerous comments suggested planning for future expansion from Midtown Station east to Madison Park, Westlake Station to Mount Baker via First Hill, and South Lake Union Station north along Aurora Avenue.

South Interbay Segment

Table 2-14 summarizes comments received from individuals on the South Interbay Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-14. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to South Interbay Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Alternatives and Station Location	<p>Numerous comments expressed support for both Preferred Alternative SIB-1 and Alternative SIB-3. Some comments were opposed to both alternatives. Some comments expressed support for Alternative SIB-2, but a greater number of comments expressed opposition to that alternative.</p> <p>Reasons given for supporting Preferred Alternative SIB-1 included lower cost, proximity to the BNSF Railway tracks, avoiding 15th Avenue West and the Southwest Queen Anne Greenbelt. Station location was also provided as a reason for support of Preferred Alternative SIB-1, because of proximity to Expedia, Smith Cove Cruise Terminal, the Magnolia neighborhood and Magnolia Bridge, and future development at the Seattle Armory property. Comments stated that having the station closer to these origins and destinations could improve ridership and encourage development along Elliott Avenue West. In addition, about 450 comments in support of Preferred Alternative SIB-1 were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5. Most comments from individuals that expressed opposition to Preferred Alternative SIB-1 did so primarily because of access concerns with the downtown tunnel portal location at West Republican Street. Others did not support the alignment along Elliott Avenue West because of impacts to businesses and the road during construction. Additional reasons included proximity to the railway (farther away from developed areas) and concerns about noise and visual impacts.</p> <p>Some comments expressed support for Alternative SIB-2 because it would align with the 15th Avenue West transportation corridor, would be in an area with greater residential density, and because it would have fewer residential displacements and park impacts compared to Preferred Alternative SIB-1. A few comments preferred the Smith Cove Station location for Alternative SIB-2 because of proximity to the Queen Anne neighborhood and to bus routes serving the Magnolia neighborhood. The majority of comments opposed to Alternative SIB-2 were concerned about the downtown tunnel portal location at West Republican Street. Other reasons provided included impacts to Elliott Avenue West and 15th Avenue West, business displacements, noise and visual impacts, and because they believed it would not serve many riders from the Magnolia neighborhood.</p> <p>Numerous comments supported Alternative SIB-3 because it would have a longer tunnel to reduce neighborhood impacts, would minimize impacts along Elliott Avenue West, and would connect to Alternative DT-2. Comments also expressed support for Alternative SIB-3 because it would have fewer residential and business displacements, fewer historic property impacts compared to the other alternatives, and because of the station location (as discussed for Alternative SIB-2). Some of these comments were submitted by residents of the Luxe Condominium (refer to Table 2-13). An additional concern about this alternative included proximity to the railway (farther away from developed areas).</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Station Access	A few comments stated that the Smith Cove Station associated with Alternative SIB-2 and Alternative SIB-3 would be more accessible from Elliott Avenue West and because of the potential to provide pedestrian and bike connections to the Queen Anne neighborhood through the Southwest Queen Anne Greenbelt. A few comments suggested enhancements to pedestrian access across Elliott Avenue West, one suggesting a pedestrian bridge be constructed.
Suggested Modifications	<p>Comments suggested modifications to station locations, station access, and multi-modal connections. Numerous comments suggested modifications to station locations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate or delay construction of Smith Cove Station. • Consolidate the Smith Cove and Interbay stations (some comments suggesting relocation to the Armory property specifically) to reduce cost. • Locate station closer to the Seattle Armory property and between West Galer Street and the Magnolia Bridge. <p>A few comments requested that the height of the Smith Cove Station be reduced.</p> <p>A comment suggested partially lidding 15th Avenue West/Northwest with transit to “stitch” the “neighborhood back together”.</p>

Interbay/Ballard Segment

Table 2-15 summarizes comments received from individuals on the Interbay/Ballard Segment. Environmental concerns related to this segment are summarized in Table 2-16.

Table 2-15. Summary of Comments from Individuals Related to Interbay/Ballard Segment

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Tunnel Alternatives	Most comments from individuals favoring a specific alternative in the Interbay/Ballard Segment expressed support for either of the tunnel alternatives because of the comparable cost to the elevated alternatives and they avoid many impacts of the elevated alternatives. More comments stated support for Preferred Option IBB-2b rather than Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, primarily because of the Ballard Station location on 15th Avenue Northwest, which is closer to the existing Ballard Hub Urban Village. Additional reasons provided include better multi-modal connections and future expansion to the north or east. Comments that expressed support for Preferred Alternative IBB-2a were related the lower cost and the potential for the project to stimulate redevelopment east of 15th Avenue Northwest.
Elevated Alternatives	<p>Numerous comments liked the elevated alternatives specifically to make stations more accessible, allow easier future expansion to the north or east, and to improve the experience of riders who would benefit from views from the elevated alternatives. Some comments supported the elevated alternatives because they believe they would be constructed faster and cost less than the tunnel alternatives. Numerous comments expressed support for Preferred Alternative IBB-1a because it would not impact traffic on 15th Avenue Northwest. A similar amount of comments supported Alternative IBB-3 because of the similar or lower cost compared to the other elevated alternatives.</p> <p>Approximately 100 Dusty Strings customers wrote comments either in opposition to Preferred Alternative IBB-1a, Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, and Preferred Option IBB-2b because that business would be displaced with those alternatives or in support of Option IBB-1b or a new alternative which would avoid this business displacement (refer to Table 2-4).</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Elevated Alternatives (cont.)	<p>Approximately 90 people wrote comments either in opposition to the alternatives along 14th Avenue Northwest or in support of the alternatives along 15th Avenue Northwest because of disruption to the Ballard Food Bank during construction (refer to Table 2-4).</p> <p>Comments that did not support elevated alternatives were concerned about business, employee and residential displacements and transportation, in-water habitat, Tribal treaty fishing, noise, historic, visual, economic, navigation, and maritime industry impacts. A few comments expressed concern about the United States Coast Guard requiring a high-level fixed bridge for Preferred Alternative IBB-1a with a clearance of 205 feet, stating that this requirement further warranted the tunnel alternatives. Concerns were raised about the operational constraints (service delays) associated with the moveable bridge for Alternative IBB-3.</p>
Station Location	<p>Comments were made about the location of stations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interbay Station. A few comments expressed support for the station location associated with Preferred Alternative IBB-1a, Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, and Preferred Option IBB-2b around 17th Avenue West because of proximity to the Magnolia neighborhood and Fishermen’s Terminal, connections to bus routes on both West Emerson Street and 15th Avenue West, and future TOD potential. Other comments felt this station would be in an area without residential development and that it would have less TOD potential and poorer pedestrian and transit connections. A few comments expressed support for the Option IBB-1b and Alternative IBB-3 station elevated above 15th Avenue West because of better proximity to neighborhoods and perception of that station location attracting higher ridership. • Ballard Station. Many comments stated support for the Ballard Station located on 15th Avenue Northwest rather than 14th Avenue Northwest because it would be closer to the existing Ballard business district, they believed it would have higher ridership and better multi-modal connections, and it would not require pedestrians to cross 15th Avenue Northwest. A few comments stated support for a Ballard Station located on 14th Avenue Northwest because of the potential to stimulate redevelopment east of 15th Avenue Northwest, and they believe it would have better pedestrian access and would not affect RapidRide bus stops.
Station Access	<p>A few comments expressed concern that the elevated Interbay and Ballard stations are too tall, recommending the height of the stations be reduced to improve access. A few comments also expressed concern that the stations are too deep, stating the stations should be shallower to make access to the platforms as efficient as possible. A few comments expressed concern about the ease of pedestrian and bike access to the Interbay and Ballard stations and suggested improvements such as underground walkways for tunnel stations in Ballard.</p>
Suggested Modifications	<p>Most comments from individuals suggested modifications primarily to station locations but also to station access and multi-modal connections. Suggested modifications to the stations were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interbay Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Design the station access for Preferred Option IBB-2b so all buses and passenger cars pick-up and drop-off on the north side of West Dravus Street or on 17th Avenue West, avoiding a pedestrian crossing on West Dravus Street. This suggestion was based on comments from Magnolia Community Council. – Design a slimmer and less costly station for Alternative IBB-3. In addition, about 450 comments supporting this modification were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway as summarized in Table 2-5. Locate the station for Option IBB-1b, Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, and Preferred Option IBB-2b closer to 15th Avenue West.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Suggested Modifications (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consolidate the Smith Cove and Interbay stations at the Armory property. • Ballard Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Locate the station at the Dirt Exchange property on Northwest 50th Street. – Locate the station on the west side of 15th Avenue Northwest. A few comments specifically referenced this station location for Preferred Alternative IBB-2a and Preferred Option IBB-2b. – Locate the station at 14th Avenue Northwest and Northwest 56th Street. – Close 15th Avenue Northwest and Northwest Market Street and build the station beneath the streets. – Incorporate entrances on all four corners of the intersection for the station at 15th Avenue Northwest and Northwest Market Street. – Move the Preferred Option IBB-2b station location away from the intersection of 15th Avenue Northwest and Northwest Market Street. <p>A few comments suggested that the elevated alternatives incorporate multiple modes of transportation, specifically transit, pedestrians, and bikes over Salmon Bay. Another comment suggested that elevated alternatives incorporate a pedestrian and bike path either on or under the guideway.</p> <p>A few comments suggested that Alternative IBB-3 have a high-level fixed bridge (instead of a moveable bridge).</p>
Future Extension	Numerous comments suggested planning for future expansion north to Greenwood and east to Wallingford and the University District.

2.4.3.4 Environmental Concerns

Table 2-16 summarizes comments from individuals about environmental concerns by resource category evaluated in the Draft EIS. The most frequently raised concerns were about property acquisition and displacement; economics; social resources, community facilities, and neighborhoods; historic properties; transportation; environmental justice; and cumulative impacts. No comments were received on electromagnetic fields.

Table 2-16. Summary of Comments from Individuals on Environmental Concerns

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
<p>Acquisitions, Displacements and Relocations</p>	<p>Many comments expressed concern about property acquisition, with most of them concerned about acquisition of residences and businesses in the Delridge, West Seattle Junction, Chinatown-International District, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments. Many of these comments requested Sound Transit try to minimize residential displacements. Some commenters asked about Sound Transit’s relocation process and compensation for their properties. Some comments suggested providing numbers of individuals displaced instead of units.</p> <p>A few comments were concerned that displacements may be undercounted due to recent redevelopment of properties. There was also concern about the removal of designated affordable housing as well as naturally occurring affordable housing (below-market-rate rental housing or more favorable mortgage situations). In the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments there were particular concerns about removal of affordable housing where there is already low housing supply and housing costs are rising. There was also concern about the loss of BladeGallery in the Duwamish Segment, Alki Beach Academy and Transitional Resources in the Delridge Segment, and grocery stores in the West Seattle Junction Segment.</p> <p>Many comments expressed concern about displacement of local, minority-owned businesses in the Chinatown-International District, particularly with Alternative CID-2a, the diagonal station configuration, and Option CID-2b. There is concern with the ability of businesses to relocate within the neighborhood and more information on these businesses was requested. In the Downtown Segment, there was concern about the displacement of the Civic Hotel, a small minority-owned business, and arts organizations at the Seattle Center. In the Interbay/Ballard Segment, there was concern about the displacement of Dusty Strings, a musical instrument manufacturer. Some comments expressed concern about potential displacement of maritime businesses in the Interbay/Ballard Segment, noting the challenge of relocating these businesses. A few similar comments were also received about the Duwamish Segment. Many comments were also concerned about the potential for businesses to become displaced during construction from impacts to access or construction disruption.</p>
<p>Land Use</p>	<p>Comments about land use focused on land use conversion and TOD. A few comments noted that industrial lands would be more appropriate for transportation infrastructure than residential or park land. Some comments felt the guideway height in the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments would be incompatible with the existing residential uses in this area. Most comments related to TOD discussed how opportunities would be better with tunnel alternatives. There was support for putting stations closer to where land is already zoned for TOD and some comments suggested zoning changes to allow for more density. There was a desire to ensure new TOD would benefit vulnerable populations, both residents and businesses. A few comments requested more information on how many units could be provided by TOD.</p>
<p>Economics</p>	<p>Comments about economics focused on business displacements and construction impacts. More comments were received about the Chinatown-International District Segment than other segments. In the Chinatown-International District Segment, there was concern about the ability of displaced businesses to relocate, as well as indirect displacement of businesses that are not able to survive disruption from a long construction period. Loss of access and parking were of particular concern, along with concern that visitors would avoid the neighborhood due to construction.</p> <p>Additional analysis to further quantify economic impacts was suggested project-wide, related to loss of future tax revenue, supply chain impacts, loss of productivity during construction, the effectiveness of mitigation, and cumulative impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic and other past construction projects. A few comments suggested providing demographic information for businesses and employees displaced. The social impacts of employees losing their jobs was also a concern. A few comments were about the impact of the project on property values.</p> <p>In the Duwamish and Interbay/Ballard segments, some comments were concerned with the loss of maritime businesses and the impact this would have on this industry. A few comments on these segments also expressed concern about the impact of elevated alternatives to Tribes’ treaty-protected fishing rights.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
<p>Social Resources, Community Facilities, and Neighborhoods</p>	<p>Most of the comments about social resources, community facilities, and neighborhoods were related to the Chinatown-International District Segment. Outside of this segment, comments were related mostly to Delridge, West Seattle Junction, and Interbay/Ballard segments. Across segments, many comments expressed concern about both permanent and temporary impacts in their neighborhoods including noise, visual, park, ecosystem, displacements, and historic resources. Common themes were community disruption, quality of life and livability, connectivity between communities, the importance of gathering spaces, and impacts on low-income support facilities and housing.</p> <p>Many comments in the Delridge Segment were concerned with displacement of Alki Beach Academy with Alternative DEL-5 and Alternative DEL-6, and Transitional Resources with Alternative DEL-6. Many were also concerned with elevated guideways changing the character of the community. Comments in the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments were also concerned about getting a similar level of investment in infrastructure as other, wealthier areas of the city, specifically in the form of tunnels.</p> <p>Comments on the Chinatown-International District were mainly about the stations changing the character and culture of the neighborhood (which is a regional hub for the Asian community) due to displacing businesses and facilitating redevelopment of the area. Other concerns included environmental health impacts and impacts to businesses, parks, senior homes, schools, and childcare facilities during construction. A few comments were also concerned with displacement of grocery stores and the Chief Seattle Club Eagle Village housing.</p>
<p>Visual and Aesthetic Resources</p>	<p>Most of the visual and aesthetic resources comments were about the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments, with some additional comments about the Duwamish, Chinatown-International District, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments. Most of the concerns were in relation to elevated guideways impacting the visual character of neighborhoods, view obstruction, blocking light, and creating shade. Some comments were concerned about the ability of impacts to be mitigated. A few comments suggested visual simulations of the light rail bridge over the Duwamish Waterway. A few comments expressed concern with the view from Pigeon Point. Some comments requested visual analysis be conducted for the Chinatown-International District Segment. A few comments were concerned with visual impacts from a bridge over Salmon Bay.</p>
<p>Air Quality</p>	<p>Most of the air quality comments were about the Chinatown-International District Segment. Many comments expressed concern about ventilation shafts during operation and general air quality during construction. Concern about air quality from construction and cumulative impacts were expressed for other segments as well. Other comments related to air quality focused on greenhouse gas emissions during construction and included requests for additional analysis of these emissions. A few comments also discussed the connection between the lost ecological benefit of trees and green spaces removed for the project and air quality benefits. Some comments supporting the gondola in West Seattle cited less production of greenhouse gases during construction as a reason they support it.</p>
<p>Noise and Vibration</p>	<p>Most of the noise and vibration comments were about the Delridge, West Seattle Junction, and Chinatown-International District segments. Many comments were concerned with impacts from elevated guideways to residents in the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments and mitigation for these impacts. Some comments were concerned with noise during construction affecting business operations. A few comments requested additional mapping of noise and vibration impacts as well as more information about noise from exhaust fans and vent shafts.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised about vibration impacts in the Chinatown-International District and Downtown segments, particularly for performance and recording spaces at the Seattle Center.</p>
<p>Water Resources</p>	<p>Most of the water resources comments were about the Interbay/Ballard Segment, and supported tunnel alternatives to avoid in-water impacts.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Ecosystems	<p>Most of the comments about ecosystems focused on West Seattle Link Extension, with many related to avoiding impacts to trees at the West Seattle Golf Course. Numerous comments supported Alternative DUW-2 to avoid habitat impacts in the West Duwamish Greenbelt. A few comments about the Duwamish and Delridge segments mentioned mature trees and canopy cover, particularly along Southwest Genesee Street and the Longfellow Creek Natural Area. A few comments also discussed aquatic species impacts from increased stormwater runoff and the potential for shoreline restoration with the project to improve salmon habitat.</p> <p>A few comments supported the tunnel alternatives in the Interbay/Ballard Segment because they would avoid in-water and shoreline impacts to Salmon Bay. A few other comments were related to avoiding impacts to salmon, birds (including heron and osprey), wetlands, and wildlife and habitat in general.</p>
Energy	<p>Comments about energy mostly discussed energy used for construction of the project and supported use of renewable energy sources.</p>
Geology and Soils	<p>Comments submitted about geology and soils were primarily about the West Seattle Link Extension, with a few about the South Interbay and Interbay/Ballard segments. Comments were related to steep slopes, landslide hazards, seismic resiliency, erosion, and potential impacts to building foundations.</p>
Hazardous Materials	<p>Comments submitted about hazardous materials were related to the potential release of contaminants during demolition of older buildings and work in Superfund sites in the Duwamish Segment.</p>
Public Services, Safety and Security	<p>Most of the comments about public services, safety, and security were related to the Chinatown-International District Segment. These comments were concerned with maintaining emergency services for the community during construction and noted the large number of elderly residents in the neighborhood. Some comments were also concerned with potential impacts to schools in the neighborhood during construction.</p> <p>Comments were also received about displacement of or impacts to the Ryerson Bus Base in the Chinatown-International District Segment, the Central Library in the Downtown Segment, postal facilities in the SODO and South Interbay segments, and fire stations in multiple segments. Comments for multiple segments were concerned with safety and security at and around stations and under elevated guideways, and impacts to emergency services and waste management during construction.</p>
Utilities	<p>Many comments about utilities were concerned with utility shut-offs or relocations/reroutes during construction, particularly in the Chinatown-International District Segment.</p>
Historic and Archaeological Resources	<p>Most of the comments about historic and archaeological resources were related to the Chinatown-International District Segment, particularly impacts to the Seattle Chinatown and Pioneer Square-Skid Road national historic districts. Many comments in the Chinatown-International District Segment were concerned with removal of historic buildings as well as impacts to the Chinatown Historic District. Comments in other segments were related to avoiding historic properties. A few comments felt that the archaeological data was too limited and suggested additional analysis.</p>
Parks and Recreational Resources	<p>Many comments noted concern about potential impacts to public parks and open space, in particular the West Seattle Golf Course in the Delridge Segment, Hing Hay Park in the Chinatown-International District Segment, and the Seattle Center in the Downtown Segment. While most comments about the West Seattle Golf Course asked to avoid it, some thought impacting it would be preferable to displacing homes on the north side of Southwest Genesee Street. Most other comments related to these parks were concerned with avoiding impacting the park, use of the park, and access to the park.</p> <p>A few comments were about potential impacts to other public parks including the West Duwamish Greenbelt, 22nd Avenue Southwest Street-end, Longfellow Creek Natural Area, Junction Plaza Park, Donnie Chin International Children's Park, Urban Triangle Park, Kinnear Park, Centennial Park, Myrtle Edwards Park, Southwest Queen Anne Greenbelt, Interbay Golf Course, and Gemenskap Park.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Section 4(f) Resources	Most comments about Section 4(f) resources were related to support of a gondola in West Seattle, noting that it may be able to avoid these resources.
Transportation – Transit	<p>Many comments were received about WSBLE ridership, with most supporting station locations that optimize ridership or requesting access improvements to increase ridership. Some questioned the ridership methodology or requested it be updated to reflect changed conditions from the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Many comments were received about the need for quality transfers at stations, both between bus and rail and between different rail lines. This was noted as being particularly important at hub stations (SODO, Chinatown-International District, and Westlake), but was also mentioned frequently for the Delridge Segment. Some comments were concerned with reliability of escalators and elevators at stations and the impacts of these on travel time and ridership. A few comments noted the importance of quality transfers in providing equitable service to low-income populations and communities of color. A few comments also questioned the segmenting of the existing light rail into two lines and expressed concern that it would force a transfer for some trips that can be made directly today.</p> <p>Numerous comments were concerned with impacts to transit during construction, including bus detours due to roadway closures. A few comments were concerned with loss of the SODO Busway and with impacts to the Seattle Streetcar during construction.</p>
Transportation – Local Streets and Arterials	Comments about traffic impacts on local streets and arterials were mostly related to roadway closures during construction. Impacts in the Chinatown-International District and Downtown segments were commented on most frequently, although numerous comments were also about the Delridge, West Seattle Junction, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments. Some comments were also about traffic effects from elevated guideways in the West Seattle Junction and Interbay/Ballard segments, or around stations such as the Avalon Station and Ballard Station. Some comments stated that impacts to traffic were acceptable to “build the project right” and that the project would help reduce congestion. A few comments felt that the project would not help traffic.
Transportation – Pedestrians and Bikes	<p>Comments about pedestrians were mostly concerned with pedestrian safety and the potential for unpleasant pedestrian environments around stations that are near busy streets and during construction when there would be increased traffic on detour routes. Many comments stated the need to provide good pedestrian access to stations.</p> <p>Comments about bikes were generally similar across all segments and focused on the need for bike parking at stations, improving access for bikes to/from and within stations, better accommodation of bikes on trains, and safe detours during construction. Some suggested improvements included creating a path under the guideway in Interbay and making the Salmon Bay crossing multi-modal.</p> <p>Numerous comments mentioned ensuring accessibility of stations for those with limited mobility, including seniors. Requests related to this included reliable and direct elevators, minimizing station depths, and making transfers fast and reliable. Some comments were also concerned with the mobility of seniors and differently abled populations during construction, when sidewalks and other pedestrian routes may be closed and detoured. A few comments were concerned with bus route restructures requiring additional transfers, which would be an added burden for these populations.</p>
Transportation – Parking	Most of the comments about parking were concerned with loss of parking in the Chinatown-International District and Downtown segments. Some comments were concerned with loss of access to private parking garages in the Downtown and South Interbay segments. A few comments were concerned with parking in the neighborhood by light rail users and a few others supported adding park-and-rides at stations, mostly in West Seattle.
Transportation – Freight	Most comments about freight were concerned with effects on major freight routes and access to industrial facilities in the Delridge, South Interbay, and Interbay/Ballard segments.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Transportation – Navigation	<p>Numerous comments were concerned about the impact of the bridge alternatives on navigation. A few comments were concerned about the Duwamish Waterway, but most were concerned about impacts to Salmon Bay and the Lake Washington Ship Canal. Concerns were raised about permanent impacts to the movement of commercial and recreational vessels from clearances under the bridges and guideway columns in the water, and the impact to maritime businesses as a result.</p>
Environmental Justice	<p>Most comments expressed concern about the impact of alternatives on 5th Avenue South on vulnerable communities of color and low-income populations in the Chinatown-International District. Commentors were particularly concerned about the loss of community history and culture, and displacement and disruption of residents and minority-owned businesses. Many comments expressed concern that the project would cause further adverse impacts to the neighborhood and community which has experienced past harm from government projects and recent impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic and increases in hate crime on this community. Many comments expressed concern about other cumulative impacts to the vulnerable community in the Chinatown-International District, as detailed in Table 2-12. Many commentors expressed preference for the alternatives on 4th Avenue South as a more equitable solution and to minimize environmental justice impacts.</p> <p>A few comments were about the RET process for the project. Commentors believe that the RET process does not advance the City of Seattle’s commitment to its Race and Social Justice Initiative and that the 5th Avenue South alternatives contradict the outcomes referenced in the RET report of identifying opportunities to repair past harm. A few comments requested that a more thorough environmental justice analysis be conducted.</p> <p>A few comments mentioned the benefits the project would provide to residents of the Chinatown-International District of more frequent and reliable access to transit, jobs, and services throughout Seattle and the region, while alleviating traffic congestion and parking issues in the district.</p> <p>In the Delridge and West Seattle Junction segments, some comments discussed the importance of fast, seamless transfers from buses at Delridge and Avalon stations for underserved communities to the south. For multiple segments, comments were concerned with minimizing impacts to vulnerable communities, access to and the loss of affordable housing (existing and potential future), gentrification, and health concerns. A few comments requested translation of information to additional languages. A few comments were about Tribal treaty fishing rights and mitigation for in-water impacts that could affect these rights.</p>
Cumulative Impacts	<p>Many comments about cumulative impacts were about the Chinatown-International District Segment and requested further consideration of the impacts from past infrastructure projects, such as Interstate 5, and more recent impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic and increases in hate crime on this community. Some comments were also concerned with cumulative health impacts on this community from air quality during construction. Additional outreach to the community on this topic was requested.</p> <p>Some comments for other segments also requested consideration of the COVID-19 pandemic in cumulative impacts to businesses. In West Seattle, comments suggested that the over 2-year closure of the West Seattle Bridge and roadway construction in the Delridge Segment should also be considered. Some comments noted that both potential direct and indirect displacement of residents and businesses could contribute to ongoing gentrification of some neighborhoods. A few comments discussed mitigation for cumulative impacts of wildlife habitat and in-water impacts.</p>

2.4.3.5 Other Comment Categories

Table 2-17 summarizes other categories of comments received from individuals.

Table 2-17. Summary of Other Categories of Comments from Individuals

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Support for the Project	Many comments stated support for the project because of the need for better and faster transportation, to reduce traffic, to support future population and employment growth, to emit less greenhouse gas, to provide better service to low-income people, to connect communities, for easier access to airport, to improve tourists' experience, and to improve access to businesses. A few comments noted that all alternatives would have environmental impacts but stated that overall, there would be a net benefit.
Opposition to the Project	Comments opposing the project were mostly concerned with cost and environmental impacts and stated that the costs did not outweigh the benefits. Some of the concerns expressed included crime around stations; only serving higher-income populations; and the displacement of homes, businesses, and jobs. Some comments felt that existing transit was sufficient, especially for West Seattle, and that the money could be better spent elsewhere.
Light Rail Operations	Comments about light rail operations were mostly concerned with train frequency, on-time performance, or reliability, with many of these concerned about the moveable bridge for Alternative IBB-3. A few comments suggested use of automated trains.
Project Schedule	Most comments related to the project schedule requested that it be built sooner. Reasons for this included cost, traffic congestion, and climate change. Many comments were concerned with the duration of the construction schedule and requested faster construction methods be identified and road closures and detours be reduced in length. A few comments were concerned about additional delays to the project schedule.
Purpose and Need	Some comments questioned the need for the project, particularly due to changes in work patterns from the COVID-19 pandemic. Some commenters felt that the need should be better demonstrated in the Final EIS, while a few comments stated that the project could not fully meet its environmental purpose statement due to greenhouse gas emissions.
Planning and NEPA	Comments about the planning and NEPA process were focused on understanding how the Sound Transit Board reaches a decision, how the range of alternatives is established, and the accessibility of the Draft EIS. There were a few comments about the length and readability of the document.
Design and Construction Methods	Most of the comments about design were concerned with the size and design of stations and minimizing impacts of the stations. A few comments were concerned with the location of the station vent stack in the Chinatown-International District Segment. Some comments suggested evaluation of other construction methods for tunnels and tunnel stations to minimize impacts.
Budget/Funding	Many of the comments about cost suggested ways to reduce project costs and suggested removing or consolidating stations, reducing the size of stations, reducing depth of stations, and reducing the number of entrances. Some comments expressed concern that the overall cost of the project has increased or noted that the costs of tunnels were now more comparable with elevated alternatives. A few comments questioned the need for a new downtown tunnel as well as the project in general, based on cost. Numerous comments felt that higher costs, especially for tunnels, were acceptable if impacts to the human and natural environment could be avoided or reduced. Some comments also requested more information on how costs were calculated and what was included in them.
Community Outreach	Many comments about community outreach were related to how the Draft EIS was communicated to the public, how the public has been engaged in the process, and how input from the community should be considered by the Sound Transit Board.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Community Outreach (cont.)	Many comments specific to the Chinatown-International District stated that community concerns have not been listened to in the past and urged greater partnership, and some of these comments requested a comment period extension. They also commented on the need for translation of more materials and the need to make information more accessible for those with more limited internet access or ability. Comments from other areas of the project included seeking diverse opinions, not conducting outreach by segment, expanding the area of outreach activities, concern about not having questions answered at public meetings, and providing more information about how design decisions are made.
Station Amenities	Some comments requested restrooms at stations, along with bike parking, more security officers, and ADA access. A few comments were about station naming and design and a few requested that stores be incorporated into stations.
Sound Transit 3	Comments about Sound Transit 3 were related to budget, alternatives evaluated relative to what was approved by voters, and mode choice. A few comments requested more information on how the Sound Transit 3 program will help communities south of West Seattle.

2.4.3.6 Suggestions for Other Alternatives

Table 2-18 summarizes comments on other alternatives from individuals.

Table 2-18. Summary of Comments from Individuals on Other Alternatives

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
West Seattle Link Extension	
Other Modes	<p>Comments suggested modes of transportation for West Seattle other than light rail as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the comments from individuals suggesting another mode suggested a gondola for West Seattle. Gondola supporters stated that the topography of West Seattle is too hilly for light rail and that the area would be better served by gondola acting like a feeder system to light rail on the east side of the Duwamish Waterway. They feel that a gondola would better meet the transportation needs for West Seattle faster and for less cost, displacement, disruption, and embodied carbon. • Bus rapid transit that feeds into the light rail system on the east side of the Duwamish Waterway. • A light rail alternative adjacent to the Duwamish Waterway where topography is flat and stations would provide access to low-income and minority populations, while also providing a gondola connection over Pigeon Ridge to West Seattle. • A new bus-only bridge from West Seattle, across the Duwamish Waterway, connecting to the SODO Busway. • A cable car. • Extended water taxi service. • A foot passenger ferry from Fauntleroy Ferry Terminal to Downtown Seattle.
Pigeon Ridge/West Seattle Tunnel	<p>Comments suggested studying the purple line, Pigeon Ridge/West Seattle Tunnel, from the level 2 alternatives evaluation as described in Appendix M of the Draft EIS. Comments suggested that with rising real estate prices and falling tunneling costs, this alternative may now be considered more affordable than it was during scoping. These comments supported this alternative because they thought it would reduce impacts to habitat and wildlife, minimize construction period road closures, reduce displacements to minority and low-income communities, reduce business displacements, and reduce risks from constructing light rail on steep slopes.</p>

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
New Tunnel Alternatives	There were requests for other tunnel alignments along the West Seattle Link Extension. Comments suggested tunneling under the Duwamish Waterway and then continuing with a tunnel for the rest of the alignment to minimize impacts to West Seattle. A tunnel was requested from the point where the guideway touches land on the west side of the Duwamish Waterway, following the route of the Preferred Alternatives in West Seattle, with the Delridge and Avalon stations, and two Alaska Junction stations at Fauntleroy Way Southwest and at 42nd Avenue Southwest.
Extensions to the South	<p>Comments stated that the West Seattle Link Extension includes stations in the wealthier areas of West Seattle instead of reaching the low-income areas and areas with greater minority populations to the south. Stations were mostly suggested in High Point, White Center, and Burien. The following alternatives were suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the Alaska Junction Station and add a station at 35th Avenue Southwest and Southwest Morgan Street. • An alignment on 35th Avenue Southwest because there would be more room to fit the guideway; with an option of building light rail at-grade in this location that could extend in the future to High Point, Westwood Village, and South Seattle College. • A guideway on a bridge across the Duwamish, elevated along Fauntleroy Way Southwest, with stops at the Fauntleroy Ferry Terminal, White Center, and SeaTac. • A station in Youngstown on Delridge Way Southwest near Spokane Street then extending the alignment down Delridge Way Southwest at-grade with an additional station between Hillcrest and Highland Park and a station with a park-and-ride at Southwest Roxbury Street and 17th Avenue Southwest. • An alignment to High Point, without going through the junction, since High Point was described as a potential station location identified in City planning efforts. • A station at Westwood Village instead of the Alaska Junction with a park-and-ride to connect other neighborhoods in West Seattle.
Two Extensions	Splitting the West Seattle Link Extension in two, with one extension serving the east side of West Seattle (Delridge) and another extension serving the west side (including the West Seattle Junction). The two extensions would merge to the south in future phases to reach SeaTac Airport. Another suggested alternative was a spur light rail extension to West Seattle Junction through the West Seattle Golf Course, with the main light rail extension continuing south to minimize cost for land acquisition, disruption to neighborhoods during construction, and noise.
Other Suggested Alternatives	<p>The following alternatives were also suggested to minimize impacts to West Seattle neighborhoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One light rail station in West Seattle with a parking garage. • Light rail with a terminus station at Harbor Island with a park-and-ride garage with bus connections. • A light rail station on West Marginal Way with electric vehicle shuttles to connect people in West Seattle to the station. • Only one station in West Seattle, on Fauntleroy Way Southwest.
Duwamish Segment	
Connect to Additional Communities	Connecting to the communities of South Park and Georgetown with light rail extension or bus rapid transit.
Multi-modal Bridge	A new West Seattle replacement bridge for vehicles with light rail running on the side to save costs for both projects.
Immersed Tube Tunnel	An immersed tube tunnel (a tunnel constructed elsewhere, which is then brought to the tunnel site to be sunk into place) for the Duwamish Waterway crossing.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
Delridge Segment	
Tunnels in Delridge	A tunnel beginning in Delridge and continuing to the West Seattle Junction.
Stations Further South	Stations south of the Delridge Station in the Delridge neighborhood were suggested. One suggested alternative was to extend the alignment to allow for a station near Louisa Boren Stem K-8 school at 5950 Delridge Way Southwest. Another suggested alternative was to have a station further south down Delridge Way Southwest to serve minority and low-income communities and have a greater walkshed and more TOD opportunity.
Delridge Playfield and West Seattle Golf Course	A light rail alignment in the north end of Delridge Playfield and the West Seattle Golf Course to avoid property acquisitions and reduce cost.
West Seattle Junction Segment	
Tunnel under California Avenue Southwest	A tunnel station with a mezzanine under California Avenue Southwest to facilitate bus transfers.
Tunnel under Fauntleroy Way Southwest.	A tunnel under Fauntleroy Way Southwest rather than 41st or 42nd Avenue Southwest to avoid impacts to smaller streets in residential areas.
Ballard Link Extension	
Chinatown-International District Segment	
Alternative in Pioneer Square	Alternative in Pioneer Square closer to the waterfront, specifically along 1st Avenue South or 2nd Avenue South, to avoid impacting Chinatown-International District.
Alternative near Interstate 5	Alternative along Interstate 5 and a station in the Little Saigon neighborhood.
At-grade Alternative	At-grade alignment in the roadway to reduce cost and minimize disruption to businesses during construction.
Downtown Segment	
Alternative Using the Existing Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel	Alternatives interline and use the existing Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel to reduce cost and environmental impacts. A comment specifically suggested that the Ballard Link Extension run from SODO through the existing Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel and a new tunnel be constructed from Westlake Station to Interbay. Comments suggested constructing a stub or spur line between Westlake and Ballard. One comment suggested using automated trains to reduce the size and cost of the stations.
Mix-and-match Alternative	Alternative combining the Preferred Alternative DT-1 alignment along 5th Avenue with the alignment for Alternative DT-2 along Mercer Street.
Midtown Station in First Hill	Alternative DT-2 with a Midtown Station located in First Hill.
Denny Station to Serve Belltown	Denny Station constructed near Tilikum Place Park at 5th Avenue and Denny Way to better serve Belltown.
Elevated Alternative in Downtown	Elevated alternatives in Downtown to reduce cost. One comment suggested an elevated alignment along 1st or 5th Avenue. Another suggested the alternatives be elevated through South Lake Union and go over the State Route 99, noting the roads are wide enough to accommodate an elevated guideway.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
South Interbay Segment	
Preferred Alternative SIB-1 Tunnel Portal West of Elliott Avenue West	Alternative that continues the downtown tunnel under Elliott Avenue West to a Smith Cove Station on the west side of the roadway for Preferred Alternative SIB-1. It was suggested that the size of the station be minimized and that buses pick up and drop off on the west side of Elliott Avenue West. This suggestion was based on comments from Magnolia Community Council.
South Interbay Tunnel Alternative	Tunnel alternative through Interbay connecting the Downtown and Interbay/Ballard segments tunnel alternatives to minimize environmental impacts. Comments specifically suggested that this alternative continue to a Ballard Station located around 20th Avenue Northwest. This suggestion was based on comments from Magnolia Community Council.
South Interbay Alternative along BNSF	Alternative along the BNSF Railway for the entirety of its length through Interbay. It was suggested the alignment could be elevated above the railway.
Interbay Golf Center Alternative	Alternative using Interbay Golf Center to minimize acquisition of residences and businesses.
Queen Anne Alternative	Alternative and station constructed in Queen Anne rather than Interbay. One comment specifically suggesting the alternative be in a tunnel.
Alternative serving Magnolia	Alternative in Magnolia, with one comment suggesting the alternative be oriented east-west and continuing through Interbay and Queen Anne to Montlake and Leschi. One comment suggested station locations near Magnolia Playfield. Other comments suggested alternatives to better serve Magnolia with additional stations in Interbay, including near the Magnolia bridge, near Smith Cove Park, Thorndyke Avenue West, near Fishermen's Terminal, and 15th Avenue West.
Interbay/Ballard Segment	
New Alignment North of Interbay Station Near 17th Avenue West	Alternative that extends from Interbay Station for Preferred Alternative IBB-1a, Preferred Alternative IBB-2a, or Preferred Option IBB-2b north along Thorndyke Avenue West, turns northeast at the intersection with 16th Avenue West, continuing northeast over the West Emerson Street interchange. Some of the Dusty Strings customers who submitted comments wrote in support of this new alternative (suggested by the owners of Dusty Strings) to avoid acquisition of the business (refer to Table 2-4).
Interbay Station at 15th Avenue West Connecting to Tunnels	Interbay Station above 15th Avenue West (Option IBB-1b and Alternative IBB-3) instead be in a retained cut (below a rebuilt 15th Avenue West/West Dravus Street interchange) and transition to connect to the tunnel alternatives under Salmon Bay.
Tunnel Alternative with Ballard Station Closer to the Core of Ballard Urban Village	An alternative with Ballard Station located west of 15th Avenue Northwest (around 20th or 22nd Avenue Northwest and Northwest Market Street) be studied because it would be closer to the existing Ballard Hub Urban Village and commenters believed it would have higher ridership. Many comments specifically requested that the 20th Avenue Tunnel Ballard – Thorndyke Portal Design Option considered in the initial assessment be reevaluated. Comments suggested that City of Seattle-owned land such as Ballard Commons or Bergen Place would be good station entrances. Comments stated that this alternative may have a comparable cost to the other alternatives and would be better for future expansion of the line to the north and east. About 450 comments in support of a tunnel alternative with Ballard Station on 20th Avenue Northwest were based on the project-wide comments made by the Urbanist and Seattle Subway (refer to Table 2-4). In addition, many comments supporting inclusion of this alternative were based on comments from Magnolia Community Council.
Alternative with Two Stations in Ballard	Alternative with two stations in Ballard, one in the existing Ballard Hub Urban Village around 20th Avenue Northwest and one east of 15th Avenue Northwest.

Theme of Comment	Comments/Suggestions
New East/West Alternative in Ballard	A new east/west alternative in Ballard. One comment suggested that a new alignment be constructed to connect with the proposed alternatives along 14th Avenue Northwest and provide connections between the University of Washington and Shilshole Bay. Another suggested a circular alignment just north of the Lake Washington Ship Canal that runs north through the Ballard neighborhoods, past Ballard High School, and east to cross the existing line near the University of Washington. A comment suggested that a north-south light rail alignment incorporate east-west lines, potentially streetcar lines or bus routes.
Alternative along 15th Avenue West/Northwest	A light rail alignment along 15th Avenue West/Northwest. It was suggested that the project combine the alignment with the Ballard Bridge replacement to accommodate both light rail and vehicles. Another comment suggested that light rail use the 15th Avenue West/Northwest corridor and that vehicles be moved from this road corridor to 14th Avenue Northwest.
Multi-modal Tunnel Alternative	A multi-modal tunnel constructed for both light rail and vehicular traffic, and conversion of Ballard Bridge to a pedestrian and bike path.
Immersed tube tunnel	An immersed tube tunnel (a tunnel constructed elsewhere, which is then brought to the tunnel site to be sunk into place) for the Salmon Bay crossing.

2.5 Late Comments

Comments received after the comment deadline primarily included submittals supporting comments made by the Cascade Bicycle Club, Civic Hotel, and Blade Gallery. A few also supported the 4th Avenue South alternatives in the Chinatown-International District Segment, including a comment from Seattle Best Tea, a business in the neighborhood. Comments were also received from Champion Party Supply, with concerns about being displaced in the South Interbay Segment, and from Karigo LLC, a property owner in South Lake Union, supporting comments made by other businesses in the South Lake Union neighborhood.

This page is intentionally left blank.

3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

3.1 Engagement Approach

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, typical in-person community engagement activities were limited per state and local public health mandates and recommendations. In response, Sound Transit implemented an adaptable engagement plan during the 90-day public comment period that prioritized digital or virtual engagement for the safety and well-being of the community and Sound Transit staff. Digital engagement included virtual briefings, meetings, hearings, and office hours, in addition to e-notifications such as email updates and phone conference outreach. As agency and local public health restrictions lifted, project staff adjusted to a hybrid engagement approach. In-person opportunities included presentations at hybrid or in-person meetings, briefings, and tours; one-on-one engagement at local events, existing light rail stations, and residential housing; and a corridor-wide, in-person public open house event centrally located along the project corridor. Community members who stopped by could learn about the project and Draft EIS and provide public comments.

Additionally, prior to the publication of the Draft EIS and public comment period, the WSBLE staff sought new and expanded upon existing relationships with organizations, community groups and leaders, and agency partners. One of these efforts, highlighted throughout the engagement below, included building on the existing partnership with the City of Seattle's Department of Neighborhoods Community Liaison program. Sound Transit began this partnership during the Alternatives Development phase of the project in 2018. This relationship was strengthened by expanding the partnership with 11 Community Liaisons who had existing community connections and were bi/multilingual, which provided strategic guidance and engagement support prior to and during the Draft EIS public comment period.

The following sections of this report outline key engagement strategies, resources, tools, and activities employed during the Draft EIS publication public comment period. Ongoing consultation with Tribes and coordination with agencies is also described.

3.2 Engagement Tools and Resources

To make information about the WSBLE Project widely available, Sound Transit created (and is continually updating) a variety of materials and communication tools. This includes an Online Open House, which is an active project website that serves as a resource hub for community members to learn about and get involved in the project. Materials include project fact sheets, Draft EIS briefing booklets and readers guides, and presentations. Communication tools include traditional and social media, press releases, email updates, and mailers. These materials and tools, translated into up to seven languages, provide updated information on the project and let community members know where and how to provide feedback.

3.3 Draft EIS Publication and Distribution

The Draft EIS comment period started on January 28, 2022. The documents were distributed to Tribes, Tribal Organizations, and federal, state, and local agencies. The documents were also made available to the public for review at Sound Transit offices; electronically on the Sound Transit WSBLE website (<https://www.soundtransit.org/system-expansion/west-seattle-ballard-link-extensions>) and Online Open House (<https://wsblink.participate.online>); and hard copies were distributed to the following public libraries and community-based organizations:

- Seattle Public Libraries
 - Ballard Branch, 5614 22nd Avenue Northwest, Seattle, WA 98107
 - Beacon Hill Branch, 2821 Beacon Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98144
 - Central Library (Downtown Seattle), 1000 4th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104
 - Columbia City Branch, 4721 Rainier Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98118
 - Delridge Branch, 5423 Delridge Way Southwest, Seattle, WA 98106
 - Fremont Library, 731 North 35th St, Seattle, WA 98103
 - Greenwood Branch, 8016 Greenwood Avenue North, Seattle, WA 98103
 - High Point Branch, 3411 Southwest Raymond Street, Seattle, WA 98126
 - International District Branch, 713 8th Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98104
 - Magnolia Branch, 2801 34th Avenue West, Seattle, WA 98199
 - New Holly Branch, 7058 32nd Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98118
 - Queen Anne Branch, 400 West Garfield Street, Seattle, WA 98119
 - Rainier Beach Branch, 9125 Rainier Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98118
 - Southwest Branch, 9010 35th Avenue Southwest, Seattle, WA 98126
 - West Seattle Branch, 2306 42nd Avenue Southwest, Seattle, WA 98116

- King County Libraries
 - Burien Library, 400 Southwest 152nd Street, Burien, WA 98166
 - White Center Library, 1409 Southwest 107th Street, Seattle, WA, 98146

- Community-based Organizations
 - Alliance for Pioneer Square, 105 South Main Street, Suite 201, Seattle, WA 98104
 - Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association, Youngstown Cultural Arts Center, 4408 Delridge Way Southwest, Seattle, WA 98106
 - Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority, Hing Hay Coworks, 409B Maynard Avenue South, Seattle, WA 98104

- University of Washington – Suzzallo Libraries, 4000 15th Avenue Northeast, Seattle, WA 98195

Copies of the Draft EIS were provided to members of the public by request.

Public comments on the Draft EIS were accepted through April 28, 2022 and could be made in any language and via the following methods: mail, email, online and hard copy comment forms, transcribed phone messages, and via a court reporter at the open houses and hearings.

3.3.1 Draft EIS Notifications and Advertisements

The project team published notifications and advertisements once the Draft EIS was posted online and throughout the comment period. The notifications not only informed the public about the availability of the Draft EIS, but also about upcoming public meetings/hearings, and resources about how to get involved and make public comment. The notifications and advertisements were as follows:

- A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS in the *Federal Register* and in the *SEPA Register* on January 28, 2022.

- Public notices and ongoing ad campaigns through traditional paid advertisements and where appropriate, in-language ethnic media ads, presentations, or interviews in local newspapers, online blogs, radio, and television. (Media: *The Seattle Times*, *The West Seattle Blog*, *Westside Seattle*, *MyBallard.com*, *The Stranger*, *Crosscut*, *The Seattle Medium*, *International Examiner*, *NW Asian Weekly*, *Runtanews.com*, *NW Vietnamese News*, *Siete Dias*, *Seattle Chinese Post*, *Chinese Radio Seattle*, *Do206*, *El Rey 1360 AM*, *Seattle Gay News*, *Tu Decides*, *Somali Bridge TV*, and *Korean-American TV Broadcasting*, *Amigos de Seattle Radio*, *Radio Magia Seattle*, *M Radio Live*).
- Project mailer that was translated into four languages and sent to approximately 130,000 residents and businesses in the project corridor (all addresses within 0.5 miles from the project alternatives, as well as addresses within 0.5 miles of terminus stations and 0.5 miles of Delridge Way Southwest between Southwest Genesee Street and Southwest 100th Street in the White Center neighborhood, a distance of about 3.5 miles).
- Six email notifications sent to about 11,000 email addresses in the project subscriber list.
- Two formal press releases submitted to media outlets across the project corridor and region.
- Over 1,200 poster notices, translated into six languages, displayed in publicly accessible areas near proposed stations and along the project corridor at the onset of the publication of the Draft EIS comment period and again 15 days prior to the public meetings/hearings.
- Social media content, including a project video, posted and shared by community organizations, partner agencies, and Community Liaisons and garnered 140,000 impressions during the comment period.

Additional engagement communication tools included an online and physical Draft EIS toolkit that was provided to elected officials, agency partners, community organizations and groups to distribute to their networks, and a project email and phone line.

3.3.2 Online Open House

The Sound Transit WSBLE Online Open House website was the primary tool for accessing the Draft EIS and providing comments. The Online Open House included links to each Draft EIS chapter and appendix, as well as answers to common questions to help visitors quickly find the information they were most interested in. Within the Online Open House, there were also sections about station planning, links to recorded Community Advisory Groups meetings (see Section 3.4.3), resources for property owners, and an overview of different ways to get involved, including the virtual public meetings/hearings, in-person public open house event, a briefing request tool, property owner webinars, and office hours.

Office hours were virtual, one-on-one, sessions with Sound Transit staff. These 20-minute sessions allowed members of the public to ask questions about the Draft EIS and receive assistance in navigating the document. Anyone interested in an office hours session could sign up using the form on the Online Open House.

Lastly, the Online Open House included a comment form to submit Draft EIS comments to the project team. The Online Open House was translated into Simplified and Traditional Chinese, Spanish, and Vietnamese, as well as other languages using Google Translate.

3.4 Engagement Activities

Sound Transit participated in public meetings/hearings, open houses, briefings, workshops and tours with organizations and community groups across the corridor and were available at community events and spaces to discuss the project with businesses, neighborhoods, potentially affected property owners, and other interested groups. The following sections provide additional information on the virtual public meeting/hearings, in-person public open house event, briefings, workshops, and other engagement activities.

3.4.1 Virtual Public Meetings/Hearings

Sound Transit held four virtual public meetings/hearings that included oral testimony during the 90-day comment period. The meetings/hearings were attended by anyone interested in learning about the project and Draft EIS, and each focused on a different geographic area of the project. Table 3-1 lists the dates, times, and focus area of the public meetings/hearings.

Table 3-1. WSBLE Draft Environmental Impact Statement Virtual Public Meetings/Hearings

Date	Geographic Area	Type of meeting
March 15, 2022; 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.	Focus on Interbay and Ballard	Presentation and public hearing, court reporter available
March 22, 2022; 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.	Focus on Downtown	Presentation and public hearing, court reporter available
March 24, 2022; 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.	Focus on Chinatown-International District and SODO	Presentation and public hearing, court reporter available
March 30, 2022; 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.	Focus on West Seattle and Duwamish	Presentation and public hearing, court reporter available

More than 400 community members attended the four virtual public meetings/hearings via Zoom Webinar. The meetings/hearings began with a detailed segment overview presentation that provided information about the respective geographic segment and the Draft EIS. The Chinatown-International District and SODO meeting on March 24 included simultaneous interpretation in Cantonese, Mandarin, and Vietnamese. The West Seattle meeting on March 30 included simultaneous interpretation in Vietnamese and Spanish. All four webinars included American Sign Language interpretation and live captioning.

A question and answer (Q&A) session was held after each of the segment overview presentations. Participants had the opportunity to ask questions to a panel of interdisciplinary subject matter experts related to the Draft EIS process and other topics. Participants typed their questions into a Q&A box and oral responses were provided by the panel of experts. The Q&A box was screen reader-friendly, enabling participants with visual impairments to submit questions as well. Interpreters were on hand to provide interpretation services for participants who spoke Cantonese, Mandarin, and Vietnamese at the Chinatown-International District and SODO hearing on March 24, and Vietnamese and Spanish at the West Seattle hearing on March 30.

The Q&A sessions were followed by public hearings. The hearings allowed participants to testify before those in attendance while a court reporter captured their comments. A total of 58 people provided verbal testimony at the public hearings.

3.4.2 In-person Public Open House

Sound Transit held an outdoor, public open house on March 17, 2022, from 12 to 6 p.m. at the International District/Chinatown Station Plaza at 5th Avenue South and South King Street. The open house included information on the entire WSBLE corridor. Staff members at the welcome table explained the purpose and format of the open house to participants. There were several project and Draft EIS materials available to read or take away including project folios, Draft EIS briefing booklets and readers guides; Draft EIS executive summaries, as well as the main volume and appendices; Racial Equity Toolkit Reports, Station Planning Framework Reports, property acquisition folios, and property owner handbooks. Copies of the executive summary, briefing booklet, and project folio were available in English, Spanish, Simplified Chinese, Traditional Chinese, and Vietnamese. Comment forms and the Draft EIS readers guides were available in English, Simplified and Traditional Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish, Korean, Somali, and Khmer.

As part of the open house, participants were invited to review displays and discuss the project with Sound Transit staff and members of the consultant team. Displays for each segment of the project were set up in different areas of the plaza. Displays included roll-plots of the project alternatives in each segment, a briefing booklet of the key findings of the Draft EIS and a copy of the Draft EIS and the executive summary.

Participants were invited to provide comments at the comment station through the following methods:

- Written comments on hard copy comment forms
- Verbal comments, transcribed by a court reporter
- Typed comments via the Online Open House (laptop with screen-reader software provided)

Community Liaisons provided assistance to participants who wanted to comment in Cantonese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Spanish, and Somali. Twenty-two people provided verbal comments and 13 people provided written comments at this public open house.

3.4.3 Community Advisory Groups

Prior to the start of the Draft EIS comment period, Sound Transit formed Community Advisory Groups (CAGs) to provide another forum to share information and collaborate with community members around benefits, issues, and tradeoffs of the project. Sound Transit invited the public to apply to these groups and individuals were selected with a diversity of experiences and perspectives, including but not limited to, income level, race, age, physical and cognitive abilities, and lived experience.

There were four CAGs and each was comprised of 10 to 15 community members, organized by geographic area, or project segment. Members served as ambassadors to their communities and brought forth community values, concerns, and ideas. CAG meetings began in November 2021 before the start of the comment period to provide participants with an overview of the project, environmental process, and station planning work to date.

These virtual meetings were held monthly, concluded in May 2022, and were recorded and posted on the Online Open House as a public resource. There were 21 meetings in total, with a list of the meetings that occurred during the comment period provided in Table 3-2. The final meeting for each geographic area (or segment) was a chance for each member to share feedback about tradeoffs between the alternatives and their thoughts on confirming or modifying

the preferred alternative. Feedback from these groups, as well as all of the public comments, were provided to the Sound Transit Board for their consideration.

Table 3-2. Community Advisory Group Virtual Meetings Held During the Draft EIS Comment Period

Date	Location	Focus of Meeting
February 2, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Interbay and Ballard	Draft EIS results overview
February 3, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Downtown	Draft EIS results overview
February 8, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on West Seattle and Duwamish	Draft EIS results overview
February 9, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Chinatown-International District and SODO	Draft EIS results overview
March 1, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Interbay and Ballard	Draft EIS deep dive
March 3, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Downtown	Draft EIS deep dive
March 8, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on West Seattle and Duwamish	Draft EIS deep dive
March 10, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Chinatown-International District and SODO	Draft EIS deep dive
April 5, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Interbay and Ballard	Draft EIS, potential cost savings, refinements
April 7, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Downtown	Draft EIS, potential cost savings, refinements
April 12, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on West Seattle and Duwamish	Draft EIS, potential cost savings, refinements
April 13, 2022; 5 to 7 p.m.	Focus on Chinatown-International District and SODO	Draft EIS, potential cost savings, refinements

3.4.4 Meetings, Briefings, Workshops and Tours

Sound Transit staff engaged community, arts, and business organizations in a variety of ways during the Draft EIS comment period. Some of those methods included group meetings, briefings, workshops and tours. Engagement activities were primarily virtual, with limited in-person activities like the station area tours.

Table 3-3 documents the 83 meetings, briefings, workshops, and tours conducted during the Draft EIS comment period. Unless designated as a workshop or tour, the activities below are briefings or meetings and do not capture the many phone calls, emails, and other related engagement that occurred during the comment period. Community Liaisons supported a number of these engagement activities, which are marked with an asterisk in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3. Engagement Meetings, Briefings, Workshops, and Tours (January 28 through April 28, 2022)

Date	Community, Arts, and Business Organizations
January 28, 2022	Washington Transportation Advocates
February 1, 2022	Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
February 2, 2022	Climate Pledge Arena

West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions

Date	Community, Arts, and Business Organizations
February 2, 2022	Puget Sound Harbor Safety Committee
February 2, 2022	Queen Anne Community Council
February 2, 2022	Sound Transit Citizen Oversight Panel
February 4, 2022	Historic South Downtown and Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda)
February 8, 2022	Mercer Corridor Stakeholders
February 8, 2022	Cornish Playhouse
February 10, 2022	West Seattle Chamber of Commerce
February 14, 2022	Alliance for Pioneer Square
February 15, 2022	CID Vision Group
February 15, 2022	Magnolia Community Council
February 15, 2022	Seattle Metropolitan Chamber, Business Issues Forum
February 16, 2022	Avalon Neighbors
February 16, 2022	Seattle Center organizations workshop series 1 of 3
February 17, 2022	Seattle Design Commission: Westlake and Seattle Center
February 17, 2022	SODO Business Improvement Area
February 21, 2022	Uptown Alliance, Land Use Review Committee
February 22, 2022	North Seattle Industrial Association
February 22, 2022	Seattle Subway
February 26, 2022	Tabor 100*
February 28, 2022	I Heart Radio
March 3, 2022	Seattle Design Commission: Chinatown-International District Segment
March 4, 2022	KEXP
March 4, 2022	Luxe Condominiums
March 7, 2022	Pigeon Point Neighborhood Council
March 7, 2022	Uptown Alliance
March 8, 2022	Downtown Seattle Association, Policy Committee
March 8, 2022	Urban Land Institute, Transit-Oriented Development Product Council
March 8, 2022	Chinese Information and Service Center (CISC)
March 9, 2022	Chinatown-International District Station workshop series 1 of 3
March 10, 2022	Mercer Corridor Stakeholders
March 10, 2022	Historic South Downtown, Alliance for Pioneer Square and Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda)
March 11, 2022	Cornish Playhouse tour
March 11, 2022	Seattle Rep tour
March 11, 2022	Vera Project tour
March 15, 2022	KEXP
March 16, 2022	Chinatown-International District Station workshop series 2 of 3

West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions

Date	Community, Arts, and Business Organizations
March 16, 2022	Puget Sound Sage, Community Leadership Institute, Transit Justice Panel
March 17, 2022	Seattle Design Commission: Ballard Station and Salmon Bay crossing
March 18, 2022	Seattle Center organizations workshop series 2 of 3
March 18, 2022	Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce: Ballard Link Extension
March 18, 2022	Transit Access Coalition
March 21, 2022	Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce: West Seattle Link Extension
March 22, 2022	Southwest Early Learning
March 23, 2022	Ballard-Fremont Neighborhood Greenway
March 24, 2022	Uptown Alliance
March 29, 2022	Business Owner and Management Association (BOMA)
March 29, 2022	Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda)
March 30, 2022	Chinatown-International District Station workshop series 3 of 3
March 31, 2022	Avalon Neighbors
March 31, 2022	Avalon Neighbors tour
March 31, 2022	Ballard Alliance Ratepayer Advisory Board
March 31, 2022	Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, WSBLE Stakeholder Collaboration
April 1, 2022	Delridge Neighborhood Development Association
April 5, 2022	Section 106 Consulting Parties
April 6, 2022	Ballard Food Bank
April 6, 2022	Senior Center of West Seattle
April 7, 2022	Seattle Design Commission: Delridge Station and Duwamish crossing
April 7, 2022	West Seattle Chamber of Commerce luncheon: engaging commercial tenants
April 7, 2022	National Association for Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP)
April 7, 2022	West Seattle Transportation Coalition, Draft EIS Comment Workshop
April 8, 2022	Seattle Center workshop series 3 of 3
April 10, 2022	Vietnamese Cultural Center*
April 11, 2022	SODO Business Improvement Area
April 11, 2022	Community Development roundtable
April 14, 2022	Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center
April 14, 2022	West Seattle Bike Connections
April 15, 2022	5th and Madison Condominiums tour
April 15, 2022	Historic South Downtown, CID Business Improvement Area, Seattle Chinatown International District Preservation and Development Authority (SCIDpda)
April 15, 2022	Heron Helpers and Seattle Audubon
April 16, 2022	Kin-On*
April 18, 2022	Chinatown-International District Business roundtable*
April 20, 2022	Historic South Downtown

Date	Community, Arts, and Business Organizations
April 20, 2022	Maritime businesses series 1 of 2
April 21, 2022	Seattle Design Commission: potential project refinements
April 21, 2022	Maritime businesses series 2 of 2
April 21, 2022	PARC SODO Stadiums
April 22, 2022	Avalon Neighbors
April 24, 2022	Vietnamese community group*
April 26, 2022	Duwamish Alive Coalition
April 27, 2022	Chinatown-International District Station Alternatives Senior Tour*

* Indicates an engagement activity supported by Community Liaisons.

3.4.5 Tabling, Door-to-Door, Peer-to-Peer, and Information Sharing

Engaging communities that have historically experienced barriers to engaging in public processes is important to Sound Transit. To begin to remove barriers to participation and expand our reach, Sound Transit partnered with community organizations to host information tables and outreach events at familiar community gathering places. The goal was to provide project information (often in languages other than English based on the anticipated audience), answer questions, and encourage people to submit comments on the Draft EIS. This effort went beyond asking community members and businesses to come to traditional events and included going door-to-door or sharing project materials and information in small groups as peer-to-peer conversations. Community Liaisons supported a substantial number of these engagement efforts to reach people in their communities. Their participation is marked with an asterisk in Table 3-4.

Table 3-4. Tabling, Door-to-Door, Peer-to-Peer, and Information Sharing (January 28 through April 28, 2022)

Date	Engagement Tabling, Door-to-Door, Peer-to-Peer, and Information Sharing Activity
February 5, 2022	Friends of Little Saigon: Little Saigon Creative tabling*
February 5, 2022	Vietnamese community information share*
February 12, 2022	Delridge corridor, Chinatown International District and Pioneer Square door-to-door business outreach*
February 13, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
February 19, 2022	Muslim American Youth Foundation tabling*
February 19, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
February 22, 2022	Westlake Station tabling*
February 24, 2022	Denise Louie Education Center peer-to-peer information share*
February 25, 2022	Corridor-wide library and Community-Based Organization materials share
February 25, 2022	Ballard door-to-door business outreach
February 27, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information and materials share*
March 1, 2022	Chinatown-International District station tabling*
March 3, 2022	SeaTac and Tukwila community markets information share*

West Seattle and Ballard Link Extensions

Date	Engagement Tabling, Door-to-Door, Peer-to-Peer, and Information Sharing Activity
March 4, 2022	Latino town Viernes de Fiesta tabling*
March 4, 2022	The Salvation Army Seattle White Center Corps and Community Center tabling*
March 5, 2022	West Seattle Bowl tabling*
March 5, 2022	LA Fitness materials share (day 1)*
March 6, 2022	Eastgate Church tabling*
March 6, 2022	Co Lam Temple celebration tabling*
March 6, 2022	LA Fitness materials share (day 2)*
March 6, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
March 6, 2022	White Center door-to-door business outreach*
March 9, 2022	West Seattle Halal Market business outreach*
March 9, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer outreach*
March 10, 2022	Occidental Square tabling*
March 11, 2022	The Salvation Army Seattle White Center Corps and Community Center tabling*
March 12, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
March 13, 2022	West Seattle Bowl tabling*
March 14, 2022	South Park door-to-door business outreach*
March 16, 2022	SODO station tabling
March 17, 2022	Chinatown-International District door-to-door business outreach*
March 18, 2022	Pioneer Square door-to-door business outreach
March 19, 2022	West Seattle Bowl tabling*
March 19, 2022	Co Lam Temple retreat tabling*
March 19, 2022	Delridge corridor neighbors door-to-door*
March 19, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
March 20, 2022	Masks Off celebration tabling*
March 25, 2022	West Seattle Food Bank tabling*
March 26, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
March 28, 2022	Chinese Radio Seattle information share*
April 3, 2022	West Seattle Farmers Market tabling*
April 5, 2022	Occidental Square tabling*
April 5, 2022	Pioneer Square door-to-door business outreach
April 6, 2022	Chinese community peer-to-peer information share*
April 6, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
April 6, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information and materials share*
April 9, 2022	SODO Flea Market tabling*
April 10, 2022	Ballard Farmers Market tabling*
April 13, 2022	Nihonmachi Terrace residential tabling*
April 15, 2022	Uptown Neighborhood door-to-door business outreach*

Date	Engagement Tabling, Door-to-Door, Peer-to-Peer, and Information Sharing Activity
April 16, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
April 16, 2022	Duwamish Alive! Earth Month Celebration tabling
April 17, 2022	Chinese American Civic Association peer-to-peer information share*
April 17, 2022	Chinatown-International District community member conversations*
April 17, 2022	High Point and West Seattle mosque tabling*
April 17, 2022	West Seattle Halal Market tabling (day 1)*
April 17, 2022	Mariners Game Day Chinatown-International District station tabling (day 1)*
April 17, 2022	Chinatown-International District door-to-door business outreach
April 18, 2022	Ballard Food Bank tabling*
April 18, 2022	High Point and West Seattle mosque tabling (day 2)*
April 18, 2022	West Seattle Halal Market business tabling (day 2)*
April 18, 2022	Chinatown-International District door-to-door business outreach*
April 19, 2022	Negocios y Finanzas Radio tabling*
April 20, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information and material share*
April 20, 2022	Delridge library tabling*
April 20, 2022	Hirabayashi Place residential information share
April 21, 2022	Vietnamese community peer-to-peer information share*
April 21, 2022	High Point library materials and information share*
April 22, 2022	Bush Hotel residential tabling*
April 22, 2022	Chinatown-International District door-to-door business outreach
April 22, 2022	El Salvadorean Bakery tabling*
April 22, 2022	Hope Academy Mosque tabling*
April 23, 2022	High Point Earth Day tabling*
April 26, 2022	NP Hotel residential information share
April 28, 2022	Vietnamese community information share*
April 28, 2022	Spanish community information share*
Multiple days	White Center and Delridge corridor bus stop peer-to-peer outreach*

* Indicates an outreach activity supported by Community Liaisons.

3.4.6 Property Owners and Tenants

In fall 2021, Sound Transit mailed letters in advance of the Draft EIS publication and comment period to approximately 1,400 potentially affected property owners who would be identified in the Draft EIS as being potentially affected by one or more of the project alternatives. The property owner letters included details on how to attend a Zoom Webinar with the project team, including real estate staff, to learn about the project and Sound Transit’s property acquisition process. Webinars were offered on an ongoing basis from November 2021 through the end of the comment period on April 28, 2022.

From fall 2021 until the start of the Draft EIS comment period, the project team conducted 19 property owner and tenant webinars. During the Draft EIS comment period, the project team conducted another 15 property owner and tenant webinars, for a total of 34 webinars. The property owner and tenant webinars served as an introduction to the property acquisition process and led to many follow-up, one-on-one or small group conversations through emails, phone calls, in-person, and virtual meetings, as well as office hour sessions. Fifty-nine individual property owner meetings were also conducted.

Some property owners and tenants participated in other community and/or business organization briefings described in Section 3.4.4. Sound Transit also engaged property owners and tenants during the coordination of fieldwork activities before and during the Draft EIS comment period.

3.5 Increased Accessibility and Focused Engagement with Communities of Color, Limited English Proficiency and Low-Income Populations

Sound Transit recognizes the importance of engaging communities of color, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and low-income populations and providing involvement opportunities throughout project planning, environmental review, and design processes. Building on engagement during the Alternatives Development phase, Sound Transit deepened collaboration with community-based organizations, social service providers, and other community partners and the City of Seattle's Department of Neighborhoods Community Liaisons program. As mentioned above, Sound Transit expanded the partnership with the Community Liaisons program to include 11 Community Liaisons who were involved in a series of six intensive training and feedback sessions, pre-Draft EIS publication outreach efforts to build awareness, and strategic guidance around how to engage the populations they serve in a way that is more relevant and accessible. In addition, they led or supported a wide range of activities with their community networks about the Draft EIS process and how to comment during the public comment period.

As noted above, Sound Transit provided peer-reviewed translated materials and presentations online and at in-person events. Project materials, including the Online Open House website, printed project update materials, project folios, the Draft EIS Readers Guide, and the Executive Summary of the Draft EIS were translated into Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Vietnamese, and Spanish. With strategic guidance from community organizations and Community Liaisons, Sound Transit translated select additional materials in Somali, Korean, and Khmer.

Sound Transit also proactively provided language interpretation at events in the Chinatown-International District, the Delridge Corridor, and at select engagement activities corridor-wide. As described in Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, simultaneous interpretation was provided during the virtual public meetings/hearings focused on Chinatown-International District, SODO, West Seattle, Duwamish segments and at the in-person open house event. Sound Transit partnered with community leaders and community-based organizations to offer neighborhood-specific events, including the Chinatown-International District station alternatives senior walking tour where 83 Chinatown-International District senior residents had the opportunity to learn about the project, ask questions, and provide comments on the Draft EIS.

Sound Transit also expanded its informational and educational ad campaign across 15 ethnic media platforms. This included Community Liaison presentations and interviews with Spanish

radio channels and Somali and Korean television, reaching upwards of 30,000 to 50,000 views respectively.

All of Sound Transit's notices and literature for the WSBLE Project have language blocks translated into Traditional Chinese, Vietnamese, Spanish, Tagalog, Russian, and Korean stating information is available in alternate formats by calling 1-800-201-4900. These languages were selected based on 2015 to 2018 United States Census American Community Survey data for the project corridor and community input. When contacted by a member of the public with limited English proficiency, Sound Transit staff can use an immediate phone translation service that provides over-the-phone interpretation in 150 languages, 24 hours a day and seven days a week.

These efforts have allowed Sound Transit to better reach the various communities in the corridor and involve people representative of the population in the corridor during the public comment period for the Draft EIS.

3.6 Tribes

The FTA initiated Government-to-Government Consultation on the WSBLE Project during the EIS scoping process in 2019. Since then, the WSBLE team and FTA staff have routinely met with, and shared technical information about the project with, Consulting Tribes. The WSBLE project team offered individual meetings, and review and comment opportunities on environmental documentation and the evaluation of impacts on Tribal rights and interests. The Government-to-Government Consultation will be an ongoing process that will continue throughout environmental review, design, construction, and operation of the project.

3.7 Agencies

During the environmental scoping process that began in early 2019, FTA and Sound Transit invited agencies with special expertise or interest in the project to be cooperating and participating agencies during the EIS process and consulted with these agencies through the preparation of the Draft EIS. Appendix F of the Draft EIS lists the meetings that occurred through the alternatives development and Draft EIS preparation. During the Draft EIS comment period, Sound Transit provided briefings to the U.S. Postal Service, the Port of Seattle, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as well as to the project's Interagency Group, which consists of representatives from the FTA, City of Seattle, King County Metro, the Port of Seattle, WSDOT, and Northwest Seaport Alliance.

This page is intentionally left blank.