

EDMONDS CROSSING

Connecting ferries, bus & rail



9.1 Introduction

An EIS/Design public hearing was held on April 2, 1998, at the Edmonds Public Library to receive comments on the Draft EIS. This section contains the written transcript of that hearing and responses to the comments made. Each substantive comment requiring a response is indicated with a comment number in the left margin of the testimony and corresponds to the response. The corresponding numbered responses follow the transcript.

Where comments are similar to those by previous speakers, the reader is referred to the preceding comments and responses by the comment number.

9.2 Environmental Impact Statement/Design Hearing Summary

The transcript of the hearing begins on the following page.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EIS/DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING

EACH SPEAKER WAS GIVEN THIS INFORMATION BEFORE
MAKING THEIR COMMENTS

"This Environmental Impact Statement/Design Hearing is being held to comply with the Washington State Department of Transportation design guidelines which meet the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act, Title 23 of the U.S. Code, and the Department of Transportation Act, Title 49 of the U.S. Code. It also complies with the State Environmental Policy Act of 1971, Chapter 43.21c and 47.04 of the Revised Code of Washington, and regulations in Chapter 197-11 and Chapter 468-12 of the Washington Administrative Code."

THE FOLLOWING ARE

ORAL COMMENTS MADE ON RECORD AT THE PUBLIC HEARING

FRANCES MURPHY: Frances Murphy, 5804
168th Southwest, Lynnwood 98037.

My comments go to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of February '98. I go to Section 4, Environmental consequences. Page 4-23.

The first comment goes to the runoff from

1 UNOCAL property. This is from the report. Will most
2 certainly be destructive to the Willow Creek Drainage
3 basin system, far more than the report stated, which
4 was the conveyance impacts would be minimal.

5 The report makes reference to high tide
6 conditions backing up marine water into Edmonds
7 saltwater marsh, preventing Willow Creek from carrying
8 marsh outflows to Puget Sound. These comments seem
9 cavalier at best. The scoping process seems to assume
10 that natural areas of the project they are in are not
11 important enough to consider savable. We in the South
12 County, South Snohomish County area, Edmonds, Lynwood
13 and Mountlake Terrace treasure are march and our
14 shoreline.

15 This area is being subjected to very
16 intense development. So callous dismissal of open
17 spaces is not appropriate or acceptable.

18 The plan to undertake alternative to
19 placing the new ferry dock at Point Edwards is
20 reasonable in our view. But that alternative is not
21 acceptable if it will destroy the marsh and create
22 strong water flood conditions that are under no
23 controls.

24 There is a casual reference to development
25 of controls, but I saw none. And all it talks about

4 1 is that the open space and the wetland would take that
2 water, and that doesn't happen. The proposal to put
3 123 meters of Willow Creek into culvert will alter the
4 conveyance capacity of the channel because increased
5 run off would be the equivalent of a hundred year
5 6 storm coming every year. With vastly reduced
7 permeable surface in the surrounding area, the ability
8 of the culvert to absorb increase volumes of water is
9 reduced sharply.

10 And now Section 5. Maybe this is Section
11 4. Evaluations page 5-13.

12 The Edmonds marsh is designated as a
13 wildlife sanctuary with a listing of the various kinds
14 of wildlife that actively use the marsh. As the
15 report states -- and this is in the report -- the
16 marsh is one of the last remnants of an original
17 pristine wetland along the southwest shore of Edmonds.
6 18 Such brackish/estuarine salt marshes have largely been
19 filled in and developed, thus increasing the
20 importance of these marshes that remain.

21 Now, that's from a report by the watershed
22 company of 1987 and that's quoted in the Draft EIS.
23 Page 5-20.

24 The Point Edwards alternative that
25 would require use of .06 Hectare is .15 acre of the

6

1 Edmonds saltwater marsh is unnecessary, and would
2 further reduce the size of the marsh, and, in effect,
3 destroy it. We need to remember that the remaining
4 saltwater marsh represents perhaps only 50 percent of
5 the original saltwater marsh. The Port's development
6 of its harbor square is one of the major reasons for
7 the reduction in size of the original marsh. It seems
8 to us we need to retain our urban open space and
9 unique wildlife refuge and habitat that development,
10 even scoping of a ferry dock multimodal system seems
11 to underestimate the value of open space. And the
12 quality of life of the residents of the south
13 Snohomish County region who will be left with the
14 wreckage from the placement of the ferry dock, less
15 open spaces, less resident wildlife in our marsh for
16 the enrichment and enjoyment for the people in our
17 community.

7

18 Why not place the railroad tracks on the
19 west sides of the present tracks? I understand the
20 Environmental Impact Statement proposes to place these
21 tracks on the east side which will invade the marsh.
22 The Port of Edmonds is the owner of the property on
23 the west side of the tracks, and surely the port has
24 property to spare, especially when they get paid for
25 the property.

1 Page 5-25. To quote the EIS, indirect
2 impacts have the potential to be greater. A larger
3 area that is .12 Hecatere or .3 acre of wetland buffer
4 would be cleared from the southern edge of the marsh
5 by placing the roadway closer to the wetland,
6 increasing the potential for habitat removal, and
7 disturbance of species sensitive to human activity.

8 It's very unclear what they mean when they
9 say clearing that much of the wetland buffer. They
10 are referring to a wooded area along the southern
11 boundary that borders the road presently there, and
12 that is a rookery for 17 pairs of great blue heron
13 that consider that permanent residence, and I don't
14 think the cavalier letter that the evaluators viewed
15 taking part of their rookery is realistic and it
16 certainly isn't going to happen that the heron will
17 tolerate that. The current site of the road is
18 necessary. And it is tolerable enough invasion of the
19 saltwater marsh. It's there already. But to widen
20 that road by taking a part of the buffer on the north
21 side of the road will be an unacceptable move.
22 Because the colony of 17 pairs of great blue heron
23 have an established rookery in these trees. These
24 same herons have adjusted to human neighbors until
25 now. Our obligation is to protect their habitat, not

8 | 1 | thoughtlessly eliminate their home and callously
2 | 2 | decided they, quote, might be or might not be
3 | 3 | frightened away.

4 | The Department of Transportation does not
5 | call Edmonds its home. And the Department has no
6 | right to come in and destroy that which we treasure.
7 | The objective is to plan a transportation system, not
8 | make our community less livable.

9 | Now, my final comment.

10 | Since the City of Edmonds was founded, its
11 | people have chosen to settle here because of the
12 | natural beauty of the location and its natural
13 | setting. Because this area retains so much of its
14 | original beauty, we who live here work very hard to
15 | teach casual visitors to Edmonds about the importance
16 | of protecting our natural resources. The Department
9 | 17 | of Transportation, made up of individuals who
18 | appreciate beautiful places, seems to have forgotten
19 | to place the value of our natural setting as a high
20 | priority, indeed, to assign it any priority.

21 | We need to plan for increased populations,
22 | and the transportation of these populations, but we
23 | don't have to trash the richness of each small
24 | community in the process of planning the future. We
25 | in this community treasure our natural wildlife, and

9 1 we don't want to see the tiny segment of marsh left to
2 us to be reduced for a purpose, worthy though it is,
3 that could be accomplished with more sensitivity
4 toward the wild creatures that now live peacefully as
5 our neighbors.

6
7 C. EDWARD SIMONS, M.D.: Point Wells

8 is located on the East shore of North Puget Sound
9 approximately one mile south of Edmonds, WA and is
10 currently owned by Chevron Company. It is currently
11 phased out as a petroleum products facility except for
12 an existing asphalt processing plant. It is an area
13 of 30+ Acres occupying mostly Tideland on the seaward
14 side of the Burlington-Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way
15 and tracks and extending 4400+ feet northward from the
10 16 King-Snohomish County line adjoining the town of
17 Woodway to the east. It is an overall level area
18 being cleared of tanks and lines of petroleum product,
19 unloading and storage facilities. It is currently
20 being considered as one option for a wastewater
21 processing unit for the north end area. It is also
22 becoming a jurisdictional subject between the town of
23 Woodway and City of Shoreline. There are surely other
24 interests maneuvering for acquisition and development
25 depending on future availability. Currently it is

1 under Snohomish County jurisdiction. Chevron Company
2 apparently has no current plan of disposition.

3 Point Wells is a unique property, being
4 the only location between Tacoma and Everett offering
5 potential availability, level space, large area,
6 (30 Ac) tideland and deep water access, rail line
7 access, four lane highway access (185th St.). In
8 short, it is the ideal location for a multimodal
9 transportation facility development. The
10 Edmonds-Kingston Ferry site-options are all woefully
11 short of adequate space for expansion in Edmonds. The
12 Chevron Co. asphalt plant could be relocated to the
13 Union Oil site in Edmonds. There would be abundant
14 space for ferry parking, rail depot, ferry slips and
15 also room for a wastewater processing facility if so
16 selected by Metro. Development of Point Wells would
17 be the least disruptive of existing alternate
18 locations for multimodal transport use on the east
19 side of North Puget Sound.

20 In view of the above favorable factors,
21 consideration should be given by appropriate State
22 government agencies for early acquisition of the Point
23 Wells property by Washington State by whatever means
24 necessary. Action will assure availability for
25 development of Point Wells as a superior multimodal

1 facility.

2 So the addendum is that after reading
3 this, I hope it will become obvious that in the near
4 future that Point Wells will assume the position of
5 being the most logical spot for a multimodal
6 transportation site from many aspects, mainly level 30
7 acre space and ready access to all the involved modes
8 of transportation, including the ferry, highway and
9 rail; as well as a probable site for a wastewater
10 disposal site. And with probable removal of the
11 Chevron asphalt plant to a different site. I continue
12 to believe that this site should be acquired from
10: 13 Chevron by whatever means necessary for preservation
14 for future use.

15 When this deliberation was started there
16 was one factor that was missing, and that was it was
17 not known that Chevron was going to be vacating this
18 desirable area, which is on tide land on the seaward
19 side of the railway. And this throws the whole thing
20 into a different light and provides a great deal more
21 available level space for all uses than anyplace on
22 the Edmonds waterfront. I guess that's about as much
23 as I can say about it.

24 I believe that, again, in the near future
25 that it will become obvious that this is the least

10 | 1 disruptive and most desirable site for a multimodal
2 | 2 transportation hub.

11 | 3
4 | REX CARLAW: I prefer Alternative 3
5 | because I think it would be more convenient for foot
6 | passengers from the peninsula wanting to make use of
7 | the business and recreational facilities located in or
8 | near downtown Edmonds.

9 | I also prefer the shorter distance
10 | between the foot passenger ferry unloading area and
11 | the connecting train and bus transit facility.

12 | None of the existing alternatives provides
13 | adequate parking for walk-on passengers from the
14 | peninsula.

12 | 15 Alternative 3 would allow passengers not
16 | accommodated by the provided parking greater access to
17 | private lots located in the downtown area.

18 |
19 | WALT THOMPSON: My concerns -- I am the
20 | president of the Edmonds Trout Unlimited. We run the
21 | Salmon hatchery here in the UNOCAL property. So we're
22 | very involved with the ecology and what goes on in
23 | this property in terms of the water, Willow Creek, the
24 | outflow of the wetlands into the Puget Sound area and
25 | especially we're real concerned and I'm concerned

1 about the care and the level of interest in Salmon
2 migration back and forth across through that
3 multimodal area complex.

4 As you know, they are talking about
5 putting another four hundred feet in to the culvert so
6 it would end up as a six hundred foot culvert where
7 fish have to migrate through in order to come back
8 into the hatchery. And also the outflow in juvenile
9 salmon have to go out through that same area. And as
10 everybody knows, the salmon enhancement is kind of a
11 topical issue now, and it seems like it's going the
12 opposite direction of which most people feel is to the
13 benefit of the Salmon resource, which is to enhance
14 the area, as opposed to degrade the area, their
15 opportunity to survive.

16 And one of the things that is involved
17 in that is that a beach area where the outflow of the
18 wetlands comes across the Edmonds Marina Beach, I feel
19 that that's going to be impacted by the structure of
20 the breakwater adjacent to the ferry landing, and also
21 the structure of the docks to accommodate the people
22 and the ferries.

23 And that that beach in there it packs
24 in with sand during the summertime. Consequently, in
25 the fall and the wintertime the southwest winds, wave

1 action that comes across that beach there, scours it
2 and pulls the sand away from the culvert, leaving the
3 culvert totally exposed, there allowing the sand to
4 come back into that culvert.

5 If you put a wind barrier out there and
6 a wave barrier out there, you're going to create a
7 situation where I believe the sand and sediment in
8 that little bay in there where that culvert comes out
9 is going to be able to maintain itself, to stay there,
10 won't be pushed out into the deeper water.

11 Consequently, it will pack in and the
12 fish will not be so, you know, engaged to get into
13 that culvert. That's kind of my interest. I'm really
14 concerned about also with what's going to happen to
15 the water. We would like to see that actually that
16 outflow of the wetlands be daylight, more of it to be
17 daylight than it is now. The more possibility of
18 enhancing that tidal flow, the better.

19
20 LES BLUME: I've lived in the Edmonds
21 area for over forty years. I think that this project
22 is about twenty years behind the times. We should
23 have had this long ago. And moving people is one of
24 the major projects in any society. The population and
25 the density of the Northwest is bound to increase and

15 | 1 we should be ready to accept all challenges and keep
2 | 2 our area environmentally sound and with the newest
3 | 3 type of development as possible.

4 |
5 | ED J. MCMORROW: So the Draft Proposal
6 | 6 is seriously flawed on a number of points. But the
7 | 7 chief flaw is in what kind of projected increase in
16 | 8 auto ferry traffic do we have in Edmonds and how that
9 | 9 would be handled by the surface streets out to the
10 | 10 major freeway and Highway 99.

11 | And then also that impact of -- and I'm
12 | 12 looking at ten, fifteen, twenty years. I don't know
13 | 13 how long EIS's are supposed to go out for. Because
14 | 14 the property values in the downtown area and along
15 | 15 that entire route that the cars would take will be
17 | 16 severely impacted by what I see as potential growth in
17 | 17 automobile traffic that a project of this scope with
18 | 18 specifically the triple dock, allows.

19 | Because as I see it now, with the
20 | 20 repair to the old dock with overhead loading, they are
21 | 21 going to put a third boat on the run, so we have got
22 | 22 three boats on that run, we can just consider it that
23 | 23 Kingston really only has one dock, they can handle up
24 | 24 all those three boats with one dock at each end.

25 | So if you put three in the Point

1 Edwards side or the mid waterfront side, you could
2 also put three in Kingston. They already got two. By
3 my math, that's nine boats. That's a lot of cars, two
4 hundred per ferry, that would be, you know, something
5 like unloading and loading in ten minutes. I mean,
6 there would be -- the flow of automobiles.

7 And so I would, in fact, rename the
8 project. One part -- phase of the project I would
9 call the Edmonds freeway project. And also -- and
10 this traffic will come from the ability of this
11 increased ferry capacity, will allow that the land on
12 the North Kitsap Peninsula on a massive scale, with a
13 reliable commute that this project would have,
14 companies such as Pulp Resource which owns a large
15 majority of the land in North Kitsap Peninsula, will
16 do, as their records show, build luxury homes, golf
17 course, and then they -- the surrounding area I'm sure
18 they would go ahead and put in a sewer system and the
19 whole thing.

20 And my guesstimate you got to be
21 looking at at least thirty thousand more people living
22 over there in the next fifteen years. And a number of
23 those are going to need to come, you know, are going
24 to want to link to the Seattle urban area.

25 So I would contrast the real estate

1 development of downtown Edmonds in this manner. Do we
2 want to put a big freeway in Edmonds to allow the
3 developing suburbanization of Kitsap Peninsula, and
4 will carry all that traffic, or you could even take
5 the total alternative and say if the auto ferry was
6 eliminated from Edmonds, which would be an identity
7 crisis -- in fact, I would call this an identity
8 crisis in Edmonds. If you eliminated the auto ferry
9 from Edmonds, and then built amenities such as the
10 UNOCAL becoming a beautiful park, investigate putting
11 a bicycle freeway down the railroad right of way to
12 downtown Seattle, the multimodal center transit would
13 be where the old Safeway store is. If you could
14 eminent domain that, you can get your railroad track,
15 the bus connection there and foot ferries easily could
16 be handled with their people-mover idea, sidewalk. If
17 you did have that, and that type of development --
18 because I'm not a NIMBY, not in my backyard. This is
19 not NIMBY, this is front yard. Not in my -- NIMFY.

20 So the total lack of covering the
21 broader impact in the downtown Edmonds area of this
22 potential increase in traffic, it just makes it a
23 seriously flawed document. It's -- well, I feel the
24 eel grass is pain, but I know that we need quite a few
25 more pages on traffic and less on eel grass.

19

1 I talked to a ferry representative and
2 he gave me a -- we did some top-of-the-head figures on
3 what market pricing for the operating budget of the
4 ferry would be for cars. And that doesn't include
5 capital budget, cost of boats or docks or maintenance,
6 operating budget for the ferries, I believe, is just
7 oil and salaries. And per car, we came up with about
8 twelve bucks, that's market rate. They have not done
9 any studies, if the ferry was market rate, how that
10 would affect auto usage. I mean, it's obviously going
11 to have a big effect.

12 And that would be a public feasibility.
13 Not likely at this point, but that could change with
14 the proper program, if Edmonds wanted to go ahead and
15 fight that. I realize that we do get a certain amount
16 of money, DOT pays for our traffic police. But if
17 they did build this project, it would be certainly in
18 Edmonds' interest to have an additional per car fee,
19 at least, to cover the deterioration in property
20 values that the long-term development of this project
21 would cost for the local area.

22 And one specific area of traffic that's
23 severely missed in this document is the north bound
24 traffic, how are they going to get over to 220th? I
25 mean, I live right next to Pine Street. If they try

1 to cut up that way, that would tie up the street,
2 absolute disaster. If they go up to the top of the
3 hill to the little gas station there and take a left
4 by the cemetery, how are they going to get out on
5 100th Avenue there? We'll have to put a light there
6 because they want to get left there and then go down
7 to 220th and go right.

21 8 Those are all heavily residential
9 areas, lot of kids in those areas, like to ride their
10 bikes around and stuff. I just foresee mayhem from
11 people rushing to try and get places and get out of
12 the traffic. As it is, when the ferries are running
13 full and they unload and the light at Westgate
14 changes, it backs up all the way to the other light,
15 the next most westward light in both lanes. And if
16 you put the kinds of boats on this run that it would
17 be feasible with the multi-dock system, that kind of
18 auto traffic is going to severely impact the delivery
22 19 of emergency services across the Edmonds Way, you
20 know, and around in that area. That's going to affect
21 people's health and welfare in trying to get fire and
22 emergency medical coverage and police coverage.

23 In short, this project will just plug
24 up Edmonds Way with enormous cars at sometime in the
25 not-too-distant future. It's got to happen unless

1 there is drastic changes and in the way we utilize
2 automobiles and develop land, it is inevitable that
3 that will occur. I don't need a Ouija Board for that.

4 So this project is flawed, very flawed and
5 not in the best interest of Edmonds long term. Could
6 be reshaped in a number of ways. I'm not opposed to
7 it moving to Point Edwards, if it was a single dock.
8 But I don't think the economics work out.

9 The problem with trains, you know, there
10 are going to be more trains on there, bigger freight
11 trains, and I don't see any change there. And with
12 the existing dock location, I mean, that's my
13 preferred alternative is to leave things alone.
14 That's the preferred alternative for me, and I think
15 in the best interest of Edmonds and my property value.
16 I live on 1024 North Avenue South, downtown Edmonds.
17 I have lived there since 1976.

18 And oh, the other point that's not
19 addressed is it would seem to me it would be possible
20 to build a different kind of auto ferry which would
21 even increase the amount that they can do with triple
22 docks on both Edmonds and Kingston. And that would be
23 a ferry that only carried cars, no heavy vehicles, and
24 was a catamaran hull because they have higher hull
25 speeds in crossing, you know, once it gets moving, it

23

1 could cross the sound in a quicker time. They could
2 build those out of aluminum, could just have no
3 superstructure above basically, just be a barge,
4 catamaran barge that took cars. And it could come
5 across at twice the speed the ferry does.

6 And they could -- so they could be doing
7 that in the future even with the single dock
8 situation. So even if we stayed with the single dock
9 situation, it's possible that that could increase the
10 capacity above what they would be with the three boats
11 that they want to have in the near future by speeding
12 up crossing times with the different types of ferries.

13 I'm not a naval engineer, but I think that
14 should be explored. Call up that boat builder Nichols
15 Boat Builders, they build those CATS, catamarans, big
16 catamarans. They are up on Whidbey or something.
17 They would know whether it could be done.

18
19 JOHN DEWHIRST: I've got about ten
20 points. First is that in the EIS there is nothing
21 about a station area around the multimodal station.
22 There is no mention of development around the
23 multimodal station and there is nothing about transit
24 orient development, known as TODS.

25 So I guess my overriding concern in

24 1 this area sort of how it's being integrated into the
2 community, how the station and the station area is
3 being integrated into the community.

25 4 Second point is that I'd like the EIS
5 to address how it's coordinating with the State Rail
6 Program, EIS, the RTAs commuter rail EIS and UNOCAL's
7 cleanup EIS.

26 8 Third point is that there is no
9 discussion of bus access to the multimodal station.
10 There is no talk about routes, the number of routes,
11 circulation within the multimodal station. The
12 numbers of busses, the numbers of patrons, and this
13 alternative access is a real important issue for
14 Edmonds.

27 15 Fourth point that the EIS does not
16 address the access from other areas in South County,
17 Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace and beyond, it really
18 doesn't talk about where the riders are coming from,
19 and is the ability of the streets leading into the
20 multimodal stations able to handle the traffic from
21 the area.

28 22 The fifth point is that there is no
23 bicycle access discussed in the program or the EIS,
24 nor anything about bicycle parking. SR104 is not
25 bicycle friendly, and I think this should be part of

1 the mitigation package.

2 There is nothing about bicycle access
3 to the rail station component of the EIS. There's
4 nothing in there about bicycle access to the ferry.
5 And then there's nothing about if you arrive by bus or
6 train with your bicycle, how do you get from those
7 points up to the ferry or vice-versa because both the
8 train and all the CTs, busses and the RTA busses have
9 all -- will all have bicycle racks on them.

10 Sixth point is there is nothing about
11 pedestrian circulation to the multimodal station from
12 the west. From the railroad tracks, is there any
13 provisions for pedestrian walkway over the tracks?
14 And there's nothing about walkways or sidewalks from
15 the east from SR104 into the site.

16 The seventh concern is the walking
17 distance within the multimodal station from the buss
18 drop-off point and the rail platform to the ferry. To
19 me, it seems like it's a very long way to walk. Two,
20 is the time factor and the convenience. And is this
21 -- are these going to be turnoffs for people to use
22 what everybody envisions, which I think is a good
23 idea.

24 Eighth concern is the connection
25 between the multimodal station and Main Street. I

1 think the EIS does a fairly decent job of explaining
2 withdrawing the current ferry terminal from its
3 present location and moving it down there, and then
4 opportunities it gives to Main Street to connect to
5 the waterfront and all that good stuff. But it does
6 not address connecting the multimodal to Main Street,
7 and I think it's a very important connection.

8 Number nine point is all throughout the
9 document they say that the cost of doing nothing,
10 i.e., Alternative 1 is zero, and it's not zero. I
11 don't think they took into consideration the safety
12 factor, the long-term traffic problems, air pollution,
13 and all of the other spinoffs. But mainly just the
14 safety issue of loading, unloading the ferries when
15 the trains go by. And I think in the last two years
16 we have had three accidents or four accidents when the
17 ferry was either loading or unloading, and it is
18 usually Friday.

19 And the tenth point is there is
20 inferences throughout the EIS about impacts on the
21 ferry system, that this preferred Alternative site 2
22 because of wind exposure and tide exposure, those
23 kinds of things, will have an impact on the ferry
24 operations, but it really doesn't talk about what
25 those impacts are and how significant or insignificant

33

1 and the costs of those things are. That's it.

2

3 JOE DRAY: I'm a resident of Edmonds,
4 and I'm very much vigorously opposed to the plan,
5 especially Alternative 3 that would put the double
6 ferry dock out there right at the end of the UNOCAL
7 pier. I think that's the worse of all possible
8 combinations for a site.

34

9 But one of the things that provides the
10 quality of life in this area is that park and its
11 environment, and we would strongly urge anyone
12 responsible for the planning of this program to
13 consider converting that whole UNOCAL site to a park
14 rather than to consider running four lanes of traffic
15 into it for two or three ferry docks.

35

16 Several million dollars have been spent
17 within the last two years on the existing ferry dock,
18 and we see no useful, positive benefit to the city of
19 Edmonds and its citizens for relocating that ferry
20 facility at all. We in Edmonds, many of us, are
21 vigorously opposed to it at all levels of government
22 and we would encourage anyone responsible for the
23 environmental impact study of this to carefully look
24 at the impact statement as it exists.

25 There's a wetlands there that we feel

1 would definitely be seriously impacted by construction
2 of a lot more concrete and multimodal transportation
3 terminal there.

4 And in short, not only does this --
5 especially Alternative 3 -- destroy the quality of
6 life in Edmonds, but it also severely impacts the
7 environment. And we believe that the existing ferry
8 terminal is quite adequate for the nature and quality
9 of life in Edmonds, and we oppose any change.

10

11 GEORGIA DRAY: I think that adding a
12 ferry terminal at Point Edwards is a bad idea. I
13 think it will ruin the quality of Edmonds. It will
14 ruin the quality of the Edmonds Marina Beach, which is
15 one strong point of living in Edmonds. I think it
16 will increase traffic in a bad way. That's it.

17 (End of oral comments.)

18 (Public Hearing concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

36

9.3 Environmental Impact Statement/Design Hearing Responses

Frances Murphy, 5804 168th SW, Lynnwood, WA

- T-1. If the UNOCAL site is not cleaned up, Willow Creek will continue to suffer from contaminants leaching off the site. The analyses conducted for the EIS assumed that the UNOCAL site would be cleaned up prior to the development of either of the build alternatives. With the proposed project, runoff from all of the pollution-generating areas (for example, roads, parking lots, garbage storage areas) would pass through a new treatment system prior to discharge to Willow Creek. The resulting runoff quality from the UNOCAL site would be an improvement over existing conditions, because minimal runoff treatment currently occurs. The Draft EIS fairly states that Willow Creek would therefore not suffer adverse impacts due to long-term runoff quality. As for construction-phase impacts, the Draft EIS acknowledges that sediments would be discharged to the creek, even with thorough application of erosion and sediment controls on the construction site. However, those impacts would not be expected to be major. Given the sensitive nature of Edmonds Marsh and the proximity to Willow Creek, the erosion and sediment control plan for this project would receive extensive scrutiny from a variety of permitting agencies. In the process, the best possible protective measures would be taken to prevent degradation of Willow Creek and Edmonds Marsh.
- T-2. It is expected that high tides would periodically cause marine water to back up into Edmonds Marsh and temporarily prevent or reduce fresh water outflows from the marsh. This is a desirable scenario because it would replicate natural conditions that previously existed in the marsh. If stream flows were high at times of moderate high tides, the water level in the marsh would exceed the tide level and the marsh would drain sufficiently to Puget Sound. Properties adjoining the marsh would not flood at these times. As part of the project, a new tide gate would be installed in Willow Creek downstream of the marsh to prevent extreme high tides from causing flooding on those properties. The tide gate would rarely be closed, and when closed it would only be for short periods of time. If an extreme high tide occurred coincident with extremely high stream flows, City staff would have to determine whether tide water or stream flows would pose the greater threat for flooding of properties adjacent to the marsh and operate the tide gate accordingly.
- T-3. The project was designed with careful attention to minimizing impacts to the natural environment. The vast majority of the area in which the project would be constructed is currently disturbed, paved, or both. In addition, in response to public and agency comment on the Draft EIS, the Point Edwards alternative has been modified to avoid impacts to Edmonds Marsh associated with the bus driveway adjacent to the Burlington Northern and Santa Fe railroad tracks (for details, see Section 4.8, Wetlands).
- T-4. The proposed project includes a variety of stormwater management measures that would collectively minimize impacts on Edmonds Marsh, Willow Creek, and Puget Sound. See Section 4.6, Waterways and Hydrological Systems,

and Section 4.7, Water Quality, for a discussion of the mitigation measures related to water quality and waterways and hydrological system impacts; these sections provide details on the types of temporary erosion and sediment controls and permanent stormwater treatment facilities that would be implemented.

- T-5. It is incorrect to assume that a 100-year storm flow would occur every year as a result of the project. As documented in Section 4.6, Waterways and Hydrological Systems, of the Draft EIS, development of the UNOCAL site under Alternative 2 would result in about 2 cubic feet per second of additional flow entering Willow Creek during a 100-year storm event. This would represent an increase in the 100-year flow rate in the creek of a few percent. The total size of the Willow Creek basin is 735 acres, whereas the UNOCAL site is approximately 28 acres (about 4 percent of the total basin area). The project would result in increased impervious surface on only a portion of the 28-acre UNOCAL site. New sections of Willow Creek culvert within the site would be designed to handle the total flow generated in the basin, including runoff from the redeveloped UNOCAL site. Downstream of the site, Willow Creek would be daylighted to offset adverse fishery impacts. In so doing, the new sections of creek channel would also be sized to handle the peak flows generated in the basin.
- T-6. See response T-3.
- T-7. Placement of the second rail line through Edmonds is a decision that will be made as part of the Sound Transit Commuter Rail environmental analysis decision process. A new rail line east of the existing line was depicted for the Edmonds Crossing project based upon input from Burlington Northern/Santa Fe Railroad prior to formation of Sound Transit by the voters. The design of the Edmonds Crossing multimodal transportation center would not be substantially impacted by the location of the new rail line. The schedule for design and construction of the Edmonds Crossing project will allow Sound Transit to choose the new rail alignment and most likely build the rail line and an interim rail station prior to the construction of the Edmonds Crossing facilities.
- T-8. Additional information regarding great blue herons has become available subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS, and that information is included in the Final EIS. Refer to Sections 3.2.8 and 4.9, Vegetation, Fish, and Wildlife, of the Final EIS. Also refer to response 4 to the letter from the Department of Ecology.
- T-9. The Edmonds Crossing project has carefully inventoried the environmental elements, conceptually designed facilities to minimize impacts on the environment, evaluated the impact of the proposed project, and disclosed those impacts in a draft environmental impact statement for public review. Certain elements of the proposed facilities were identified and carried through the environmental assessment to determine if the impacts could be minimized or mitigated. One such proposal was the bus driveway that was proposed to run from the terminal at the Point Edwards site to Dayton Street and would lie between the existing railroad tracks and the wetlands. As a result of the environmental analysis, the impact of this concept was found to exceed the value of the facility, and the bus driveway has since been dropped

from the proposed project. The impact upon the saltwater marsh has essentially been eliminated with the removal of the bus driveway.

C. Edward Simons, M.D., 22300 Woodway Park Road, Woodway, WA

T-10. See response 6 to letter from Joseph Dray.

Rex Carlaw, P.O. Box 1405, Kingston, WA

T-11. Comment acknowledged.

T-12. Parking would be provided for walk-on passengers using this ferry route in either direction. One reason for creating 460 parking spaces at the Modified Alternative 2 site (Point Edwards) and 490 parking spaces at the Alternative 3 site (Mid-Waterfront) was to respond to the need for parking for walk-on passengers. The number of parking spaces proposed is based upon an inventory of the existing parking within a reasonable walking distance from the existing Main Street ferry terminal and field observations of the behavior of walk-on passengers. An objective of this project is to provide adequate parking within the project to limit the impact upon parking resources on local streets.

Walt Thompson, 720 Spruce Street, Edmonds, WA

T-13. Refer to response 1 to the letter from Edmonds Laebugten Salmon Chapter-Trout Unlimited.

T-14. Refer to response 2 to the letter from Edmonds Laebugten Salmon Chapter-Trout Unlimited.

Les Bloom, 19026 Olympic View Drive, Edmonds, WA

T-15. Comment acknowledged.

Ed. J. McMorrow, 1024 Fourth Avenue South, Edmonds, WA

T-16. Forecast ferry traffic volumes and their impacts on state highways and city streets are analyzed in the "Off-Site Traffic Analysis" (presented in Appendix B of the Final EIS).

T-17. The volume of traffic projected would be the same for both build alternatives and the No Build alternative. Thus, any future impacts that result from increased traffic volumes would be the same for all alternatives. The flow of these trips through the City would be expected to vary according to the alternatives. However, the most important changes would result in shifting trips to state highways, such as SR 99 and SR 104. The potential impact on adjacent property values would likely be marginal to insubstantial for two reasons: 1) the increase in trips on these routes resulting from either build alternative would be a very small fraction of total daily volume; and 2) the property values along the major transportation route already generally reflect the impact of current and expected traffic.

- T-18. Forecast growth will occur in northern Kitsap County whether or not the project is implemented as indicated in the No Action alternative (Transportation discipline report [CH2M HILL et al., December 1995]). With both build alternatives, the majority of ferry traffic would be removed from downtown Edmonds, and the waterfront area would be available for redevelopment.
- See also the responses to comments 6 and 9 from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- T-19. Forecast ferry traffic volumes and their impacts on state highways and Edmonds streets are analyzed in the “Off-Site Traffic Analysis,” presented in Appendix B of the Final EIS.
- T-20. The Washington State Department of Transportation has a policy established by the Transportation Commission that requires uniform rates for all cross-Sound routes. The imposition of a special fee for use of a facility in Edmonds or any other terminal is not allowed under this policy. The impact on property values from the project was evaluated, and it was concluded that those impacts would be marginal to insubstantial.
- T-21. Forecast ferry traffic volumes en route to 220th Street SW, the route ferry traffic would use to get to 220th Street SW, and the impacts of this traffic are analyzed in the “Off-Site Traffic Analysis” presented in Appendix B of the Final EIS.
- T-22. See response 6 to letter from Edward McMorrow dated April 5, 1998.
- T-23. Washington State Ferries has recently developed a systemwide plan that was adopted by the Transportation Commission. This planning process included the evaluation of alternative types of vessels for certain routes. The systemwide plan suggests the acquisition of new technology ferries to provide higher speed service on some routes in the future. The Edmonds-Kingston crossing is not considered a route that can be served by alternative technology vessels because of its short distance and high volume of freight trucks; the faster catamaran-type vessels are best suited to long runs with long vessel travel time and limited heavy truck traffic. The systemwide plan anticipates the use of Jumbo Class ferries, such as the Walla Walla and Spokane, will be supplemented by smaller vessels as necessary to meet future growth in travel volumes.

Higher speed crossings would not improve the operations at a single-slip facility like the existing Main Street ferry terminal. Existing operations are based on a 40-minute cycle, with the vessel docked for 20 minutes and crossing 20 minutes. With a two-boat operation, the dock would be available for 20 minutes in each cycle. Theoretically, another vessel could be put into operation to use this 20 minutes of dock availability. If a third vessel were added, the capacity of the dock would be maximized and growth would not be possible. Adding a third vessel to the route would also mean that any disruption in the schedule would cause delays for all vessels throughout the remainder of the day.

John Dewhirst, 22311 98th Avenue West, Edmonds, WA

- T-24. Refer to response 7 to the letter from Snohomish County.
- T-25. See response 6 to the letter from Snohomish County.
- T-26. Washington State Ferries intends to work with Community Transit to ensure coordinated schedules. For its part, WSF intends to move toward a three-boat schedule that would allow for 30-minute headways; these headways should provide better opportunity in the future to attempt schedule coordination.
- T-27. Forecast multimodal transportation center and ferry traffic volumes traveling to and from areas outside of Edmonds, and the ability of access routes to accommodate this traffic, are analyzed in the “Off-Site Traffic Analysis” presented in Appendix B of the Final EIS.
- T-28. Refer to response 3 to the letter from the U.S. EPA.
- T-29. Refer to response 2 to Snohomish County.
- T-30. Refer to response 2 to the U.S. EPA.
- T-31. The connection between the multimodal transportation center and the Main Street downtown area in Edmonds is an important feature of the project. For the Point Edwards alternative, a local circulator bus route would be initiated to connect the two areas. Pedestrian walkways would provide access from Point Edwards to various parts of Edmonds along two routes: first, along the access roadway to the Pine Street/SR 104 intersection and second, along Admiral Way through the Port of Edmonds.

Alternative 3, the Mid-Waterfront site, is considered close enough to downtown to allow pedestrian access. The Mid-Waterfront terminal would be connected to existing walkways to allow pedestrian movement without supplemental facilities or a circulator bus.

- T-32. Cost estimates presented in the Draft EIS are focused solely on construction-related activities. Because no construction-related activities are proposed as part of the No Action alternative, no costs were assumed in the Draft EIS (there would be, of course, the cost of normal maintenance activity associated with keeping the existing facilities operating).

The other indirect costs mentioned in the comment (such as the degradation of safety conditions at the Main Street rail crossing, long-term traffic problems in the Edmonds downtown area, and the resulting air pollution) are all very real costs but are extremely difficult to quantify.

- T-33. Refer to response 10 to the Suquamish Tribe.

Joe Dray, 21307 Pioneer Way, Edmonds, WA

- T-34. A major component of Modified Alternative 2 is the realignment of the proposed ferry pier. Rather than placing the pier along the alignment of the existing UNOCAL pier, as described in the Draft EIS, the pier is now proposed to straddle the boundary between the Marina Beach Park and the Port of Edmonds Marina. To accommodate the pier structure, a strip of

existing parkland (0.38 acres) would need to be acquired. The pier structure, however, would be high enough above the existing ground level to allow for continued use of the park beneath, including the existing parking area and grassy area, and the existing pedestrian walkway connecting the Port Marina and the park. Beyond the grassy area, the clearance between the bottom of the pier structure and the existing ground level would be too low to allow for safe activity (this would include a roughly 75-foot-wide strip of sand beach at the bottom of the Port Marina breakwater between the grassy area of the park and the shoreline). In addition, this proposed pier alignment would provide the opportunity to merge the existing park area to the north and the beach property to the south into a single, contiguous, and more expansive park. That, in combination with the proposed removal of the existing UNOCAL pier, would also enhance views of the Puget Sound and Olympic Mountains.

- T-35. Interim upgrades have been made to the existing Main Street ferry terminal so it could continue to operate safely under ever-increasing travel demands while a new facility is designed and constructed. Most of the improvements at the existing terminal have been designed so that they can be moved and reused at another facility.

Even with the improvements to the existing terminal, the facility cannot adequately meet the future travel demands. Travel on this route has grown more than 7 percent between July 1997 and July 1998.

The Edmonds Crossing project is also needed to improve the quality of life in the city. Increasing train traffic will disrupt ferry operations and make it more difficult to maintain a schedule and interfere with traffic circulation in the downtown area. Ferry traffic also interferes with the City's revitalization efforts and long-range plans to connect the downtown business area with the waterfront.

Georgia Dray, 21307 Pioneer Way, Edmonds, WA

- T-36. Comment acknowledged.

SEA31009908191.doc/043010030