

# Appendix B

## References





## **B. REFERENCES**

### **S. SUMMARY**

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2009. Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Final Long-Range Plan: 2009-2030. June 30, 2009. Available on the internet:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/planning/>

### **1 PURPOSE AND NEED**

Mukilteo, City of. 1995a. Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal and Access Study, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. City of Mukilteo, Mukilteo, WA.

Mukilteo, City of. 1995b. Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal and Access Study, Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. City of Mukilteo, Mukilteo, WA.

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2009. Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Final Long-Range Plan: 2009-2030. June 30, 2009. Available on the internet:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/planning/>

WSDOT. 2010. Alternatives History through 2009. Available on the internet at:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/library.htm>

WSF (Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division). 2004. Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal Master Plan Design Report. May 2004.

### **2 ALTERNATIVES**

Mukilteo, City of. 1995b. Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal and Access Study, Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. City of Mukilteo, Mukilteo, WA.

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2010. Alternatives History through 2009. Available on the internet at:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/library.htm>

WSF (Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division). 2004. Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal Master Plan Design Report. May 2004.

### 3 TRANSPORTATION

Everett, City of. 2004. City of Everett Planning and Community Development Letter, dated December 2004.

PSRC (Puget Sound Regional Council). 2010. Transportation 2040. Available on the internet at: <http://www.psrc.org/transportation/t2040/t2040-pubs/final-draft-transportation-2040>

TRB (Transportation Research Board). 2000. Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Special Report 209.

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2009. Washington State Department of Transportation Ferries Division Final Long-Range Plan: 2009-2030. June 30, 2009. Available on the internet: <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/ferries/planning/>

### 4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

#### 4.1 Introduction

No references found.

#### 4.2 Land Use and Economics

Berk and Associates. 2006. City of Mukilteo Economic Development and Annexation Study, October 2006 Berk Associates, 120 Lakeside Avenue Suite 200, Seattle, Washington 98122 Available on the Internet at: [http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/files/anx-berkecondevstudy%20\(10-06\).pdf](http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/files/anx-berkecondevstudy%20(10-06).pdf)

Everett, City of. 2009. Everett Shoreline Master Program. Available on the Internet at: <http://www.ci.everett.wa.us/default.aspx?ID=869> City of Mukilteo. 2004. Mukilteo Shoreline Master Program. Available on the Internet at: <http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/page.asp?navid=171>

Ervine, Gerry. 2011. Email communication. May 3, 2011, City of Everett Planning and Community Development Department. Shoreline Planner.

Mukilteo, City of. 2010. Comprehensive Plan. Available on the Internet at: <http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/Page.asp?NavID=57>

Mukilteo, City of. 2011. Draft Amendment to Mukilteo Shoreline Master Program. Available on the Internet at <http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/page.asp?navid=171>

PSRC (Puget Sound Regional Council). 2010. Transportation 2040. Available on the internet at: <http://www.psrc.org/transportation/t2040/t2040-pubs/final-draft-transportation-2040>

USAF (U.S. Air Force). 2010. Draft Environmental Assessment, Transfer of Mukilteo Tank Farm 1 July 2010. Project: AMC199519, Contract Number FA8903-08-D-8770, Task Order: 0041 Headquarters Air Mobility Command Integrated Planning Branch 507 Symington Drive Scott Air Force Base, Illinois 62225-5022 Available on the internet at: <https://newafpims.afnews.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-100707-019.pdf>

#### 4.3 Noise

FTA (Federal Transit Administration). 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Available at [http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA\\_Noise\\_and\\_Vibration\\_Manual.pdf](http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf).

FHWA (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration). 1995. Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance. June 1995

FHWA. 1997. Measurement of Highway-Related Noise. FHWA-PD-96-046, DOT-VNTSC-FHWA 96-5. March 1997. By C.S.Y. Lee and G.G. Flemming. National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA. Available at: <http://www.ntis.gov>.

FHWA. 2010. Construction Noise Handbook. Available at: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction\\_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm).

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2004 and 2010 Annual Traffic Report.

Gilbertson, S. 2004. Quiet Zone Noise Monitoring Results Tech Memo, Mukilteo. Washington State Department of Transportation. October 2004.

#### 4.4 Visual Quality, Aesthetics, and Light and Glare

Jacques, J.L. 1980. Landscape Appraisal: The Case for a Subjective Theory. *Journal of Environmental Management* 10:107–113.

Kaplan, R. 1985. The Analysis of Perception Via Preference: A Strategy for Studying How the Environment is Experienced. *Landscape Planning* 12:161–176.

Kaplan, S. and R. Kaplan. 1982. *Cognition and Environment: Functioning in an Uncertain World*. Praeger, New York. (Republished in 1989 by Ulrich's, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)

Mukilteo, City of. 2004. *Lighthouse Park Master Plan*. Prepared by MacLeod Reckord Landscape Architects. Available on the Internet at: <http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/files/lhmp-master%20plan.pdf>

Real, E., C. Arce, and J.M. Sabucedo. 2000. Classification of Landscapes Using Quantitative and Categorical Data, and Prediction of Their Scenic Beauty in North-Western Spain. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20(4):355–373.

Sekuler, R., and R. Blake. 1994. *Perception*. McGraw-Hill.

USAF (U.S. Air Force). 2010. Draft Environmental Assessment, Transfer of Mukilteo Tank Farm 1 July 2010. Project: AMC199519, Contract Number FA8903-08-D-8770, Task Order: 0041 Headquarters Air Mobility Command Integrated Planning Branch 507 Symington Drive Scott Air Force Base, Illinois 62225-5022 Available on the internet at: <https://newafpims.afnews.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-100707-019.pdf>

Yarbus, A.L. 1967. *Eye Movements and Vision*. Plenum, New York.

#### 4.5 Social Impacts and Environmental Justice

Everett, Port of. 2004. *Proposed Satellite Rail/Barge Transfer Facility, Final Environmental Impact Statement (Volumes I, II, and III)*.

Executive Order 12898. 1994. *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. Federal Register 59(32) 7629-7633. Washington D.C.

FHWA. 2001. *1995 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey Databook*, based on data from the 1995 Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey. Prepared for Office of Highway Policy Information, HPPI. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C. October.

FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A. Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C. FHWA. 1998. Order 6640.23, *FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. Federal Register. USDOT, FHWA, Washington, D.C.

Housing Authority of Snohomish County. 2011. *Online directory of Homeless Housing Resources, Short-Term Housing Resources, Rental Assistance and related Properties*. Accessed at <http://www.hasco.org/properties>

Mukilteo, City of. 2010. Comprehensive Plan. Available on the Internet at:  
<http://www.ci.mukilteo.wa.us/Page.asp?NavID=57>

Section 8 Housing Assistance. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban  
Development. [www.hud.gov/apps/section8](http://www.hud.gov/apps/section8). Washington, D.C.

Snohomish County, 2011. Solid Waste: Where does my garbage go? Accessed at:  
[http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/Public\\_Works/Divisions/Solid  
Waste/Garbage/wheregarbagegoes.htm](http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/Public_Works/Divisions/Solid_Waste/Garbage/wheregarbagegoes.htm).

U.S. Census. 2000. United States Census 2000. U.S. Department of Commerce,  
Bureau of the Census. Washington, D.C.

WDFW (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2005. Washington's  
Comprehensive Conservation Strategy. Washington Department of Fish and  
Wildlife, Olympia, WA.

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2003. Centennial  
Accord Plan. Adopted June 29, 2003.

WSDOT. 2004. WSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual, M31-11, Section  
458 Environmental Justice. Washington State Department of Transportation,  
Olympia, Washington.

#### 4.6 Cultural Resources

Andrews, M. 2008 National Register of Historic Places Registration Form: Mukilteo  
Light Station. Andrews History Group, Seattle. On file, Washington State  
Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Olympia, Washington.

Green, R.L., 1981. Underwater Archaeological Reconnaissance of Two Proposed  
Expansion Sites for the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal. On file, Washington  
Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Olympia, Washington.

Interstate Publishing Company. 1906. An Illustrated History of Skagit and  
Snohomish Counties. Interstate Publishing Company. Chicago, Illinois

Kaehler, G.A., Lewarch, D.D., Forsman, L.L., and Larson. 2006. Mukilteo  
Multimodal Ferry Terminal Cultural Resources Assessment Discipline Report,  
Mukilteo. Snohomish County, Washington [Draft]. LAAS Technical Report  
2005-06, prepared for Washington State Department of Transportation,  
Washington State Ferries, Seattle. Larson Anthropological Archaeological  
Services Limited. Gig Harbor, Washington.

- Miss, C.J., Robert Kopperl, Charles M. Hodges, Sharon A. Boswell, and William White III. 2008. Results of Additional Heritage Resources Investigations at the Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal Project Site. Prepared for Washington State Ferries. Northwest Archaeological Associates, Inc., Seattle, Washington.
- Miss, C.J., and White, W. III. 2008. Results of Test Excavations at Site 45SN398A. Prepared for Sound Transit and Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. Northwest Archaeological Associates, Inc. Seattle, Washington.
- National Park Service. 1997. How to Complete the National Register Registration Form. National Register Bulletin (formerly 16A). U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources. Washington, D.C.
- Rinck, B.A., and E. Heideman. 2008. Cultural Resources Assessment for the Mukilteo Lighthouse Park Project Phase 2, Snohomish County, Washington. Prepared for Barker Landscape Architects, Seattle. NWAA Report Number WA08-028. Northwest Archaeological Associates, Inc., Seattle, Washington.
- Shong, M.V. 2006a. State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Form. On file at the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia, Washington.
- Shong, M.V. 2006b State of Washington Archaeological Site Inventory Form. On file at the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia, Washington.
- Schumacher, J. 2005. Cultural Resources Assessment for the Port of Everett Rail/Barge Transfer Facility, Snohomish County, Washington. Technical Report 01099. Western Shore Heritage Service, Inc., Bainbridge Island, Washington.

#### 4.7 Air Quality

- Associated General Contractors of Washington. 1997. Guide to handling fugitive dust from construction projects. Seattle, Washington.
- Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2000. 1999 Air quality trends in Washington. Olympia, Washington.
- Ecology. 2003. 2000-2002 Air quality trends. Olympia, Washington.
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). Ambient Monitored Data. Air Data URL: <http://www.epa.gov/air/data/geosel.html>
- EPA. 1992. Guidelines for Modeling Carbon Monoxide from Roadway Intersections. Report Number: EPA-454/R-92-005. November 1992.

EPA. 1992. Automobiles and carbon monoxide. Fact Sheet Number EPA-400-F-92-005. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

EPA. 1993. Motor vehicle-related air toxics study. Report Number EPA-420-R-93-005. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

EPA. 1995. Compilation of air pollutant emission factors, fifth edition (AP-42).

EPA. 1999. Transportation air quality.

EPA. 2000. Air quality index: A guide to air quality and your health. Report Number EPA-454/R00-R005.

EPA. 2001. The projection of mobile source air toxics from 1996 to 2007: Emissions and concentrations (draft). Report Number EPA-420-R-01-038.

EPA. 2002a. Latest findings on national air quality 2001 status and trends. Report Number EPA-454/K-02-001.

EPA. 2002b. National air toxics assessment.

FHWA (Federal Highway Administration). 2006. Interim guidance on air toxic analysis in NEPA documents. February 3, 2006.

FHWA. 2009. Interim guidance on air toxic analysis in NEPA documents. September 30, 2009.

PSRC (Puget Sound Regional Council). 2010. Transportation 2040. Available on the internet at: <http://www.psrc.org/transportation/t2040/t2040-pubs/final-draft-transportation-2040>

USDOT (U.S. Department of Transportation). 2001. Transportation conformity reference guide. Federal Highway Administration.  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/TA/ProgMgt/STIP/STIPHP.htm> (last accessed 11 June 2008)

WSDOT (Washington Department of Transportation). 2008. Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry terminal Air Quality Discipline Report Working Draft. July 2005.

#### 4.8 Hazardous Materials

USAF (U.S. Air Force). 2010. Environmental Baseline Survey: Defense Fuel Supply Point. Mukilteo, WA. March 19, 2010.

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2010. Environmental Procedures Manual M31-11.09. Olympia, WA. October 2010.

## 4.9 Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- CalTrans (California Department of Transportation). 1983. Energy and Transportation Systems. July 1983.
- CalTrans. 2008. The Climate Registry, General Reporting Protocol, Version 1.1. May.
- CalTrans. 2011. Price Index for Selected Highway Construction Items. Available online at <[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/contract\\_progress/cost-index-summary.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/contract_progress/cost-index-summary.pdf)>.
- Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington,  
<http://cses.washington.edu/cig/fpt/ccscenarios.shtml>
- Energy Information Administration. 2011. Washington State Energy Profile: Consumption. Available at:  
[http://www.eia.gov/cfapps/state/state\\_energy\\_profiles.cfm?sid=WA](http://www.eia.gov/cfapps/state/state_energy_profiles.cfm?sid=WA)
- NHTSA (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration). 2010a. NHTSA and EPA Establish New National Program to Improve Fuel Economy and Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Passenger Cars and Light Trucks. Fact Sheet. Available online at:  
<[http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/cape/CAFE-GHG\\_Fact\\_Sheet.pdf](http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/cape/CAFE-GHG_Fact_Sheet.pdf)>.
- NHTSA. 2010b. NHTSA and EPA to Propose Greenhouse Gas and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Trucks; Begin Process for Further Light-Duty Standards. Fact Sheet. May. Available online at:  
<[http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/cape/LD\\_HD\\_FE\\_FactSheet.pdf](http://www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/rulemaking/pdf/cape/LD_HD_FE_FactSheet.pdf)>. Accessed on October 9, 2010.
- The Climate Registry. 2008. General Reporting Protocol. Version 1.1, May 2008.
- Washington State Department of Commerce [formerly Community, Trade, and Economic Development]. 2008. 2009 Biennial Energy Report with Indicators. December 2008. Available at:  
<http://www.commerce.wa.gov/DesktopModules/CTEDPublications/CTEDPublicationsView.aspx?tabID=0&ItemID=6814&MId=863&wversion=Staging>.
- WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2010a. Sustainable Transportation 2010. Available online at:  
<<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/SustainableTransportation/report.htm>>.

WSDOT. 2010b. Guidance for Project-Level Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change Evaluations. October 2010. Available at:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/73ADB679-BDA6-4947-93CA-87C157862DD7/0/GreenHouseGasGuidanceOct2010.pdf>.

#### 4.10 Geology

Atwater, B.F., M.R. Satoko, S. Kenji, T. Yoshinobu, U. Kazue, D.K. Yamaguchi. 2005. The Orphan Tsunami of 1700: Japanese Clues to a Parent Earthquake in North America. U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 1707.

Baum, R.L., Harp, E.L., Hultman, W.A., 2000, Map Showing Recent and Historical Landslide Activity on Coastal Bluffs of Puget Sound between Shilshole bay and Everett, Washington. U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-2346. Version 1.0.

GeoEngineers. 2008. Liquefaction and lateral spreading evaluation, Mukilteo Ferry Terminal, Mukilteo, Washington. Prepared for the Washington Department of Transportation. March 26, 2008.

Gonzalez, F.I., compiler, 2003, Sherrod, B.L., Atwater, B.F., Frankel, A.P., Palmer, S.P., Holmes, M.L., Karlin, R.E., Jaffe, B.E., Titov, V.V., Mofjeld, H.O., Venturato, A.J., Puget Sound Tsunami Sources – 2002 Workshop. A contribution to the Inundation Mapping Project of the U.S. National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program. June 2003.

Johnson, S.Y., Potter, C.J., Armentrout, J.M., Miller, J.J., Finn, C., and Weaver, C.S. 1996, The southern Whidbey Island fault: An active structure in the Puget Lowland, Washington. Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 108, p. 334-354

Johnson, S.Y., Blakely, R.J., Brocher, T.M., Sherrod, B.L., Kelsey, H.M., and Lidke, D.J., compilers. 2004. Fault number 572, Southern Whidbey Island fault zone, in Quaternary fault and fold database of the United States: U.S. Geological Survey website, <http://earthquakes.usgs.gov/regional/qfaults>, accessed 03/30/2011 03:31 PM.

Karlin, B., 2011, Submarine Landslide Morphology of the Puget Sound. Personal communication of unpublished data. April 26, 2011.

Koshimura, S., and H. Mofjeld. 2001. Inundation modeling of local tsunamis in the Puget Sound, Washington, due to potential earthquakes. NOAA/ Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory. ITS 2001 Proceedings. Session 7 Number 7-18. p. 861-873

- Minard, James P., 1982. Distribution and description of geologic units in the Mukilteo quadrangle, Washington: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-1438, 1 sheet, scale 1:24,000.
- Mukilteo, City of. 2009. Critical areas and shoreline Elements of 2009 Comprehensive Plan (2nd Preliminary Draft). August 24, 2009. As amended by Ordinance No.1226, November 16, 2009.
- Mukilteo, City of. 2011. Shoreline Master Program – Draft 3. City of Mukilteo, Washington. January.
- Smith, Mackey. 1976. Preliminary surficial geologic map of the Mukilteo and Everett quadrangles, Snohomish County, Washington: Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Geologic Map GM-20, 1 sheet, scale 1:24,000.
- Soil Survey Staff, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey for Snohomish County. Available online at <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/> accessed [03/28/2011]
- Terracon. 2010. Preliminary geotechnical findings Lighthouse Park Pathway, Mukilteo, Washington. Prepared for the City of Mukilteo. August 25, 2010.
- Tetra Tech/KCM et al. 2001. City of Mukilteo comprehensive surface water management plan. Prepared for City of Mukilteo by Tetra Tech/KCM, Inc., and associated firms.
- WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2003. State Route 525, XL1379 Mukilteo multi-modal ferry terminal Preliminary Geotechnical Report. Prepared for the Washington State Ferries. May 21, 2003.
- WSDOT. 2004. State Route 525, XL1379 Mukilteo multi-modal ferry terminal revised geotechnical report. Prepared for the Washington State Department of Transportation. January 30, 2004.
- WSDOT. 2006a. State Route 525, XL1379 Mukilteo multi-modal ferry terminal – drilled shaft and driven pile capacity and liquefaction impacts H-Span and overhead loading structures. Prepared for the Washington State Ferries. June 20, 2006.
- WSDOT. 2006b. State Route 525, XL1379 Mukilteo multi-modal ferry terminal – terminal building and bulkhead geotechnical recommendations. Prepared for the Washington State Ferries. July 20, 2006.

WSDOT. 2010a. Environmental Procedures Manual. M 31-11.09. Washington State Department of Transportation Environmental and Engineering Programs. October.

WSDOT. 2010b. Geotechnical design manual, M 46-03.03. Washington State Department of Transportation Environmental and Engineering Programs. November.

#### 4.11 Water Resources

Ecology (Washington Department of Ecology). 2005. Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Publications 99-11 through 99-15. Prepared by the Washington State Department of Ecology, Water Quality Program. February 2005.

Ecology. 2009. 2008 Washington State Water Quality Assessment 303(d) List. Available online: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/2008/>

Herrera (Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc.). 2003. Hazardous Materials Site Assessment, Former Defense Fuel Support Point Mukilteo Property, Mukilteo, Washington. Prepared for Jacobs Civil Inc. and Washington State Ferries. December 2003.

Herrera in association with Moffatt & Nichol. 2006. Water Resources Discipline Report: Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal. Prepared for Washington State Ferries and Washington State Department of Transportation.

Oasis (Oasis Environmental, Inc.). 2006. Request for No Further Action, Areas 1, 2 and 3, Former Defense Fuel Support Point Mukilteo, Mukilteo, Washington. March 2006.

Tetra Tech/KCM et al. 2001. City of Mukilteo Comprehensive Surface Water Management Plan. Prepared for City of Mukilteo by Tetra Tech/KCM, Inc., and associated firms.

#### 4.12 Ecosystems

Anchor (Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.). 2005a. Eelgrass Survey. Prepared for Washington State Ferries Terminal Engineering Department. July 2005.

Anchor. 2005b. Biological Resources Survey. Prepared for Washington State Ferries Terminal Engineering Department. July 2005.

Anchor. 2005c. Geoduck (*Panopea abrupta*) Survey. Prepared for Washington State Ferries Terminal Engineering Department. July 2005.

- Bash, J., C. Berman, and S. Bolton. 2001. Effects of turbidity and suspended solids on salmonids. Center for Streamside Studies, University of Washington. 80 pp.
- Confluence Environmental. 2011. Draft Mukilteo Multimodal Project Eelgrass Survey. October 18, 2011. 87 pp.
- Engås A, Loïkkeborg S, Ona E, Soldal AV (1996) Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*Gadus morhua*) and haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*). *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 53:2238–2249.
- Everett, Port of. 2004. Proposed Satellite Rail/Barge Transfer Facility, Environmental Impact Statement (Volumes I and II).
- Hastings, M.C., A.N. Popper, J.J. Finneran, and P. Lanford. 1996. Effects of Low Frequency Sound on Hair Cells of the Inner Ear and Lateral Line of the Teleost Fish *Astronotus ocellatus*. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 99(3):1759– 1766.
- Hastings & Popper. 2005. Effects of Sounds on Fish. January 28, 2005.
- Herrera (Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc.) in association with Moffatt & Nichol. 2006. Water Resources Discipline Report: Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal. Prepared for Washington State Ferries and Washington State Department of Transportation.
- Jeffries, S. 2005. Telephone conversation with S. Jeffries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. January 5, 2005
- Krahn, M.M., M.J. Ford, W.F. Perrin, P.R. Wade, R.P. Angliss, M.B. Hanson, B.L. Taylor, G.M. Ylitalo, M.E. Dahlhelm, J.E. Stein, and R.S. Waples. 2004. 2004 Status Review of Southern Resident Killer Whales (*Orcinus orca*) under the Endangered Species Act. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFSNWFSC-63, 73p.
- Love, M.S., M.M. Yoklavich, and L. Thorsteinson. 2002. The rockfishes of the Northeast Pacific. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.
- McDowell, M. 2011. E-mail correspondence from Michael McDowell, Confluence Environmental. Seattle, Washington. April 5, 2011.
- Miller, D.J. and S.F. Borton. 1980. Geographical distribution of Puget Sound fishes: Maps and data source sheets. University of Washington Fisheries Research Institute. 3 vols.

- Moore, S.E. and J.T. Clarke. 2002. Potential impact of offshore human activities on gray whales. *Journal of Cetacean Research Management* 4:19-25.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2008a. Proposed Designation of Critical Habitat for the Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American Green Sturgeon. Draft Biological Report. Available at:  
[http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/gs/Final\\_Draft\\_GS\\_BioRpt.pdf](http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov/gs/Final_Draft_GS_BioRpt.pdf).
- NMFS. 2008b. Preliminary Scientific Conclusion of the Review of the Status of Five Species of Rockfish: Bocaccio (*Sebastes paucispinis*), Canary Rockfish (*Sebastes pinniger*), Yelloweye Rockfish (*Sebastes ruberrimus*), Greenstriped Rockfish (*Sebastes elongates*), and Redstripe Rockfish (*Sebastes proriger*) in Puget Sound, Washington. Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service. Seattle, Washington. December 2, 2008.
- NMFS. 2009. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Proposed Endangered, Threatened and Not Warranted Status for Distinct Population Segments of Rockfish in Puget Sound. *Federal Register*. Vol. 74, No. 77, pp. 18516-18542.
- Norberg, B. 2000. Telephone conversation with Brent Norberg, National Marine Fisheries Service. Seattle, Washington. February 24, 2000.
- Norberg, B. 2003. Telephone conversation with Brent Norberg, National Marine Fisheries Service. Seattle, Washington. January 22, 2003.
- Osborne, R.W. 2008. The Whale Museum. Southern Resident Killer Whale Sighting Compilation 1990-2008.
- Palsson, W.A., T. Tsou, G.G. Bargmann, R.M. Buckley, J.E. West, M.L. Mills, Y.W. Cheng, and R.M. Pacuski. 2009. The biology and assessment of rockfishes in Puget Sound. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington. 208 pp. <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00926/wdfw00926.pdf>.
- PI Engineering (Pacific International Engineering). 2002. Eelgrass and Biological Resource Survey, Mukilteo Ferry Terminal. Julie Haddad and Tracey McKenzie. Prepared for: Washington State Ferries. November, 2002
- Popper, A. N. 2003. Effects of anthropogenic sound on fishes. *Fisheries*, 28 (10):24-31.
- Richardson, W.J, C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme and D.H. Thomson. 1995. *Marine Mammals and Noise*. Academic Press, San Diego, California.

- Stratus Consulting Inc. 2006. Creosote-treated wood in aquatic environments: Technical review and use recommendations. Prepared for NOAA Fisheries, Southwest Division. 106 pages.
- Tetra Tech/KCM et al. 2001. City of Mukilteo Comprehensive Surface Water Management Plan. Prepared for City of Mukilteo by Tetra Tech/KCM, Inc., and associated firms.
- Tonnes, D. 2011. E-mail correspondence from Dan Tonnes, National Marine Fisheries Service. Seattle, WA. March 30, 2011.
- Turnpenny, A.W.H., K.P. Thatcher and J.R. Nedwell. 1994. The effects on fish and other marine animals of high-level underwater sound. Report FRR 127/94, Fawley Aquatic Research Laboratories, Ltd., Southampton, UK.
- Turnpenny, A., and J. Nedwell. 1994. The Effects on Marine Fish, Diving Mammals and Birds of Underwater Sound Generated by Seismic Surveys. Fawley Aquatic Research Laboratories Limited, Marine and Freshwater Biology Unit, Southampton, Hampshire, UK.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2011. Endangered Species Program. Available at: <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/>. Last updated May 4, 2011.
- Wahl, T.R., B. Tweit, and S.G. Mlodinow (eds). 2005. Birds of Washington, Status and Distribution. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, Oregon.
- Wiles, G.J. 2004. Washington State Status Report for the Killer Whale. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.
- Williams, G.D., R.M. Thom, D.K. Shreffler, J.A. Southard, L.K. O'Rourke, S.L. Sargeant, V.I. Cullinan, R. Moursund, & M. Stamey. 2003. Assessing Over-water Structure-Related Predation Risk on Juvenile Salmon: Field Observations and Recommended Protocols. Prepared for the Washington State Department of Transportation. September 2003
- WDFW (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2011. Priority Habitat and Species Data. Olympia, WA.
- WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2010. Environmental Procedures Manual M 31-11.07. Washington State Department of Transportation, Environmental and Engineering Programs, Environmental Services Office. Olympia, Washington. February 2010.

#### 4.13 Public Services and Utilities

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2010. Utilities Manual. M 22-87.02. Available online:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M22-87.htm>

#### 4.14 Other Considerations

No references found.

### **5 DRAFT SECTION 4(F)**

No references found.

### **6 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

No references found.

### **7 AGENCY, TRIBAL, AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

WSDOT (Washington State Department of Transportation). 2010. Community Guide to Scoping and the Project Concepts. Available online:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/library.htm>

WSDOT. 2011. Scoping Report. January 12, 2011. Available online:  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal/library.htm>



# Appendix C

## Index





## C. INDEX

- acquisitions .....S-20, S-21, 2-17, 3-31, 4-12, 4-24,  
4-89, 4-101, 6-5
- agency coordination.....7-1, 7-2
- air quality.....S-20, S-21, S-23, 4-69, 4-84,  
4-101, 4-104, 4-105, 4-106, 4-107,  
4-108, 4-109, 4-110, 4-112, 4-113,  
4-114, 4-138, 4-139, 6-6
- Area of Potential Effects  
(APE) .....4-92, 4-99, 4-101, 5-2, 5-5, 5-7
- best management  
practices.....4-128, 4-150, 4-153, 4-166, 4-167,  
4-169, 4-170, 4-189, 4-190, 4-195
- bicycle facilities .....S-5, 1-9, 2-19, 3-40
- climate change.....S-20, S-24, 4-107, 4-131, 4-132,  
4-134, 4-139, 4-140, 4-167, 4-197,  
6-6
- construction activities.....S-23, 2-1, 2-17, 2-18, 2-24, 3-30,  
3-31, 3-32, 3-33, 3-42, 4-1, 4-34,  
4-35, 4-84, 4-85, 4-90, 4-111,  
4-125, 4-126, 4-127, 4-132, 4-162,  
4-163, 4-164, 4-166, 4-168, 4-169,  
4-184, 4-190, 4-194, 4-197, 6-7,  
6-9, 6-10
- construction costs .....4-111
- construction duration.....2-17
- construction noise .....S-22, 4-26, 4-27, 4-32, 4-34
- contaminated  
soils/material .....4-115, 4-119, 4-120, 4-125, 4-126,  
4-127, 4-129, 4-130, 6-9
- cooperating agencies.....2-21, 4-91, 7-2
- creosote piles.....S-24, S-25, S-29, S-33, 4-123,  
4-182, 4-183, 4-187, 4-189, 6-9
- cultural resources.....S-20, 1-11, 4-1, 4-92, 4-95, 4-101,  
4-102, 5-2, 6-6, 6-8, 6-10, 7-6, 7-12
- cumulative impacts .....3-1, 3-35, 4-1, 4-12, 4-15, 4-17,  
4-18, 4-21, 4-22, 4-23, 4-33, 4-34,  
4-88, 4-101, 4-112, 4-131, 4-137,  
4-139, 4-153, 4-170, 4-187, 4-195
- dredging.....S-21, 2-18, 4-126, 4-128, 4-152,  
4-162, 4-169, 4-186, 4-197, 6-7, 6-9
- economics.....S-20, S-21, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-8, 4-12,  
4-15, 4-17, 4-18, 4-19, 4-21, 4-22,  
4-23, 4-68, 4-69, 4-152, 4-197, 6-5
- ecosystems.....S-21, S-25, S-29, 4-1, 4-21, 4-91,  
4-170, 4-186, 4-187, 4-190, 6-6,  
6-9, 6-10, 7-12
- Endangered Species Act  
(ESA) .....4-115, 4-170, 4-177, 4-178, 4-179,  
4-186, 4-189
- energy.....S-20, S-24, 4-113, 4-131, 4-132,  
4-134, 4-135, 4-136, 4-137, 4-138,  
4-139, 4-149, 4-181, 4-196, 6-6
- environmental justice..... S-20, S-22, 4-49, 4-68, 4-69, 4-71,  
4-79, 4-80, 4-82, 4-83, 4-89, 4-90,  
4-92, 6-6
- federally listed species .. 4-177, 4-179
- floodplain .....4-140, 4-160, 4-161, 4-167, 4-197,  
6-6
- freight .....1-1, 3-1, 3-2, 3-11, 3-30, 4-2, 4-29,  
4-33
- geology.....S-20, S-24, 4-140, 4-141, 4-153,  
6-6
- greenhouse gases.....S-24, 4-132, 4-133, 4-134, 4-135,  
4-136, 4-137, 4-138, 4-139
- habitat.....S-25, S-26, S-29, 2-24, 4-8, 4-78,  
4-82, 4-158, 4-165, 4-169, 4-170,  
4-171, 4-173, 4-174, 4-176, 4-177,  
4-178, 4-179, 4-180, 4-182, 4-183,  
4-184, 4-186, 4-187, 4-188, 4-189,  
4-191
- hazardous materials..... S-20, S-23, S-24, S-28, 4-69,  
4-114, 4-115, 4-117, 4-118, 4-119,  
4-120, 4-122, 4-123, 4-125, 4-126,  
4-127, 4-128, 4-155, 4-159, 4-160,  
4-165, 4-190
- historic resources .....S-23, S-26, 4-101, 4-103, 4-198,  
5-1, 5-2, 5-5, 5-7, 5-8, 5-10, 5-15,  
6-6
- indirect effects .....3-34, 4-1, 4-19, 4-20, 4-33, 4-34,  
4-86, 4-87, 4-92, 4-112, 4-139,  
4-152, 4-194, 6-7
- Ivar's restaurant.....3-9, 3-26, 4-2, 4-12, 4-15, 4-20,  
4-39, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-79, 4-80,  
4-94, 4-100, 4-119
- Japanese Creek .....S-12, S-25, 2-12, 2-16, 2-24, 3-28,  
4-16, 4-22, 4-25, 4-73, 4-91, 4-99,  
4-100, 4-123, 4-126, 4-127, 4-128,  
4-137, 4-149, 4-150, 4-151, 4-152,  
4-158, 4-166, 4-171, 4-174, 4-178,  
4-179, 4-183, 4-187, 4-188, 5-5,  
5-14, 6-8, 6-9
- Japanese Gulch Site .... S-23, S-26, 4-42, 4-45, 4-46, 4-73,  
4-94, 4-97, 4-99, 4-100, 4-104,  
4-141, 4-158, 4-171, 4-175, 4-176,  
5-3, 5-5, 5-7, 5-8, 5-10, 5-11, 6-8,  
6-9
- land use.....S-6, S-20, S-21, S-28, 1-10, 3-35,  
4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-5, 4-9, 4-11, 4-14,  
4-16, 4-18, 4-19, 4-20, 4-21, 4-22,  
4-23, 4-24, 4-26, 4-30, 4-33, 4-35,  
4-46, 4-47, 4-68, 4-69, 4-71, 4-89,  
4-90, 4-138, 4-141, 4-174, 5-14, 6-5,  
6-7
- Level of Service (LOS) .. S-19, 1-12, 3-1, 3-3, 3-6, 3-8, 3-16,  
3-17, 3-18, 3-36, 3-38, 3-39

Losvar Condominiums ...	4-29, 4-31, 4-32	NOAA Mukilteo	
mitigation measures .....	3-37, 3-41, 4-1, 4-23, 4-24, 4-34, 4-48, 4-84, 4-89, 4-90, 4-101, 4-102, 4-103, 4-113, 4-128, 4-153, 4-154, 4-166, 4-188, 4-189, 4-190, 4-195, 4-196	Research Station.....	S-1, 1-1, 2-5, 2-22, 3-4, 4-29, 4-32, 4-33, 4-35, 4-40, 4-45, 4-48, 4-87, 4-88, 4-120, 4-163, 4-166, 4-187
Mount Baker terminal.....	S-1, S-12, S-19, S-26, 1-1, 1-4, 2-12, 2-20, 2-21, 2-22, 2-23, 3-4, 3-11, 3-28, 3-34, 3-36, 4-2, 4-4, 4-8, 4-12, 4-14, 4-16, 4-17, 4-18, 4-23, 4-25, 4-29, 4-33, 4-37, 4-40, 4-43, 4-45, 4-46, 4-55, 4-74, 4-78, 4-81, 4-83, 4-86, 4-88, 4-89, 4-97, 4-117, 4-119, 4-137, 4-158, 4-166, 4-187, 5-3, 5-5, 5-8, 5-11, 5-16, 6-10	noise.....	S-20, S-22, 6-6
Mukilteo ferry terminal.....	S-1, S-16, 1-1, 1-4, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 2-1, 2-6, 3-1, 3-3, 3-4, 3-6, 3-8, 3-9, 3-11, 3-16, 3-17, 3-18, 3-19, 3-21, 3-22, 3-25, 3-26, 3-27, 3-28, 3-29, 3-30, 3-31, 3-32, 3-33, 3-35, 3-36, 3-37, 3-38, 3-41, 3-42, 3-43, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, 4-9, 4-20, 4-29, 4-33, 4-47, 4-73, 4-94, 4-134, 4-153, 4-155, 4-177, 4-181, 5-5	Old Mukilteo Townsite...	S-23, S-26, 4-94, 4-97, 4-99, 4-100, 5-7, 5-10, 5-11, 6-8, 6-9
Mukilteo Light Station.....	S-23, 3-3, 3-4, 3-6, 3-8, 3-9, 3-11, 3-17, 3-20, 3-21, 3-23, 3-24, 3-29, 3-34, 3-35, 3-36, 3-37, 3-41, 3-42, 3-43, 4-94, 4-98, 5-7, 5-8, 6-8	overhead passenger loading.....	S-12, S-14, S-17, S-28, 2-7, 2-12, 3-12, 3-13, 4-135, 4-197, 6-4
Mukilteo Shoreline Site ..	S-23, S-26, 4-94, 4-96, 4-99, 4-100, 5-7, 5-10, 5-11, 6-8	parking.....	S-10, S-12, S-14, S-19, S-25, 1-1, 1-5, 2-5, 2-6, 2-9, 2-12, 2-13, 2-16, 2-17, 2-21, 2-23, 3-1, 3-3, 3-8, 3-9, 3-11, 3-21, 3-22, 3-23, 3-24, 3-25, 3-26, 3-27, 3-28, 3-29, 3-30, 3-32, 3-33, 3-34, 3-35, 3-36, 3-40, 3-41, 3-42, 3-43, 4-2, 4-8, 4-9, 4-11, 4-12, 4-14, 4-16, 4-17, 4-18, 4-20, 4-21, 4-22, 4-25, 4-26, 4-31, 4-33, 4-37, 4-44, 4-45, 4-47, 4-49, 4-69, 4-71, 4-73, 4-74, 4-79, 4-81, 4-82, 4-88, 4-89, 4-100, 4-103, 4-104, 4-135, 4-150, 4-160, 4-182, 5-5, 5-9, 5-15, 6-2, 6-5, 6-7, 6-8, 7-9
Mukilteo Tank Farm .....	S-1, S-7, S-12, S-14, S-20, S-21, S-22, S-23, S-25, 1-1, 1-4, 1-7, 1-12, 1-13, 2-1, 2-6, 2-9, 2-12, 2-13, 2-16, 2-18, 2-19, 2-20, 2-21, 2-22, 2-23, 2-24, 3-34, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, 4-9, 4-11, 4-12, 4-14, 4-15, 4-16, 4-17, 4-18, 4-20, 4-21, 4-22, 4-23, 4-33, 4-37, 4-40, 4-42, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-46, 4-47, 4-48, 4-73, 4-78, 4-81, 4-82, 4-85, 4-86, 4-87, 4-88, 4-92, 4-101, 4-117, 4-119, 4-120, 4-122, 4-123, 4-124, 4-125, 4-126, 4-127, 4-128, 4-137, 4-141, 4-149, 4-153, 4-158, 4-159, 4-166, 4-176, 4-179, 4-183, 4-187, 4-188, 4-191, 4-194, 5-7, 6-5, 6-7, 6-8, 6-9, 6-10	parks.....	S-26, 2-5, 4-4, 4-16, 4-47, 4-49, 4-68, 4-69, 4-70, 4-71, 4-73, 4-78, 4-83, 4-86, 4-88, 5-1, 5-2, 5-5, 5-8, 6-10
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) .....	S-1, S-29, 4-35, 4-68, 4-70, 4-115, 4-132, 4-140, 4-155, 4-171, 4-191, 7-1, 7-2, 7-4, 7-6, 7-13	pedestrian facilities.....	3-8, 3-37, 4-16
National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) ..	S-23, 4-92, 4-94, 4-95, 4-96, 4-97, 4-98, 4-101, 4-102, 5-1, 5-5, 5-7, 5-8, 6-8	Point Elliott Treaty Site..	S-23, S-26, 4-94, 4-96, 4-97, 4-98, 5-7, 5-10, 5-11, 6-8, 7-4, 7-12
		Port of Everett	
		fishing pier .....	S-12, S-14, 2-12, 2-16, 4-12, 4-46, 4-73, 4-79, 4-83, 4-84, 4-90, 4-181, 5-2, 5-8, 5-11, 6-10
		project scoping .....	1-7
		promenade .....	S-14, 2-16, 3-23, 3-24, 4-4, 4-8, 4-12, 4-14, 4-16, 4-18, 4-22, 4-23, 4-25, 4-47, 4-73, 4-81, 4-82, 4-83, 4-89, 5-5, 5-9
		public involvement.....	S-29, 1-7, 4-70, 7-1, 7-6, 7-7, 7-13, 7-14
		public services and utilities .....	S-4, 4-69, 4-191
		purpose and need .....	S-4, S-20, S-27, S-29, S-30, 1-7, 1-10, 2-20, 2-21, 4-2, 4-9, 4-24, 5-12, 6-1, 7-1, 7-4, 7-7, 7-14
		recreation .....	S-26, 4-4, 4-16, 4-49, 4-68, 4-86, 4-87, 4-174
		safety.....	S-4, S-5, S-20, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, 1-10, 1-13, 2-1, 2-6, 2-20, 3-1, 3-12, 3-37, 3-42, 4-43, 4-82, 4-88, 4-91, 4-130, 4-140, 4-142, 4-146, 4-152, 4-154, 4-193, 4-195, 4-197, 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, 6-4, 7-9
		Section 106 .....	4-91, 4-92, 4-104, 5-10, 5-14, 5-16, 7-1, 7-4

Section 4(f).....	S-21, S-26, S-27, S-29, 5-1, 5-2, 5-4, 5-5, 5-7, 5-8, 5-10, 5-11, 5-12, 5-14, 5-15, 5-16, 6-7, 6-10	visual quality.....	S-22, 4-35, 4-36, 4-41, 4-42, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-46, 4-47, 4-49, 4-69, 4-84, 4-90, 6-6
Silver Cloud Inn.....	4-19, 4-24, 4-29, 4-31, 4-32, 4-39, 4-40, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-46, 4-51, 4-53, 4-74, 4-84, 4-85, 4-90, 4-119, 4-179, 5-2, 5-5	walk travel times.....	3-4, 3-6, 3-19, 3-20, 3-21
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) .....	S-1, 1-1, 1-7, 4-35, 4-68, 4-115, 4-132, 4-140, 4-155, 4-171, 4-191, 7-1, 7-2, 7-15	water resources.....	S-21, S-25, 4-82, 4-123, 4-140, 4-155, 4-156, 4-157, 4-158, 4-160, 4-162, 4-164, 4-166, 4-167, 4-169, 4-176, 4-182, 4-185, 4-190, 6-6
shoulder queues .....	S-18, 3-4, 3-5, 3-12, 3-14, 3-15, 3-17, 3-18, 3-31, 3-38, 3-43	wetlands .....	4-158, 4-167, 4-171, 4-174, 4-186
social environment.....	S-20, S-22, 4-68, 4-70, 4-87, 6-6		
soils.....	S-20, S-24, 1-8, 4-99, 4-114, 4-121, 4-123, 4-127, 4-128, 4-130, 4-131, 4-141, 4-142, 4-146, 4-148, 4-149, 4-150, 4-153, 4-154, 4-159, 4-163, 4-165, 4-169, 4-196, 6-3, 6-6		
Souder Mukilteo station .....	S-19, 2-23, 4-187		
Tank Farm Pier .....	S-12, S-14, S-21, S-22, S-25, S-26, S-29, 1-7, 2-12, 2-13, 2-18, 4-17, 4-40, 4-45, 4-78, 4-82, 4-83, 4-86, 4-90, 4-91, 4-97, 4-100, 4-117, 4-120, 4-121, 4-122, 4-123, 4-126, 4-141, 4-149, 4-152, 4-161, 4-162, 4-164, 4-165, 4-170, 4-176, 4-177, 4-181, 4-182, 4-183, 4-186, 4-189, 4-190, 4-197, 5-14, 6-6, 6-9, 6-10		
transit .....	S-4, S-5, S-6, S-10, S-12, S-14, S-17, S-20, S-23, S-30, 1-1, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, 1-10, 1-13, 2-6, 2-9, 2-13, 2-16, 2-17, 4-3, 4-12, 4-14, 4-16, 4-25, 4-26, 4-31, 4-33, 4-44, 4-45, 4-49, 4-69, 4-78, 4-79, 4-81, 4-82, 4-91, 4-100, 4-123, 4-126, 4-132, 4-137, 4-138, 4-148, 4-197, 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, 6-4, 6-5, 6-8, 6-9, 7-8, 7-9		
transit center .....	S-28, 2-9, 2-13, 2-16, 2-17, 3-14, 3-21, 3-22, 3-23, 3-24, 3-28, 3-34, 3-36, 3-40, 3-41, 4-12, 4-79, 5-15, 6-4, 6-5, 6-9, 7-8		
tribal consultation.....	7-5		
tribal fishing.....	4-75, 4-79, 4-80, 4-82, 4-83, 4-84, 4-86		
vibration .....	S-20, S-22, 4-1, 4-26, 4-27, 4-29, 4-32, 4-33, 4-34, 4-35, 4-69, 4-84, 4-85, 4-86, 4-92, 6-6		



# Appendix D

## List of Contributors





## D. LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Name	Project Role	Education
<b>Federal Transit Administration, Region 10 (Federal lead agency)</b>		
Dan Draais	Environmental Protection Specialist	JD, University of Virginia BA, Dartmouth College
Jennifer Horwitz	Environmental Protection Specialist	MS, Economics, Illinois State University BA, International Policy and Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison
<b>Washington State Department of Transportation (state lead agency)</b>		
Brian Bigler	Ecosystems Expert Reviewer	Post Graduate Studies, Research Institute of North Pacific Fisheries, Hokkaido University BS, Fisheries Science, University of Alaska-Fairbanks
Sarah Calderwood	Hazardous Materials Expert Reviewer	MS, Geology, Central Washington University BS, Environmental Science, The Evergreen State College
Katherine Chesick	Hazardous Materials	JD, University of California-Berkeley BS, Geology, Stanford University
Michael Chidley	Historic and Cultural Resources Expert Reviewer	MA, Anthropology, University of Nebraska- Lincoln BA, Anthropology, University of Illinois- Urbana/Champaign
Ernest Combs	Land Use, Social Environment, and EJ Expert Reviewer	
Megan Cotton	Tribal Liaison	MPA, Tribal Governance, The Evergreen State College BA, Native American Studies, The Evergreen State College
Akberet Ghebreghzabiher	Air Quality	BS, Civil Engineering, University of Washington
Joy Goldenberg	Corporate Communications	BS, Civil Engineering, University of Washington
Kevin Hall, P.E.	Water Resources Expert Reviewer	BS, Civil Engineering, Washington State University
Allison Hanson	ESO Mega Projects Environmental Director	BA, Environmental Education, Western Washington University
Paul Krueger	Environmental Team Manager	MLA, University of Washington BA, Art History, Beloit College
Karin Landsberg	Energy and Climate Change	MA, Whole Systems Design, Antioch University Seattle BS, Biochemistry, Oregon State University Environmental Law and Regulation Certificate, University of Washington
Jim Laughlin	Noise Expert Reviewer	BS Marine Biology, California State University, Long Beach
Cong Ly	Water Resources	BS, Civil Engineering, Washington State University

<b>Name</b>	<b>Project Role</b>	<b>Education</b>
Larry Magnoni	Noise	AA & S, Civil Engineering Technology, Walla Walla Community College
Christina Martinez	Environmental Documentation Expert Reviewer	BS, Environmental Science, Western Washington University
Nicole McIntosh	Engineering Design Manager	BS, Civil Engineering, University of Washington
Phillip Narte	Project Tribal Liaison	BA, Business Administration, Western Washington University
George Ritchotte	Ecosystems	MS, Wildlife Biology, University of Montana BA, Biology, Franklin and Marshall College Wetland Science Certificate, University of Washington
Sandy Salisbury	Visual Quality Expert Reviewer	MLA, University of Washington BA, Geography, California State University -Long Beach
Tim Sexton, AICP	Air Quality, Energy and Climate Change Expert Reviewer	MPH, Environmental Health, University of Iowa MS, Urban and Regional Planning, University of Iowa BA, Anthropology and International Business, University of Iowa
Eric Smith	Geology Expert Reviewer	BA, Geology, California Lutheran University
Richard Warren	Transportation Expert Reviewer	MA, Public Administration, University of Washington BA, Urban Planning, Rutgers University
<b>Axis Environmental</b>		
Sasha Visconty	ESA Lead	MS, Marine Affairs, University of Washington BA, Editorial Journalism with Emphasis on Environmental Policy, University of Washington
<b>BergerABAM</b>		
Jilma Jimenez, P.E.	Design Lead	MSE, Wright State University BSE, Walla Walla University
Shawna Lawrence, P.E.	Project Engineer	BS, Civil Engineering, Seattle University
Mike Wray, P.E.	Structural Engineering Lead	BS, Civil Engineering, California State Polytechnic University
<b>Northwest Archaeological Associates, Inc.</b>		
Christian Miss	Historic and Cultural Resources	MA, Anthropology, Idaho State University BA, Biology, Case Western Reserve University
<b>Parametrix</b>		
Ryan Abbotts, AICP	Transportation	BS, Urban and Regional Planning, University of Waterloo
Julie Brandt, P.E.	Ecosystems	BS, Civil Engineering, University of Illinois
Derek Chisholm, AICP	Social Environment and Environmental Justice and Historic and Cultural Resources	MPA, Western Carolina University BS, Organizational Management, Covenant College

<b>Name</b>	<b>Project Role</b>	<b>Education</b>
		LEED GA Certification
Colin Drake, AICP	Environmental Planner and EIS Author	BA, Human Biology, Stanford University MUP, New York University
Maya Hunnewell	Environmental Planner	MA, Public Administration, University of Washington BA, Government and Legal Studies, Bowdoin College
Michael Marshall, RG	Geology	BS, Geology, Portland State University
John Perlic	Transportation	MS, Civil Engineering, University of Washington BS, Civil Engineering, West Virginia University
Eric Roth	Geology	
David Sherrard, AICP	Land Use, Economics, and Visual Quality	BA, Geography, University of Chicago
Mike Warfel	Hazardous Materials	MS, Geological Engineering, University of Missouri-Rolla BS, Geology, University of Illinois
Daryl Wendle	EIS Manager	MA, English, New York University BA, English, University of Oregon
<b>PRR</b>		
Laura LaBissoniere Miller	Communications	BA, English, University of Washington
Hadley Rodero	Communications Lead	BA, Environmental Studies, Middlebury College
<b>Tetra Tech INCA</b>		
Sandy Glover, PE, PMP	Consultant Project Engineer	BS, Civil Engineering, Ohio State University
<b>Two Hundred</b>		
John Barden	Visual Simulations	BA, Environmental Design, University of Colorado-Boulder



# Appendix E

## Alternatives No Longer Considered





## E ALTERNATIVES NO LONGER CONSIDERED

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Nearly three decades of planning activities have focused on different approaches and alternatives to address the need for an improved multimodal facility serving travel between Whidbey Island and the Mukilteo area. The Mukilteo/Clinton ferry route is part of State Route (SR) 525, the major transportation corridor connecting Whidbey Island to the Seattle-Everett metropolitan area. It is Washington State Ferries' (WSF) second busiest route for vehicle traffic and has the third largest annual ridership in the WSF system. The existing Mukilteo ferry terminal is aging and needs major repairs to improve safety, reliability, and multimodal connections.

Alternatives for improving the terminal have been discussed in various efforts since the 1970s. The City of Mukilteo completed a *Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal and Access Study* in 1995. WSF began detailed master plan efforts with multiple concepts in the *2004 Mukilteo Multimodal Terminal Master Plan Design Report* (WSF 2004a). This was followed by additional planning, design, and environmental studies of a variety of concepts.

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) began studying the Mukilteo Multimodal Project in 2004 to improve ferry operations, safety, transit connections, and access, and WSDOT and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) initiated the environmental process in 2006. In 2007, the Washington State Legislature put the project on hold due to funding and constructability issues associated with the previously identified alternatives. WSDOT and FTA re-initiated this project's environmental process in February 2010 with new project concepts for review and evaluation.

WSDOT and FTA are preparing this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). As a source of funds for this project, FTA is the federal lead agency for the NEPA EIS process. WSDOT is the state lead agency for SEPA.

WSF has been developing alternatives for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project since the beginning of the NEPA/SEPA process in 2004. A summary of this process through 2009 can be found in *Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal Project Alternatives History Through 2009* (WSF 2010).

## **2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN 2004 EA AND 2006 EIS PROCESSES**

During the initial 2004 Environmental Assessment (EA) and 2006 EIS processes, WSDOT and FTA evaluated two Build alternatives and identified insurmountable challenges associated with archaeological resources, the amount of overwater construction, difficult geotechnical conditions, and infeasible costs. The project was placed on hold in 2007 while additional planning and environmental investigations continued to address these areas of concern and to allow for the finalization of the WSDOT Ferries Division Long-Range Plan.

### **2.1 Compact Terminal Alternative**

The Compact Terminal Alternative proposed to relocate the ferry terminal and develop a multimodal transit center on 6 to 7 acres of the Mukilteo Tank Farm, located east of the existing ferry terminal. The transit center would have accommodated about seven articulated buses and included an area for passenger pick-up and drop-off. With a capacity for two boat loads of vehicles, the ferry holding area would have occupied about 2.6 acres and would have been over the water. A new extension of First Street to access the terminal would have separated ferry traffic from local traffic on Front Street. A pedestrian bridge would have connected the ferry terminal to the proposed Mukilteo Sounder Station, commuter parking, and the waterfront promenade. A joint-use parking structure would have provide 275 to 400 parking stalls.

### **2.2 Upland Terminal Alternative**

The Upland Terminal Alternative would have occupied approximately 12 to 13 acres of the Mukilteo Tank Farm. The main holding area would have been on land and had a holding capacity for two boat loads of vehicles. The over-water trestle and transfer span would have occupied about 0.7 acre. Access to the proposed transit center and parking structure would have been on Front Street. A pedestrian bridge would have connected the ferry terminal to the proposed Sound Transit Mukilteo Commuter Rail Station (Mukilteo Sounder Station), commuter parking, and the waterfront promenade. The transit center would have accommodated about seven articulated buses and included an area for passenger pick-up and drop-off. A joint-use parking structure would have provided up to 480 parking stalls.

### 3 CONCEPTS CONSIDERED BUT NOT STUDIED FURTHER

Before the screening process began, WSF evaluated the area in between Mukilteo and Edmonds as well as between Mukilteo and Everett as potential locations for replacing the Mukilteo terminal, but determined these locations to be unsuitable for a multimodal ferry terminal because of potential environmental impacts and severe community disruption. The shoreline of Puget Sound and Possession Sound in these areas is characterized by steep forested bluffs and unstable soils, with the busy BNSF rail line at the base of the bluffs. The ravines that punctuate these bluffs are generally undeveloped forested stream corridors. Land use is almost exclusively residential with no state highways nearby. Constructing a ferry terminal in these areas would result in adverse impacts to protected fish and wildlife and would likely impact forested wetlands. In addition, these locations would require extensive construction or reconstruction of access roads to connect the terminal to the nearest state highway, which would be very disruptive to the adjacent communities.

WSF also reconsidered replacing the existing ferry route between Mukilteo and Clinton with a floating or elevated bridge across Possession Sound. The shore-to-shore span of the bridge would be approximately 2.76 miles, not including the support structures. This span would be approximately 70 percent longer than the longest span currently in existence. This concept is still not feasible because of potential environmental impacts and the high cost for such a structure.

In Everett, WSF considered several locations for relocating the ferry terminal within the Port of Everett. Of these, WSF determined that the two existing Pacific Terminals, Pier 1 and Pier 3, were not feasible. Placing a ferry terminal at either of these locations would divide operations at the Port of Everett in half, greatly reducing the usability of the southern half of the Port. With both locations, ferry schedule reliability would be adversely affected by frequent conflicts between ferries and vessels using both the Port of Everett and Naval Station Everett.

## 4 SCREENING PROCESS

WSF and FTA developed criteria for the Level 1 and 2 screening processes based on the project Purpose and Need Statement (see *Chapter 1. Purpose and Need*). WSF and FTA screened and evaluated the proposed concepts based on how well each concept met the purpose and need for the project. WSF and FTA used the results of the two-level screening process, along with comments received through the scoping process, to choose which concepts will be studied in the EIS.

### 4.1 Level 1 Screening

The project team evaluated ten concepts in the Level 1 screening process. These concepts are described in *Chapter 2. Alternatives*. The concepts are listed below, grouped geographically.

#### Existing Mukilteo Terminal

- No Build
- Existing Site Improvements

#### Elliot Point

- Elliot Point – Option 1
- Elliot Point – Option 2
- Elliot Point – Option 3
- Mount Baker Terminal

#### Edmonds

- Edmonds - Existing Terminal
- Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements
- Point Edwards

#### Everett

- Port of Everett South Terminal

For the Level 1 screening, each concept was screened against three primary criteria. Each of these primary criteria included multiple questions. For the criteria that evaluated safety and security or transportation, each of the concepts was rated in terms of how well it met each of the criteria. For the criteria that evaluated environmental impacts, each concept was rated by its likelihood to avoid adverse impacts. The criteria used in the screening were as follows:

- Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?
- Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?
- How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?

Table 1 summarizes the results of the Level 1 screening for each concept. The details of the screening results for the Level 1 analysis are documented in *Mukilteo Multimodal Project Level 1 Screening Result*. None of these concepts were eliminated in the Level 1 analysis; all were carried forward into the Level 2 analysis.

**Table 1. Summary of Level 1 Screening Results**

Level 1 Screening Results Summary	No Build	Existing Site Improvements	Elliot Point – Option 1	Elliot Point – Option 2	Elliot Point – Option 3	Mount Baker Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Site	Edmonds – Point Edwards	Port of Everett South Terminal
<b>(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?</b>										
1(A) Does the concept improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians by reducing conflicts?										
1(B) Does the concept address the structural deficiencies of the existing terminal?										
1(C) Does the concept allow for the facility to be secured as required by Homeland Security?										
<b>(2) Does the concept improve transportation operations compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?</b>										
2(A) Would the concept provide a terminal with improved multimodal connections?										
2(B) Would the concept provide adequate facilities for future transit service?										
2(C) Is there enough room to provide holding facilities that can handle at least 1.5 times the capacity of the ferry (approximately 215 vehicles)?										
2(D) Would the concept provide improved facilities for loading and unloading the ferry reliably to maintain schedules?										
<b>(3) How well does the concept avoid environmental effects?</b>										
3(A) Ecosystem resources (aquatic habitat, wetlands)?										

**Table 1. Summary of Level 1 Screening Results**

Level 1 Screening Results Summary	No Build	Existing Site Improvements	Elliot Point – Option 1	Elliot Point – Option 2	Elliot Point – Option 3	Mount Baker Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Site	Edmonds – Point Edwards	Port of Everett South Terminal
3(B) Historic, cultural, and parkland resources?	●	●	●	●	●	●	◆	●	◆	▲
3(C) Proximity effects (noise and visual)?	◆	◆	●	●	●	●	◆	●	◆	▲

▲ Meets criterion or likely to avoid adverse effects  
 ◆ Partially meets criterion or avoidance uncertain or mixed  
 ● Does not meet criterion or likely to not avoid adverse effects

## 4.2 Level 2 Screening

Similar to the Level 1 screening, the project team used the three primary criteria for the Level 2 screening analysis to evaluate the ten concepts. For the Level 2 screening they evaluated these criteria in more detail than the Level 1 screening. Table 2 summarizes the results of the Level 2 screening for each concept. The detailed results of the Level 2 screening are documented in *Mukilteo Multimodal Project Level 2 Screening Results*.

**Table 2. Summary of Level 2 Screening Results**

Level 2 Screening Results Summary	No Build	Existing Site Improvements	Elliot Point – Option 1	Elliot Point – Option 2	Elliot Point – Option 3	Mount Baker Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements	Edmonds – Point Edwards	Port of Everett South Terminal
<b>(1) Does the concept improve safety and security at the terminal facility compared to existing conditions at the Mukilteo terminal?</b>										
1(A) Does the concept reduce conflicts between local and ferry vehicle traffic compared to existing conditions?	●	●	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	●	▲	▲
1(B) Does the concept reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists during ferry loading and unloading?	●	◆	◆	▲	◆	▲	●	▲	▲	▲

**Table 2. Summary of Level 2 Screening Results**

Level 2 Screening Results Summary	No Build	Existing Site Improvements	Elliot Point – Option 1	Elliot Point – Option 2	Elliot Point – Option 3	Mount Baker Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Terminal	Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements	Edmonds – Point Edwards	Port of Everett South Terminal
<b>(2) Does The Concept Improve Transportation Operations Compared To Existing Conditions At The Mukilteo Terminal?</b>										
2(A) Does the concept improve the reliability of ferry loading/unloading operations compared to the existing Mukilteo terminal?	Red Hexagon	Yellow Diamond	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Green Triangle	Green Triangle
2(B) Would the location of the terminal avoid ferry conflicts with maritime traffic that would adversely affect ferry schedule reliability?	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Yellow Diamond	Yellow Diamond	Yellow Diamond	Red Hexagon
2(C) Does the concept provide effective connections between modes (ferry, bus, and rail)?	Yellow Diamond	Yellow Diamond	Yellow Diamond	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Red Hexagon	Yellow Diamond	Yellow Diamond	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon
2(D) Does the concept improve or maintain the connection between Whidbey Island and Seattle-Everett metropolitan area for the majority of users?	See below.									
2(D1) Does the concept improve or maintain peak period trip time? (estimated existing travel time in minutes)	See below.									
Clinton to Seattle (downtown)	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon
Clinton to Seattle (University of Washington)	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon
2(D2) Does the concept improve or maintain service frequency on the ferry route?	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon
<b>(3) How Well Does The Concept Avoid Environmental Effects?</b>										
3(A) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on stream habitat and species?	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle
3(B) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on marine and near-shore habitat and species?	Yellow Diamond	Yellow Diamond	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Green Triangle	Red Hexagon	Red Hexagon	Yellow Diamond

**Table 2. Summary of Level 2 Screening Results**

<b>Level 2 Screening Results Summary</b>	<b>No Build</b>	<b>Existing Site Improvements</b>	<b>Elliot Point – Option 1</b>	<b>Elliot Point – Option 2</b>	<b>Elliot Point – Option 3</b>	<b>Mount Baker Terminal</b>	<b>Edmonds – Existing Terminal</b>	<b>Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements</b>	<b>Edmonds – Point Edwards</b>	<b>Port of Everett South Terminal</b>
3(C) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on wetland habitat and species?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
3(D) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on upland habitat valuable to migratory birds?	▲	▲	◆	◆	◆	◆	▲	▲	●	▲
3(E) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on historic properties?	●	●	●	●	●	●	▲	▲	◆	▲
3(F) What is the potential for avoiding the use of parklands (publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges)?	▲	◆	◆	▲	▲	◆	▲	●	◆	▲
3(G) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with land use plans and zoning?	●	●	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	●	▲	▲
3(H) What is the potential for avoiding conflicts with shoreline plans?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	▲	▲
3(I) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on neighborhoods from ferry traffic?	◆	◆	▲	▲	▲	▲	●	●	●	●
3(J) What is the potential for avoiding adverse effects on navigable waterways from the placement of new structures?	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	●

- ▲ Meets criterion or likely to avoid adverse effects
- ◆ Partially meets criterion or avoidance uncertain or mixed
- Does not meet criterion or likely to not avoid adverse effects

## **5 CONCEPTS NO LONGER CONSIDERED**

WSF and FTA used the screening processes described above along with feedback received during the scoping process to determine which concepts should be studied further in the Draft EIS. WSF and FTA decided to not study the following concepts further for the reasons described below.

### **5.1 Edmonds**

None of the concepts located in Edmonds would meet the purpose and need of the project. Moving the terminal from Mukilteo to Edmonds would substantially degrade the transportation service of the ferry route for passengers. The frequency of the route would decrease by 54 percent and travel times between Clinton and the Seattle area (which represents the majority of trips on the route) would be 35 to 57 percent longer, depending on the mode used. Vehicles would continue to be queued in adjacent neighborhoods during peak periods. Public and agency opposition to all of the Edmonds concepts was very strong. Additional issues related to the individual concepts are discussed below.

#### **5.1.1 Edmonds – Existing Concept**

The Edmonds – Existing Concept currently lacks adequate holding facilities for the current Edmonds/ Kingston route. Separating the holding for the two routes would be difficult and adding an additional route would increase congestion. Train volumes on the BNSF railway mainline are expected to increase from the current 35 trains per day to as many as 70 trains per day in 2020 and 104 in 2030 (WSDOT 2004). Conflicts between rail traffic and ferry traffic would worsen if a second route were added.

#### **5.1.2 Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements**

The Edmonds – Existing Site Improvements Concept would expand the holding facilities to accommodate two routes; trains would continue to negatively affect the reliability of the ferry route. The expansion of the holding lanes over water would have both a negative impact on habitat and require the use of upland and underwater areas in Brackett's Landing North, a popular park for diving. Expansion of the terminal into Conservancy Saltwater Environment area would not be consistent with shoreline plans.

#### **5.1.3 Edmonds – Point Edwards Concept**

The Edmonds – Point Edwards Concept, would have poor multimodal connectivity. Although a multimodal facility that addresses future growth could be constructed at this location, it would be separated from the ferry vessels by a long 1,300-foot trestle (WSDOT 2004). Sound Transit had considered moving Mukilteo Station to Point Edwards, but when a ferry terminal at that location was abandoned by WSF, Sound

Transit focused on improvements to the existing commuter rail station that is more than 0.75 miles from the ferry. While the concept would remove ferry traffic from downtown Edmonds, it likely would adversely affect traffic congestion in neighborhoods along SR 104 south of Pine Street. A portion of Marina Beach Park would be used by this concept, though removal of the existing terminal in Edmonds would allow the Brackett's Landing parks to be improved. This concept would also have a larger overwater footprint than most of the other concepts and would have a negative impact on habitat.

## **5.2 Everett**

### **5.2.1 Port of Everett South Terminal Concept**

This concept would not meet the purpose and need of the project. Moving the terminal from Mukilteo to Everett would substantially degrade the transportation service of the ferry route for passengers. The frequency of the route would decrease by 43 percent and travel times between Clinton and the Seattle area (which represents the majority of trips on the route) would be 32 and 46 percent longer, depending on the mode used. In addition, the South Terminal location would degrade multimodal connections compared to the existing terminal in Mukilteo. The commuter rail station would be 1.75 miles from the terminal. Also, Community Transit has indicated that they would not serve a ferry terminal at this location, so ferry riders would have fewer options for direct bus service from the terminal. This concept would also introduce ferry traffic and related congestion into adjacent neighborhoods. The Port of Everett South Terminal Concept would displace deepwater port facilities and functions at the Port of Everett that would be very difficult to relocate.

Public and agency opposition to the Port of Everett South Terminal Concept was very strong.

## **5.3 Mukilteo**

### **5.3.1 Elliot Point – Option 3**

While this concept meets most aspects of the project purpose and need, the Elliot Point – Option 2 Concept would provide better transportation operations at the same location with the same or fewer negative impacts. These two Elliot Point options occupy the same location on the Mukilteo waterfront but differ in the arrangement of project elements. Of all the concepts evaluated, they offer the closest multimodal connections by placing all modes within one quarter-mile of each other. Option 2 has closer bus/ferry and rail/ ferry connections than Option 3, while Option 3 has a closer rail/bus connection. For all of these connections, the distances are within one-tenth mile of each other.

While Option 2 and Option 3 are very similar to each other, Option 3 has characteristics that make it less desirable. With Option 3, passengers going between the ferry and the commuter rail station would cross offloading ferry traffic at a crosswalk. Option 2 would avoid this potential conflict, making it more consistent with the project purpose and need. Of all the concepts, Option 3 is closest to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service Mukilteo Research Station where they have collected water from Possession Sound for use in scientific studies for several decades. This water source could be adversely affected by the proximity of the ferry terminal. As with the other Mukilteo concepts, there are historic properties at the site. Because Option 2 and Option 3 are otherwise very similar, WSF and FTA find it reasonable to continue studying Option 2 and to drop Option 3.

### **5.3.2 Mount Baker Terminal**

This concept addresses most of the issues related to improving local traffic, safety, and security at the terminal facility. It also provides capacity for growth in transit service at the terminal. However, it degrades the connections between transportation modes by spreading them farther apart than any of the other Mukilteo concepts. Joint use of the existing Mount Baker Terminal by the Port of Everett and WSF is not possible, so the Port of Everett would need to build a new pier in the vicinity. The potential for adverse impacts to historic properties from this concept is very similar to Elliot Point – Option 1. The Mount Baker Terminal Concept has no support from other jurisdictions and agencies.

Because the Mount Baker Terminal Concept provides fewer benefits than the Elliot Point – Option 1 Concept and has similar or worse impacts, WSF and FTA find it reasonable to exclude the Mount Baker Terminal concept from further analysis.



# Appendix F

## Distribution List





## F. DISTRIBUTION LIST

The Draft EIS has been publically distributed in an array of formats, consistent with NEPA. Written notices of availability were mailed to all addresses within ½ mile of the project area, and email notices were sent to the project's mailing list, including the parties who have previously submitted formal scoping comments. Chapter 7 and the EIS fact sheet also provide more information on the general availability of the document and the other public notices and advertisements for the Draft EIS. The entire EIS is also available on the project's website at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal>

Printed copies of the EIS were distributed in two forms: (1) Executive Summary with an attached CD with the entire EIS contents, including appendices and supporting discipline reports; or (2) full EIS volumes with an attached CD. Hard copies are also available for public review at the project's public meetings, at the WSDOT State Ferry Division office, at the City of Mukilteo, and at the libraries listed below.

Printed copies of the executive summary were also available on request from WSDOT at no charge, and printed copies of the full EIS were available on request for the cost of printing.

The EIS was distributed to the following (\* noting locations where the document is available for public review.)

### **Federal Agencies**

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Federal Highway Administration

National Marine Fisheries Service

National Park Service

U.S. Air Force

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

U.S. Coast Guard

U.S. Department of Interior

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

### **Native American Tribes**

*Federally Recognized Tribes:*

Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the Muckleshoot Reservation

Nooksack Indian Tribe of Washington

Samish Indian Nation  
Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe of Washington  
Snoqualmie Tribe  
Stillaguamish Tribe of Washington  
Suquamish Indian Tribe of the Port Madison  
Swinomish Indians of the Swinomish  
Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation  
Upper Skagit Indian Tribe of Washington  
*Non-federally Recognized Tribes:*  
Duwamish Tribe  
Snohomish Tribe of Indians

**Washington State Agencies**

Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation  
Department of Ecology  
Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Transportation\*  
Office of the Attorney General

**Local and Regional Agencies**

City of Edmonds  
City of Everett  
City of Mukilteo\*  
Community Transit  
Everett Transit  
Island County  
Skagit-Island County Regional Planning Organization  
Port of Everett  
Port of South Whidbey  
Puget Sound Regional Council  
Snohomish County  
Sound Transit

## **Libraries**

Clinton Library\*

Edmonds Library\*

Everett Public Library – Main Library\*

Mukilteo Library\*

## **Legislators and Congressional Delegates**

U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell

U.S. Representative Jay Inslee

U.S. Representative Rick Larsen

U.S. Senator Patty Murray

Rep. Barbara Bailey (10th District)

Sen. Mary Margaret Haugen (10th District)

Rep. Norma Smith (10th District)

Rep. Marko Liias (21st District)

Rep. Mary Helen Roberts (21st District)

Sen. Paull Shin (21st District)

Rep. John McCoy (38th District)

Sen. Nick Harper (38th District)

Rep. Mike Sells (38th District)

## **Community and Special Interest Groups**

Friends of the Mukilteo Waterfront

Japanese Gulch Group

## **Businesses**

Ivar's Mukilteo Landing

Mongrain Glass Studio

Silver Cloud Inn

BNSF

