

EVERETT—SEATTLE Final Environmental Impact Statement



APPENDIX A2

STATION SITE SCREENING



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Transit Administration

December 1999

STATION SITE SCREENING

This appendix describes the process that culminated in the identification of station site alternatives for detailed study in the Everett to Seattle Commuter Rail EIS.

The communities in which stations would be located were identified during the several years of planning and programmatic environmental review undertaken by Sound Transit and predecessor organizations, and confirmed by the Sound Move election (this is more fully described in Chapter 1 of this EIS). The multimodal alternative sites for Everett, Edmonds and Mukilteo were identified through other SEPA and NEPA environmental processes which are identified in the list of references and incorporated by reference into this EIS. With prior programmatic environmental and planning efforts having identified appropriate communities for commuter rail station locations, this current EIS focuses on an analysis of appropriate station site alternatives within those communities. The following describes and documents the process of identifying candidate station sites.

Sound Transit staff and consultants undertook a series of meetings with planning staffs of local jurisdictions and meetings with interested parties to identify candidate station sites. Table 1 indicates dates and locations of meetings. Candidate sites were measured against a group of criteria, some general and some specific to this project (e.g., the need to accommodate a 1,000-foot platform from 10-car trains). Input received and the criteria were used to screen out alternatives which could not meet project objectives and goals. At least two alternatives were identified for each station site to be studied in detail in the EIS. This appendix summarizes notes from the meetings with City staffs, and summarizes the station siting criteria. Also summarized are the reasons for screening specific station site alternatives from further detailed analysis in this EIS. Table 2 indicates all sites that were considered, and shows which were included for further analysis in the EIS.

Table 1
Sound Transit Team/City Staff
Station Siting Meetings

Date	Jurisdiction
November 21, 1997	City of Everett
November 19, 1997	City of Mukilteo
November 21, 1997	City of Edmonds
November 10, 1997	City of Shoreline
December 11, 1997	City of Seattle

**Table 2
Station Sites Discussed**

*Indicates sites included for further study in the EIS	
Everett Multimodal Facility*	Ballard, Golden Gardens Park
Everett Bond Street*	Ballard, Old Ballard Station
Mukilteo, Near Existing Ferry Terminal	Ballard NW 65 th Street (if extended)*
Mukilteo at Proposed Multimodal Facility Site*	Ballard NW 70 th Street*
Mukilteo at Proposed Multimodal Site with Remote Parking*	Seattle – Broad Street*
Edmonds Existing Amtrak Station*	Seattle – Vine Street
Edmonds Proposed Multimodal Facility*	Seattle – Vine/Bell Street
Shoreline Metro Pumping Station*	Seattle – Interbay
Shoreline Richmond Beach Saltwater Park*	Seattle - Lenora Street
Shoreline Point Wells*	

During the public scoping for this EIS, five meetings were held in the locations to be served by the stations. Written and oral input from the public concerning station sites was received. This input was also used to identify alternatives to be analyzed in detail in this EIS.

Both the meetings with City staffs and input from the public were primary considerations, along with the criteria in confirming station sites for study in the EIS.

APPROACH TO STATION SITE SCREENING

- 1 Ascertain standards for station development with Sound Transit staff.
- 2 Review station sites with Sound Transit bus operations and other bus operators.
- 3 Contact cities and review potential station sites.
- 4 Review station locations at public scoping meetings to ascertain the input of the local community.
- 5 Visit sites and review suitability for the proposed station accommodations.
- 6 Review and analyze data on each station and prepare a report identifying which station sites are the sites recommended for detailed analysis in the EIS

SITING AND DESIGN CRITERIA

- Potential sites must be available or able to be acquired by Sound Transit, able to accommodate the ultimate platform length (1,000 feet), and have enough area for a bus drop-off, kiss and ride, and other amenities (e.g., fare, machines, telephones, trash receptacles, etc.) associated with a commuter rail station.
- The mainline track should be located adjacent to the station straight track and on a less than 1% slope. Shallow curves and slopes may be acceptable but may require costly design solutions.
- Areas of severe development challenge should be avoided especially where extraordinary elevation changes exist (between the on street areas and the platforms). The 100-year flood level around the site must be identified, if applicable.
- To avoid any interference with the road crossing signals when a train is stopped at the station, platforms need enough area so that they are a sufficient distant from any cross streets.
- Railroad track and right-of-way should be essentially level, well drained, and straight for 800 to 1,000 feet. Railroad track in the station area needs to be without switches and/or signals (a 1,000-foot platform is required to accommodate up to 10-car trains).
- The proposed site should be sufficiently close to the commuter service area.
- Either the local public transportation system should be able to provide service to the station without significantly altering existing transit service patterns or additional service must be available to provide a convenient new feeder.
- Sites with potential to serve as an intermodal hub are most desirable.
- The road system adjacent to the proposed station site should support the increased traffic without major improvements. An existing pedestrian network in the neighborhood surrounding a potential site is desirable.
- The local utility network should be able to support the proposed development without major costs and or relocation.
- To avoid backups or delays on surrounding streets, potential sites and parking areas should be easily accessible from the existing street system. No major modifications or special design considerations should be needed.
- Identify if any special design considerations may be needed for security (commuters and parked cars) at the station. If no parking will be provided, identify how commuter parking impacts can be mitigated at reasonable cost.

- Potential sites should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and compatible with the existing zoning and comprehensive plan.
- To secure and serve platforms in their right-of-way, potential sites should be operationally acceptable to the BNSF.
- Potential sites should be selected with the cooperation/acceptance of local agencies with jurisdiction.
- Potential sites where significant environmental impacts are likely to occur should be avoided unless appropriate mitigation measures are reasonable and cost effective.
- Potential sites should be developable within the available or reasonable budget.

STATION SITES PROPOSED FOR STUDY IN THE EIS

Everett Station

Alternative 1a - Proposed Multimodal Facility with Bond Street Station as an additional neighborhood commuter rail station (Bond Street station is the existing Amtrak Station at Bond Street).

Alternative 1b - Proposed Multimodal Facility without Bond Street Station as an additional neighborhood commuter rail station.

(Note: The commuter rail component of the Multimodal Facility includes 1,200 parking spaces in a structure, or in a combination of structure and surface parking. The Bond Street Station includes 50 parking spaces).

Mukilteo Station (120 parking spaces)

Alternative 2a - East of SR 525 with Nearby Parking

Alternative 2b - East of SR 525 (same station location as 2a) with Remote Parking

Edmonds Station (120 parking spaces)

Alternative 3a - Existing Amtrak Station

Alternative 3b - Union Oil Terminal (proposed multimodal facility)

Shoreline Station (120 parking spaces)

Alternative 4a - Richmond Beach Saltwater Park

Alternative 4b - Point Wells (in Snohomish County, proposed for future annexation by Shoreline)

Alternative 4c - Metro Pump Station

Ballard Station (120 parking spaces)

Alternative 5a - NW 65th Street

Alternative 5b - NW 70th Street

Seattle Downtown Station (existing parking)

Alternative 6 - Broad Street.

King Street Station (existing; no new parking spaces)

OTHER STATION SITES CONSIDERED

The following sites were considered and are not recommended for the reasons shown:

Ballard, Golden Gardens Park

- Traffic impacts identified by neighborhood and Seattle Park Department concerns.
- Access is by narrow park roads that would need extensive upgrading to serve a station site.
- Agencies with jurisdiction likely would not permit joint use of the park for a commuter rail station because another alternative site that meets the project purpose and need exists.
- Public and agency concerns that parking conflicts would exist during busy summer months.

Mukilteo, Near the Existing Ferry Terminal

- Public and city concern regarding aggravation of existing parking and traffic issues around the State Park and downtown commercial area.
- Restricted length for 1,000-foot long platforms due to existing Boeing siding.
- Would require closing existing at-grade vehicle crossing.

Ballard, Old Ballard Station

- Not enough straight track to accommodate 1,000-foot long platforms.
- Difficult vehicular access due to steep topography.
- Station is accessed by a narrow road not suitable for bus access.

- Development constraints due to topography.
- Station parking would require property acquisition/displacements.
- The eastside platform would require extensive retaining walls.

Seattle /Vine Street

- Inadequate length for the proposed ultimate 1,000 ft. platforms.
- Restricted platform space.
- Cost of construction.
- Could require closure of up to two street grade crossings.
- Restricted bus and car drop off availability.

Seattle, Vine/Bell Streets

- Could require closure of up to three street grade crossings.
- Insufficient site area for a platform on the west side of the tracks.
- Insufficient straight track.
- Cost of construction.
- Inadequate space for bus or car drop-off.

Seattle, Interbay

- Extensive freight truck traffic would present a safety issue for rail passengers.
- Potential for truck/freight train conflicts and delays due to high volume of existing truck traffic.
- Two yard tracks are adjacent to the mainline tracks; this would prevent passenger access to station platforms.
- Complex freight/switching operations due to massive nearby rail yard could make a station at this location unacceptable to BNSF.

Seattle, Lenora Street

- Inadequate straight track to construct 1,000-foot platform due to existing track curvatures to north and south and to track super elevations (seven degree to north, four degree to south).
- Reductions in super elevations would significantly reduce existing freight train speed.
- Station at this location would result in closure of two existing at-grade vehicle/pedestrian crossings to accommodate platforms.
- Cost of construction.