

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 1 : United States Coast Guard District, 13th [WorldCat Identities]

Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) has prepared a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to better understand how the Ship Canal Water Quality Project will affect the environment and community. The Draft Supplemental EIS was issued Sept. 22, , and is available for public comment through Oct. 24,

Subsequently, the court vacated the injunction and NOAA drastically reduced the size of the project. Applying a restrictive standard of review, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals rules that the supplemental EIS provided NOAA with adequate information to evaluate the environmental effects of the project. It adequately considered the navigational risks associated with the project, especially considering the altered plans, and it fairly acknowledged opposing scientific viewpoints. Further, the court rules that the decision to locate in Sand Point was not arbitrary and capricious and thus may not be overturned by a court. Counsel for Appellants 1st Ave. Ever since the establishment of the headquarters in Seattle, NOAA officials have been concerned with the necessity from an economic standpoint to consolidate operations at a single facility. The Sand Point site currently lacks docking facilities of any type. While the passage of ocean vessels from Puget Sound to Lake Union is not an uncommon occurrence, such vessels rarely enter Lake Washington. Lake Washington is currently devoted primarily to recreational use by local residents. Shortly thereafter, plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction. The court ruled that the final EIS was deficient in its failure to discuss adequately alternative sites and for failing to discuss increased navigational hazards which would result from the passage of large vessels through Montlake Cut to Lake Washington. In November , the Director of the NOAA issued a decision memorandum in which he approved consolidation of the Seattle facilities at Sand Point and set out his reasons for doing so. In January , during the pendency of this appeal, the NOAA substantially altered its plans for consolidation of its facilities at Sand Point. The revised project will require moorage space to accommodate two NOAA vessels, rather than twelve vessels as originally planned. The supplemental EIS fails to address adequately the navigational risks associated with Sand Point; 2. The supplemental EIS fails to acknowledge and respond to responsible opposing views; 3. The decision to berth oceangoing vessels on Lake Washington is reviewable under the "arbitrary and capricious" standard. Standard of Review Sitting as an appellate court reviewing an environmental impact statement which has received a clean bill of health from the district court, we deal with now-familiar principles. *Warm Springs Dam Task Force v.* The task of the district court is also a limited one. The correct standard is provided in the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U. The narrow standards of review applicable at both the trial and appellate court levels leave the judiciary with an extremely narrow substantive role, if any. It is to insure a fully informed and well-considered decision, not necessarily a decision the judges of the Court of Appeals or of this Court would have reached had they been members of the decisionmaking unit of the agency. Administrative decisions should be set aside in this context, as in every other, only or substantial procedural or substantive reasons as mandated by statute,. NEPA does not require that the agency elevate environmental concerns over legitimate non-environmental considerations. In the words of an earlier Supreme Court decision, the agency must take a "hard look" at the environmental consequences. *Sierra Club, U.* Guidelines in evaluating the adequacy of an EIS are well established. An EIS need set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a "reasoned choice. The two-fold purpose of an EIS is to ". Specifically, SLW alleges that the risks have not been researched adequately in that no tests for slow-speed stopping of large vessels have been conducted, and that the adverse environmental impacts of an oil spill have not been fully investigated. The district court acknowledged that more research could be performed to determine with greater precision the slow-speed stopping distances of NOAA vessels, but concluded that available research was sufficient to apprise the decision-maker of the risks involved. The supplemental EIS contains a lengthy appendix which describes in some detail a study of navigational risks likely to be encountered in berthing at Sand Point. The NOAA includes an estimate of slow-speed stopping distances for its two largest vessels. The EIS further recommends as a portion of the "mitigation package" that

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

slow-speed tests be conducted in order to provide additional information for vessel captains. The purpose of the proposed research was to mitigate the navigational risks by making such data available to the vessel captains, and not to postpone necessary preliminary research. In more general terms, SLW attacks the risk assessment for its failure to employ a "worst case" analysis. The EIS specifically notes that a "worst case" analysis was used, and nothing in the data presented suggests to the contrary. The SEIS does not contain any data on the size of spill that would be likely to result from a collision, nor does it discuss the effects of such a spill in detail; it states only that spills would be "difficult to contain and to clean up" and that fuels used by NOAA ships "are toxic to both flora and fauna. As we have noted above, the NOAA has abandoned this portion of its plan and now intends to berth its fleet outside of Lake Washington. The safety record of vessels traversing the Lake Washington Ship Canal, and the greatly reduced number of transits through the Montlake Cut that will be necessary now that the NOAA has altered its plans, convinces us that the chance of a major oil spill is remote. A discussion of "remote and conjectural consequences," while possibly desirable, is simply not required by NEPA. This contention breaks down into two stages. The account of the passage is laid out in a footnote. The information presented was sufficient to provide the NOAA with a reasoned basis for making its decision. SLW has further argued that the supplemental EIS does not take into account the published views of several state and local land use officials that the presence of oceangoing ships on Lake Washington would be inconsistent with certain land use goals established for the area, including the Lake Washington Regional Shoreline Goals and Policies. The primary complaint is that specific views were not represented in the supplemental EIS. The district court found that these summaries adequately conveyed the substance of the criticisms. The summaries sufficiently apprised the decision-maker of the opposition of certain officials to the project, and their reasons. Viewing the EIS as a whole, the agency had an adequate basis for evaluating the concerns of the land use jurisdictions affected by the Sand Point project. Again, the EIS has adequately taken into account similar views. The decision to locate at Sand Point SLW invites us to overturn the decision to locate at Sand Point as being arbitrary and capricious. In so doing, SLW in effect asks that we evaluate as a substantive matter the decision itself. This we cannot do. In another context, this court has stated that: We cannot weigh the relative merits of one proposal against another, nor can we attempt to compare beneficial environment effects. We may only examine the decision for the requisite good-faith consideration of environmental facts as expressed in the EIS. Consequently, an opportunity for public review and comment on the Option Assessment was provided. There was an adequate basis for determining that the construction costs favored Sand Point. Property acquisition costs would appear to support a decision to place some or all facilities at Sand Point. Moreover, the Decision Memorandum summarizes briefly the extended discussion in the Option Assessment dealing with the Lake Union proposal. Based upon the content of the Decision Memorandum, we cannot say that the Director failed to make a good-faith, reasoned choice. The Decision Memorandum is not a document required by NEPA and need not contain a detailed discussion of all potential alternatives. We review it here only to satisfy ourselves that the Director did not act in bad faith. The ultimate conclusion that Sand Point is an appropriate site for NOAA facilities may well be a blunder, but we have served our purpose under NEPA by assuring that it was a "knowledgeable blunder. Brinegar, supra, F. We find that the Sand Point location decision was neither arbitrary nor capricious. See *Town of North Hempstead v. Village of North Hills*, F. We defer resolution of these issues for a case where they are more squarely presented. Washington became the first state to enact a comprehensive management program when it passed the Shoreline Management Act of , R. See WAC, Chapter The Region eventually adopted the Lake Washington Regional Shoreline Goals and Policies from which local jurisdictions were expected to develop their shoreline master programs. The Regional Goals and Policies contained an unequivocal statement against the expended moorage of oceangoing ships on the lake. Following completion of the regional policy statement, the City of Seattle published the Seattle Shoreline Master Program "SSMP" , which did not include an express prohibition against moorage of large vessels. SLW argues that because the federal Coastal Zone Management Act requires federal projects affecting the shoreline to be consistent with state and local

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

programs and because the Lake Washington Regional Goals and Policies so clearly prohibit the moorage of oceangoing ships on Lake Washington, this court must find that the NOAA contravened the federal consistency provisions of the Act by attempting to develop a docking facility for large ships at Sand Point. The SSMP, it is urged, must be read in a manner consistent with the regional planning policies even though it does not expressly prohibit moorage of ocean vessels on the lake. Both federal and state law provide a mechanism for determining whether a proposed federal project is "consistent" with state shoreline management programs. Under the regulations implementing the Coastal Zone Management Act, the federal agency must determine in the first instance whether a proposed project is consistent with the state program. In the event that the federal agency concludes that its proposed project is consistent with the state management program, it must then submit a "consistency determination" to the appropriate state agency describing the activity, its effects, and data to support the conclusion that the project is consistent. If the state agency fails to respond within 45 days, then the federal agency is entitled to "presume" that the project has been deemed consistent with the state program. The WDOE has promulgated somewhat similar guidelines which provide that if the WDOE determines that a project is consistent, then "nothing more will be done. At the time, the federal regulations on consistency determinations were not in force. According to one affidavit filed by D. The Director of the Seattle Department of Community Development responded positively to the consistency determination in a letter dated October 10, We concur with the district court. Where procedures to resolve potential federal-state disagreements over matters affecting the jurisdiction of both have been established, we should be reluctant to set aside determinations made pursuant to those procedures absent a compelling reason to do so. The Mack affidavit discloses that regard was given to the merits of the Sand Point project. Any doubt that a federal agency is required to obtain a substantial development permit prior to undertaking a project in the State of Washington is dispelled by the state regulations implementing the Shoreline Management Act. WAC provides inter alia that: The first specific mention of the substantial development permit issue in the record appears in a memorandum addressed to the magistrate on February 7, The point was more fully argued in a pair of subsequent memoranda addressed to the district judge, with a rejoinder to the contention filed by the NOAA on April 9, The district court found that it would be unfair to consider the argument because it had been raised for the first time over one year after the NOAA had undertaken to cure the defects in the first EIS. SLW argues that the complaint was sufficient to put the NOAA on notice of the development permit issue, and that the issue was tried by consent of the parties under Fed. The complaint was insufficient to put NOAA on notice of the precise argument that the permit was required. As the briefs in this case have amply demonstrated, an allegation of "inconsistency" under the Coastal Zone Management Act is a wide-open argument which involves an examination of a number of different federal, state, and local regulatory schemes. Moreover, the complaint does not allege a violation of WAC Consequently, even under our liberal standards of pleading, the complaint was inadequate to give notice of the substantial development permit issue. We are unpersuaded that Rule 15 b required that the district court reach the merits of the issue.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 2 : United States. Army. Corps of Engineers. Seattle District | The Online Books Page

Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Lake Washington Ship Canal which was developed after the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Montgomery, Consulting Engineers, Inc. Licenses and Permits Required to Implement Wastewater Facilities Plan Building, grading, complex source permit, shoreline permit and other local governmental permits would be required before implementing most of the alternatives described herein. All comments should be sent to Mr. Department of Agriculture U. Department of Defense U. Department of Interior U. Department of Health, Education and Welfare U. Department of Housing and Urban Development U. House of Representatives Joel Pritchard, U. Alternatives in the Draft Facility Plan are focused on facilities at West Point, Alki, Carkeek Park, and Richmond Beach, but other sites within these designated service areas have been considered as options, The Metro plant at Renton is not included in the proposed facilities, but effects of alternatives on Renton are described since Renton is an integral part of the Metro system. This Draft EIS summarizes the impacts of the alternatives for the West Point plant and service area as well as alternative sites in Interbay. Regional Alternatives The eight regional alternatives are summarized below, particularly as they would affect the West Point Plant. Each alternative is evaluated on a co-equal basis in the Draft; no recommended alternative has been selected. Regional alternatives were developed to address, in various combinations, four polar issues: Components considered in developing alternatives included service area, collection system and transfer interceptors, treatment process, plant site, treated wastewater discharge location, combined sewer overflow control, and sludge management. Interceptors to serve new growth areas were not included. Two of the alternatives C and D address combined sewer overflows, a local water quality problem. Four alternatives E, F, G and H provide secondary treatment and other variable features. From the eight regional alternatives, it is possible to derive hybrid alternatives that select components from more than one alternative and blend them into a new alternative, such as secondary treatment plus combined sewer overflow control. Alternative A - No Action No capital expenditure would be made for expansion, modification or upgrading of treatment plants and no construction of new interceptors during the planning period until West Point would continue to serve the existing sewered population in the present service area. West Point would continue as the regional sludge processing center. No new structures would be built at the plant site. Alternative B is evaluated as the "no action" alternative pursuant to PL and NEPA requirements and serves as the baseline for other alternatives. Improved sludge management and disinfection practices would be provided in Alternative B and all following alternatives. Four new transfer interceptors and improvements to the Alki outfall would be included. Primary treatment of mgd average mgd peak flow would be provided prior to discharge to Puget Sound. Additional sludge digesters would be constructed to handle increased solids loads. A new wet weather enhanced primary treatment plant would be constructed in the lower Duwamish industrial area and the Alki plant would be abandoned, both in At West Point, the plant would be upgraded to advanced primary treatment by The service area would be reduced relative to Alternative B, so average capacities of mgd, wet weather mgd would be provided. Construction of two new digesters, chemical storage and feed buildings, and filter press would complete the minor site modifications. The four Puget Sound plants would be upgraded to enhanced primary treatment with chemical addition during the summer for improved solids removal. The West Point site modifications would be the same as in Alternative C. The Carkeek Park plant would provide primary treatment for wet weather flows only beginning in ; dry weather flows would be pumped to West Point. Serving the same population and service area as Alternative B, plus the addition of Carkeek Park dry weather flows, the West Point Plant would provide secondary air activated sludge treatment to mgd average, mgd peak flows. Additional facilities at the site would be secondary aeration tanks and clarifiers, and new digesters. Twelve acres of shoreline fill would be required for this proposal. A major new secondary treatment facility would be constructed in the Duwamish industrial area in ; the Alki plant would be abandoned at that

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

time. A new outfall off Alki Point would be built for discharging effluent from the Duwamish and Renton plants. The Carkeek Park plant would provide primary treatment for wet weather flow only beginning in ; dry weather flows would be pumped to West Point. The West Point secondary plant would treat 97 mgd average, mgd peak flows. With this reduction in capacity relative to Alternative B, the oxygen activated sludge secondary process could be accommodated at the existing site with no shoreline fill required. Additional facilities would include secondary aeration tanks and clarifiers, cryogenic low temperature oxygen facilities and a filter press. West Point would continue as a primary treatment plant for wet weather flows only, beginning in A new secondary treatment plant in the Interbay area Commodore Way or Golf Park sites would be constructed. The West Point plant would appear as it does under existing conditions for its function as a wet weather primary treatment plant. The new Interbay plant would treat mgd average, mgd peak flows by secondary treatment for discharge through the West Point outfall in dry weather and through a new Elliott Bay outfall in wet weather. Approximately 33 acres would be required in the Interbay area. Areas of growth would be served by new inland plants with local effluent and sludge re-use possible. Advanced waste treatment would be provided at new North and South Lake Sammamish plants. A new secondary plant at Kenmore would discharge treated effluent to Puget Sound. The West Point plant would treat mgd average, mgd peak flows by the secondary, air activated sludge process. Twelve acres of shoreline fill would be required to accommodate new secondary aeration tanks, clarifiers and sludge digesters. Environmental Impacts The primary direct and secondary indirect impacts of each alternative are described by categories in the physical, biological and human environments plus natural resources and energy. A summary of the major effects of each alternative is described below. Alternative A No Action Alternative A, which would continue sewerage service to the present sewered population but provide no new service or capital improvements, would have comparable impacts in as existing conditions. In Puget Sound, the discharge of solids, metals, toxicants and other materials would continue at present rates. Although effects as measured to date from present discharges have been very minor, the possibility of subtle, long-term impacts must be considered. The site interacts on regional parklands or residential areas would continue. Odor at these residences would not be a problem due to dispersal. Sludge truck traffic would double. The Alternative would not comply with PL No Shoreline Management Act permits would be needed. CSO flow increases of 20 to 40 percent would present localized adverse water quality impacts in the inland surface waters Lake Washington and Ship Canal used by migratory fish. Construction of the second Kenmore interceptor could possibly adversely affect salmon spawning areas in a portion of Lake Washington. In Puget Sound, discharge of primary effluent would add more materials than presently that could adversely affect water quality, such as solids, oxygen-demanding materials, bacteria, nutrients and toxicants. Long-term impacts of this discharge are difficult to ascertain, based on limited data, but could be detrimental to Puget Sound. The site impacts would be approximately the same as in Alternative A, since only minor improvements would be made by adding digesters. Recreational uses at the adjacent West Point beaches would be limited. Localized moderate to major benefits to migratory fish routes and spawning areas would result. In Puget Sound, enhanced primary treatment would result in a 20 percent reduction in solids loads relative to Alternative B, but an increase over existing conditions, so water quality improvements due to Metro discharge are not anticipated therein. Alternative C does not comply with the PL requirements for secondary treatment as currently written. Lake Washington, in particular, would benefit in localized areas from CSO reductions of approximately 75 percent. This was judged as a moderate benefit to salmon spawning areas. Discharge to Puget Sound would be approximately equivalent to Alternative C, wherein water quality improvements were not anticipated due to increases in wastewater flows and loads. The West Point site would appear similar to its present condition. As such, it would limit beach use and could be visible to users of Discovery Park. Odors in nearby neighborhoods would not be a problem since dispersal is adequate and there are no residents in the immediate area. Sludge truck trips through the park would be seven trips per day less than in Alternative B. Alternative E - Secondary Secondary treatment would reduce the solids loads and corresponding metals, oxygen-demanding materials, toxicants, and other

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

contaminants to Puget Sound by approximately 75 percent compared to Alternative B. Although the exact impacts of this reduction are not known, it appears to be beneficial from the standpoint of subtle, long-term effects. However, nutrients would probably increase in Puget Sound which could affect the size of plankton blooms. Constructing the Kenmore parallel interceptor could destroy salmon spawning areas in part of Lake Washington by siltation. A shoreline management permit would be required and could be granted if there were no other feasible alternative. Odors could increase at the site, but covering the clarifiers would help alleviate impacts. Use of the West Point beaches would be limited by the new facilities, which could be viewed from Discovery Park. Although the extent of existing information makes it difficult to quantify the benefit from water quality improvement, subtle long-term improvements would be expected with the smaller load of solids, BOD, toxicants, metals and others. The site impacts at West Point would not be so extensive as Alternative E, because the oxygen activated sludge treatment facilities could be accommodated on the existing site. The cryogenic facilities associated with oxygen production would be tall and more visible than other structures when viewed from off the site. Occasional noise could be associated with the oxygen facilities, which also would have more potential risks than air activated sludge in being more explosive. Based on experience from similar facilities, this risk appears to be negligible. The sludge truck traffic would be half that of Alternative B. Some impacts on Elliott Bay from the Interbay outfall could be expected. The construction of the Kenmore parallel would destroy some salmon spawning areas by siltation. Site impacts at Interbay would be significant. If the Golf Course site were used for the Interbay plants, local residents would be affected by odors during construction and operation and a recreational facility would be displaced. The construction suitability at the Golf Course site is questionable. If the optional Commodore Way site were selected, approximately 60 businesses would be displaced, with the transfer of jobs. At West Point, the site would appear as it does now.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 3 : Save Lake Washington v. Frank

SDEIS Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Ship Canal Lake Washington Ship Canal Lake Washington Ship Canal (Ship Canal) influences adult salmon and.

Montgomery, Consulting Engineers, Inc. Licenses and Permits Required to Implement Wastewater Facilities Plan Building, grading, complex source permit, shoreline permit and other local governmental permits would be required before implementing most of the alternatives described herein. All comments should be sent to Mr. Summary Selected Water Quality Parameters: Department of Agriculture U. Department of Defense U. Department of Interior U. Department of Health, Education and Welfare U. Department of Housing and Urban Development U. House of Representatives Joel Pritchard, U. Alternatives in the Draft Facility Plans are focused on facilities at West Point, Alki, Carkeek Park, and Richmond Beach, but other sites within these designated service areas have been considered in alternatives. The Metro plant at Renton is not included in the proposed facilities, but effects of alternatives on Renton are described since Renton is an integral part of the Metro system. Each alternative is evaluated on a co-equal basis in the Draft EIS; no recommended alternative has been selected. The Final EIS will include a recommended alternative and will undergo a 90-day public review period. Regional alternatives were developed to address, in various combinations, four polar issues: Interceptors to service new growth areas were not included. Two of the alternatives C and D address combined sewer overflows, which create a local water quality problem. Four alternatives E, F, G and H provide secondary treatment and other variable features. From the eight regional alternatives, it is possible to derive hybrid alternatives that select components from more than one alternative and blend them into a new alternative, such as secondary treatment plus combined sewer overflow controls. The eight regional alternatives are summarized below. There would be no construction of new interceptors or increase in plant capacity during the planning period until Alternative B is evaluated as the "no action" alternative pursuant to Public Law PL and NEPA requirements and serves as the baseline for comparing other alternatives. Improved sludge management and disinfection practices would be provided in Alternative B and all following alternatives. Four new transfer interceptors and improvements to the Alki outfall would be included. A new wet weather enhanced primary treatment plant would be constructed in the lower Duwamish industrial area and the Alki plant would be abandoned, both in the summer for improved solids removal. The four Puget Sound plants would be upgraded to enhanced primary treatment with chemical addition during the summer for improved solids removal. The Carkeek Park plant would provide primary treatment for wet weather flows only beginning in ; dry weather flows would be pumped to West Point. The Carkeek Park plant could be abandoned in depending on City of Seattle Sewer separation programs. A major new secondary treatment facility would be constructed in the Duwamish industrial area in ; the Alki plant would be abandoned at that time. A new outfall off Alki Point would be built for discharging effluent from the Duwamish and Renton plants. The Carkeek Park plant could be abandoned in depending on City of Seattle sewer separation programs. West Point would continue as a primary treatment plant for wet weather flows only, beginning in A new secondary treatment plant in the Interbay area Golf Park site would be constructed. Areas of growth would be served by new inland plants with local effluent and sludge reuse possible. Advanced waste treatment would be provided at new North and South Lake Sammamish plants. A new secondary plant at Kenmore would discharge treated effluent to Puget Sound. Environmental Impacts The primary direct and secondary indirect impacts of each alternative are described in categories in the physical, biological and human environments plus natural resources and energy. The major effects of each alternative are summarized below. Alternative A - No Action Alternative A, which would continue sewerage service to the present sewered population but provide no new service or capital improvements, would have comparable impacts in as existing conditions. Bacterial levels would probably continue to exceed standards for swimming Lake Washington and shellfishing Carkeek Park and Alki Beach in some areas. Eelgrass beds at Alki, important in herring production and local

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

fisheries, could be affected by combined sewer overflows and inadequate dilution at the existing outfall. In Puget Sound, the discharge of solids, metals, toxicants, and other materials would continue at present rates. Although effects as measured to date from present discharges have been very minor, the possibility of subtle, long-term impacts must be considered. The site impacts on regional park lands or residential areas would continue. Alternative A would not comply with the secondary treatment requirements of PL , but the implementation of this alternative is not realistic. It is evaluated merely to show the consequences of no action. Energy consumed by continued operating practices at West Point, Alki, Carkeek Park and Richmond Beach would be 24 million kilowatt-hours per year, approximately equivalent to the energy consumed annually by homes. Capital costs would not be incurred under Alternative A. Combined sewer overflow increases over present conditions of 36 percent to some inland waters would produce localized adverse water quality impacts in waters Lake Washington and Ship Canal used by migratory and resident fish. Construction of the second Kenmore interceptor could possibly adversely affect salmon spawning areas in a portion of Lake Washington. An indirect impact would be a three-fold increase in discharge from the Renton plant to the Duwamish River, which could adversely affect migrating fish. Shellfishing areas would be less subject to contamination at Alki, due to improvement in the outfall. For Puget Sound, discharge of primary effluent would add more materials that could adversely affect water quality, such as solids, oxygen-demanding materials, bacteria, nutrients and toxicants. Long-term impacts of this discharge are difficult to ascertain, based on limited data, but could be detrimental to Puget Sound. The site impacts would be approximately the same as in Alternative A, since only minor improvements would be made at plant sites. Localized moderate-to-major benefits to migratory fish routes and spawning areas would result. However, the discharge of an expanded Renton plant to the Duwamish would have adverse impacts on migratory fish. In addition, the discharge to the Duwamish estuary from the proposed Duwamish wet weather plant could add pollutants to the area, which is already stressed for fish and other biota by oil, grease, ship wastes and poor flushing characteristics. Some shellfishing conditions and public health protection at Alki would improve with the improved outfall there. In Puget Sound, enhanced primary treatment would result in a 20 percent reduction in solids loads relative to Alternative B. However, solids loads to Puget Sound would remain approximately as under existing conditions; an increase in flow would be counteracted by a corresponding decrease in solids concentrations. Therefore, water quality improvements due to Metro discharge are not anticipated. Construction impacts for the CSO holding tanks and regulator stations could cause temporary disturbances such as noise, odor and traffic disruption. However, once facilities are operational, impacts would be negligible. Because no substantial changes would be made at the treatment plants, they would still exist in or near parks that provide regional recreational opportunities. Socioeconomic impacts of constructing a new plant in the Duwamish have not been determined yet, but are being studied by Metro. Energy use would be 36 million kilowatt-hours per year, equivalent to consumption from residential units. Alternative C does not comply with the PL requirements for secondary treatment. Consequences could include penalties and ineligibility for grant funding. Lake Washington, in particular, would benefit in localized areas from combined sewer overflow reductions of 83 percent. This was judged as a moderate benefit to salmon spawning areas. A 50 percent combined sewer overflow decrease to the Ship Canal should benefit migrating fish. The Alki outfall improvement would probably benefit nearby shellfishing areas. The treatment plant sites would remain as they are now with little change in the on-site facilities for the chemical storage and additional equipment used in enhanced primary treatment. Plants at West Point and Carkeek Park would continue to exist near regional park lands. Energy consumption would be approximately 34 million kilowatt-hours per year, equivalent to the consumption for residences. This alternative would not comply with the secondary treatment requirements of PL , with possible consequences on penalties and funding. Alternative E - Secondary Secondary treatment would reduce the solids loads and corresponding metals, oxygen-demanding materials, toxicants, and other contaminants to Puget Sound by over 70 percent compared to Alternative B. Although the exact impacts of this reduction are not known, it appears to be beneficial from the standpoint of subtle,

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

long-term effects. In addition, this alternative makes little change in combined sewer overflows, which could have localized adverse effects on salmon spawning and beach areas in Lake Washington, plus migratory fish routes in the Ship Canal. Improvements to the Alki outfall could benefit shell-fishing and eelgrass beds there. Constructing the Kenmore parallel interceptor could possibly destroy salmon spawning areas in a part of Lake Washington by siltation. The site impacts would include 12 acres of shoreline fill needed at West Point and expansion of Alki into neighborhood baseball fields. Energy requirements for secondary treatment would be higher than primary or enhanced primary. Annual energy consumption would be 87 million kilowatt-hours, equivalent to residential connections. This alternative would comply with the secondary treatment requirement of PL. Timing requirements of the NPDES permit dated June 14, include completion of the Facility Plan and EIS by June 30, followed by development of a compliance schedule for design and construction to meet the required date for completion of best practicable treatment facilities. This discharge would be approximately 26 percent larger in terms of flow than the present West Point discharge. Information on existing conditions off Alki is limited, so more studies are needed before exact impacts can be determined there. A preliminary conclusion is that nutrients from secondary effluent could influence the size of plankton blooms near Restoration Point. Removing the Renton effluent from the Duwamish River would be beneficial in terms of nutrients, dissolved oxygen and migratory fish routes. Alternative F would also reduce combined sewer overflows to inland waters by about 30 percent, a minor improvement to fish spawning areas and migratory routes. Metro is currently studying the Duwamish area for more information. Some plants in or near parks West Point, Carkeek Park would remain, but the Alki plant would be abandoned in Energy use would be 81 million kilowatt-hours per year, comparable to the requirements of residences. Alternative F complies with the secondary treatment requirements of PL. The compliance schedule would be developed after June as discussed previously. Some impacts on Elliott Bay from the new Interbay outfall could be expected. Effects of combined sewer overflows on freshwater would also be the same as in Alternative E.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 4 : Seattle Neighborhoods: Montlake -- Thumbnail History - calendrierdelascience.com

A public meeting to learn more about the Ship Canal Water Quality Project and a public hearing on the Draft Supplemental EIS will be held on October 18, from p.m. to p.m. at the Lake Washington Rowing Club, N Northlake Way, Seattle, Washington.

Coast Guard on August 29, The Final EIS includes a number of components: The Green Line is proposed to use traditional monorail 1 technology, which would consist of linked train cars straddling an elevated guideway beam that provides electric power to run the vehicle. Green Line trains would run on rubber tires that are locked onto the beam and would be operated automatically and not require drivers. The proposed mile-long Green Line would be constructed in City of Seattle public right-of-way and on separate right-of-way that would be acquired by the SMP. The Seattle Popular Monorail Plan, which was adopted in August by the Elevated A monorail is a form of elevated street railway mass transit use. Alternatives that do not conform to that Green Line description with respect to the technology to be used, the general route to be followed, or the general vicinities of station locations are not evaluated in the EIS because the SMP does not have authority or funding to pursue such alternatives without voter approval. Prior environmental review and planning evaluated an extensive array of alignment, station location, and technology alternatives. Following the approval of Petition No. The Green Line also proposes modifications of the existing high-rise West Seattle Bridge, which may need a bridge permit from the U. March 25, Volume 68, Number 57 Notices, p. The Green Line would provide a safe, speedy, and reliable transportation alternative to travel on congested city streets and highways through a grade-separated mass transit system that would allow passengers to travel efficiently above the traffic on the streets below. Planning for the Green Line has been based on adopted City and regional land use and transportation plans as well as on the expressed desires of Seattle citizens. As traffic congestion in Seattle worsened during the s, both Seattle citizens and the City of Seattle government explored options to provide increased mobility and an alternative to congestion see Section 4. Future demand would not be adequately addressed by existing types of service, and transit modes evaluated should be those that would not need to operate in traffic Seattle Transit Study for Intermediate Capacity Transit, City of Seattle strategic planning office, November With these findings as a basis and with study of neighborhood plans, transit routes and service levels, and congestion levels, the Intermediate Capacity Transit Study identified five corridors out of a total of 47 routes that were studied as feasible for intermediate-capacity transit. Each of these corridors was found to present unique characteristics that suggested the need for higher-capacity transit than was already being provided by existing transit modes. At the same time, Seattle citizens, through Initiatives 41 and 53, asked City government to consider monorail to meet in-city intermediate- capacity transit needs. Monorail was proposed as a way to provide safe, speedy, reliable mobility that would provide an alternative to congested streets by operating on an elevated guideway that was separated from the roadway. The ETC conducted a several-year planning process that included extensive citizen consultation and exploratory visits to functioning monorail systems around the world. Following its analysis, the ETC concluded that monorail could be cost-effective to construct and viable to operate in Seattle and recommended a five-line, citywide monorail system that would be initiated with the Green Line, which would incorporate portions of two of the seven recommended intermediate-capacity transit corridors. Potential routes along the Green Line corridor were evaluated during in the Seattle Popular Transit Plan Programmatic EIS, which led to the selection of a general monorail route that was submitted to Seattle voters in November and approved for implementation. This analysis was continued over the course of through an extensive community involvement process as well as detailed engineering, environmental, operational, and design work. Coast Guard and that analyzed alternatives for alignments and station locations for the Green Line. The comments received, and responses to those comments, are included in Volumes 5 and 6 of this Final EIS. A summary of comments is included in Chapter 6 in Volume 1A. The system carried nearly eight million riders in its first six months and earned back its

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

construction costs in just five months. Four decades later, the system is still in operation, one of very few transit systems to support operations without a subsidy. As transportation needs increased in Seattle and the surrounding region, both local and regional comprehensive plans emphasized the need for a multimodal transportation system that would encourage transit, walking, and bicycling as alternatives to the automobile. Seattle citizens, through the initiative process, began exploring monorail as a potential mode of transit that could provide an alternative to traffic congestion. In , monorail supporters launched Initiative 41, which proposed an X-shaped, mile citywide monorail system. The initiative passed with 53 percent voter approval and created the ETC, which was formed as a Public Development Authority to plan the monorail system. Initiative 53 specifically required the ETC to propose a specific plan and funding for an initial monorail line to be considered by Seattle voters. The Plan outlined a conceptual mile, five-line citywide monorail system and proposed the Green Line as a first stand-alone monorail line. The Seattle Popular Transit Plan Programmatic EIS included an evaluation of the alternatives and significant environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the full citywide plan as well as from alternative routes for the Green Line. This corridor would extend from Ballard and West Seattle to Downtown. A route along this corridor, the Green Line, would be developed first, as Phase I of the citywide monorail system. The citywide plan in the Seattle Popular Monorail Plan also included the following additional corridors, which were described at a conceptual level in the Plan: Connection hubs to transit service across Lake Washington to Bellevue and Kirkland via SR or future ferry service could be provided. This corridor could connect to Lake City, allowing for linkages to out-of-city systems to the northeast. This corridor could provide future links to the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and other destinations to the south. The Green Line corridor was selected in the Seattle Popular Monorail Plan to be the first monorail line to be built following an extensive public consultation process and further analysis of transit and transportation options for the five potential monorail corridors. The Green Line was identified as a corridor that could serve not only Downtown Seattle but also a number of other key, high-traffic destinations including the stadiums, Seattle Center, Key Arena, Pike Place Market, the ferry terminal, and the intermodal transit hub at King Street Station. In addition, the Green Line could serve two residential communities, Ballard and West Seattle, that depend on increasingly congested bridge connections to the Downtown core and which, in the case of West Seattle, could face significant congestion impacts from earthquake-related improvements to a key roadway, the Alaskan Way Viaduct. From north to south, the major route alternatives examined during included: More detail on the alternative stations, routes, Operations Center, and operating requirement assumptions used for the analysis of the Green Line route alternatives is documented in the Seattle Popular Transit Plan Programmatic EIS. Funding for the Green Line also includes planning activities for a potential second monorail phase. All funding for design and construction of future monorail phases must be submitted to Seattle voters for approval. Future phases are not the subject of this Green Line EIS, which focuses specifically on alternatives to build and operate the Green Line, although these phases are discussed in Section 4. The Green Line has been proposed as an independent, stand-alone transit system that would serve tens of thousands of passengers a day and provide service to key Seattle destinations and communities, as well as connections to a variety of transit modes, including bus, light rail, commuter rail, ferry, bike, foot, and auto. Although the Green Line is envisioned as part of what would ultimately become a citywide monorail system, it would function independently of other potential future monorail lines and as such is not dependent on future decisions to propose or fund a second or subsequent phase of the monorail system. SMP is governed by a nine member Board of Directors, led by an Executive Director, and supported by staff, technical consultants, and volunteers. Notice was also published in the Seattle Times, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the Daily Journal of Commerce, and a number of community and local newspapers. During the EIS scoping process, six public scoping community workshops were held at the locations and dates below: In March , the U. An additional series of agency meetings was conducted during the initial public scoping period, and public comments were invited. All comments received were submitted to both SMP and the U. The Seattle Popular Transit Plan Programmatic EIS provided environmental review for the citywide plan,

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

including the selection of the Green Line as the first monorail corridor to be implemented, and evaluated route and station vicinity alternatives for the Green Line. The Green Line Draft EIS evaluated a defined project-level proposal for the Green Line, including a detailed analysis of the alignments, stations, and related facilities proposed to be built and operated. A day comment period ran from August 29 to October 14, and a public hearing was held on September 29, at the Seattle Center Northwest Rooms. Written and oral comments were received from individuals; community groups; institutions; non-profit organizations; businesses; the City of Seattle; and federal, state, regional, and local agencies during the comment period. A summary of the comments is provided in Chapter 6. Volumes Five and Six include a copy of each of the comment letters, emails, and the hearing transcript followed by responses to each of the comments. EPA stated, "[w]e strongly support the project purpose and need to provide a safe and reliable mass transit alternative to travel on congested city streets and highways and to better link the Seattle neighborhoods through which the proposed monorail passes. Consistent with these provisions, the City of Seattle, when it reviews future Green Line project applications, may consider the extent to which probable significant adverse impacts could be mitigated by its adopted Comprehensive Plan and development regulations, and other applicable governmental regulations. The Act requires federal approval for the construction of any bridge, dam, dike, or causeway over or in navigable waterways of the United States. Permitting and approvals for bridges under Section 9 has been delegated to the U. In order to fully consider the secondary and cumulative impacts of the proposed bridge permit, the scope of the U. The anticipated federal permits and approvals that apply to the Green Line are identified in the EIS fact sheet, and further discussed in the applicable environmental impact analysis sections. The Homeland Security Act of transferred the U. Coast Guard from the U. This transfer became effective on March 1, As a DOT agency, the Coast Guard was responsible for implementing Section 4 f of the Transportation Act of , which requires DOT agencies to perform a particular type of alternatives analysis for transportation projects that use any land from a public park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or any historic site. The Coast Guard will, nevertheless, ensure project environmental impacts on these resources are identified and assessed in the EIS, and appropriately considered before any final agency action on the project is taken. As noted above, a finding of need for a new form of intermediate-capacity transit within specific corridors was made by the City of Seattle. This finding was informed by a number of other evaluations of transportation needs, which included: It is an integrated land use, economic, transportation, and growth management strategy that includes the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required for federal funding for regional transportation improvements. Vision proposes a regional growth management strategy that includes identifying and maintaining urban growth areas, supporting compact communities, focusing growth in designated urban centers, and redeveloping urban transportation corridors. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which was updated in and is now called Destination see below , calls for a regional rapid transit system with local Seattle connections. The regional system would support higher densities, policies, and facilities to promote high-occupancy vehicle use and discourage the use of single-occupant vehicles. The plan provides guidance for major capacity investment decisions that are proposed to address regional transportation system needs. The PSRC developed a course to improve the transportation system to meet anticipated growth with systems and policies to support it. Intermediate-capacity service would connect neighborhoods, major destinations, and transit transfer stations. The study evaluated bus rapid transit, streetcars and trams, and elevated transit on a total of 47 potential routes, from which five corridors were identified as feasible for intermediate-capacity transit where new modes of transit could provide greater passenger-carrying capacity and reliability than buses operating in mixed traffic. Corridor and design hearings on the recommended alignment will be held before the SMP Board selects a final alignment.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 5 : F2d Save Lake Washington v. A Frank W W | OpenJurist

draft environmental impact statement Eight miles of man-made channels and inland bodies of water between Puget Sound and Lake Washington have been recorded as the Hiram M. Chittenden Locks and Related Features of the Lake.

A Frank W W F. Argued and Submitted Aug. Withdrawn and Resubmitted Feb. Decided April 13, Ever since the establishment of the headquarters in Seattle, NOAA officials have been concerned with the necessity from an economic standpoint to consolidate operations at a single facility. The Sand Point site currently lacks docking facilities of any type. While the passage of ocean vessels from Puget Sound to Lake Union is not an uncommon occurrence, such vessels rarely enter Lake Washington. Lake Washington is currently devoted primarily to recreational use by local residents. Shortly thereafter, plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction. The court ruled that the final EIS was deficient in its failure to discuss adequately alternative sites and for failing to discuss increased navigational hazards which would result from the passage of large vessels through Montlake Cut to Lake Washington. In November , the Director of the NOAA issued a decision memorandum in which he approved consolidation of the Seattle facilities at Sand Point and set out his reasons for doing so. Advertisement 8 In January , during the pendency of this appeal, the NOAA substantially altered its plans for consolidation of its facilities at Sand Point. The revised project will require moorage space to accommodate two NOAA vessels, rather than twelve vessels as originally planned. The supplemental EIS fails to address adequately the navigational risks associated with Sand Point;² The supplemental EIS fails to acknowledge and respond to responsible opposing views; ¹¹ 3. The decision to berth oceangoing vessels on Lake Washington is reviewable under the "arbitrary and capricious" standard. Standard of Review 13 Sitting as an appellate court reviewing an environmental impact statement which has received a clean bill of health from the district court, we deal with now-familiar principles. Warm Springs Dam Task Force v. The task of the district court is also a limited one. The correct standard is provided in the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U. It is to insure a fully informed and well-considered decision, not necessarily a decision the judges of the Court of Appeals or of this Court would have reached had they been members of the decisionmaking unit of the agency. Administrative decisions should be set aside in this context, as in every other, only for substantial procedural or substantive reasons as mandated by statute,.. NEPA does not require that the agency elevate environmental concerns over legitimate non-environmental considerations. In the words of an earlier Supreme Court decision, the agency must take a "hard look" at the environmental consequences. Sierra Club, U. An EIS need set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a "reasoned choice. The twofold purpose of an EIS is to " Specifically, SLW alleges that the risks have not been researched adequately in that no tests for slow-speed stopping of large vessels have been conducted, and that the adverse environmental impacts of an oil spill have not been fully investigated. The supplemental EIS contains a lengthy appendix which describes in some detail a study of navigational risks likely to be encountered in berthing at Sand Point. The NOAA includes an estimate of slow-speed stopping distances for its two largest vessels. The EIS further recommends as a portion of the "mitigation package" that slow-speed tests be conducted in order to provide additional information for vessel captains. The purpose of the proposed research was to mitigate the navigational risks by making such data available to the vessel captains, and not to postpone necessary preliminary research. In more general terms, SLW attacks the risk assessment for its failure to employ a "worst case" analysis. The EIS specifically notes that a "worst case" analysis was used, and nothing in the data presented suggests to the contrary. The SEIS does not contain any data on the size of spill that would be likely to result from a collision, nor does it discuss the effects of such a spill in detail; it states only that spills would be "difficult to contain and to clean up" and that fuels used by NOAA ships "are toxic to both flora and fauna. As we have noted above, the NOAA has abandoned this portion of its plan and now intends to berth its fleet outside of Lake Washington. The safety record of vessels traversing the Lake Washington Ship Canal, and the greatly reduced number of transits through the Montlake Cut that will be necessary now that the NOAA has altered its plans,

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

convinces us that the chance of a major oil spill is remote. A discussion of "remote and conjectural consequences," while possibly desirable, is simply not required by NEPA. This contention breaks down into two stages. The account of the passage is laid out in a footnote. The information presented was sufficient to provide the NOAA with a reasoned basis for making its decision. The primary complaint is that specific views were not represented in the supplemental EIS. The district court found that these summaries adequately conveyed the substance of the criticisms. The summaries sufficiently apprised the decision-maker of the opposition of certain officials to the project, and their reasons. Viewing the EIS as a whole, the agency had an adequate basis for evaluating the concerns of the land use jurisdictions affected by the Sand Point project. Again, the EIS has adequately taken into account similar views. The decision to locate at Sand Point 29 SLW invites us to overturn the decision to locate at Sand Point as being arbitrary and capricious. In so doing, SLW in effect asks that we evaluate as a substantive matter the decision itself. This we cannot do. In another context, this court has stated that: We cannot weigh the relative merits of one proposal against another, nor can we attempt to compare beneficial environment effects. We may only examine the decision for the requisite good-faith consideration of environmental facts as expressed in the EIS. Consequently, an opportunity for public review and comment on the Option Assessment was provided. There was an adequate basis for determining that the construction costs favored Sand Point. Property acquisition costs would appear to support a decision to place some or all facilities at Sand Point. Moreover, the Decision Memorandum summarizes briefly the extended discussion in the Option Assessment dealing with the Lake Union proposal. Based upon the content of the Decision Memorandum, we cannot say that the Director failed to make a good-faith, reasoned choice. The Decision Memorandum is not a document required by NEPA and need not contain a detailed discussion of all potential alternatives. We review it here only to satisfy ourselves that the Director did not act in bad faith. The ultimate conclusion that Sand Point is an appropriate site for NOAA facilities may well be a blunder, but we have served our purpose under NEPA by assuring that it was a "knowledgeable blunder. Brinegar, supra, F. We find that the Sand Point location decision was neither arbitrary nor capricious. See *Town of North Hempstead v. Village of North Hills*, F. We defer resolution of these issues for a case where they are more squarely presented. See WAC, Chapter The Region eventually adopted the Lake Washington Regional Shoreline Goals and Policies from which local jurisdictions were expected to develop their shoreline master programs. The Regional Goals and Policies contained an unequivocal statement against the expanded moorage of oceangoing ships on the lake. Following completion of the regional policy statement, the City of Seattle published the Seattle Shoreline Master Program "SSMP" , which did not include an express prohibition against moorage of large vessels. The SSMP, it is urged, must be read in a manner consistent with the regional planning policies even though it does not expressly prohibit moorage of ocean vessels on the lake. Under the regulations implementing the Coastal Zone Management Act, the federal agency must determine in the first instance whether a proposed project is consistent with the state program. In the event that the federal agency concludes that its proposed project is consistent with the state management program, it must then submit a "consistency determination" to the appropriate state agency describing the activity, its effects, and data to support the conclusion that the project is consistent. If the state agency fails to respond within 45 days, then the federal agency is entitled to "presume" that the project has been deemed consistent with the state program. The WDOE has promulgated somewhat similar guidelines which provide that if the WDOE determines that a project is consistent, then "nothing more will be done. At the time, the federal regulations on consistency determinations were not in force. According to one affidavit filed by D. The Director of the Seattle Department of Community Development responded positively to the consistency determination in a letter dated October 10, We concur with the district court. Where procedures to resolve potential federal-state disagreements over matters affecting the jurisdiction of both have been established, we should be reluctant to set aside determinations made pursuant to those procedures absent a compelling reason to do so. The Mack affidavit discloses that regard was given to the merits of the Sand Point project. Any doubt that a federal agency is required to obtain a substantial development permit prior to undertaking a project in

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

the State of Washington is dispelled by the state regulations implementing the Shoreline Management Act. WAC provides inter alia that: The first specific mention of the substantial development permit issue in the record appears in a memorandum addressed to the magistrate on February 7, The point was more fully argued in a pair of subsequent memoranda addressed to the district judge, with a rejoinder to the contention filed by the NOAA on April 9, The district court found that it would be unfair to consider the argument because it had been raised for the first time over one year after the NOAA had undertaken to cure the defects in the first EIS. As the briefs in this case have amply demonstrated, an allegation of "inconsistency" under the Coastal Zone Management Act is a wide-open argument which involves an examination of a number of different federal, state, and local regulatory schemes. Moreover, the complaint does not allege a violation of WAC. Consequently, even under our liberal standards of pleading, the complaint was inadequate to give notice of the substantial development permit issue. Rule 15 b provides in pertinent part that: See *Bobrick Corporation v. Layrite Products Company, F.* It is clear that an attempted amendment causing prejudice to the defendant can be rejected by the trial court. *United States, F.* Given the length of this litigation and the ample opportunity which SLW had to press the development permit issue, we find no abuse of discretion. We also note that while NOAA did not formally object to the raising of the question before the district judge, neither did SLW formally move to amend its pleadings. The district court acted properly.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 6 : Print Land Use Notice - Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

The Green Line would include a new bridge, crossing the Lake Washington Ship Canal (near the existing Ballard Bridge), which would require both a bridge permit from the Coast Guard and an environmental review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Early real-estate promoters chose the name Montlake to summon up bucolic images of lakes and mountains, the better to sell lots. What had been an important transportation corridor, with several villages in the area, for Lakes Duwamish people became a placid urban neighborhood -- dubbed by one history of the neighborhood an Urban Eden. Construction of SR in the early s doomed a large swath of the community for right-of-way, and also sliced the neighborhood in two and despoiled parts of the shoreline. Planned widening of SR scheduled to begin in will bring further changes to the built and natural environments. Prior to the completion of the Montlake Cut, Foster Island was composed of two smaller islands and a submerged low spot between the two islands. When the lake level fell after the completion of the Montlake Cut, the formerly submerged area was exposed, and the two small islands became one larger island. Despite its cultural significance, for a short time in the s Foster Island apparently contained a sawmill. Waterman pinpoints the portage point as "just south of where the present canal is cut. I am informed that a little creek drained out of Lake Washington, up which the boats were pushed as far as they could be made to go, and then carried them the remainder of the distance on their shoulders. Waterman collected another Lushootseed name for the area now immediately north of Montlake Playfield: A canoe portage, which was controlled by a local group known as the hloo-weelh-AHBSH, was located just south of the present-day Montlake cut After Lake Washington was lowered in , these marshes became exposed and desiccated" Cultural Resources Assessment Discipline Report, The marshy area north of Washington Park was filled with material excavated during construction of the Montlake Cut. Between about and , this area also served as a municipal landfill known as the Miller Street Landfill. Further dredging in this area occurred during the construction of the Arboretum in the mids and during construction of State Route These environmental changes made it difficult for Native communities to continue fishing, hunting, and gathering in the Montlake area. Additionally, the Lakes Duwamish were pushed out of their traditional homes by the treaties signed at Medicine Creek and Point Elliott and the City of Seattle charter, adopted in , which prohibited Indians from living within the city limits. Just two Indian families, the Zakuse family and Cheshiahud and his wife Madaline, lived on small farms on Portage Bay into the late s and early s. Platting and Neighborhood Development Land survey records dating from January indicate the presence of an Indian Trail between the eastern shore of Union Bay and the western shore of Portage Bay at about the location of modern-day SR This would have been a portage route for watercraft, since it was the narrowest portion of what was prior to the completion of the Lake Washington Ship Canal in unbroken land separating Lake Union and Lake Washington. The idea that a canal would one day link Lake Union with Lake Washington seemed obvious to early settlers. Because of this, the land near that predicted canal was valuable. This plat contained the foot-wide strip that would later become part of the Lake Washington Ship Canal. By , all of the land that would eventually compose the Montlake neighborhood had been claimed by three men: The land including the future Montlake neighborhood was incorporated into the City of Seattle in Development of what would become the Montlake neighborhood started in , with most of the housing stock constructed between and The area east of 24th Avenue was intended to be most exclusive. Seattle real-estate investor H. Turner filed a plat for the H. Turner Park Addition in Twin brothers Calvin and William Hagan b. As property was purchased and divided by those who purchased it, street names assigned to the area multiplied. Some of these named streets ran only a block or two before changing names. In the late s, the Seattle City Council standardized street names throughout the city, resulting in many streets -- including some in Montlake -- being renamed. The Seattle Yacht Club was established in and has been located at its current E Hamlin Street site just southwest of the Montlake Cut since It features a clubhouse and moorage for boats.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Montlake neighborhood has rich associations with beloved Seattle boating events, including Opening Day ceremonies on the first day of boating season each year. The annual Windermere Cup named to honor its sponsor, a Seattle real-estate company is a rowing competition held in the Montlake Cut on Opening Day, and draws thousands of spectators, rain or shine. Lake Washington Ship Canal Construction of the Lake Washington Ship Canal between and , seemingly inevitable once non-Native settlement had begun, was decades in coming. Harvey Pike, who had taken the land between Lake Washington and Lake Union in payment for painting the Territorial University, began digging a canal there in but as recounted by Seattle historian Clarence Bagley "soon found the task much greater than he originally conceived it and ceased work. In , a shallow foot-wide cut regulated by locks known as the Portage Canal was constructed between Union Bay and Portage Bay. Designed to ease the process of transporting logs between timber and sawmill operations, the Portage Canal used the natural difference in water levels between Lakes Union and Washington: The canal is dredged to 30 feet, and is feet in width. Waterside trails abut the canal. The Montlake Bridge is designated a City of Seattle landmark, and has been placed on both the state and national registers of historic places. A small portion of land originally reserved for the Lake Washington Ship Canal but not used -- the canal was located farther north instead -- still remains north of SR behind the houses facing East Hamlin Street. This was the site of the original log canal between Lake Union and Lake Washington. Dredging and straightening the Montlake Cut produced soft mud and sand that was dumped in nearby shallow water, altering the marshy shoreline. Between the s and the s, fill from dredging and later from construction of SR was deposited in what is now the Montlake Playfield. Streetcars Beginning on May 30, , the Montlake neighborhood enjoyed streetcar service. On September 8, , the name of the line was changed to Montlake. With the opening of the new Montlake Bridge in , the line was extended over the canal and around the Stadium Loop; [from the route continued along] 43rd Street, W. The line was abandoned on February 10, Thereafter Montlake was served by trackless trolleys and later by King County Metro buses. Metro bus service, although much more extensive than the old streetcar service, still travels over some of the same route. As of , Metro Routes 43 and 48 duplicate the streetcar route as they travel through central Montlake. Montlake residents petitioned the Seattle School Board for their own school, and in , the school board purchased the city block bounded by 20th and 22nd avenues N and E Calhoun and McGraw Streets. In , Montlake children began attending classes at Portage School, a temporary portable building on that site. A second portable was added in . Seattle voters approved a tax levy that same year to erect a permanent Portage School building, among several other schools. The renamed Montlake School replaced Portage School in , serving first through seventh grade the first year and through eighth grade thereafter. Kindergarten students were welcomed beginning in . Since , the school has offered Kindergarten through fifth grade. As of , children attend Montlake Elementary. In the s and s, houseboats moored there, and Dahlialand, a local garden store, utilized nearby acreage to grow dahlia bulbs for commercial use. The playfield was expanded in the early s when material dredged for construction of the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge was dumped along its edge. The Montlake Community Club, founded in the early twentieth century as the Interlaken Improvement Club, is a cohesive group of neighbors and volunteer community activists who have worked together over many years to protect their neighborhood. The bulk of the property was deeded to the city as a gift, and further parcels were bought until , when the purchase of Foster Island completed the park. Under the agreement, the university designed, constructed, planted, and managed the arboretum and botanical garden in Washington Park. The Olmsted Brothers firm drew up a formal plan for the arboretum in March . More than workers employed by the WPA carried out construction of the arboretum between and . The arboretum and its waterways include Marsh and Foster islands. The Highway Department now Washington State Department of Transportation condemned more than 40 acres of Washington Park for the SR right-of-way, and dredged the wetlands around Marsh and Foster islands extensively. Marsh Island is the considerably smaller island located west of Foster Island. Before construction of the Lake Washington Ship Canal and Hiram Chittenden Locks in lowered the water level on Lake Washington, the north and south portions of Foster Island were separated by water. Lake Washington

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Boulevard winds through the Washington Park Arboretum between the Montlake neighborhood and the northern edge of the Madison Park neighborhood. The boulevard enabled visitors to travel to the fair via a scenic route, and carried a new streetcar line that provided access to the fair from downtown. The plat of the Montlake neighborhood deeded acreage to the city for a park amenity. Trails In , a waterfront trail was constructed on floating piers through Marsh and Foster Islands, physically connecting the islands with the Arboretum. Another heavily used public amenity of the Montlake neighborhood is the Bill Dawson Trail. Libraries In , a small private lending library opened at 23rd Avenue N now E. The Seattle Public Library provided the books and staff. In , The Seattle Public Library took over the lease on the station. This station branch moved into the former soda fountain next door at 23rd Avenue N now E in McGraw Streets, developed mainly in the s. Early twenty-first century businesses include a coffee shop, mini-market, antique shop, and several restaurants. Other important businesses that are part of the Montlake community include St. The Boyer clinic opened in as Dr. Wyckoff Spastic Pre-school and Clinic. The facility served children with cerebral palsy and other neuromuscular disorders. The current two-story, 13, square-foot building at Boyer Avenue was designed by Ibsen Nelsen and the Fred Bassetti group, and opened in . The airy, modern building was designed by noted northwest architect Paul Thiry , and housed the collection of the Seattle Historical Society founded in and later the Seattle Maritime Historical Society. A circular drive led to a covered walkway, through which visitors could access the building. The setting was a park-like mix of formal plantings and open space. Although workable from the exterior, this change greatly altered flow within the building. MOHAI made do, adding an auditorium facility, and the museum remained a feature of the neighborhood. This location takes MOHAI -- and its 70, annual visitors -- from a largely residential neighborhood to the densely urban neighborhood of South Lake Union. Freeways The construction of SR in cleaved the Montlake neighborhood in two. In addition to cutting the neighborhood in two, SR construction also physically cut away at the land comprising the Montlake, North Capitol Hill, and Roanoke neighborhoods.

DOWNLOAD PDF LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Chapter 7 : Full text of "Seattle Monorail Green Line Final EIS"

modifications to the Lake Washington Ship Canal (including the Chittenden Locks, Shilshole Bay, and surrounding Lake Washington basin) for the purposes of water conservation and ecosystem restoration.

Environmental Protection Agency, and the U. Specifically, the Plan would achieve the following objectives: Identify areas of Seattle where projects are needed to reduce combined sewer overflows. Evaluate alternatives for reducing combined sewer overflows in these areas. Identify additional areas where projects to reduce stormwater pollution would improve water quality. Recommend a schedule for designing and constructing projects. Estimate program costs and associated impacts on SPU customer bills. Consider regulatory, public and stakeholder input. These projects are currently funded and are scheduled for implementation, and they will occur regardless of whether the Plan is implemented. The City would also continue to implement a portion of two of its CSO reduction strategies: However, the City would not implement any additional projects to further reduce CSOs or reduce stormwater pollution. Long-Term Control Plan Alternative: The City must address these CSOs to protect public health and the environment, and comply with the Clean Water Act and state regulations. Any of these four options would meet the Plan objectives. The options were developed under one of two basic concepts: The options vary in terms of the number, size, and potential location of storage facilities considered. The Integrated Plan Alternative includes control of all remaining uncontrolled CSO outfalls and reduction of stormwater pollution. Stormwater runoff is a major contributor to surface water quality issues. The objective of the Integrated Plan is to implement stormwater pollution management projects that would provide greater benefits to surface water quality than those provided by the LTCP CSO reduction strategies alone. The Integrated Plan represents a more comprehensive approach to water quality management by integrating stormwater pollution management with CSO reduction strategies. However, the City would delay the completion of some of the CSO control projects until , while high-benefit stormwater treatment technology projects would be completed prior to For example, smaller flow diversions could become small storage tanks. An Integrated Plan is an optional approach that is not required, but can be used to satisfy the Consent Decree. Identification of a preferred alternative is expected to occur following release of the Final EIS in late As individual projects are identified, site-specific environmental review will be conducted prior to implementation. Depending on the preferred alternative and the amount of time needed to obtain regulatory approval of the Plan, some projects and actions would be ready for site-specific environmental review starting in Timing of Construction Construction of the projects in the selected alternative would occur from through LTCP Alternative or from through Integrated Plan Alternative. Construction would be followed by post-construction monitoring to confirm the CSO outfalls are controlled.